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Managing self poisoning

Gastric lavage is perhaps more important in developing countries

Editor—In their clinical review of recent advances in the management of self poisoning, Jones and Volans briefly discuss gastric lavage and state: “many clinical toxicologists rarely use this method now.” The impression given could support the abandonment of gastric lavage. This could be particularly deleterious in developing countries.

In developing countries, poisons consumed are commonly toxins such as organophosphorus compounds and aluminium phosphide, and thus mortality is high. The organophosphorus compounds are usually consumed in liquid form. In such cases of poisoning, prevention of absorption of even a small amount may make a considerable difference. Furthermore, antidotes to poisons and intensive care may not be available. Any intervention, such as gastric lavage, which can be carried out easily cannot be neglected. The value of gastric lavage depends on the amount, toxicity, and effect of the poison and the time since consumption. Its role in certain cases should have been highlighted.

Madhur Dev Bhattacharjee postgraduate teacher Department of Medicine, Bir Hospital, Kathmandu, Nepal

Gastric lavage is now seldom performed. With this loss of training opportunity for new staff, the skills needed to perform the procedure safely may be lost, with the result that it may not be performed in the few patients in whom it remains indicated.

Clearly, the sooner activated charcoal is given the better. It has been given successfully in the prehospital setting. This is probably the best way, and in many cases the only way, of administering it in the one hour time frame that clinical toxicologists recommend.

Although the authors suggest a carboxyhaemoglobin level of > 40% as an indication for hyperbaric oxygen therapy, another recent review has suggested a much lower (> 20%) level as an indication for this therapy.

Unlike other authors, Jones and Volans do not include pregnancy as a special indication for hyperbaric oxygen therapy. The fact that two recent publications in journals from the BMJ Publishing Group should give different recommendations for managing important aspects of such a common problem illustrates the divergence of opinion in this area and the problems faced by accident and emergency staff while making decisions.

These issues need to be clarified, and consensus guidelines relevant to the realities of ingestion have already been implemented in many accident and emergency departments, gastric lavage is now seldom performed. With this loss of training opportunity for new staff, the skills needed to perform the procedure safely may be lost, with the result that it may not be performed in the few patients in whom it remains indicated.

Incidentally, there is no evidence showing that clinical toxicologists recommend oxygen is far from proved then surely we must consider it seriously in all patients on the grounds of common sense, or we must not use it at all on the grounds of evidence. Incidentally, there is no evidence showing selective benefit in those patients who have been obtunded, and to preach such a qualification is unjustified.

I welcome evidence based medicine wholeheartedly but can’t help smiling when I encounter authorities making clearcut recommendations … up to a point—the point after which they get cold feet.

Dilip D'Cruz visiting consultant in emergency medicine Accident and Emergency Department, Khoula Hospital, Muscat, Oman


Guidelines for accident and emergency departments are needed

Editor—In their review on the management of self poisoning Jones and Volans suggest that decontaminating the gut by gastric lavage or administration of activated charcoal be carried out within one hour of ingestion of the toxin.1 In practice, however, it is rare for such patients to present at an accident and emergency department and to be assessed within one hour of ingestion. There are many reasons for this, including patients’ delay in seeking help, transportation time to hospital, and triage category. The average time from receipt of an emergency call to arrival at hospital is 38 minutes for all patients in the West Midlands area (5 Edwards, West Midlands Ambulance Service, personal communication). Additionally, the standard UK triage system assigns asymptomatic poisonings to category 3 (to be seen within one hour of arrival).1

As similar recommendations on time since ingestion have already been implemented in many accident and emergency departments, gastric lavage is now seldom performed. With this loss of training opportunity for new staff, the skills needed to perform the procedure safely may be lost, with the result that it may not be performed in the few patients in whom it remains indicated.

Common sense makes no sense

Editor—Although Jones and Volans’s article updating doctors on the management of poisoning is welcome and informative, I was a little bemused by the contradictions in it.1

We are told that gastric lavage should not be used unless two criteria are met: it should be used within an hour of ingestion of the poison, and the amount of toxin should be substantial. Though these criteria are repeated often in the literature there is no evidence to support either of them. The literature indicates only that there is no difference in outcome when gastric lavage is repeated often in the literature there is no evidence to support either of them. The literature indicates only that there is no difference in outcome when gastric lavage is performed. With this loss of training opportunity for new staff, the skills needed to perform the procedure safely may be lost, with the result that it may not be performed in the few patients in whom it remains indicated.

We are told that gastric lavage should not be used unless two criteria are met: it should be used within an hour of ingestion of the poison, and the amount of toxin should be substantial. Though these criteria are repeated often in the literature there is no evidence to support either of them. The literature indicates only that there is no difference in outcome when gastric lavage is performed. With this loss of training opportunity for new staff, the skills needed to perform the procedure safely may be lost, with the result that it may not be performed in the few patients in whom it remains indicated.

We are told that gastric lavage should not be used unless two criteria are met: it should be used within an hour of ingestion of the poison, and the amount of toxin should be substantial. Though these criteria are repeated often in the literature there is no evidence to support either of them. The literature indicates only that there is no difference in outcome when gastric lavage is performed. With this loss of training opportunity for new staff, the skills needed to perform the procedure safely may be lost, with the result that it may not be performed in the few patients in whom it remains indicated.
in accident and emergency departments need to be drawn up. This should ideally be done by a joint working party of UK toxicologists, prehospital care providers, hyperbaric therapy clinicians, and accident and emergency clinicians.

Mehmood Chaudhry  
specialist registrar in accident and emergency medicine  
Heartlands Hospital, Birmingham B9 5SS  
mehmoodchaudhry@talk21.com

Rakesh Khanna  
specialist registrar in accident and emergency medicine  
Manor Hospital, Walsall WS2 9PS


Indications for the use of whole bowel irrigation are weak

Editor—I was surprised to see in Jones and Volans’ review of management of self poisoning the headline advice that when a potentially lethal amount of a drug is not adsorbed by activated charcoal, whole bowel irrigation with polyethylene glycol solution is recommended.†

One of the references cited is the American Academy of Clinical Toxicologists/European Association of Poisons Centres and Clinical Toxicologists’ position statement on whole bowel irrigation. The position statement reports a thorough review of the literature and appraisal of the data concerning whole bowel irrigation (WBI) and states: “There are no established indications for the use of WBI… The use of WBI for the removal of ingested packets of illicit drugs and in the management of patients who have ingested substantial amounts of poisons not adsorbed by activated charcoal is also of theoretical benefit.” This seems a weak foundation for such a strong recommendation of a procedure that is not without complications.

Michael Trumble  
specialist registrar  
Department of Therapeutics and Pharmacology, Queen’s University of Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN  
g.m.trumble@qub.ac.uk


Body packers need careful treatment

Editor—We support most of Jones and Volans’ recommendations concerning the management of self poisoning, which have been reached using an evidence based approach.‡ However, we think that their suggestions for managing self poisoning among drug couriers who have ingested packets of drugs (body packers) are based on anecdotal case histories and contradiect most of the published literature. Some of these suggestions may be dangerous.

Methods of drug smuggling are becoming increasingly sophisticated, which has led to the development of packaging that is more tolerant of gastrointestinal transit. Breakdown of packages is now thought to be relatively rare. Most authors therefore recommend a conservative approach to body packers who have no symptoms.§

Although there are reports of success, we do not recommend endoscopic removal of packages from the stomach or colon owing to the considerable danger of perforation on capture. With the average package of cocaine containing 10 times the median lethal dose, perforation is likely to be fatal.

The use of whole bowel irrigation and laxatives is more controversial and needs more controlled research. However, Caruana et al report a series of 50 patients treated with mineral oil without a single instance of a package degradation. Visser et al cast doubt on the use of mineral oil in their report of a single case, but their patient had shown signs of cocaine toxicity before the oil was given, which suggests that the packet was already starting to degrade.¶

In conclusion, we recommend a conservative approach to treating body packers with no symptoms. Endoscopy is contraindicated and surgery should be reserved for those with delayed transit, bowel obstruction, or signs of toxicity or passage of damaged packages.

John Hollingsworth  
specialist registrar in accident and emergency medicine  
University Hospital Aintree, Liverpool L9 7AL


Poisons database is still not on the NHS net

Editor—A couple of points about Jones and Volans’ clinical review: Firstly, ketamine is not just a veterinary anaesthetic but is still available in most operating theatres.

Secondly, it is appalling that a poisons database is still not on the NHS net. The guidelines are exactly that—guidelines and not protocols. The lack of an evidence base behind the bowel irrigation guidelines may reflect limited experience of the procedure, but it is a potentially important advance in treating patients with overdose of slow release formulations or substances that do not bind to charcoal. We wanted to raise awareness of whole bowel irrigation and to indicate when we, as clinicians, would consider using it in our patients, though clearly more data collection is needed to show efficacy. Whole bowel irrigation may offer a new conservative approach to treating body packers. Sadly, there are still sudden deaths from packages that rupture, and, as Hollingsworth and Jones point out, the need for removal must be judged by risk assessment. When signs of toxicity are developing, such as cocaine toxicity, the need for urgent removal is pressing and the risk assessment strongly favours removal of the packet.

When our article was submitted to the BMJ, TOXBASE was not available on the internet. It is now available at www.phiax.com.co.uk. We contribute to updating TOXBASE and strongly support its use as a first line in helping to answer poisons inquiries.

Alison J Jones  
consultant physician  
Glyn Volans  
director  
National Poisons Information Service, Gyu’s and St Thomas’s NHS Trust, London SE14 5ER
Differentiating between audit and research

Undue protection of patient confidentiality jeopardises both research and audit

Erratum—Wilson et al have highlighted an important double standard that distinguishes clinical research from audit.1 While researchers are obliged to struggle for ethical approval to examine patient records,2 auditors seldom have to, even though they may be temporary, non-medical staff without a long term professional commitment to respect patient confidentiality.

The protection of confidentiality is clearly essential in each activity, so we would expect both to be affected equally by the implementation of the Data Protection Act (1998) this month. Unfortunately, it seems that identifiable information about patients, and access to their records, can be obtained only with their explicit or implicit permission. The extent to which the act will require protection of both anonymised and patient identifiable data will affect, and even perhaps jeopardise, epidemiological research, audit, and therefore clinical governance. Even the BMA’s stringent contemporary guidelines on this issue have been deemed insufficiently protective and therefore unlawful.3

Gone will be the days of carefully considered guidance from working parties with strong lay membership, which have advised that, “research involving access to medical records, registers, or existing biological samples only, without direct patient contact or involvement, is not considered to require individual patient consent or independent ethical approval provided explicit consent to access a patient’s records is obtained either from the official custodian of those records or from the patient’s clinician.”4

This kind of well intentioned protection of patients will inevitably wreck epidemiological research. Furthermore, if the same rules are applied, we cannot see how meaningful audit or clinical governance can ever happen. For example, the interpretation of “league tables,” or even early warning of another Bristol, would be impossible without ready access to routine patient records, both in primary and in secondary care. The cost to society of hampering timely medical research and audit must surely outweigh the risk of bona fide researchers and auditors endangering patient confidentiality. The uncertainty surrounding access to patient records is causing great confusion, contradictory guidelines, and fear of litigation and is making clinical research even more difficult than it already is.

Charles P Warlow professor of medical neurology
Rustam Al-Shahi MRC clinical training fellow
Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Western General Hospital, Edinburgh EH4 2NU

Clinical audit is research

Erratum—In their paper Wilson et al write: “Our experience shows that consensus is lacking on the definition of research and audit.”1 They are right. A dictionary defines research as “a careful search; investigation; systematic investigation towards increasing the sum of knowledge.”2 The nearest it comes to a medical definition of audit is “a calling to account generally; a check or examination; a periodical settlement of accounts.”3 The best current definition is probably Wilson et al’s: “Perhaps the most helpful distinction (between research and audit) is about motivation and the objectives of the project: audit has the objective of directly improving services against a standard; research may include the objective of defining best practice.”4

Not everyone may agree with Wilson et al, which is why we wrote to the BMJ in 1997.5 Our journal Anaesthesia, in its notice to contributors, had introduced a new hurdle: “Prospective ethics approval should be acquired for papers based on clinical audit data.”6 Partly as a result of our letter, we believe, and partly from the subsequent correspondence in the columns of BMJ, Anaesthesia removed the hurdle. That does not mean that the journal was entirely convinced by the arguments. Nor does it mean, as is clear from Wilson et al’s paper, that health authorities and ethics committees up and down the land are less confused now than they were then.

Taking the dictionary definitions of research, it is plain that clinical audit has to be, must be, research. The remaining question is whether an audit is ethical. Since the Clinical Audit Committee of the BMA seems to have taken upon itself responsibility for ethical issues in audit,7 perhaps it should look once again at the problem and find a definitive and non-politically correct solution which might satisfy scientists, writers, editors, and literary pedants.

P V Scott consultant
Department of Anaesthetics, Alexandra Hospital, Redditch, Worcs B98 7UB

Authors take issue with commentary on their paper

Erratum—We commend the development of the BMJ’s guidelines on educational interventions, which were used to assess our paper.8 At several points in Ker’s commen-
Mortality prediction model is preferable to APACHE

Entror—In their article on scoring systems in intensive care, Gunning and Rowan provide a detailed description of the APACHE II mortality prediction model.1 This model was developed with data collected between 1979 and 1982 and was replaced by APACHE III in 1991.2 Unfortunately, there is a substantial charge for using APACHE III; thus, many intensive care units continue using the outdated APACHE II, but do you really want to compare your standard of care with that delivered by North American units 20 years ago?

There are several other problems with APACHE II and APACHE III. Firstly, they use the worst value of several physiological variables (such as blood pressure and heart rate) in the first 24 hours in intensive care to calculate each patient’s risk of dying. Any score that uses data collected over 24 hours is affected by the quality of care provided3— the very thing that units are trying to assess. Patients mismanaged in a bad unit will have higher APACHE scores than similar patients managed in a good unit, and the bad unit’s high mortality will be incorrectly attributed to its having sicker patients.

Secondly, using the worst scores in 24 hours gives a spurious impression of accuracy;4 many deaths occur during the first 24 hours in intensive care, and during this time the score is diagnosing death rather than predicting it (it is not difficult to detect that something is wrong with a dead patient).

Thirdly, the worst scores in 24 hours depend on the method of data collection, being about 25% higher with continuous computer monitoring than with manual recording.5

Fourthly, collecting the worst value of 15 variables over 24 hours is difficult; either a disproportionate amount of work goes into collecting the information (which reduces the resources available for more creative research) or, as often happens, it is collected inaccurately or is not collected at all.

The mortality prediction model uses data collected during the first hour after admission to intensive care.6 It was developed by Stanley Lemeshow, professor of biostatistics at the University of Massachusetts, who coauthored one of the standard texts on logistic regression. The model has been derived and tested on over 19 000 patients in Europe and North America and is free.7 For children, the paediatric index of mortality model uses data obtained at the time that a child is admitted to intensive care,8 and it too is free (http://pedscm.wust.edu/clinical/pim-readme.html).

The mortality prediction model has substantial theoretical, practical, and financial advantages over the APACHE model for use in adults in intensive care.

Frank Shann director of intensive care Intensive Care Unit, Royal Children’s Hospital, Melbourne 3052, Australia

Reports by development and evaluation committees are undoubtedly a valuable contribution to the evaluation of available treatments and the rational provision of health-care resources. The quality of the report from which the conclusions are drawn must be scientifically sound. Using the development and evaluation committees’ own criteria for scientific validity of data, is it time that the committees’ reports are peer reviewed before publication?

Nick Bosanquet professor of health policy
Health Policy Unit Division of Primary Care and Population Health Sciences, Imperial College
School of Medicine, Department of Primary Health Care and General Practice, London W2 1PG
n.bosanquet@ic.ac.uk

Keith Fox professor of cardiology
University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH3 9AG

3 Nicholson T, Steinitz K. Low molecular weight heparins (dalteparin and enoxaparin) compared with unfractionated heparin for unstable angina and non-Q-wave myocardial infarction. Southampton: Wessex Institute for Health Research and Development, 1999. (Report No 95.)

Reply by members of committee

Editor—Bosanquet and Fox’s criticisms of the development and evaluation committee’s conclusions1 and report2 on low molecular weight heparins are without foundation.

The authors make much of the omission from the report of the one year follow up data from the ESSENCE trial.1 True, electronic searching failed to identify Fox’s paper, published with an uninformative title and after we had searched the relevant database. But we also had contact with enoxaparin’s manufacturers and with experts in the field, none of whom mentioned the paper. It is unlikely that its inclusion would have made a material difference: the report already indicated that enoxaparin was probably less costly and more effective than unfractionated heparin, even if its benefits lasted for only 30 days and not one year. Furthermore, it is incorrect to say that no abstracts of Fox’s paper were included: one was (reference 24), but because of past criticism this committee has decided to use data from abstracts only in sensitivity analyses. We make no apology for this caution.

The committee’s discussion of the report in March 1999 was annotated. The final “not proved” conclusion took account of the whole range of evidence presented in the report and was formulaically derived from the committee’s decision grid.3 The committee recognised that important new evidence was expected soon and so earmarked the report for early review.

Bosanquet and Fox have oversimplified the correspondence since June 1999. Once the ESSENCE follow up data4 were identified and their implications agreed, an addendum was prepared (published on the committee’s website (www.hta.nhswwwbhs. uk/rapidhka/) and circulated with new copies of the report) and a full update was scheduled. After discussion with the NHS Executive it has now been decided to withdraw the original report. The committee will consider the update in the next few months, as originally planned. We reject the assertion that this dialogue has not been handled appropriately.

With regard to the final suggestion about peer review, all of the committee’s reports are shown to several (named) experts in the field for their guidance and comments before being finalised and presented to the committee.

Bosanquet and Fox comment on the value of development and evaluation committee reports in providing decision makers in the health service with rapid but systematic reviews on the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of treatments. The handling of this report and of its criticisms show not the weaknesses but the strengths of the system.

Bruce Campbell chairman of development and evaluation committee (South East and South West regions) Vascular Surgery Department, Royal Devon and Exeter Healthcare NHS Trust, Royal Devon and Exeter Hospital (Wonford), Exeter EX2 5DW
Ken Stein consultant in public health medicine North and East Devon Health Authority, Barnstaple EX31 1RW

Ruaridh Milne visiting senior lecturer in public health medicine Wessex Institute for Health Research and Development University of Southampton, Southampton SO16 7PX
R.Milne@wotton.ac.uk


Author’s reply

EDITOR—I agree with Fickling and Bhalla that it would be inappropriate to screen all patients with osteoporosis for coeliac disease. The statement in the review that “all patients” should be screened is overenthusiastic and should be amended to read “all patients with unexplained osteoporosis.” Because of the high prevalence of coeliac disease, in particular clinically silent disease, I believe that patients with unexplained osteoporosis should be screened for coeliac disease even when there are no additional clinical clues pointing towards coeliac disease. We screened 371 female patients with suspected, but unexplained, osteoporosis and confirmed coeliac disease in five patients; two further patients were persistently positive for endomyosal antibody but refused small intestinal biopsy. The findings have been submitted for publication.

Conleth Feighery professor of immunology Department of Immunology, St James’s Hospital and Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 8, Republic of Ireland

Osteoporosis and coeliac disease

Screening all patients with osteoporosis would be inappropriate

EDITOR—In his review of coeliac disease Feighery comments on the high incidence of osteoporosis in coeliac patients and says that this may be a presenting feature.1 He goes further to recommend, however, that all patients with osteoporosis should be screened for coeliac disease by measurement of endomysial antibodies. Most patients with osteoporosis do not have coeliac disease, and it is our experience that it is unusual for such patients to present without some other feature of coeliac disease. In their survey of 92 patients with osteoporosis Lindh et al comment that none of those patients found to have coeliac disease had intestinal symp- toms, but one mentioned a history of anaemia.2 Such a proposal would have considerable implications for resources, both in the cost of the assays and in the substantial number of patients that would require referral to the gastroenterologists for intestinal biopsy. We suggest that screening for coeliac disease be reserved for when unexplained osteoporosis presents in association with anaemia or low serum concentrations of calcium in permanently tired premenopausal women and men aged 60 years who have a family history of coeliac disease or any gastrointestinal symptoms.

W E Fickling research registrar Royal United Hospital, Bath BA1 3NG
W.Flicking@btinternet.com

A K Bhalla consultant rheumatologist Royal National Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases, Bath BA1 1RL


Hospital of the future

Health economics may be misleading

EDITOR—I close observer of the NHS ... might be forgiven for thinking that the debate about the concentration of acute hospital services has been driven more by the needs of NHS managers and the medical professions than by the needs of the local populations that they are supposed to serve.2 As director of the York Health Economics Consortium, he explains that the apparent logic of rationalisation and mergers is not supported by the evidence. He argues that service planners would do well to give more prominence to the importance of ensuring that hospital services are local and easily accessible.

Fine words, but what about the rationalisation in Liverpool that followed the consortium’s recommendations in 1992? In their review of accident and emergency and related acute services for Liverpool Health Authority, the economists confidently pre-
dicted that efficiencies in health care would reduce the number of beds needed by 500. Moreover, by combining these efficiencies with predictions of diminishing health needs in a dwindling population, they concluded that, by 2001, Liverpool and its neighboring districts would require up to 1000 fewer beds. Their case was supported by speculation that comprehensive care in the future would be more often delivered by general practitioners and—despite fierce opposition by local people and their doctors—it was accepted. The consequences have been dire. For want of beds anywhere in Liverpool, patients in the new “super” emergency department now routinely wait for 24 hours or more in conditions that make everyone miserable and angry. Even heroic efforts by the staff have not prevented care for many being seriously compromised.

The crisis here—as in so many other parts of the NHS—results primarily from undue reliance on untested health economics and prompts a number of questions. If transparent, evidence based practice and accountability are required of clinicians, should they not apply to health economists? The answer would matter little if this government—like its predecessors—did not so clearly depend on health economists to justify its policies. Indeed, much of the hostility towards doctors originates with the privileged health economists of York. Doctors’ requests for a cautious approach to NHS reforms are treated with scorn, but when will health economists render themselves accountable for the effects of their prescriptions?

L C Luke consultant in accident and emergency medicine Royal Liverpool University Hospitals, Liverpool L7 8NX cluke@rluh-tr.nwest.nhs.uk

Seasonality of birth in children with diabetes

Results of various studies differ

Entror—Rothwell et al have found evidence for seasonality of birth in children with diabetes from Great Britain but not elsewhere. They do not, however, give ascertainment estimates for the centres participating in the study. Consequently, selection bias may play a part in their results, particularly in the centres with low case ascertainment.

Although this is a large multicentre study, the authors have not analysed the pooled data. They point out that sample sizes from many centres were too small to provide enough power for the seasonality of birth in these children to be assessed. It would be interesting to know if the analysis of the pooled data still showed a significant pattern.

The authors have previously shown evidence of seasonality of birth in children with diabetes in Scotland, Yorkshire, and England and Wales. In contrast, the current report shows no evidence for this effect in children born in England and Wales, although the chi-square value is greater than the one quoted in their previous paper. It is difficult to reconcile these two sets of data.

Rothwell et al also state that a similar pattern has been found in the Netherlands. The authors who reported the study there found that more boys with diabetes were born in April, May, and November but did not find an effect either for girls or for boys and girls combined. In contrast, Rothwell et al report a significant seasonal pattern of birth, with a peak in early summer and a trough in winter.1 The pattern in Britain is clearly different from that in the Netherlands.

We have examined this phenomenon by the same methodology in our local register, the Cornwall and Plymouth children's diabetes register. Children diagnosed with type 1 diabetes under the age of 16 were enrolled in our register, with 94.4% ascertainment. The analysis was of 417 children with diabetes born between 1970 and 1995. Our results showed that no significant seasonality exists in the south west of England (χ2 = 4.05, df = 2, P = 0.13). This result is in line with results from Sardinia1 and some other European countries but is contrary to the results presented by Rothwell et al. In our opinion, the evidence derived from such registers and its support for the environmental cause of childhood diabetes need to be assessed further.

Hongxin Zhao research student H.Zhao@plymouth.ac.uk

Andrew G Demaine senior lecturer B Ann Millward consultant diabetes MRC Molecular Medicine Research Group, Plymouth Postgraduate Medical School, University of Plymouth, Plymouth PL6 6BX

Maternally transmitted infection might increase risk of diabetes

Entror—Rothwell et al write that further studies are required to determine whether abnormal seasonality of birth exists in childhood diabetes. Studies have been done in Israel,3 China,4 and Japan,5 but the authors seem not to be aware. These studies support the hypothesis that in populations with a higher incidence of type 1 diabetes a maternally transmitted infection to the fetus or newborn infant increases the risk of their developing diabetes.

Zviaron director WHO Collaborating Centre for the Study of Diabetes in Youth, Endocrinology and Diabetes Research Unit, Schneider Children’s Medical Centre of Israel, Petah Tikva 45920, Israel laron@clalit.org.il

Rationing certainly exists in treatment for cancer

Editor—I sympathise with the views given in the news item by Woodman about the report by the Campaign for Effective and Rational Treatment1 and the letter by de Takats:2 funding for both supportive treatment in cancer and cancer chemotherapy is inadequate in the NHS. In my own field of haematological oncology, decisions are made daily that deny either the most effective agents or those with fewest side effects solely on grounds of cost. It is no longer true (if it ever was) that the patient in front of me will receive the best care that I am capable of delivering; rather, he or she will receive the highest quality of care that is possible given what is affordable within the directorate.

Bisphosphonates to prevent bone disease in myeloma are a case in point. Two studies have shown their clinical efficacy.1,3 Their widespread use in my unit will cost an additional £75 000 a year. This has been identified as a substantial cost to our principal purchasers, who, while agreeing to their use, cannot provide additional funding. This results in the absurd situation where we ask sympathetic general practitioner colleagues to prescribe bisphosphonates, although the NHS financial burden would probably be less if they were prescribed by the hospital.

There are numerous other areas where we as doctors ration access to optimum treatment on grounds of affordability and conspire not to tell patients. In my own field the other drugs most frequently withheld are serotonin antagonists (for emesis), haematopoietic growth factors, purine analogues, rituximab, and liposomal amphotericin. I do not agree with Glynn-Jones that it is not “primarily a question of money”:4 in my directorate it most certainly is. Despite constant vigilance our pharmacy budget has a projected overspend of £60 000 (annual budget £670 000) and there is considerable pressure within the trust to contain expenditure.

Those of us working in oncology have recognised for years that rationing exists in the NHS. I hope that some of these contentious areas may be resolved by definitive guidance from the National Institute for Clinical Excellence, although I doubt that such guidance will result in the release of additional funds. In the meantime should we not be more honest with our patients?

Donald W Milligan
consultant haematologist
Department of Haematology, Birmingham Heartlands Hospital, Birmingham B9 5ST milligdl@heartsol.wmids.nhs.uk

Distress symptoms may be easy to miss

Editor—MacQuoqoudale’s young woman with a wart on her nose was trying to transmit a distress signal on an unusual wavelength.5 Whenever I hear of a suicide, especially an unexpected one, I wonder whether one of us in our profession failed to receive, or recognise, such a signal.

The suicide I have had on my conscience for 45 years was of a young man, an immigrant to Australia from central Europe. I had taken out his acutely inflamed appendix a few months before and had got to know him a little during his convalescence, so my failure to recognise his problem was all the more inexcusable.

He wanted to see me on a day when I was frantically busy. Everything seemed to be happening at once—two women in labour; an accident at a nearby factory, with several men needing stitches; and a waiting room full of patients. His complaint was that he couldn’t get a date with a girl he was attracted to and thought he must smell. I saw him in the hall, not my office, and was brusque, telling him not to bother me with such a trivial problem when he could see how busy I was. He turned and walked quietly away.

Next morning I was called by the police, wanting to know what he had seen me about. He had a receipt from the receptionist for an office visit on the previous afternoon, and had high on his shoe the barrel of a rifle in his mouth and pulled the trigger. I knew instantly what a terrible wrong I had done him, but no amount of lamentation could restore him to life.

I hope I never again failed to recognise distress signals transmitted on unusual wavelengths. In my teaching of medical students I have often told this story of my terrible mistake.

John Last
everus professor of epidemiology
University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON K1H 8M5, Canada
jmlast@uottawa.ca

1 MacQuoqoudale DW. A memorable patient: The young woman with a wart on her nose. BMJ 1999;319:1345-6 (20 November)

Centralisation of cancer services in rural areas has disadvantages

Editor—Smith describes “disproportionate time and energy” being spent in “a battle over surgical services” in Dumfries and Galloway.1 In our rural practice of 2700 patients 32 cases of cancer were identified over 2.5 years. When travel to local services was excluded the 32 patients travelled on average 1479 km—over 20 hours by private car. Eleven died of their disease over that period and travelled an average of 1880 km, taking nearly 30 hours. No one chose ambulance transport, but six had to rely on it as their sole method of transport and three used a mixture of ambulance transport and private car. One 84 year old patient who was receiving radiotherapy described a 7.5 hour one way journey by the patient transport service from Edinburgh to Stranraer. Even by car this would have taken over three hours.

Patients who died survived an average 165 days, of which 22 days (13% of their remaining life) was spent travelling or in remote (by rural perspective) hospitals.

One third of Scotland is regarded as rural. Proposed centralisation of cancer services’ places an extra burden on patients already frail from cancer or the effects of treatment. Will they benefit? Extrapolating our figures to the Wigtownshire district suggests that 482 900 km of patient travel occurs a year and 5800 inpatient days are spent in a cancer hospital more than three hours’ travel from home. Four people from Stranraer have been killed in traffic accidents while visiting relatives in the past 15 years.

Solutions include developing and improving use of community resources; better personal communication and cooperation between specialists and general practitioners; block clinic bookings, allowing transport to be shared; and mobile facilities for imaging, investigations, or treatment. Patients travelled to Edinburgh rather than Glasgow for treatment (an extra 113 km) for reasons that did not seem to be patient centred. Telemedicine seems to have made little impact on travelling.2

Rural patients suffer the financial penalty of having to travel large distances. This is compounded by social and emotional deprivation caused by separation from home and friends. They have to balance spending 13% of their remaining life in a distant and lonely hospital against benefit from unpleasant and painful treatment. Visitors find the travel expensive and inconvenient.

Where cancer services are provided locally the uptake of treatment increases.3 If equity of access is important4 then where such barriers to treatment exist and services are made less, not more accessible, we have to strain to be optimistic.

1 Smith R. The NHS in Dumfries and Galloway: straining but not optimising. BMJ 1999;319:1352-7 (22 October)