Galway series			Aberdeen series		
Age (years)	HLA-A	HLA-B	Age (years)	HLA-A	HLA-B
44	2, 3	27, 40	41	1, 9	8, 12
49	1, 3	7, 8	53	2, 3	7
34	11, 3	7, 12	53	3	7, 12
53	1, 3	7, 14	53	3	7, 14
56	1, 3	7, 15	61	3	7, 40
56	3	7	58†	3	7
68*	3	7	28†	3	7

*Haemoderosiderosis. †Father and son.

The results from the Irish and Scottish series are shown in the table. (The French results cannot be similarly presented.) Striking though they are in themselves, they involve such small numbers that many further series will be needed to settle the issue one way or other, especially as most of these too will, unavoidably, be small and as there was no excess of B7 as such in the French series.

W G SHEWAN
S A MOUTAT
T M ALLAN

Blood Transfusion Centre,
Royal Infirmary,
Aberdeen

1 Simon, M, *et al*, *Nouvelle Presse Medicale*, 1975, 19, 1432.

2 Bodmer, W F, *National Cancer Institute Monographs*, 1973, 36, 127.

Medical aspects of North Sea oil

SIR,—With reference to the report by a working party set up by the Scottish Council of the BMA¹ may I draw your attention to one or two erroneous statements?

It is stated in the report (p 10) that "Although a diver can breathe compressed air down to a depth of 50 m he will require a mixture of oxygen and helium for a greater depth. At more than 50 m the nitrogen in the air becomes narcotic and must be replaced by another inert gas." This is technically incorrect as compressed air can be breathed down to 90 m (300 feet) although at this depth narcosis makes it impractical to use. The reason for the 50-m limit on air is the Offshore Installations (Diving Operations) Regulations 1974, which impose this limit (article 14). While it is desirable to have this limit, this depth is exceeded sometimes on units not covered by the regulations and I myself have often dived to 76 m on air in the Royal Navy.

Of greater importance is the definition on p 11 of "bounce" diving. To state that the time limit at 150 m is "no longer than 10 minutes" is completely erroneous, as our company has tables in use which allow 30 minutes at 500 feet (152 m) and 600 feet (182 m). One of the other leading companies has tables that allow 120 minutes at 550 feet (167 m) and 60 minutes at 600 feet. Decompression for these divers is of course considerably longer than the five hours quoted, but they certainly do not fall into the "saturation" classification.

Also the decompression time quoted for the "saturation diving" definition is unrealistic—"after such saturation for a week at a level of 200 m, the diver will require a fortnight for decompression—a severe restriction." One of the slowest decompression profiles for saturation is the US Navy schedule. Even on this procedure decompression from 200 m (656 feet) will take only 186 hours (7 days 18 hours),

which is vastly different from 14 days. We also have faster profiles which would allow safe decompression from this depth in either 100 hours 30 minutes (4½ days) or 80 hours (3½ days). The shorter of these procedures is generally used only in emergencies due to pulmonary oxygen toxicity problems, but to quote 14 days is way out. The prospect of this type of decompression expectation could well deter prospective members of hyperbaric medical/surgery teams.

Finally, "the belief that the surgical team should go to the diver," while emphasised by medical people at a recent conference in Aberdeen, is a view which we in the diving fraternity, in certain circumstances, would question.

R H HOLLAND

Safety Officer
(Eastern Hemisphere)
Oceanengineering International Services Ltd,
Aberdeen

¹ British Medical Association Scottish Council, *Report of the Working Party on the Medical Implications of Oil Related Industry*. Edinburgh, BMA, 1975.

Tertiary syphilis and acute vertebral collapse

SIR,—In a recent leading article (20 December, p 669) you cite Ghosh and Holt¹ as recently describing vertebral collapse in association with tabes dorsalis. The detailed case report as published by them was, on inspection, extremely familiar—so familiar, in fact, that I am in no doubt that it had originally been published some five months earlier² by two of the clinicians involved in the management of this patient's acute cauda equina compression.

While duplication of case reporting must inevitably occur as the number of journals available proliferates, it is perhaps unfortunate that you were possibly unaware of the initial report of this unusual, but treatable, cause of vertebral collapse and paraplegia. It is also necessary to point out that while the histology of the area of the collapsed lumbar vertebra showed many features of chronic inflammation, the pathologist was unable to state that this was definitely a gumma, although we did suggest that on the evidence this was by far the most likely diagnosis.

I do feel that it is not unreasonable to expect that you should consider at least all United Kingdom publications (which might be relevant to the chosen subject) before writing what is, after all, meant to be an authoritative review for those in the profession less familiar with that particular subject than you should be.

RICHARD W GRIFFITHS

Regional Plastic and Jaw Surgery Centre,
Mount Vernon Hospital,
Northwood, Middx

¹ Ghosh, A K, and Holt, S, *British Journal of Venereal Diseases*, 1975, 51, 349.

² Griffiths, R W, and Rose, M J, *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry*, 1975, 38, 558.

Role of community hospitals

SIR,—Dr K S Cliff (25 October, p 239) asks what is the role of the community hospital. The answer surely is that it is to meet certain restricted hospital needs on a local basis, to bridge the geographical and social gap between the larger and more sophisticated district general hospitals.

There is some agreement that such a hospital can successfully provide: (1) inpatient facilities for medical cases within the scope of a general practitioner staff; (2) preconvalescent care for local people discharged early from the DGH; (3) geriatric and terminal care for those who live in the vicinity; (4) specialist outpatient facilities, x-ray and a pathology collecting service; and (5) an "on-call" minor trauma service. In addition, the service to the local population can be greatly enhanced if a health or medical centre, with all the facilities that are associated with general practice, is physically part of the same complex. Such a hospital can often be staffed by nurses who are not willing to travel a long way to a more distant DGH and also by other less highly trained local people.

The only point upon which there seems to be a divergence of opinion is the question whether such a hospital should support general surgery. Most surgeons stress the waste of their time spent travelling, the duplication of expensive theatre equipment, and so forth. This is certainly an area that deserves independent cost/benefit study. So far as visiting is concerned I believe that the visiting of geriatric and terminal care patients assumes greater importance than in the case of acute and usually short-term surgical patients. It is also this class of patient to whom the "local" character of the hospital is most beneficial.

E O EVANS

Stratford-upon-Avon

* * Dr Evans sent a copy of this letter to Dr Cliff, whose reply is printed below.—ED. BMJ.

SIR,—I am in broad agreement with Dr Evans's comments, though one must express some concern that the community hospital should not be turned into an expensive convalescent and geriatric hospital. There is good evidence to show that some peripheral hospitals which could become community hospitals find difficulty in recruitment of staff because of the slow turnover and throughput through the beds due to their restricted use as a preconvalescent and geriatric unit.

While some surgeons may see the community hospital and the performance of surgical operations in it as a "waste of time," my paper did indicate what might happen to a district general hospital should that facility be withdrawn. As yet I have not seen the evidence in respect of the costings relative to surgery in a district general hospital and a peripheral hospital, nor the cost benefit that accrues to the general public as a whole in not having to travel anything up to 20 miles to receive a minor surgical procedure which could be adequately carried out in a community hospital. At this stage we are, of course, in the process of examining the role of the hospital practitioner grade in the NHS as a whole, and it would seem that surgical services are an area in which the hospital practitioner grade could play a fundamental role in the community hospital concept, where the population is large enough to warrant this.

While agreeing with Dr Evans in respect of items 1-5 in his letter, I think one must be careful in respect of statements regarding visiting geriatric patients in a local community, for evidence now suggests that because of the mobility of the population as a whole the elderly patient may have no surviving relatives at all in the community in which she