level. At present, therefore, it would seem that the issue has yet to be settled and is not resolved by an ex cathedra statement.

Apart from the question of whether clinical procedures are effective or not, one must still face the fact that resources are limited. Presumably it will always be necessary to choose between competing projects or forms of expenditure, and the demonstration of the clinical effectiveness of a technique is thus only a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for it to be recommended for implementation. Doctors working in the specialty may not be content about this state of affairs, but the ultimate objective must surely be the optimum allocation of resources throughout the whole NHS and indeed the entire economy.

M H MILLS

Public Sector Economics Research Centre,
University of Leicester,
Leicester

¹ Allan, R, and Dykes, P, *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*, 1974, 20, 154.

² Morris, D W, et al, *American Journal of Digestive Diseases*, 1975, 20, 1103.

³ Sandlow, L J, et al, *American Journal of Gastroenterology*, 1974, 61, 282.

⁴ Hoare, A M, *British Medical Journal*, 1975, 1, 27.

Craniopharyngiomas

SIR,—We would like to comment upon one point in your leading article (3 July, p 5).

In referring to our paper¹ you rightly state that in craniopharyngioma concomitant strabismus may occur as a presenting feature, a fact recorded also by Wybar.² It is, however, misleading to imply that the onset of such squints is characteristically sudden. Any form of non-paralytic squint can present suddenly, but an unobtrusive onset is much more common. This holds good in craniopharyngioma.

The possibility that direct involvement of the visual path may be providing a visual obstacle to binocularity and so initiating a concomitant deviation should be remembered in every case of squint in a small child. The presence of optic atrophy or of a sluggish pupil should be excluded.

HUGH B KENNEDY
R J S SMITH

Institute of Neurological Sciences,
Glasgow

¹ Kennedy, H B, and Smith, R J S, *British Journal of Ophthalmology*, 1975, 59, 689.

² Wybar, K, *Annals of Ophthalmology*, 1971, 3, 6, 645.

Sexual problems clinic

SIR,—As one who dealt tremulously with a few of the patients with sexual problems not treated by our Oxford sexual problems clinic in 1974-5, I must express relief at the modesty of the results claimed by my colleague, Dr John Bancroft, and Mrs Lesley Coles (26 June, p 1575).

This modesty may not be apparent either in the tables provided or in the claim, valid in itself, for "substantial benefits for two-thirds of those receiving treatment"—presumably based on table IV, which shows 53 (68%) in successful outcome or worthwhile improvement. But this 68% is of a total of only 78, while the sample studied was of 200. How comes this? For a start table IV omits altogether 19 patients (2 women, 17 men) whose problem is stated in table III as "others" and

Successful outcome	Worthwhile improvement	No worthwhile improvement	Dropped out	Given advice only	Not yet completed	Undisclosed "others"	Refused or inappropriate
29(14.5%)	24(12%)	10(5%)	15(7.5%)	2(1%)	15(7.5%)	19(9.5%)	86(43%)

whose outcome is as undisclosed as their exact problem. We need to know more about them and about the two given advice only: what advice and why only advice? Then there are a further 15 (9 women, 6 men) still receiving treatment or on the waiting list. To them must be added the 86 (43% of the whole sample) who, for reasons given in the text, refused or were refused treatment. Of the total sample, the outcome was successful in only 14.5%, and with improvement worthwhile in 12%, making a total ameliorated cohort of 53 (26.5%), a quarter of all.

All this could have been seen at a glance in the accompanying table if it had been included in the paper. May not this more modest presentation conduce to clear understanding?

SEYMOUR SPENCER

Oxford

*.*We sent a copy of this letter to Dr Bancroft and Mrs Coles, whose reply is printed below.—Ed, BMJ

SIR,—Dr Seymour Spencer is, of course, free to interpret our results in whatever way he chooses, but it is not clear to us what point he is trying to make. The issue is not whether we should be awarded a prize for the best results but whether the time and effort put into therapy is justified by the outcome.

When estimating outcome we can see no purpose in including those who were not treated, any more than those who were referred but did not attend. The reporting of outcome, as we noted, is in any case a difficult matter and our estimates must be regarded as crude. For this reason we confined the reporting of outcome to those patients with common types of sexual dysfunction. We are not concealing information which would alter the message we are hoping to convey, which, briefly stated, is that: (a) nearly half the patients seen in such a clinic reject or are not considered suitable for our methods of treatment; (b) of those who are treated, a sufficient number, in our opinion, benefit to justify the expenditure of time and the use of these treatment methods; (c) considering the extent to which treatment was carried out by inexperienced therapists, better results could be expected with more therapeutic experience; (d) the work load generated by such a service is relatively small and for a comparable area would probably require no more than six or seven sessions of therapist time per week.

JOHN BANCROFT
LESLEY COLES

University Department of Psychiatry,
Warneford Hospital,
Oxford

Hazards of modern competitive tennis

SIR,—The recent matches at Wembley have suggested two points of medical interest.

Firstly, with the advent of high-speed service there are risks of serious injury to people on the server's side of the net, especially the server's partner, spectators at the courtside,

and the net monitor. The latter—often elderly—sits with bowed head on his hands folded on the post top.

It has been estimated that in expert hands a service ball attains 140 mph (225 kph). A direct hit at this speed on the right target could produce instant death; death following intracranial haemorrhage; ruptured ear drum or eyeball; or detached retina. As there is no reason to believe otherwise, speeds will increase. Protection of side seats by wire screen is obvious. The umpire and net judge could be protected by wearing motorcycle helmets. An electronics expert could easily arrange a visual or audible signal to show that the ball has hit the net cord; it seems odd that in this age the game can depend on a man laying his skull on a net post. I suppose expert players carry insurance for third-party trouble; there could be some hefty claims.

Secondly, during the games we were frequently annoyed by the insanitary habit of a very prominent foreign competitor who filled his mouth with liquid and then spat it out in a stream at the feet of his opponent. And this in a club where permission to remove jackets in a heat wave has to be requested!

E M R FRAZER

Bretby Village,
Nr Burton-on-Trent

Extrinsic allergic alveolitis

SIR,—It is indeed disappointing that our two papers^{1,2} are not mentioned in your leading article on this subject (3 April, p 791). Two points are unsatisfactory in your article. The first one relates to the simple test of detection of precipitating antibodies. Although indeed this may provide evidence of exposure to antigen, this can usually be obtained by taking the history. The point is that precipitating antibodies do not distinguish between asymptomatic exposed individuals suffering from other respiratory disease and symptomatic patients with extrinsic allergic alveolitis.

You then go on to refer to the not fully understood immunological mechanisms. In our publication¹ we were able to show clearly that although precipitins were in fact present in symptomatic individuals with pigeon breeders' disease, lymphocyte transformation in vitro was clearly a valuable test in the distinction of those patients with allergic alveolitis. This implied therefore that cellular mechanisms may be more important than the classic Arthus reaction as previously suspected. This relatively simple laboratory technique, we feel, becomes an important diagnostic test in allergic alveolitis.

RONALD PENNY

Department of Immunology,
St Vincent's Hospital,
Darlinghurst,
New South Wales, Australia

¹ Hansen, P, and Penny, R, *International Archives of Allergy and Applied Immunology*, 1974, 47, 498.

² Penny, R, *Medical Journal of Australia*, 1974, 1, 979.

*.*We agree, as we pointed out, that the presence of precipitins does not necessarily