CORRESPONDENCE

Deaths and anaesthesia

- T B Boulton, FFARCS; P V Scott, FFARCS;
C G Heggs, MB; J M Manners, FFARCS;
J A W Wildsmith, FFARCS..... 730

Standard intravenous regional analgesia

- J I Alexander, FFARCS, and others; H
Weisl, FRCS; A W Fowler, FRCS; M S Pegg,
FFARCS; J R Bell, MB; Christine A Moore,
FFARCS; C W Pattison, MB..... 731

Training for general practice

- J D J Havard, MD, and D H Irvine, FRCP;
D Bracher, MB; B A Crompton, MB; Sir
Reginald Murley, FRCS..... 732

Water intoxication and oxytocin

- A M Smith, FRCOG..... 733

Wheezing, asthma, and pulmonary dysfunction 10 years after infection with respiratory syncytial virus in infancy

- R P Younes, MD..... 734

St George's University School of Medicine, Grenada: benefit or liability?

- G H Bourne, DSC; D L McLellan, FRCP;
N Sender, MD..... 734

Paraquat ingestion with methaemoglobinaemia treated with methylene blue

- A Yardley-Jones, FRCSed..... 735

Immune guided missiles

- A C Newland, MRCPATH, and D C Linch,
MRCP..... 735

Obstructive sleep apnoea syndrome

- D R James, MB; J Wallace, MB..... 736

Problems with perinatal pathology

- J M Kerry Bluglass, MRCPsych..... 736

A resurgent evil

- J C Anderson, MRCP; J Callander, MRCP..... 736

The NHS 1982

- D W Cairns, FRCS; R A Keable-Elliott,
FRCP..... 737

Prisoners' medicine

- R F Fisher, SRN..... 737

Action for victims of medical accidents

- Anne Savage, MB..... 737

Drug interaction with coumarin derivative anticoagulants

- A A Sharp, FRCP..... 737

Blood pressure and contraceptive use

- C R Kay, FRCP..... 737

Coronary disease

- W J Trowell, MB; R Finn, FRCP, and others..... 738

Should every survivor of a heart attack be given a beta-blocker?

- C Furberg, MD, and others..... 738

Letting intrauterine devices lie

- W G Mills, FRCOG; A J Eynon-Lewis, BSC;
Ann E Capewell, MB, and others..... 739

The health visitor and prevention

- June Thompson, SRN; Monica E Briscoe,
PHD, and A W Clare, MD..... 739

Childhood drownings in private swimming pools: an avoidable cause of death

- W O Tarnow-Mordi, MRCP, and R S
Money-Kyrle, MB..... 740

ABC of Diabetes

- A M Nussey, FRCP; G Williams, MRCP, and
others..... 740

Impact of maternal serum alpha-fetoprotein screening on antenatal diagnosis

- D C Hogg, MRCP..... 741

ZX81 epilepsy—a case for lumping

- P A G Sandercock, MRCP, and C P Warlow,
MD..... 741

Manpower proposals

- C K Connolly, FRCP..... 741

Medical unemployment

- J M Ioannou, LRCP..... 742

Chiropody and podiatry

- G C Jenkins, FCIS..... 742

More consultants, fewer juniors

- J S S Stewart, FRCS..... 742

Points Managing cerebral malaria (P E C

- Manson-Bahr and F I C Apted); Letting
intrauterine devices lie (Danielle B Freed-
man; Wendy L Jefferson); Give cyclists
room to move (C S Good; L R Moore);
Drug interaction with coumarin derivative
anticoagulants (D P Oakley); Anaesthesia
and manpower proposals (M D A Vickers);
Fees for cervical smears (J J Slome);
Temples, tubes, and plastic bags (J G
Fairer); Never on Sundays (H Jacobs);
Atropine poisoning in early infancy due to
Eumydrin drops (P A G M de Smet);
Rubella vaccination: persistence of anti-
bodies for up to 16 years (S C Arya); The
so-called Miller-Fisher syndrome: a mis-
nomer (C A McDowell); Dangerous cots
(C A K Bird); Effect of reduction of anti-
convulsants on wellbeing (D A A Primrose);
Management of extrapulmonary tuberculo-
sis (A O Robson); Hydralazine and
psoriasis (P Isaac); Unusual strychnine
poisoning and its treatment (R A Lawren-
son); St George's University School of
Medicine, Grenada: benefit or liability?
(T A Davies)..... 744

We may return unduly long letters to the author for shortening so that we can offer readers as wide a selection as possible. We receive so many letters each week that we have to omit some of them. Letters should be typed with double spacing between lines and must be signed personally by all their authors, who should include their degrees. We cannot acknowledge their receipt unless a stamped addressed envelope or an international reply coupon is enclosed.

Correspondents should present their references in the Vancouver style (see examples in these columns). In particular, the names and initials of all authors must be given unless there are more than six, when only the first three should be given, followed by *et al.*; and the first and last page numbers of articles and chapters should be included. Titles of papers are not, however, included in the correspondence section.

Deaths and anaesthesia

SIR,—The sadly anonymous author of your leading article on deaths and anaesthesia (21 August, p 530) displays considerably more common sense than some leader writers who have commented in the professional journals and lay newspapers on the recently published report *Mortality Associated with Anaesthesia*.¹ There is, however, one matter on which the record should be put straight.

Your leader writer refers to the fact that "half the deaths occurred in the ward on the day of operation" and later to the astounding fact that 20% of hospitals still do not have recovery rooms; he then states that this lack of provision is "yet further evidence of current

underfunding in the NHS." I have been an active campaigner for recovery rooms and intensive care units, to which the more serious postoperative cases should be sent for several days, in the various hospitals in which I have worked since the mid '50s. My enthusiasm being first kindled by experience as a senior registrar in pioneer recovery units at the University of Michigan and at Southend General Hospital under Dr J Alfred Lee. I am sorry to have to say that it is unfair to lay the blame for difficulty or failure in establishing such units wholly on financial stringency in the NHS. The primary reason has in fact often been lack of support or outright

opposition from medical disciplines other than anaesthesia and from senior administrative nursing staff. "My patients are better looked after postoperatively in my ward by my nurses than is possible in any intensive care unit," has been a typical ex cathedra declaration. How can such a statement be true if apart from any other advantage one considers the difference in nurse-to-patient ratio between a general ward and a well run recovery or intensive care unit? Administrative nurses have often been opposed to the formation of such units because of the very fact of the higher ratio of nurse to patient staffing required and have claimed at times that it was "not

possible to recruit nurses for this type of work." I have, however, known keen young nurses to be actively discouraged from working in intensive care units with "all that complicated dangerous electronic equipment."

The geographical separation of operating theatres has also been deployed as an argument against the provision of recovery rooms in some hospitals, but others have demonstrated that it is possible to overcome this difficulty if there is a will to do so. It may be that anaesthetists themselves are partly to blame for not refusing to work where recovery wards and intensive care units do not exist. It has, however, become almost traditional among medical staff in the NHS to do the best that they can in the prevailing circumstances and to be ever optimistic that persuasion rather than confrontation will bring about change.

I am now privileged to work in a district where the majority of the medical and nursing staff have long since recognised the need for and value to patients of recovery and intensive care units. I have great sympathy for those of my anaesthetist colleagues who still have to watch their patients disappear to some distant ward staffed on a general basis, and who are effectively denied the possibility of making a decision to ventilate safely and electively the more seriously ill cases postoperatively because of the lack of facilities and trained supervision.

T B BOULTON

Royal Berkshire Hospital,
Reading

¹ Lunn JN, Mushin WW. *Mortality associated with anaesthesia*. London: Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, 1982.

SIR,—Anaesthetics are poisons, and the physical state of anaesthesia is as close to death as any doctor or dentist deliberately contracts to bring a patient. That is true whether the surgery is major or minor (there is no such thing as a "minor" anaesthetic), whether anaesthesia is induced by general practitioner or specialist, and whether it takes place in a district hospital starved of resources or in a referral centre where those resources are sometimes taken for granted.

For these reasons, and after five years of incalculable effort, the publication of the Association of Anaesthetists' study on mortality related to anaesthesia¹ is a key event. We have long known—or rather we think we have known—what is needed to put our house in order. Now we have the hard evidence and a numerical base from which to start. That is the true measure of Dr Lunn and Professor Mushin's achievement, and it is the one aspect of the audit to which your leading article (21 August, p 530) does less than justice.

The report reaches at least two important conclusions. Firstly, despite public concern² and editorial dismay British anaesthesia in fact is extremely safe—safer probably than anywhere in the world. Nevertheless, in setting the highest standards, the association rightly feels it could and should do more to make it still safer. An estimated anaesthetic mortality of 1:10 000 within six days of operation (about 280 deaths a year in three million administrations) compares not too unfavourably with the estimated surgical mortality of 60:10 000. The second conclusion is equally clear: we need the best anaesthetists we can get. "Anaesthesia carries more risk in the hands of inexperienced doctors than any other branch of medicine."³

Anaesthesia then is not for the amateur or the faint-hearted. But there is a worldwide shortage of anaesthetists of any calibre.³ Instead of bewailing the fact, the Department of Health, clinicians who persistently belittle the specialty, and—most important—the deans of medical schools might do better to ask why. "Is the traditional one or two weeks 'untimely ripp'd' and grudgingly from the five or six years of his education sufficient to afford the medical student an insight into the scope of modern anaesthesia? It would do much for the morale of what is necessarily the single largest hospital specialty, not to mention the beneficial effects on its recruitment, if like our colleagues in surgery, medicine, and general practice anaesthetists were allowed to tell of what they know."⁴ They have now told us.

Anaesthesia is a young specialty. With the association's report, which incidentally is a model of plain English, the specialty comes of age. It is a proud moment.

PETER V SCOTT

Department of Anaesthetics,
Bromsgrove General Hospital,
Bromsgrove, Worcs B61 0BB

¹ Lunn JN, Mushin WW. *Mortality associated with anaesthesia*. London: Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, 1982.

² Anonymous. *The Times* 1982 Aug 10:3 (col 4).

³ Roddy PC, Hambleton R. *DHEW publication No (HRA)77-31*, 1976.

⁴ Scott PV. *Anaesthesia* 1980;35:581-4.

SIR,—It is a great shame that your leading article (21 August, p 530) did not mention the excessive working hours of many of the doctors administering general anaesthetics. I wonder how many of the deaths resulted from anaesthetics administered by harassed SHOs late at night, perhaps after 70 or more hours on duty. While the correction of the underfunding, or perhaps the inappropriate funding, of the National Health Service is important, the first priority must be to ensure that the excessive hours of juniors in all specialties, but anaesthetics in particular, are corrected without further delay.

C G HEGGS

London W5

SIR,—Your leading article (21 August, p 530) makes the comment that a depressing picture emerges from a report stating that one in 10 000 patients undergoing surgery died as a result of anaesthesia alone. I find it remarkable that you made no comment regarding the six in 1000 patients dying within six days of operation, although the risks of operation appear to be 60 times greater than the risks of anaesthesia. If 280 deaths in Britain each year are totally attributable to anaesthesia then 16 520 are related to surgery.

Surely your constructive remarks regarding anaesthesia-related deaths should be applied to the far greater number of non-anaesthetic deaths. Should there not be a closer look at the selection and assessment of patients for operation, the choice of operation, and the skill and expertise of those carrying out the surgery and postoperative care? Certainly anaesthetists expect a review of the 0.01% of patients who die as the result of the anaesthetic, but equally the causes of the 0.6% deaths, almost all of which are not due to anaesthesia alone, should be analysed. After all, a mere 2% reduction in non-anaesthetic deaths would save 330 lives a year, which is more than

all the deaths attributable solely to anaesthesia.

J M MANNERS

Shackleton Department of
Anaesthetics,
Southampton General Hospital,
Southampton SO9 4XY

SIR,—Like much of the reaction to the recent survey of anaesthetic mortality¹ your leading article (21 August, p 530) is a little unsympathetic. The report is described as depressing, but is it really so depressing that anaesthesia is totally responsible for the death of one patient in 10 000 when one considers the many potential causes of disaster to which every one of those 10 000 is exposed? Comparisons with other specialties may not be valid, but are British anaesthetists deserving of so critical a reaction? The report estimates that 60 patients in 10 000 die within six days of surgery, that one of those 60 dies as a result of anaesthesia, and that anaesthesia may play a part in another six. What of the other 53?

J A W WILDSMITH

Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh,
Edinburgh EH3 9YW

¹ Lunn JN, Mushin WW. *Mortality associated with anaesthesia*. London: Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, 1982.

Standard intravenous regional analgesia

SIR,—It is ironic that the article on standard intravenous regional analgesia (21 August, p 554) should appear in the same issue as a leading article drawing attention to deaths in anaesthesia. The article did not have an anaesthetist as an author, and stated baldly that it is unnecessary to fast the patient. Loss of consciousness and convulsions are very real hazards as the cuff may suddenly deflate unnoticed by the surgeon, and we know of two patients who have convulsed despite the cuff remaining inflated. Aspiration of vomit, inadequate care of the airway, and inadequate resuscitation may then lead to death. Your leading article pointed out that inhalation of vomit is a major cause of mortality associated with anaesthesia. Diazepam 10 mg followed by a further 10 mg for uncontrolled convulsions is foolhardy advice as the most likely result is respiratory arrest.

It is our view, as anaesthetists, that the technique of intravenous regional anaesthesia, while useful, has real risks, and that patients should be starved and given care as skilled as that for a general anaesthetic, which is not possible with an operator-anaesthetist.

J I ALEXANDER
J B BOWES
G M COOPER
N GOODMAN
D G HUGHES

P HUTTON
R W JOHNSON
C PRYS-ROBERTS
N B WILLIAMS

Bristol Royal Infirmary,
Bristol BS2 8HW

SIR,—Your recent article on intravenous regional analgesia (21 August, p 554) prompts me to tell you of a problem that was encountered with this method of anaesthesia when it was used in the fracture department of Cardiff Royal Infirmary.

During the period when intravenous anaesthesia was used for the reduction of Colles