Data were voluntarily provided by members of the Society of Cardiothoracic Surgeons of Great Britain and Ireland. Tom Treasure is responsible to the society for the collection and collation of these data and has a mandate from the society's annual general meeting of its members to disseminate information based on the data.

Contributors: AS, TT, and JvdM were responsible for study concept and design. TT and AS were responsible for acquisition of the data and administrative, technical, or material support. AS and JL analysed the data and provided statistical expertise. AS drafted and TT finalised the manuscript. All authors interpreted the results and critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content. TT and AS are guarantors.

Funding: There was no specific funding for this study.

Competing interests: None declared.

Ethical approval: Not required.

- 1 Lewis RJ, Caccavale RJ, Sisler GE, Mackenzie JW. One hundred consecutive patients undergoing video-assisted thoracic operations. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1992;54:421-6.
- 2 Wennberg JE. Understanding geographic variations in health care delivery. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340:52-3.
- 3 Detsky AS. Regional variation in medical care. *N Engl J Med* 1995;333:589-90.
- 4 Laycock WS, Siewers AE, Birkmeyer CM, Wennberg DE, Birkmeyer JD. Variation in the use of laparoscopic cholecystectomy for elderly patients with acute cholecystitis. *Arch Surg* 2000;135:457-62.
- 5 Sedrakyan A, van der Meulen J, Lewsey J, Treasure T. Video assisted thoracic surgery for treatment of pneumothorax and lung resections: systematic review of randomised clinical trials. *BMJ* 2004;329:.

(Accepted 30 September 2004)

Half full or half empty VATS?

Peter McCulloch

Nuffield
Department of
Surgery, University
of Oxford, John
Radcliffe Hospital,
Oxford OX3 9DU
Peter McCulloch
reader in surgery

Correspondence to:
P McCulloch
petermcculloch@
doctors.org.uk

These paired studies on video assisted thoracic surgery (VATS) highlight a challenging question for proponents of evidence based medicine.^{1 2} After 10 years and, in this case, 12 randomised trials, why is practice so variable in specialties where the evidence seems clear? Is evidence based medicine, in fact, ineffective in changing clinical practice?

Disillusion is the child of overoptimism, and we should reflect that many influences for good remain of value despite less than universal adoption. Neither the United Nations nor the European Union has fulfilled all the ideals of their founders, but only their fanatical opponents would deny them some major achievements. Unsystematic review of recent medical progress makes a reasonably convincing case that evidence based medicine also has things to be proud of. Compared with 10 years ago, policy decisions in national health care in Europe and the United States are now informed much less by expert consensus conferences and much more by systematic reviews of the evidence. Medical journals publish more randomised trials, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses than they used to and require a higher degree of rigour in conducting and reporting studies, so the average quality of published medical research has gone up. Clinicians generally are now much more aware of principles of evidence based medicine and demonstrate this through typical guilt responses when they are forced to reveal their non-evidence based practices publicly. Guilt is said to be the first step on the road to redemption, so clinical practice too may be changing for the better.

Another important reflection is that evidence never was and never will be the whole story in medical decision making. Local resources, costs, and, particularly in the case of surgical techniques such as VATS, training needs are among the many practical and organisational barriers to changing established treatments. The systematic review reports that experience with VATS did not correlate with the proportion of eligible cases performed by VATS. This suggests that some units choose to use the technique selectively, but it might also mean that some surgeons never achieve comfort with it and abandon it after a trial period. An extensive psychological and sociological literature points to barriers to change erected by the minds of individuals

and by the shared values and traditions of groups.^{3 4} Evidence is only one lever in the process of bringing about change, and it needs to be applied at the right point and in the right way in an organisation to be effective. This does not mean that we should give up on it, but that in our quest for quality improvements in health care we should also start to look much more seriously at how change is effectively achieved in organisations. G K Chesterton, a devout Catholic, once described Christianity as having: "not been tried and found wanting; it has been found difficult and left untried."⁵ While I would hope that the same fate does not ultimately befall evidence based medicine, the evidence so far does not convince me that it won't.

Competing interests: None declared.

- 1 Sedrakyan A, van der Meulen J, Lewsey J, Treasure T. Video assisted thoracic surgery for treatment of pneumothorax and lung resections: systematic review of randomised clinical trials. *BMJ* 2004;329:.
- 2 Sedrakyan A, van der Meulen J, Lewsey J, Treasure T. Variation in use of video assisted thoracic surgery in the United Kingdom. *BMJ* 2004;329:.
- 3 Plous S. *The psychology of judgement and decision making*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.
- 4 Timmermans S, Berg M. *The gold standard: the challenge of evidence-based medicine and standardization in health care*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003.
- 5 Chesterton, GK. *What's wrong with the world*. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1910.

(Accepted 28 September 2004)

Correction

Are written responses to some referrals to a general haematology clinic acceptable?

We inadvertently transposed elements of the title of a paper by Tso and colleagues (23 October, pp 946-7), which changed the meaning entirely, after the authors had seen the proofs. The study considered whether written referrals from a haematology clinic were acceptable to general practitioners and patients, not whether they were acceptable to the haematology clinic (as implied by the originally printed title, "Acceptability to a general haematology clinic of written responses to referrals"). The correct title is "Are written responses to some referrals to a general haematology clinic acceptable?" We have corrected this on bmj.com.