residual radioactivity in serum after incubation with resin is assessed and therefore a free thyroxine index is calculated as described by Dr. D'Haene and his colleagues by dividing P.B.I. by T-3 B.C. index.

We hope this comment clarifies the situation and reinforces the need for a clear understanding of the method used to assess the T-3 resin uptake.—We are, etc.,

F. CLARK

Department of Medicine,
University of Newcastle upon Tyne

D. B. HORN

Department of Clinical Chemistry,
Western General Hospital,
Edinburgh

1 Clark, F., and Horn, D. B., *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology*, 1965, 25, 39.

2 Clark, F., and Brown, H. J., *British Medical Journal*, 1970, 2, 543 and 672.

3 Clark, F., and Brown, H. J., *British Medical Journal*, 1970, 1, 713.

SIR,—Dr. E. G. M. D'Haene and others (21 September, p. 708) have compared the free thyroxine index (F.T.I.) and effective thyroxine ratio (E.T.R.) using correlation coefficients (Spearman rank correlation) and a minimum of experimental evidence. We feel that a number of points and the final conclusions may mislead potential users of one-tube free thyroxine tests.

(1) The correlation coefficient, however, derived, between F.T.I. and E.T.R. does not reflect the ability of these tests to sort out the patients into the three categories, hypo-, hyper-, and euthyroid. Thus the fact that there is no significant correlation between F.T.I. and E.T.R. values *falling inside the normal range* is not relevant in any way to the final diagnosis.

(2) While the use of comparison of "objective measurements" with "subjective clinical impressions" is certainly dangerous and difficult in practice, it is nevertheless essential for tests to be judged at some stage by their practical usefulness. Thus the observations of Thorson *et al.*,¹ Murray *et al.*,² and ourselves (in an unpublished retrospective survey) that the diagnostic accuracy of the E.T.R. was in practice about 99%, 94.5%, and 94% retrospectively are more relevant than the judgement of a test by its correlation with another, different, "objective measurement."

(3) The statement that "correction for binding-protein abnormalities . . . when the free T-4 index is *calculated*, is more trustworthy than the *chemically regulated* correction which is more or less automatically and uncontrollably applied when measuring the E.T.R." (our italics) is based on a claim that at high concentrations of thyroxine (T-4) a greater percentage of labelled T-4 binds to the thyroxine-binding proteins than is found if triiodothyronine (T-3) is used instead. A reduction of the T-4 concentration results in binding "more or less identical" with that of T-3. They appear to have overlooked two points: (a) The non-labelled T-4 acts similarly to labelled T-4 and so their addition of 0.5 ml normal serum to each 3-ml phial (instead of 0.5 ml/100 ml in the E.T.R.) will increase the final concentration of T-4 from 1.03 to about 15.8 nmol/l. Even after their reduction of labelled T-4 to 0.21 nmol/l. their total concentration is about 14.9 nmol/l., while the E.T.R. normally contains about 3.5 nmol T-4/l. (b) The equivalent concen-

tration of T-3 used in the experiments is about one-fifth that of T-4 and so their comparisons between the binding of these substances to thyroxine-binding globulin were not valid.

Dr. D'Haene and his colleagues conclude that "at present there are no convincing reasons" for using E.T.R. instead of F.T.I. The time required to carry out both T-3 resin uptake and total T-4 estimation and their cost are about double those of single-tube tests such as E.T.R. It would seem to us that a reduction in cost and time of trained personnel would be sufficient reasons for preferring a single test procedure of comparable diagnostic reliability. Add to this a smaller coefficient of variation (even found by Dr. D'Haene and his colleagues) and a proved value for both diagnosis and monitoring treatment and it would need a convincing reason indeed to use F.T.I. instead of E.T.R. as an index of thyroid function.—We are, etc.,

M. G. WELLS

C. E. ANDREW

Radiochemistry Department,
Edgware General Hospital,
Edgware, Middlesex

1 Thorson, S. C., *et al.*, *British Medical Journal*, 1972, 2, 67.

2 Murray, I. P. C., *et al.*, *British Medical Journal*, 1972, 1, 1190.

TSH Level and Thyroid Function

SIR,—Dr. G. Antony in his letter (14 September, p. 688) commenting on our paper (13 July, p. 89) has expressed the opinion that patients with normal levels of circulating thyroid hormones and raised serum thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH) levels should be described as having subclinical or compensated hypothyroidism. He thus prefers to emphasize the presence of an abnormality in the thyroid-pituitary axis rather than that the effects of this abnormality are not clinically recognizable. He goes on to say that the choice of a particular diagnostic term tends to determine the management of the patient, which might be taken to imply that these patients should be treated with thyroxine. We think such a policy is mistaken. As long as no therapeutic implication is attached to any of these terms, they may be regarded as interchangeable. The patients in question were clinically euthyroid (whichever term is used to describe their condition) and may remain so for many years. In our opinion the prognostic significance of an elevated TSH level in these patients remains to be established and we consider that therapy should be introduced only when there is evidence of inadequate circulating thyroid hormone levels and symptoms or signs of hypothyroidism.

Part of the difficulty in this situation is that none of the terms are entirely satisfactory from a clinical, biochemical, and physiological point of view. We agree that there is a need to look for ways of measuring the peripheral effects of TSH and thyroid-releasing hormone (TRH) as well as the peripheral effects of the circulating thyroid hormones. Until it is established that a sustained elevation of TSH in the presence of normal levels of circulating thyroid hormones has an adverse effect we feel that our understanding of the condition of such patients is better served by careful

follow-up. We prefer to emphasize the clinical status of the patient, as we feel that this should govern our approach to therapy. It may occasionally be difficult to assess whether circulating levels of thyroid hormones are inadequate, as for instance in patients who have subnormal levels of serum thyroxine (T-4) but normal levels of serum triiodothyronine (T-3). We do not, however, consider therapeutic intervention justified in patients who have normal serum levels of both T-4 and T-3.—We are, etc.,

W. M. G. TUNBRIDGE

Royal Victoria Infirmary,
Newcastle upon Tyne

P. HARSOULIS

A. W. G. GOOLDEN

Hammersmith Hospital,
London W.12

Dangers of Oxytocin-induced Labour to Fetuses

SIR,—I should like to congratulate Mr. W. A. Liston and Mr. A. J. Campbell (7 September, p. 606) for reminding us of the perinatal hazards that may be associated with oxytocin stimulation of labour. Indeed, in clinical practice poor patient selection and faulty methodology all too often confirm the validity of their conclusions. However, when the indication for using an oxytocic is correct and when hyperstimulation is avoided, the procedure per se does not cause fetal distress in the first stage of labour. This holds true for both oxytocin and prostaglandins.^{1,2} On the other hand abnormal fetal heart rate patterns may appear without warning during the second stage of labour, pointing to fetal distress and making prompt delivery imperative.³ Both uterine hyperstimulation and pathological fetal heart rate patterns are most accurately diagnosed by electronic monitoring of labour and I feel, as do Mr. Liston and Mr. Campbell, that this should form an integral part of any induction trial.—I am, etc.,

M. THIERY

Department of Obstetrics,
State University of Ghent,
Belgium

1 Weaver, J. B., Pearson, J. F., and Turnbull, A. C., *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of the British Commonwealth*, 1974, 81, 297.

2 Thiery, M., in *Avortement et parturition provoqués*, ed. M. J. Bosse, R. Palmer, and C. Surreau, p. 268. Paris, Masson.

3 Vroman, S., Thiery, M., and Derom, R., in *Proceedings of the Fourth European Congress of Perinatal Medicine*, ed. Z. K. Stembera, Prague, August 1974. In press.

Diet and Coronary Heart Disease

SIR,—The main burden of the letter of Drs. K. P. Ball and R. W. D. Turner (21 September, p. 740) appears to be that the dietary recommendations of the Committee on Medical Aspects of Food Policy¹ are perverse in that they differ from those of many other committees from several other countries. Certainly this committee's report could have been produced in a much shorter time than the three years it did take, and would have required far fewer drafts than the 10 it did produce, if all it had to do was to count the views expressed in earlier reports. What it did do was to look afresh at the evidence that existed and use its own judgement in deciding how far it pointed