analyzed completely. Nevertheless, the initial results in these prophylactic trials do not appear to support the totally negative view which arises from the experimental work on the therapeutic effect of ascorbic acid which has been reported from Salisbury. These results will be described when the analysis has been completed.—I am, etc.,

C. W. M. WILSON.
Department of Pharmacology,
University of Dublin,
Dublin.

Lead Absorption in Children

Sir,—The indiscriminate use of the terms absorption, excretion, intoxication, and poisoning by Dr. Neil Gordon and his colleagues (20 May, p. 480) is misleading. They measured only blood lead concentration and inferred that it reflected absorption.

The blood lead concentration represents an equilibrium in which absorption, excretion, and tissue deposition participate. Recent animal studies in this department have shown that the concentration in the liver following oral administration of lead compounds without significant change in the blood level. Conversely, while the significance of a raised blood level is not disputed, it is not necessarily indicative of absorption but could represent release of tissue lead.

Lead poisoning in childhood usually occurs between the ages of 1 and 5 years; death and cerebral damage are well-documented sequelae.1 It is questionable whether the measurements reported by Gordon and others in older children and adolescents are relevant in any way to the aetiology of mental handicap.—I am, etc.,

Peggie R. H. D. BARLTOP.
St. Mary's Hospital Medical School,
London W.2.

Reference
1 Byers, R. K., Pediatrics, 1959, 53, 585.

Treatment of Choriocarcinoma

Sir,—Dr. K. D. Bagshawe (15 April, p. 178) appears unduly concerned that our paper (4 March, p. 521) may have weakened the support given to the use of choriocarcinoma in specialized centres such as his at Fulham Hospital. We wish to assure him that we have the highest regard for his good work, and, although we do not support the view that all cases of choriocarcinoma should be treated in specialized centres, we do agree that difficult problem cases should be channelled without delay to such centres for chemotherapy by experts like himself.

In his eagerness to defend his position Bagshawe has made certain statements which require examination. In the opening paragraph he says: "Before chemotherapy was applied to choriocarcinoma no clinician ever saw more than a few cases." This categorical statement may have been true of clinicians in Britain, but not in Asia. Before chemotherapy was introduced into our hospital we had seen two dozen cases or more, and there must be other centres in Hong Kong, Indonesia, the Philippines, and other parts of Asia who have seen many more. Such inaccurate statements do not strengthen the case which Bagshawe is trying to promote.

Two papers on choriocarcinoma from Singapore have been published.2 Bagshawe compared the figures and concluded: "The virtually simultaneous presentation of totally opposite conclusions, drawn from the same data, must cast doubt on their value." This hasty conclusion ignores the fact that the first paper1 was on pulmonary choriocarcinoma and the second was on all sites. The second paper also included more recent material than that reported in the first, although the duration of follow-up was up to 12 in both publications. There is no contradiction in our conclusions or discrepancy in our figures. Neither was there recourse to "spontaneous regression" or similar terms. The careful reader will find that Bagshawe's assumption is in error. The deaths in the "hysterectomy-chemotherapy" group have not, in any one case under treatment. Bagshawe repeatedly refers to our cases of malignant trophoblastic tumours as "hydatidiform mole." He may disagree with our classification, but there is no need to misrepresent the facts.

We find it difficult to understand the self-contradiction in Bagshawe's thinking on the value of hysterectomy. To quote him: "The reader is led to believe that some workers have claimed that hysterectomy is valueless. Such claims have not, I think, been made..." Here he appears to hold no bias against hysterectomy. Then, in the second last paragraph he says: "In describing the use of hysterectomy and concludes, "unless the uterus has perforated, hysterectomy is better deferred." Unless hysterectomy is a rare complication in choriocarcinoma. This means that Bagshawe opposes hysterectomy in the majority of cases. In his paper, which we have referred to, Bagshawe describes two cases of hysterectomy and concludes: "Hysterectomy is thus not only ineffective but also disadvantageous in some patients." Let his own statements be his judge.

In our paper we have advocated that such claims "deserve careful study before hysterectomy is abandoned altogether." Indeed, unless a strong protest were raised by such claims (based on flimsy evidence) would mislead gynaecologists into giving up hysterectomy altogether.

In our paper we claimed that our "results equal those obtained elsewhere," as Bagshawe asserts. We have reported the results of all 80 consecutive cases of malignant trophoblastic tumours from 18 different centres in Asia over the period 1948-52 for study by a panel of pathologists in the U.S.A. The non-representative nature of this pooled material led the authors themselves to conclude that "an accurate ratio of choriocarcinoma to hydatidiform mole cannot be obtained..." There is no way of estimating whether the large number of choriocarcinomas is due in part to a large number of hydatidiform moles." Yet Bagshawe makes the bold statement that the Joint Project, which amassed "806 cases of suspected trophoblastic tumours" from 18 different centres in Asia over the period 1948-52 for study by a panel of pathologists in the U.S.A. The non-representative nature of this pooled material led the authors themselves to conclude that "an accurate ratio of choriocarcinoma to hydatidiform mole cannot be obtained..." There is no way of estimating whether the large number of choriocarcinomas is due in part to a large number of hydatidiform moles." Yet Bagshawe makes the bold statement that the Joint Project found no evidence that mole was a relatively more frequent antecedent to choriocarcinoma in South-East Asia than in the U.S.A.2 We are of the opinion that the value of the Joint Project is seriously limited by the absurdly small number of cases studied—806 out of a population of several hundred millions or more. Your readers might be interested to know that for the four-year study period of the Joint Project the trophoblastic death rate was 12 in 100 cases out and that these were rejected from the final analysis because of inadequate data. We have studied over 500 consecutive cases in the past seven years. Our results may be expected to give a more truly representative and accurate picture than the collection of hitch-potch data from 18 different sources.

We find Bagshawe's mathematics perplexing. In calculating the ratio of molar to non-molar pregnancy in the last 25 cases of our series he arrives at the figure of 12.5:1. We are at a loss how this figure was arrived at. He states that the 84 expected number of cases without treatment would be "about 2." What are you talking about? He also states that our "fatality rate is twice of that of a somewhat larger series" from his own hospital. May we suggest that all these unfounded statements and self-contradictions do not strengthen the case for specialized centres and may weaken the faith of Bagshawe's supporters. Finally, may we reassure Bagshawe that we do not oppose the treatment of problem cases in his specialized unit, but we do strongly contest the unfair allegations which he has made against hysterectomy.—We are, etc.,

W. S. H. TOW.
W. C. CHENG.
Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology,
University of Singapore,
Singapore 5.

Reference
2 and Cheng, W. C., Brit. med. j., 1957, 1, 52.
3 Bagshawe, K. D., ibid., 1963, 2, 1303.

Pressurized Aerosols in Asthma

Sir,—I am grateful for your published disclaimer (27 May, p. 584) that I do not support the views of Dr. R. Munro Ford (6 May, p. 375) or others of your correspondents who condemn the use of aerosol preparations in the treatment of bronchial asthma. Indeed, the agent which I find most useful and use most frequently in the treatment of chronic asthma is 5% ocprenalone delivered from a De Vilbiss No. 40 hand nebulizer. As with other medications, I try to apprehend clearly to the patient the way in which it should be used and its limitations.

I deplore the present "hustle and cry" approach to the problem of deaths from asthma, and still more the emotional seizing on one valuable form of therapy. A recent paper by Tai and myself3 indicates how tenuous is the functional state of many patients with asthma who do not appear clinically very ill. This paper suggests that we should look afar the field of "expectation," rather than talk too glibly of "unexpected" deaths from asthma.—I am, etc.,

JOHN READ.
Department of Medicine,
University of Sydney,
Sydney, N.S.W.

Reference

Sir,—I have been following with great interest the correspondence in your columns concerning the excessive use of pressurized aerosol in asthma. Little has so far been written about the older asthmatic child in this context apart from the very instructive case described by Dr. W. Pickvance (25 March, p.