extreme reluctance, in the conclusion that, in the present circumstances, I could not regard the passage of some appropriate measure through Parliament as justifying an end to organized resistance to the elimination of facilities for independent practice from the hospitals of the N.H.S. in contexts where no alternative exists. Practical cooperation by Government in relating the rundown of facilities to the provision of alternative facilities, if not of small residue of facilities where no alternative outside the N.H.S. can be provided, would of course be quite another matter. As we have undoubtedly seen a hardening of the Secretary of State in the recent past so, I trust, we shall see a hardening of attitudes in the profession. I cannot believe that we would be right to allow our natural reluctance to resist parliamentary authority to persuade us to leave a shackled profession behind for succeeding generations.

As some of your readers may know my connexion with the Central Committee for Independent Medical Services and the committees I hasten to assure you that the views expressed here are entirely personal and, I fear, without significant support and among the leadership of the profession.—I am, etc.,

D. E. BOLT
Hampton Hill, Middlesex

Maintenance Therapy in Myeloma: Risk versus Benefit

Sir,—The Southwest Oncology Study Group has recently published the results of a study designed to compare the effectiveness of melphalan (prednisone) or melphalan plus prednisone, or BCNU plus prednisone in maintaining remissions in multiple myeloma patients. In brief, they found no differences in the frequency of relapse, the duration of remission, or in the survival time among the three groups of patients, though the frequency of pneumonia and herpes zoster was higher in patients receiving melphalan plus prednisone. They demonstrated that continued melphalan-prednisone or BCNU-prednisone chemotherapy after the first year is of no major value to responding patients in maintenance remission.

The finding is particularly timely because of one possible adverse effect of long-term melphalan treatment which has only recently come to light. In 1967, about four years after the introduction of melphalan into general use for treating multiple myeloma, reports of acute myeloid leukaemia developing in multiple myeloma patients following irradiation and chemotherapy began to accumulate. Since then numerous reports have linked an apparent increased incidence of acute leukaemia in multiple myeloma patients to melphalan treatment, irradiation, or a combination of the two; the most recent review of this subject documented a total of 46 cases in which multiple myeloma terminated as acute myeloid leukaemia. Forty-three of the 46 patients had been treated with melphalan and about one-half had also received irradiation. Patients treated with melphalan received the drug over periods of 14-102 months, and seven of them developed acute myeloid leukaemia 34-147 months later.

Acute leukaemia has also developed in a number of patients treated with melphalan for other diseases, such as macro-globulinemia, amlodipine, and cold agglutinin disease. These cases report no with certainty incriminate melphalan as a leukaemogen in man, nor does the finding that melphalan is carcinogenic in mice. Even if multiple myeloma patients treated with melphalan are at higher risk of developing acute leukaemia than is the general population, the consensus among clinicians appears to be that the increases in survival time and in the quality of life of melphalan-treated patients far outweigh the risk of drug-induced acute leukaemia. However, since no benefit appears to derive from melphalan maintenance therapy of myeloma patients in remission, perhaps the clinician should attempt to reduce this possible risk by shortening the duration of melphalan maintenance therapy or by abandoning it altogether.—We are, etc.,

SUSAN M. SHIER
RICHARD H. ADAMSON
Laboratory of Chemical Pharmacology, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, U.S.A.

1. Southwest Oncology Study Group, Archives of Internal Medicine, 1973, 133, 147.
10. Shalaby, H., and Bayrd, E. D., Archives of the National Cancer Institute, 1966, 36, 915.

Ocular Reactions to Beta-blockers

Sir,—A syndrome of skin rash with ophthalmic signs and symptoms has recently come to my attention.1 Other beta-blocking drugs may also cause this syndrome and a similar skin rash has recently been described in a patient taking oxprenolol.2

We have observed a patient in whom the ophthalmic manifestations of this syndrome occurred when taking oxprenolol. She was receiving clonidine, bendroflumazide, frusemide, digoxin, and oxprenolol. Her treatment had been unchanged for 16 months. She had taken oxprenolol for 18 months, in a dose of 10 mg twice daily for the initial two months and subsequently in a dose of 20 mg twice daily. She first noted red eyes approximately 15 months after the treatment started. She did not initially comment on this until they became sufficiently troublesome, approximately three months after they were first noticed. At this time there were no other relevant symptoms. Her eyes were examined and showed conjunctival oedema, more marked on the left side, and congestion of the conjunctival vessels. Both corneas showed punctate epithelial opacities in the exposure zone, but again did not mark on the left side. The visual acuity was unimpaired and the eyes were otherwise normal apart from hypertensive changes in the fundi.

The oxprenolol had initially been given to reduce exertional tachycardia and therefore it was withdrawn slowly over a period of one month. Her symptoms did not return, but there was some improvement in her eyes with a reduction in dose and her symptoms had completely disappeared within one week of total withdrawal. This time her eyes showed a considerable improvement. There were still some residual epithelial opacities, but the conjunctival changes had largely disappeared.

It seems probable that this syndrome, already described with practolol, may also occur with other members of this group of drugs. It is obviously important to anybody using these drugs for a prolonged period to be encouraged to use the drugs with the longest history of safe use whenever these are appropriate. Propranolol has not yet been shown to cause this effect, though there is some possibility that this may be so because the skin manifestations of the syndrome has recently been raised by Dr. P. L. Padfield and others (15 March, p. 626).—We are etc.,

MARTIN S. KNAPP
N. R. GALLOWAY
Guy Hospital, Nottingham


Gastroesophageal Reflux

Diagnosis of "Reflex Oesophageitis"

Sir,—There has been considerable correspondence in various journals in recent years about the difficulties in the diagnosis of reflux oesophagitis. Dr. G. W. Stevenson (15 February, p. 395) maintained that this test is preferable to the acid perfusion test. On the other hand Drs. Druitt and J. I. Symmons (19 February, p. 512) pointed out that "acid perfusion tests detect oesophageal pain", while "acid swallows demonstrate an oesophagus which responds to acid stimulation with a motor response, but this tells one neither that it causes symptoms nor that the patient suffers from gastro-oesophageal reflux." Drs. Yunus and Bennett also state that "the best way to..."