Screening for congenital dislocation of the hip

Unlike many examinations carried out in child health surveillance programmes, screening for congenital dislocation of the hip cannot be said to be unresearched. A selective Medline search provided over 100 papers on the screening, diagnosis, and management of the condition. From the past six years they show that the early identification of the 15-20 infants in 1000 at high risk of having instability and subluxation, dysplasia, or both, of the hip joint is of great benefit to the two to four (and perhaps more) of them who would go on to suffer the long term consequences if not treated. Workers dedicated to identifying congenital dislocation of the hip who have good back up services can identify 80-90% of all the cases in the population in the first six weeks of life. Under these conditions the selectivity, sensitivity, and cost effectiveness of the test are acceptable—anything less and the programmes fail.1 2 So the important question is not whether to set up a screening programme but how to set up one that is effective.

This important question has been partly answered by a revised version of the government handbook Screening for the Detection of Congenital Dislocation of the Hip.3 It is an excellent review of current thinking, and a doctor ignores it at his peril. The handbook is concerned only with screening and offers no advice on management. It is directed specifically at those organising and running child health surveillance programmes and those carrying them out—midwives, paediatricians, obstetricians, health visitors, general practitioners, and clinical medical officers. More’s the pity that all these groups did not receive a free copy: it went to most of the doctors but not to most of the nurses. Why not?

The most important section is on who should do the screening. The district health authority should have a policy outlining who is responsible for examining for congenital dislocation of the hip at various stages and should appoint a designated officer to review the whole programme. Several health professionals may at some time have to examine a child’s hips, and they should all be proficient—therefore training is crucially important.

The handbook discusses future developments; and ultrasound may well be used much more in diagnosis. It looks good from the little research done so far, especially as it is non-invasive and its results are sensitive. Also clinically normal but dysplastic hips do probably exist, and ultrasound may be able to detect them. Further research must therefore be funded into using ultrasound both for initial screening and for secondary screening of those children already identified as being at high risk. These would include those with a clicking or dislocatable hip and those with some other risk factor such as a family history of the condition, other congenital postural deformities, or a history of breech presentation, caesarean delivery, oligohydramnios, or severe fetal growth retardation.

For now, however, the screening programme for congenital dislocation of the hip must be that outlined in the handbook, and the next step has to be taken by those responsible for the child health surveillance programmes in the districts. If the suggestions are not already operational and they do not intend to make them so but have the funding they will need to think up a good excuse rapidly.

AIDAN MACFARLANE
Consultant Paediatrician with special interest in community child health and Clinical Lecturer in Paediatrics, District Department of Community Medicine, Radcliffe Infirmary, Oxford OX2 6HE

More evidence on unemployment and health

Most of those who have studied the future of employment agree that whichever political party is in power the total amount of employment is going progressively to diminish.1 2 A generation ago people expected to be employed over a lifetime for 100 000 hours (47 hours a week for 47 weeks a year for 47 years), but already it is down to 50 000 hours (37 hours a week for 37 weeks a year for 37 years). Soon it will be less. This means that we either share out more the employment available or we have an ever growing number of unemployed. It also means that unemployment is not going to be spirited away by either a statistical or a political sleight of hand. Researchers therefore need to continue to work to increase our limited understanding of how unemployment affects health, and health workers and health authorities need to think more creatively about how they can respond to the problem. Three papers that we publish this week and one that we published earlier in the year should help.

The earlier paper by Moser et al (10 January, p 86) has not had the attention that it deserves. Their earlier study from the 1971 census had shown that men seeking work at the time of the census had had a significantly higher mortality over the next 10 years than men in work.3 The authors were confident that the excess mortality was caused by unemployment itself and had not arisen simply because sick men were more likely to be unemployed. But in 1971 unemployment was well under a million in Britain, and the authors warned that it would be wrong to extrapolate their findings to now when unemployment is around three million. It was in 1979 that unemployment began to rise very steeply in Britain, and by 1981 the figure was similar to that now. Thus the author’s new findings that their results from the 1981 census are
similar to those from 1971 are important. It looks as if unemployment is still associated with a substantially increased mortality despite being a common experience.

Unemployment probably disables more often than it kills, and Arber (p 1069) shows from the General Household Survey 1981-2 that unemployed men report chronic ill health much more often than employed men. She shows, too, that the unemployed are concentrated in lower social classes, which explains some of the class inequalities in health that are so much in the news. Indeed, one of the most important aspects of Arber's paper is the way it brings together the debates on unemployment and health and inequalities and health—for the class differences in chronic ill health are greater among those without jobs than among those who have them. Another important aspect is the way her paper broadens the issue by showing that unemployment is associated with more chronic ill health among women when classified by their own occupations as well as when they are classified by their husbands' occupations. Further, it is not only those who describe themselves as unemployed but also those who describe themselves as housewives who have poorer health. Many women may describe themselves as housewives not because they do not want employment but because they think they will never get it. The "early retired" must also be considered among the unemployed, and the important work from Beale and Nethercott in Wiltshire has shown that far from being a protected group those older workers who take "early retirement" may be especially vulnerable.

New evidence is also presented this week on unemployment and child abuse. These twin modern evils have been assumed to go together, but Taitz et al show how complex the relation may be (p 1074). They compared the rates of unemployed men living in homes in Sheffield where children had been abused in 1974-9, when unemployment was relatively low, and 1980-5, when it was high. They found that, although the proportion of men without work increased, the increase could not be ascribed to an increase in those who had jobs and lost them. Rather there was an increase in men who had never had jobs. I draw two lessons from this study: firstly, it reminds me of the dangers of talking of the unemployed as if they were one homogeneous group; and, secondly, it provides more evidence of the creation of an "underclass" such as already exists in America.

But not all the news is bad. A medical student, Christiane Harris, and I have surveyed all the regional and district health authorities in England, the health boards of Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland, and the family practitioner committees of England and Wales to see whether they were responding to unemployment and health (p 1077). My impression when researching the series of articles on unemployment and health published in the BMJ in late 1985 was that only a few doctors and other health workers were interested in the issue. We were surprised therefore both by our high response rate (77%) and by the high percentage of respondents (50%) who were taking some action.

We suggest in our report that a conference might be called to consider what action is being taken so that authorities can learn from each other. The same conference could consider the new evidence that is appearing all the time.

Richard Smith

Assistant editor, BMJ
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**Regular Review**

**Treating Paget's disease**

D A Heath

In the past five years published reports have advocated treating Paget's disease with one of three different calcitonins (either injected or by nasal spray), three different dihydorphosphate drugs (either orally or injected and in high or low dosage for short or long periods), mithramycin, calcium and thiazides, fluoride, colchicine, and the antiviral agent inosiplex. In addition, various combinations have been proposed either as simultaneous or as sequential treatments. To add to the confusion the recommended nomenclature has been changed so that the dihydropophosphates are now called bisphosphonates, although all current abbreviations are based on the dihydorphosphate terminology and use the letter D rather than B. Apart from having to decide which patients to treat, then, doctors are faced with a bewildering choice of treatments.

**Whom to treat?**

Paget's disease is common in Britain, increasing with age and affecting 5% of those over 55. In most cases the disease is asymptomatic. The main indication for treatment is bone pain that cannot be controlled with simple analgesics. Another indication is spinal cord compression secondary to Paget's disease, for which medical treatment rapidly improves the abnormal neurological signs. Such cases are uncommon and best handled in specialised centres, and I will not discuss their management further.

Little or no evidence supports using drugs to prevent or treat established nerve deafness, facilitate orthopaedic operations, prevent or treat deformities, or prevent malignant bone tumours. Heart failure is rarely caused by...