were selected for this study. Significant improvements in the responses to suprascapular nerve block have been found, and it is now important to answer, in a reliable way how exactly which patients benefit; these studies are now being undertaken.

Dr Burn questions the choice of methylprednisolone in addition to local anesthetic. This was purely an empirical decision introduced to us by our anaesthetists colleagues. It had been their practice to use this combination for temporary nerve block both for the intercostal nerve and for the suprascapular nerve, and we had found this technique would uncontrolled pilot study. As Dr Burn points out, the effect of steroid in epidural injections is assumed to be anti-inflammatory, but this is by no means proved. It may well be that steroids have an harmful and interferes on membrane stabilisation and perhaps a secondary reduction in pain. This is obviously an important question to address and we are currently investigating with a controlled trial. We regard the nerve block as a screening procedure and, if successful, would logically lead to a more definitive approach and are ourselves investigating alternative methods of producing long term neurolysis.

P EMMER
Department of Rheumatology,
University of Birmingham,
Birmingham B15 2TJ

S BOWMAN
Department of Rheumatology,
Guy's Hospital,
London SE1 9RT

Risks of donor insemination

SIR—The leading article by Dr Christopher Barratt and Professor Ian Cooke on screening of sperm donors is one of several in recent years expressing the importance of adopting suitable precautions to prevent the transmission of an increasing number of sexually transmitted diseases to women receiving donated sperm. In the Oxford artificial insemination by donor programme we are particularly interested in screening for chlamydia.

Fifteen consecutive new prospective donors (university students) were initially screened serologically using fluorescent antibody technique tests and those with positive results underwent enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) testing on urethral swabs. The prospective donors were questioned about the acceptability of these procedures and the frequency with which they would be prepared to have them performed. Results of 14 of the fifteen fluorescent antibody technique tests were reported as titres >1/64, which suggested active infection. Not one of these 14 donors tested positive on urethral swabs. All the donors thought that screening for sexually transmitted diseases was important. All 14 who had urethral swabs thought that repeat swabs at six monthly intervals were acceptable, and 12 were prepared to have swabs at each change of sexual partner. Only one, however, was willing to have swabs taken at every donation.

The incidence of chlamydia in students is 2% and there is no reported case of chlamydial transmission by artificial insemination by donor, and even in this report it is possible that chlamydial infection predated the insemination. This is a very low recorded rate of transmission considering the incidence of the organism in the donor pool and number of artificial insemination cycles performed worldwide.

Our results confirm that serology is too nonspecific to be used as a screening test for chlamydia. A positive result gives no information about when exposure took place or at which site the infection occurred. Urethral swabs are both the most reliable and the recommended method for detecting chlamydia. To exclude the possibility of transmission of swabs would have to be taken at each donation, although this is clearly unacceptable to prospective sperm donors. In view of the small risk of transmission of chlamydia to patients receiving artificial insemination we think that urethral swabs taken at six monthly intervals or at change of sexual partner should provide adequate protection to patients while at the same time being acceptable to donors.

JULIAN N ROBINSON
ROBERT G FORMAN
LEON MACIOJA
Nuffield Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology,
John Radcliffe Hospital,
Oxford OX3 9DT


General practitioner contract

SIR—I reject the motion of censure that Scrutator has proposed on those of us in the General Medical Services Committee who voted to seek another counsel’s opinion on the legality of an imposed general practitioner contract. Scrutator may think that “spending time, money, and credit on a doubtful legal cause is ... poor politics,” but unfortunately it is the only possible politics.

Everyone would like to believe that Lord Denning’s opinion that the secretary of state was wrong in law to impose a new contract is correct, and most of those we represent will continue to insist that it is correct until the case has been defeated in open court. My local medical committee argued the case for “testing the legality of this arrangement in every court which might have jurisdiction” at the special conference of local medical committees in June 1989. The motion was carried and I have just written to the GMS to say that Arran and Local Medical Committee wishes the matter to be brought to judicial review without further delay.

Many general practitioners have loyally contributed to the GMS defence fund over the years, and the grass roots are now giving a clear message that they want some of this money used for a full scale legal battle with maximum publicity. The disadvantages of such action do not seem to outweigh the necessity to try to defeat Kenneth Clarke.  

J DAVID WATTS
Arushy and Arran Local Medical Committee,
Dundonald,
Arushy 3319 WIE

4 Scrutator writes: “My comments were in no way a motion of censure, just a personal view that the GMS’s decision would lead up a legal cul de sac, as the further legal opinion announced on 7 December has confirmed (p 1534). I derive no pleasure from the outcome as I believe that the Secretary of State for Health has acted within the law in imposing a ‘new contract’ his decision will prove counterproductive by antagonising general practitioners and evaporating the professional good will from which the NHS has so greatly benefited.”—End, BMJ.

Senior house officers and their training

SIR—I read with interest the paper by Dr Janet Jones and colleagues regarding senior house officers.1 As the junior representative of the South East Thames regional study leave appeal committee I was not surprised at the perception of service and training among junior hospital staff in the region. Our committee considers appeals from doctors who have encountered difficulty in obtaining study leave within the South East Thames region. These cases are dealt with according to the study leave regulations laid down in the document Terms and Conditions of Service for Hospital Medical and Dental Staff.

Recently, however, it has come to my attention that certain hospitals within the region are determining study leave solely on financial grounds. Consequently some junior doctors are not obtaining study leave to which they are entitled. Concern has been expressed by the South East Thames Regional Hospital Junior Staff Committee, and discussions have taken place between certain hospitals and the industrial relations officer of the BMA. Our committee receives appeals only from doctors who are aware of the committee’s existence. I feel sure that many juniors have study leave refused and yet are proceeding with further training even on further the meagre training that many posts offer. Of even more concern is the advent of the white paper and its implications for training.

Will those hospitals that opt out be willing to undertake the training commitment that many hospitals at present choose to ignore?

Until study leave becomes a statutory part of junior posts either as day release (which seems both辩证ical and unacceptable in manpower and training terms) or as periods specifically set aside during the tenure of a post these inequities will continue to prevail and junior doctors will continue to serve their employing authorities rather than being trained by them.

PETER MERRIN
Sidcup, Kent DA11 6DI


Corrections

Death after flumazenil

An author’s error occurred in the letter by Dr A G Lim (30 September, p 858). The patient was given an intravenous bolus of 3.5 ml flumazenil (100 mg/ml), not 100 mg/ml as published.

Cervical intraepithelial neoplasia in general practice

A printer’s error occurred in this letter by Dr Kambiz Boonla and others (25 November, p 1540). In the table the final heading should have read “Grade II or above” and not “Grade IV or above” as published.

Acute renal failure after infusion of gelatin

An author’s error occurred in this letter by Drs P J T Drew and S F Hussain (2 December, p 1399). The letter should have stated that potentially nephrotoxic fluorescent dyes were not used; in fact isosulfan was given together with nitrous oxide and oxygen.