a dosage of up to 400 mg daily. This drug is used for its muscle-relaxing properties in tetanus, but it was first introduced into medical practice as a venumfuge. The worm absorbs the drug but, unlike its host, is unable to metabolize or excrete it. The anthelmintic property may be related to an anticholinesterase action which upsets the neuromuscular apparatus of the worm or alternatively to an effect on redox systems. These mechanisms might be expected to paralyse the worm, but our experience is that they retain their motility on expulsion in about one quarter of the cases.

It would be helpful if further light could be thrown on this problem.—We are, etc.,

F. D. DASTUR
G. H. KASHYAP
K. G. NAIR
Department of Medicine, K.E.M. Hospital, Bombay

---
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Was it a Drug?—Forcovel Protein

SIR,—Your report (Supplement, 1 June, p. 86) has once again drawn my attention to the recommendation of the Clayton Committee that Forcovel Protein should be regarded as a non-prescription, over-the-counter, chemically proven hypoproteinaemia.

As I have previously pointed out,2 hypoproteinaemia occurs (a) as a result of defective manufacture, as in liver disease, or (b) as a result of accelerated loss, as in nephrotic syndrome or carcinoma. It does not occur in simple starvation. No amount of feeding by mouth will affect hypoproteinaemia unless the cause can be remedied. If it is remedied, then the body will once again retain protein from the diet and regain its nutritional protein status and the blood protein level will rise. It follows that any suggestion that Forcovel Procon or any other protein given by mouth is not really a food but an endeavour to treat hypoproteinaemia cannot be acceptable. I now challenge any member of the Clayton Committee to justify such a suggestion. If nobody does this time then it must be regarded as discredited and local medical committees should disregard it and use their own criteria.

Quite apart from this, the Clayton Committee perpetuates recommendations under which children (and indeed adults) born with some diseases may get nutrition free on N.H.S. prescription while those with other diseases may not. This still frequently leaves the prescribing practitioner wondering whether he may or may not prescribe what he thinks necessary for his patient’s treatment and surely defeats the whole purpose of the Clayton Committee and all its predecessors.

It is my contention that all substances given by mouth which provide nothing but nutrition (even if it is a specially modified form of protein) are food of the patient and is not expected to pay for them then some other means of prescribing or providing them should be instituted. We must put some limit to the intolerable situation whereby a third party sitting behind a desk can challenge what a doctor may or may not prescribe for his patient. The fact that the hospital doctor in outpatients is apparently free from this kind of control only adds to the general practitioner’s frustration.—I am, etc.,

A. LEWIS
London W 9

1 MIMS (Monthly Index of Medical Specialties), 1974, no. 6, p. 207. 2 Lewis, A. A., British Medical Journal, 1972, 3, 188.
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Silboestrol for Prostatic Cancer

SIR,—The value of anonymous medical articles is always questionable especially when broad generalizations are made as in your leading article "Silboestrol for Prostatic Cancer" (8 June, p. 520). The salutary findings of the Veterans Administration Cooperative Urological Research group in 1967 clearly suggest that oestrogens double the death rate in prostatic cancer by their fluid-retaining and thrombogenic properties. The conclusion reached was that they should be used only for urinary obstruction or bone pain. Since the treatment is for symptoms that it is essential to define precisely what symptoms are an indication, which you singularly fail to do.

Similarly, if the subsequent work of the V.A.C.U.R.G. in 1976 states that lower doses are safer while being effective in relieving symptoms (which you appear to accept) then it is hardly rational to recommend using larger doses than theirs on purely speculative theoretical grounds.

It is disturbing that Britain’s most influential medical journal should disseminate the hard-won knowledge it seeks to disseminate.—I am, etc.,

MALCOLM C. BATESON
Department of Medicine, Dundee University

---

Treatment of Vulval Candidiasis with 5-Fluorocytosine

SIR,—Fungicidal agents effective in the treatment of systemic candidiasis are little used for localized vulval infections because of the dangers of toxic effects of therapy and the apparently trivial nature of the disease. Nevertheless, there is a place for such treatment in severely affected women who have proved resistant to conventional methods.

A patient aged 42 had a 20-year history of vulval candidiasis varying in intensity from localized, with intense irritation. Numerous courses of treatment, including local and oral nystatins, gave only temporary relief. She was a diabetic, well controlled on insulin. The vulva had an inflamed, macerated, spotty appearance and the discharge was oozing. From this area grew Candida albicans sensitive to 5-Fluorocytosine (5-FC) in a concentration of 0·2 mg/ml.

She was admitted for treatment, and, oral, full course therapy was given, 2 g of 5-FC 6-hourly for 12 days together with 5-FC cream locally. Blood 5-FC levels were 6 μg/ml three hours after starting treatment and 20 and 32 μg/ml on subsequent occasions. There was a dramatic subjective improvement within 18 hours of starting treatment and complete freedom from vulval symptoms within three days. She developed transient abdominal cramp and mild diarrhoea which lasted for one month. Following treatment she felt in better fit than she had for many years and has remained symptom-free, with negative cultures, for four months.

Before undertaking treatment with 5-FC it is essential to make sure that the yeast is a sensitive strain, and an adequate blood level will lessen the likelihood of secondary resistance developing.

Gastrointestinal upset occurs in 5-10% of cases; laboratory abnormalities include increased serum transaminases, alkaline phosphatase, and blood urea and protein concentrations. These have usually been found in severely ill patients and may reflect underlying infection or treatment with drugs such as immunosuppressive agents rather than drug toxicity.