Comment

The relatively low response rate, particularly in high peak users, raises concern about the representativeness of this study. When the higher total consumption of sumatriptan among non-respondents in this group is taken into consideration, this bias could lead to underestimation of sumatriptan overuse. Appropriate heavy use of sumatriptan for cluster headache was rare. We conclude that heavy consumption of sumatriptan generally represents inappropriate use, mainly for tension and drug-induced headaches. Inappropriate use may be related to the patient rather than the drug. Patients at greatest risk have generally been excluded from clinical trials conducted before the drug was marketed. Greater awareness of the problem among doctors could lead to more rational use of sumatriptan.
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Is cardiothoracic ratio in healthy middle aged men an independent predictor of coronary heart disease mortality? Whitehall study 25 year follow up

Harry Hemingway, Martin Shipley, David Christie, Michael Marmot

Aetiological studies of myocardial ischaemia have tended to concentrate on factors which influence atherothrombotic processes in the coronary arteries rather than myocardial pathophysiology. The commonest clinical measure of heart size—cardiothoracic ratio—was included in the original Whitehall study of healthy middle aged civil servants. Cardiothoracic ratio is associated with left ventricular mass and left ventricular systolic function; since left ventricular mass determined by echocardiography has been shown to predict coronary heart disease in elderly people, we hypothesised that increased cardiothoracic ratio would independently predict mortality from coronary heart disease. Unlike previous studies we did not include mortality from stroke since it may be related to heart size through different pathophysiological mechanisms.

Adjusted hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for the effect of cardiothoracic ratio on all cause and coronary heart disease mortality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cardiothoracic ratio (fifths)</th>
<th>Adjusted for age</th>
<th>Adjusted for age and blood pressure*</th>
<th>Fully adjusted†</th>
<th>Adjusted for age</th>
<th>Adjusted for age and blood pressure*</th>
<th>Fully adjusted‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.4-0.439</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.44-0.449</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45-0.469</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.47</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adjusted for systolic blood pressure and diastolic blood pressure.
†Adjusted for age, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, heart rate, total cholesterol concentration, smoking habit, Rose angina, and electrocardiographic evidence of ischaemia (Minnesota codes: 1-1 to 1-3, 4-1 to 4-4, 5-1 to 5-3, and 7-1).
‡All deaths counted once.

Subjects, methods, and results

We studied the 1203 male British civil servants aged 40-69 years who participated in the original Whitehall study and were randomly selected (by random number tables) for measurement of cardiothoracic ratio from 100 mm chest radiographs. The rate ratio for all cause mortality among those in the random sample compared with those not in the sample was 1.01 (95% confidence interval 0.93 to 1.11) making a serious selection bias unlikely. Details of the standardised methods of risk factor, electrocardiographic and radiographic measurements and their quality control have been reported.1 Cardiothoracic ratio was calculated as the ratio of the maximal transverse diameter of the cardiac silhouette to the distance between the internal
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Adherence to cardiac rehabilitation guidelines: a survey of rehabilitation programmes in the United Kingdom

Robert J P Lewin, Rosie Ingleton, Andrew J Newens, David R Thompson

Two key recommendations of recent guidelines are that cardiac rehabilitation requires the skills of a range of professionals and that the patient should receive a menu based programme after an individual assessment of needs. A previous survey of 25 cardiac rehabilitation programmes found little congruence with these guidelines and noted that physicians were particularly unlikely to be involved. We extended this inquiry to include all of the discoverable rehabilitation programmes in the United Kingdom.

Subjects, methods, and results

We identified 273 cardiac rehabilitation programmes through registers maintained by professional and charitable bodies and conducted a structured telephone interview with the “main coordinator” of 263 (96%) of these programmes between 1 April 1996 and 31 March 1997. If a respondent did not have the competence to answer a particular question the appropriate person was contacted. We asked each participant whether the rehabilitation team included anyone from a list of nine healthcare professions. To examine the use of assessment measures we asked which of a list of 15 health variables were assessed; whether this was with a validated assessment (a published scale or a standardised procedure with known properties) or an informal assessment (any other method); and whether the assessment was repeated either to check the patient’s progress or to audit outcome.

Most (184 (70%)) participants reported that five or more (mean 4.6; SD 1.6) healthcare professions were represented in 234 (89%) teams, dieticians were represented in 229 (84%), and physiotherapists in 223 (85%). Less