inclined to this view. Perhaps Dr Newton and his colleagues can reanalyse their data excluding all those life events (some of which were listed by Dr Roland) that are open to subjective interpretation.

F H CREED

Department of Psychiatry,
London Hospital Medical College,
London E1 2AD

¹ Bartlett, F C, *Remembering: A Study of Experimental and Social Psychology*. London, Cambridge University Press, 1932.

² Brown, G W, et al, *Psychological Medicine*, 1973, **3**, 74.

³ Stott, D H, *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 1958, **3**, 42.

Samaritans versus suicide

SIR,—Minerva asks (22 September, p 743) "Just how effective are the Samaritans in preventing suicide?"—a question impossible to answer owing to lack of controls. Many of us have personal experience of individual cases where suicide has definitely been averted by our intervention; but these cases cannot be enumerated.

The following data, however, were extracted from the records of a random sample of 57 224 of the 250 740 individuals who sought our help during 1978. A total of 13 421 callers admitted suicidal thoughts or intentions, and 15 763 callers admitted no such thoughts or intentions; in 28 040 cases for various reasons this information was not available. Thus 45.9% of the 29 184 cases in which the topic of suicide was broached (either by the caller or by the Samaritan volunteer) admitted to suicidal ideas; or, to put it another way, 23% of the whole sample were found to be harbouring them. This gives the population a "potential" suicide rate of 23 453 per 100 000, whereas the official figure is only about eight per 100 000. Evidently we do attract those with a suicidal bent, but quite a lot of them think better of it.

Minerva also states that the suicide rate is showing no further decrease despite our increased activity. True. It is levelling out at about eight per 100 000, having dropped steadily from 12 per 100 000 in 1963 (coincidentally the year when Samaritans Incorporated came into action). One of the possible reasons for its not falling further may be that the number of our new callers each year has increased since 1973 by 60%, whereas the number of our volunteers has risen only 17%. Many of our 170 branches are over-stretched; to achieve some sort of parity with this increasing work load we need at least 6000 more volunteers—urgently.

GEORGE DAY
Honorary Consultant to
Samaritans Incorporated

Mundesley, Norfolk

High- and low-carbohydrate diets

SIR,—Dr K W Heaton of Bristol Royal Infirmary has written to us pointing out that the dietary fibre figures given in our paper concerning the use of high and low carbohydrate diets in maturity onset diabetes (30 June, p 1753) differ from those calculated using the new McCance and Widdowson food tables.¹ The discrepancy has arisen for two reasons.

Firstly, at the time the calculations were made the new tables were not available and we used preliminary figures given in the

Journal of Human Nutrition (Vol 30, Nos 5, October 1976, p 303), which for some foods differed quite considerably from the definitive version. Secondly, our calculations included the fibre content in the skin of soft fruit. The correct figures for the high- and low-carbohydrate diets should be 64 g and 17 g respectively. Clearly the overall conclusions of the study are not affected in any way by this discrepancy.

J I MANN
J EATON

University Department of Social
and Community Medicine,
Oxford OX1 3QN

¹ Paul, A A, and Southgate, D A T, *McCance and Widdowson's The Composition of Foods*, 4th edn, p 266. London, HMSO, 1978.

Cancer of the ovary

SIR,—We were interested to read your leading article (22 September, p 687) on ovarian cancer but question the therapeutic conclusions, which exclude radiotherapy from consideration.

"Advanced" ovarian cancer is an ill-defined term. Any discussion of treatment must take into consideration the known routes of spread to the para-aortic lymph nodes and diaphragm. The latter should be examined in all cases as metastases may otherwise be missed.¹ Internal mammary node involvement may be detected by lymphoscintigraphy and is probably of importance in the pathogenesis of ascites.² The role of cytoreductive surgery is now well established and it has been found that it is the amount of residual disease that affects prognosis rather than initial extent of the disease.³

What therapies should be used as adjuncts to surgery? For many years radiotherapy was the only treatment available. Its role has now been reinvestigated in a prospective randomised trial at the Princess Margaret Hospital, Toronto.⁴ Some stage I cases probably need no treatment other than surgery if staged adequately with lymphangiography and laparoscopic examination of the diaphragm. A prospective study to test this hypothesis is in progress at the Royal Marsden Hospital; patients are followed closely with repeated laparoscopy to detect recurrence early should it occur.

In stages II and III whole-abdominal radiotherapy has been shown to be effective in eliminating microscopic disease in patients with no visible residual tumour⁴; unfortunately few patients fall into such a favourable group. For those with bulky residual disease throughout the abdomen after maximal surgical resection chemotherapy is appropriate. Such "advanced" cases do indeed require determined treatment with both modalities.

The techniques of radiotherapy need further evaluation. Pelvic irradiation alone is often inadequate because of the high frequency of abdominal relapse.⁴ The whole abdomen may be irradiated either by opposing fields or by a moving strip technique. Supplementary dosage may be directed to the pelvis, para-aortic lymph nodes, and diaphragmatic lymphatics.⁵ The instillation of intraperitoneal colloidal radioactive isotope may have a promising future.⁶ It is of theoretical interest that its absorption follows the route of spread of cells released into the peritoneal cavity.

Future progress will depend on well-organised prospective randomised clinical trials with internationally agreed criteria of

response. Chemotherapy is at an early stage of its development; although response rates of 50-60% are a marked improvement, they have yet to be translated into long-term survival. This is most likely to be achieved by interdisciplinary co-operation in the management of these patients.

M V WILLIAMS
C L HARMER

Ovarian Tumour Unit,
Royal Marsden Hospital,
Sutton, Surrey SM2 5PT

¹ Rubin, P, *Seminars in Oncology*, 1975, **2**, 235.

² Bronskill, M J, Bush, R S, and Ege, G N, *Cancer*, 1977, **40**, 2375.

³ Griffiths, C T, *National Cancer Institute Monographs*, 1975, **42**, 101.

⁴ Dembo, A J, et al, *Cancer Treatment Reports*, 1979, **63**, 249.

⁵ Glatstein, E, Fuks, Z, and Bagshaw, M A, *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology and Physics*, 1977, **2**, 357.

⁶ Buchsbaum, H J, Keetel, W C, and Latourette, H B, *Seminars in Oncology*, 1975, **2**, 247.

SIR,—I consider your leading article on ovarian carcinoma (22 September, p 687) to be a fair review of the epidemiology of the disease. However, I believe every statement in the final two paragraphs is open to question.

The recommendation that at laparotomy for inoperable disease as much tumour as safely possible should be removed may seem reasonable—although no operations are entirely safe, and I would query the use of radical but macroscopic surgical techniques in treating a disease which by definition metastasises and invades initially at a microscopic level. I am not clear how a maximum response to therapy of a disease with such a varied natural history can be assessed—so when (if at all) should a repeat laparotomy be undertaken? If further "adequate" chemotherapy is required to eradicate residual tumour, is this to be established by a third laparotomy, and how long should this cycle continue? Personally (and not surprisingly) I have found in-vitro techniques for assessing tumour response to chemotherapy in vivo to be disappointing.

I deplore the use of survival figures in the final paragraph as a sole measure of prognosis. Enthusiasm is an important motivation to those involved in attempting to overcome such a common and formidable disease. However, I would urge them to remember that clinicians must treat their patients as individuals and not as survival figures, and that there may be occasions when relapse and rapid death may be a merciful release not only from the illness but from radical surgical expertise and determined chemotherapy.

M H WILKINS

Whittington Hospital,
London N19 5NF

Soft-tissue sarcomas

SIR,—Your recent leading article (8 September, p 562) emphasises correctly the therapeutic problems in treating soft-tissue sarcomas. The guidelines in soft-tissue sarcoma treatment are highly variable, probably owing to the fact that many of the reports on soft-tissue sarcoma investigation are based on a relatively small number of patients.

A recent study on 153 soft-tissue sarcoma patients,¹ treated in the University Central Hospital, Helsinki, Finland, suggests that both the histopathological diagnosis and especially the grading of the tumour seem to