balamin seems remote, unless the sensitivity is to other components. Why not, then, abandon the less safe, and less effective, of two equivalent and equally priced preparations, other than for commercial reasons?

N MCD DAVIDSON

Medical Unit,
Eastern General Hospital,
Edinburgh EH6 7LN

*Dr Davidson sent a copy of his letter to Dr A H Goodspeed, medical adviser to Glaxo, whose reply is printed below.—Ed, *BMJ*.

SIR,—I am afraid that Dr Davidson has also missed my point, which is that, while he is suggesting that cyanocobalamin should be withdrawn because occasional patients with cyanide toxicity syndromes may be harmed by its use, there are occasional patients who do display hypersensitivity following the administration of cyanocobalamin or hydroxocobalamin. For example, I am currently awaiting further developments in a case of "brisk anaphylactic reaction" to hydroxocobalamin which occurred earlier this year in Scotland. This is the second case of hypersensitivity to hydroxocobalamin of which I have learned this year. As I said in my previous letter, we have no reports of cross-sensitivity between the two cobalamins so far, and since the other constituents of both marketed preparations are identical I am afraid that sensitivity to one cobalamin is not so remote as Dr Davidson would seem to suggest.

So, again, why should cyanocobalamin be withdrawn simply because some doctors do not apparently read data sheets? And can Dr Davidson suggest an appropriate course of action for the above cases of hydroxocobalamin hypersensitivity which have actually happened other than to transfer them to cyanocobalamin, which he would have us withdraw?

A H GOODSPEED

Glaxo Laboratories Limited,
Greenford, Middx UB6 0HE

Treatment of tumours in children

SIR,—The paper by Dr E L Lennox and others on the treatment of nephroblastoma (8 September, p 567) serves to illustrate very clearly how important it is that children with cancer should be treated in centres specialising in paediatric oncology, and that their therapy should be given following well-defined protocols. The results achieved in the first Medical Research Council nephroblastoma trial, quoted in that paper, are somewhat out of date now; and the second trial organised by the Working Party on Embryonal Tumours in Childhood closed last year. The interim results of the second trial show survival rates of 90% for all children with disease confined to the kidney or with local or regional nodal spread—that is, without distant metastases.

Despite the remarkable improvement in survival achieved for children with Wilms's tumour there are still many who do not benefit from these advances, either because surgery is carried out by individuals not regularly concerned with treating cancer in children or because the radiotherapy and chemotherapy given after surgery do not follow the modern accepted guidelines. Children are still seen whose tumours have

been removed though loin incisions, making accurate staging impossible.

The United Kingdom Children's Cancer Study Group, which has been established to enable interested and active clinicians in the field to participate in therapy programmes for a wide variety of different children's tumours, has just started a new trial for nephroblastoma. It is hoped that all eligible children will benefit from the lessons learnt in previous trials both in the UK and in other countries.

JOHN MARTIN
Chairman

JILLIAN MANN
Secretary

United Kingdom Children's Cancer Study Group,
Department of Child Health,
Alder Hey Children's Hospital,
Liverpool L12 2AP

Clinical photographs of children

SIR,—It is common in clinical meetings to be faced with slides of children without clothes. It seems to me that for anyone to be stood against a wall and photographed in the nude is a potentially degrading and embarrassing thing. I would like to suggest that children should never be subjected to this indignity unless there is a compelling reason for it—and then only with the consent of the parents and, if he is old enough, the child himself.

D P ADDY

Dudley Road Hospital,
Birmingham B18 7QH

Putting children first

SIR,—The international Year of the Child is drawing to a close, and I should like to ask what in particular we as a profession have contributed to this important aspect of social medicine. I read with interest the leading article "Putting children first" (15 September, p 623), but I should like to see more emphasis given to the child before it is even conceived.

Sex education is now a recognised part of the school curriculum and I understand that marriage guidance counsellors are giving helpful instruction to children at the school level. General practitioners, however, have a unique opportunity for enlightening potential parents of the difficulties and problems, often painful ones, of successful family life. If we could convince ourselves, and young people in particular, that the child comes first; that family life is absolutely basic for the welfare of that child; that successful family life is not easy—that in fact it is all the more successful when difficulties, conflict, and even suffering, are part of it, for it is by facing problems together that growth and progress occur—then I believe that we should have made a real step forward. The child is father to the man, but man and woman, boy and girl, are parents to the child. Both of these views are equally true and equally important.

JEAN WEST

Church Stretton, Salop

Accidental injury in children and interrogation of families

SIR,—I write in response to the letter from Drs J M English and Patricia A Sutcliffe (20 October, p 1003) on accidental injury in

children and interrogation of families. This is a particularly sore point with my partners and I as in our practice a particularly unpleasant and unhappy case has arisen where the damage done by a social worker interrogating the family was far in excess of any damage that might have been done by parental abuse of one of the children.

Two points caused us considerable pause for thought—the first was that the whole attitude taken by the social workers and those who ran the non-accidental injury register was of guilt until innocence was proved. They have maintained, and still maintain, this attitude, despite exhaustive research and the absence of any cumulative suspicious evidence apart from one child in the family displaying bruises, which are of the normal nature but of remarkable frequency. The second point is the vigour and the persistence of the inquiry. The result of the ill-considered zeal in the particular case has been: (1) depression for father; (2) repeated consultations for support by mother; (3) the removal of a long-term foster child (to that foster child's considerable detriment—this child was not the subject of the original interest); (4) the inevitable knowledge in a small community that this family is the subject of inquiry and the equally inevitable belief by some that there cannot be smoke without fire.

Surely it is time for the pendulum to swing a little in the other direction—for the families to be considered, and for some system to be arrived at where if confirmatory evidence of child abuse has not been forthcoming after a certain while attention is focused away from that family and that family's name removed from the black book. The family in question have been told that they will be the subject of continual supervision and inquiry until the boy is 16 in some 10 years' time. They have also been warned that this will follow them about the country if they decide to move.

NORTH OF ENGLAND GP

Circumcision and cruelty to children

SIR,—I must take issue with Dr J E Oliver (13 October, p 933) who looks at circumcision from a very polarised point of view. As a general surgeon, I am well aware of the dangers, both physical and mental, that surround circumcision, particularly if performed without anaesthesia, but he does not mention the consequences of leaving the foreskin until 16 years of age or such time as the patient decides he wants something done.

I know remarkably little of the natural history of the foreskin; certainly I recognise the extremes, but I cannot predict the outcome of the large group who may or may not later develop paraphimosis or even a ballooning foreskin. In this group the challenge is to assess the advisability of doing a circumcision versus adopting a wait-and-see policy. My own view is that circumcision at 10 days on religious grounds alone cannot reasonably be refused. After this I do circumcision for complications only until the child is dry, around the age of 3 years, because of the dangers of meatal ulcer. Beyond 3 years I have swung towards circumcision rather than away from it, though I still discourage those with a wide opening. My reasons for so doing are that eventual circumcision at a later age entails yet more discomfort and perhaps an absence from school. A paraphimosis with all