results in vasodilatation and relaxation of the mammalian penis leading to erection.¹⁻³ However, there is no evidence to suggest that the transmitter responsible for this inhibitory effect is cholinergic in nature. Indeed the identity of the transmitter has so far not been established. We have previously suggested the possibility that the inhibitory transmitter leading to erection may be histamine.⁴ The smooth muscle of the erectile corpus cavernosa of the human penis in vitro is either contracted or relaxed by histamine. The former effect is abolished by mepyramine (a histamine H₁-receptor antagonist), which also potentiates the relaxant effect of histamine on this tissue. The relaxant effect of histamine on the human penis is abolished by burimamide,⁴ which is chemically related to cimetidine and is known to antagonise actions of histamine mediated through H₂ receptors.

Thus cimetidine, by blocking H₂ receptors on the body of the penis, may prevent erection. However, definite proof that histamine is the neurotransmitter at the sacral parasympathetic nerve is lacking.

P G ADAIKAN
S M M KARIM

Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology,
Kandang Kerbau Hospital,
University of Singapore

¹ Langley, J N, and Anderson, H K, *Journal of Physiology*, 1895, 19, 85.

² Henderson, V E, and Roepke, M H, *American Journal of Physiology*, 1933, 106, 441.

³ Baço, Z M, *Archives of International Physiology*, 1935, 40, 311.

⁴ Adaikan, P G, and Karim, S M M, *European Journal of Pharmacology*, 1977, 45, 261.

A case of compulsory admission

SIR,—Your correspondent JSP (7 April, p 949) may have found the *Man Alive* programme of 27 March entertaining, but if he considers that it was a "responsible piece of journalism" he was not paying attention. He describes it as an excellent programme; it was a slanted, misleading distortion.

Four doctors at the time (two psychiatrists, a consultant physician, and the GP who had been more concerned with the patient recently than any other) agreed that admission was appropriate. Only one, Dr Whitehead, the NHS psychiatrist involved, disagreed; he had not seen the patient for several days, and my attempt to make contact with him at the time was unsuccessful. The social worker saw the patient for a few minutes only and could not be expected to consider the differential diagnosis; the patient's "housekeeper" had been with him for just about three weeks, and "his" solicitor first became involved a fortnight before (the solicitor who had looked after the patient's affairs for 30 years and who, I am informed, is now doing so again was temporarily displaced—perhaps by reason of the patient's disordered mental state at the time).

On admission he was seen by a consultant physician, who noted, "On arrival here he was thin, unfit, and moderately dehydrated. . . . With adequate feeding, nursing care, etc, his condition improved steadily without specific therapy other than for his anaemia, and his weight rose steadily from 8 stones to 8 stones 8 pounds."

He remained on as an informal patient for five months after expiry of the Section 25 order, so presumably even the patient considered his admission was not misplaced. He then left to live with one of the daughters pilloried in the programme. He has been with her for a year. All strange behaviour indeed for one who has been "Put Away," as the programme was emotively entitled.

Dr Whitehead's opinions are not shared by the Royal College of Psychiatrists: "The

College feels that, as far as possible, relatives themselves should be encouraged to take responsibility and continue to be involved in admission and discharge procedures rather than to relegate this entirely to a professional group (social workers)."¹

Why was this propaganda exercise allowed to be presented as a serious documentary programme? One can but speculate on this; surely, however, it is time that measures were taken by the BBC to improve their standards of reporting.

M HARVEY SYMES

Hove, Sussex BN3 6GP

¹ *Bulletin of the Royal College of Psychiatrists*, April 1979.

New approach to treatment of recent stroke?

SIR,—Dr A K Admani's report (16 December, p 1678) of a double-blind trial of naftidrofuryl (Praxilene) in acute stroke has prompted the manufacturers, Lipha Pharmaceuticals Limited, to produce a brochure extolling the virtues of the drug in stroke patients.

The brochure includes descriptions of two patients admitted to the stroke unit of the Northern General Hospital, Sheffield, presumably under Dr Admani's care, in September 1978. The first was admitted following the sudden onset of loss of consciousness and a left-sided weakness. A distinction between cerebral haemorrhage and infarction was not attempted. The paper itself indicates that strokes due to recent ischaemic cerebral infarction were studied, whereas the manufacturers' literature gives as the definition of stroke used for the purposes of the trial a deficit produced by an ischaemic lesion in the cerebral hemisphere (thromboembolic or haemorrhagic insult). The second case description refers to a patient with a left hemiplegia and a carcinoma of the bronchus. Treatment included dexamethasone. The paper on the trial indicated that only strokes due to vascular causes were included.

Both patients made good recoveries, with the implication that naftidrofuryl had been at least partly responsible. The assumption is unsatisfactory in the first case, where the distinction of haemorrhage from infarction was never attempted, and in the second case, where adequate measures to exclude a cerebral metastasis were not taken.

A criticism of the trial paper has already been published (10 February, p 412). The unwarranted assumption by the manufacturers about the efficacy of the drug in two patients who would not have qualified for the trial in the first place and their description in their literature of "a major development in acute stroke therapy" seem to indicate that they have not understood or considered the merits of that criticism.

G D PERKIN

Charing Cross Hospital,
London W6 8RF

Shortening hospital stay for psychiatric care

SIR,—In his letter (17 March, p 751), Dr Peter F Kennedy has misinterpreted the study we reported earlier (17 February, p 442), in which we carried out a randomised experiment to examine the effect of an across-the-board administrative policy to shorten hospital stay for acute psychiatric patients.

The success of the experimental variable, random assignment to brief care, in reducing length of stay is reflected by the fall in the mean length of stay of 33 days for all admissions during the year before the study (1974) to a length of stay of 22 days for patients randomly assigned to brief care during the year of the study. This was an overall saving of 33%; but from the point of view of number of patients affected the saving is even greater in that the median length of stay fell from 24 days to 9, a reduction of 63%. The difference in length of stay between the brief and standard care patients fell during the experimental year owing to a halo effect. However, the potential administrative saving which can result by arbitrarily deciding that inpatient care should be as short as possible must be judged by comparing the length of stay of the experimental group to that of all patients during the year before the study.

We have data to show that the standard care patients received, if anything, higher doses of medication, and that there was no difference in the amount of social work or outside support given to the two groups. This was possible because brief and standard care patients were treated in the same facility spread between five consultants, so that heterogeneity of approach was more likely.

Unfortunately, the approach which Dr Kennedy mentions, in which all brief-care patients are sent to a separate experimental ward, does not throw light on the effects of brief care as such, for their therapeutic approach was different. This, Dr Kennedy states, "involved staff having to learn new skills and deploy their time quite differently." I will be interested to see if Dr Kennedy is able to identify whether his results are due to one experimental variable or the other.

STEVEN HIRSCH

Department of Psychiatry,
Charing Cross Hospital,
London W6 8RF

Drug-induced neurological disease

SIR,—Dr E M R Critchley in his article on drug-induced neurological disease (31 March, p 862) listed a wide range of drugs capable of causing convulsions. Recently, with the increasing number of inquiries we have received regarding solvent inhalation, it has come to our attention that convulsions may result from the acute intoxicant effects of glue sniffing.

Case 1—While sniffing Evostik glue, a 14-year-old boy became suddenly unconscious and was observed to have a generalised convulsion involving all four limbs. He remained unrousable over the following ten minutes, during which time he had a further convulsion. On arrival at hospital he was drowsy and complained of being unable to see clearly. Apart from widely dilated pupils, examination revealed no abnormality and after 24 hours of observation he was discharged home. The patient had a two-year history of glue sniffing, of which his family were unaware.

Case 2—A 15-year-old boy collapsed after sniffing Evostik glue continuously for four hours. While he was unconscious his companions reported several episodes of violent shaking of his arms and legs. By the time he was admitted to hospital he was fully conscious and very aggressive. Physical examination was normal and he was discharged home the following day. The patient had a two-year history of intermittent glue sniffing and had previously experienced five similar episodes of collapse while inhaling solvents.

Case 3—The patient, a boy of 12 years, was