and for adults with alimentary dysfunction.² (The highly soluble phosphate is absorbed rapidly over a wide area of mucosa and its clinical effect in rheumatoid arthritic patients is of similar duration to that following ordinary prednisolone.) The measurement of free corticosteroid hormones in urine, as a means of assessing their bioavailability, was recommended² and precise gas chromatographic techniques were subsequently described.³

H F WEST

Axminster, Devon EX13 5TL

¹ West, H F, *British Medical Journal*, 1959, 2, 680.
² Bailey, E, Murphy, D, and West, H F, *Archives of Diseases in Childhood*, 1963, 38, 71.
³ Bailey, E, *Journal of Endocrinology*, 1964, 28, 131.

The surviving twin

SIR,—The question and answer (7 April, p 934) on psychological reactions in a surviving twin were of great interest to us, as we are concerned with a similar case at present.

This case, which is being described in more detail elsewhere, involved a surviving twin following a sudden infant death ("cot death"). The mother complained that the survivor was "possessed" by the spirit of the dead twin, and that this was causing his "naughty" behaviour. Psychiatric assessment disclosed that this was not a true delusional belief, but an explanation given by the mother in the face of difficult and unmanageable behaviour.

In fact, since the cot death two years ago, she had severely rejected the surviving twin. He was recently admitted to hospital when it was discovered that she was locking him up, and he was felt to be at risk. The problems of a very complicated domestic and social background could not be readily resolved and the child is now in foster care.

KERRY BUGLASS

University Department of
 Psychiatry,
 Queen Elizabeth Hospital,
 Birmingham B15 2TH

STUART GREEN
ROSALYN PROOPS

Children's Hospital,
 Birmingham B16 8ET

Cervical cytology

SIR,—I was interested to read Dr R E G Sloan's letter (19 May, p 1356) concerning the reliability of technicians' reports on cervical smears. He complains that in one centre there were too many requests for repeat smears whereas in another comments were confined solely to the presence or absence of atypical cells.

In order to receive reliable reports it is essential that the specimens are collected correctly. A cervical scrape should include the squamocolumnar junction as this is an important site of origin of intraepithelial neoplasia. A satisfactory cervical scrape therefore must contain endocervical cells, usually in sheets. In only 5-10% of women, mainly those in the older age groups, the squamocolumnar junction is displaced and out of reach. While the absence of endocervical cells is of no particular importance in a "positive smear" a negative smear is unreliable unless endocervical cells are present and requests for repeat of such films are absolutely justified. I suggest that if Dr Sloan and his colleagues revise their smear-taking techniques the number of repeat smears will be drastically reduced.

With regard to his second complaint, I would like to point out that Dr Sloan confuses the task of the screener in population-screening centres with that of the cytopathologist, whose diagnostic scope extends far beyond the recognition of dysplasias and intra-epithelial carcinomas of the cervix. That the screeners are highly successful in their laborious efforts of reading large numbers of slides is evidenced by the declining incidence of invasive cancer of the cervix and its falling death rate. Incidental findings such as trichomonal, monilial, and herpetic infections are usually also reported but are not the main concern of the screener.

It is grossly unfair to submit buccal and nasal smears labelled as cervical scrapes to a screening centre and to expect the screener to recognise the ruse. The technician in the Gloucestershire laboratory would, in all probability, have rejected the smears and asked for a repeat—but then Dr Sloan complains about such a request. The Yorkshire laboratory stating that there were no malignant cells in the specimens submitted is probably right and Dr Sloan should feel reassured about the state of the epithelia in his buccal and nasal cavities.

ERICA WACHTEL

Harley Street Cytology Centre,
 London W1

Blood transfusions and Jehovah's Witnesses

SIR,—Adult Jehovah's Witnesses, who refuse to receive blood and blood derivatives, may sign a form accepting full responsibility for their action. This release of medical and administrative staff from responsibility is acceptable so long as the patient is not subsequently rendered unconscious (and therefore unable to change his mind) by the administration of an anaesthetic for which he has given his signed consent. This consent should not be conditional on the non-administration of blood as it imposes an unacceptable burden on the anaesthetist, in whose care the patient has placed himself while unconscious.

I recently anaesthetised a Jehovah's Witness for an emergency caesarean section. During the procedure she developed diffuse intravascular coagulation and I had to abandon the unequal struggle with fluids and plasma expanders and resorted to fresh frozen plasma and 8 units of blood. The patient survived and she accepted, with regret, the need for the transfusion.

As often happens, a week later another Jehovah's Witness needed anaesthesia for examination for possible placenta praevia. When I gave an undertaking not to give blood except as a last resort, there was a hysterical response from both the patient and her husband with an absolute refusal of any blood under any circumstance. In the interest of the patient, I eventually made all the necessary promises and proceeded to anaesthetise her for examination and eventual caesarean section as I had done in the past—that is, agreeing not to give blood but prepared to do so if absolutely necessary.

Jehovah's Witnesses seem to be impervious to the problems they create for the nursing and medical staff (the anaesthetist in particular) by merely signing a quasilegal document. I therefore wonder whether I should carry on as in the past, and possibly be sued if I give blood when I consider it life saving, or whether I should also draw up and sign a quasilegal document agreeing to administer anaesthesia

without this absolute restriction. I would be grateful for a legal opinion and the view of any medical practitioners who are Jehovah's Witnesses.

F CASALE

Colchester, Essex CO3 3NG

Medical reports and confidentiality

SIR,—I was interested to read the letter from Drs G B May and W P Garson (26 May, p 1427) and welcome the most enlightening reply from Dr David Gullick (16 June, p 1631). As a physician with an interest in life insurance medicine may I stress that the insurance company is only too anxious to give the patient the best possible deal—maximum cover for minimum outlay—and, further, that requests for medical attendants' reports are made as much for the benefit of the insured as the insurers. As Dr Gullick so rightly points out, this information is the property of the patient, who always gives permission for its disclosure.

On receipt of the request from the patient for insurance cover the underwriters' task is to assess any increased risk to life posed by past or present disease, and this may lead to an increased premium if the fit members of society are not to subsidise the unfit. Accurate assessment of risk may be difficult even when all the medical facts are known, but how much more difficult when they are not. In this latter situation the assessor may have to impose an extra for uncertainty, which might not exist were fuller information available. If there is any doubt about the histology of an excised lesion, the cause of an episode of jaundice, or whether the suicide attempt was genuine the premium may well be loaded; if on the other hand it is clear beyond doubt that the polyp removed was benign, that the jaundice was infective and not alcoholic hepatitis, or that the suicide attempt was just a simple call for help the premium may be normal or the loading minimal.

The medical examiner's report, although very helpful with regard to the current situation, cannot possibly give overall information to the same degree of accuracy as a medical attendant's report—particularly as the patient himself may be unaware of the exact nature of a previous illness. The insurance company is as concerned with the patient's welfare as is his doctor; and any general practitioner who refuses to disclose information requested by a Life Office for the purpose of insurance, far from helping his patient, may be doing him a positive disservice.

R C KING

Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN2 4TW

Small hospitals and the nursing shortage

SIR,—I would like to draw attention to a parochial matter in north-west Surrey which could have serious implications nationally.

On Wednesday 30 May, the chairman of the medical staff of Walton-on-Thames Hospital received a telephone call from the district management team for north-west Surrey to say that from the following Sunday the women's ward of Walton Hospital would be closed for seven weeks. A similar call was received at the neighbouring Weybridge Hospital, with the added information that the casualty services at that hospital would be