had a stillbirth rate of 10.1 per 1000. A decline in the hospital stillbirth rate for this minimal-risk group from 11.7 to 10.1 per 1000 is relatively less than that achieved outside, from 4.2 to 3.4—hardly an impressive vindication of the current policy of moving towards hospitalisation for all.

Thus the more recent evidence on stillbirths fails to support the conclusion drawn by Mrs Fedrick and Professor Butler from 1958 data. The need for further research is as great as ever.

MARJORIE TEW

The Queen's Medical Centre,
University of Nottingham

¹ Tew, M. *New Society*, 1977, **39**, 120.

² Tew, M., *Journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners*, 1977, **27**, 689.

³ Tew, M., in *The Place of Birth*, ed S Kitzinger and J Davis. London, Oxford University Press, 1978.

⁴ Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, *Registrar General's Statistical Review of England and Wales for 1969*. London, HMSO, 1971.

⁵ Registrar General, unpublished return for 1975.

Hospital laboratory computing

SIR,—Your leading article (18 February, p 387) and Professor I D P Wootton (1 April, p 851) are right in saying that medical computing systems that can easily be transferred to other sites are highly desirable. I would, however, like to question whether we yet have such systems for hospital laboratory computing in Britain. Dr M D Buckley-Sharp (4 March, p 577) lists a number of recipient laboratories of the excellent Phoenix system from the Hammersmith Hospital, but he does not say if any of them are actually being served by their computer system on a routine basis. As I have said before,¹ we should not accept that a system is a general one until it has proved itself in routine use at a number of recipient sites.

Simple transfer of medical computing systems has proved an elusive goal in the past, but it is still one which we should try to achieve. Success in overcoming the problems it presents should be carefully and accurately recorded for the benefit of others trying to achieve it. May we know, therefore, how many laboratories now routinely use Phoenix (or a derivative of it) and for how long they have done so?

E C COLES

Division of Computing and
Statistics,
Clinical Research Centre,
Harrow, Middx

¹ Coles, E C, *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, 1974, **8**, 355.

Drug information services

SIR,—The total number of inquiries received by the regional drug information centres, as reported by Dr F N Leach (25 March, p 766), represents only a small percentage of the total number of inquiries made annually to drug information centres and, if taken alone, underestimates the advisory role of these services. The results of a small survey will illustrate this point.

The survey was conducted during a two-week period in 1976 and detailed all inquiries received across a teaching district of 1700 acute beds serving most specialties. There is an active ward pharmacy programme at each of the hospitals within the district and a department of clinical pharmacology and therapeutics at the hospital in which a specialist

pharmacy-based district drug information service has been developing over four years. The extrapolated district total of inquiries for 1976 was 5800 compared with a total of 8584 from the eight regional centres listed by Dr Leach. During the survey period the drug information pharmacist dealt with 13% of all inquiries, the rest being answered by pharmacists in the course of their work; 10% were made directly to the centre and 3% referred. However, within the hospital in which it is based the centre answers 33% of inquiries. During the survey period 8% of inquiries arose outside the district.

The types of inquiry made to the district drug information service were very similar to those quoted by Dr Leach. The highest proportion came from hospital pharmacists as a result of clinical problems met on the ward rounds. This demonstrates the interception of inquiries by district and area centres. Non-clinical staff accounted for nearly as many inquiries as clinicians. A multidisciplinary approach is required for the provision of a comprehensive drug information service, which includes clinical, pharmaceutical, and scientific problems.

The national usage of drug information resources and the contribution of local drug information pharmacists is greater than Dr Leach's paper, concentrating on the regional centres only, would suggest.

KATHLEEN LAWDAY

Drug Information Pharmacist,
Queen Elizabeth Medical Centre

Queen Elizabeth Hospital,
Birmingham

British standard insulin syringe

SIR,—Let us stop, look, listen, and think—let us not be stampeded and corralled into accepting U-100 (100 U/ml) insulin as the only one, with all other strengths banned (Drs B F Brearley and J Mackie, 18 March, p 713). This would irrevocably condemn all insulin-dependent diabetics to one system of varying (expensive) syringes and all its drawbacks. One system, like a monopoly, could become a tyranny.

Let the positive aim of this country be the acceptance of U-100 as a new factor for assessment for improved insulin administration to patients and not be abused as a weapon to remove the possibility of better techniques. One technique I suggest is to combine the use of U-20 and U-100 using the present standard syringe only, with its 20 graduation marks. For U-100 one graduation mark would measure 5 U and for U-20 1 U of insulin, this information to be precisely engraved on the syringe.

Thus the largest part of one injection could be measured from U-100 in multiples of 5 U and the balance of less than 5 U from U-20, which would give accurate end-point measurement to 1 U per graduation for the dose. For several reasons precision measurement of dose is of great importance. Small doses would be measured from U-20 insulin up to 20 U. I have used this simple technique on myself for many years with U-80 and U-40. These would be withdrawn when U-100 and U-20 became available.

The advantages for the patient are the lower volume given by U-100 and great precision of measurement by U-20; the use of one syringe only for all doses of insulin, and therefore no added stress; and for the NHS and our country

no massive additional cost for multiple differing syringes and holders.

Adopting the American technique, banishing all insulin concentrations except U-100, excludes this suggested (British) technique. Adopting the suggested (British) technique of one standard insulin syringe and of two insulin concentrations, U-100 and U-20, does not prevent anyone adopting the American technique, but in the beginning they should have to buy the special syringes required.

M M SHEPHERD

Blairgowrie,
Perthshire

Outpatient chemotherapy for breast cancer

SIR,—We wish to comment on the letter from Dr R Bell and others (1 April, p 857) concerning the oral administration of 400-mg doses of methotrexate.

The statement that the patients' supreme effort of swallowing 10 tablets every hour for 16 h results in similar blood levels to those achieved by infusion of the drug is not supported by hitherto published evidence. Although doses of less than 30 mg/m² have been shown to be nearly completely absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract,^{1,2} absorption is protracted and incomplete with doses of 80 mg/m² or more, leading to plasma levels less than one-tenth of those achieved after intravenous administration.^{3,4} If this is, in fact, the case it is not surprising that in the study by Dr Bell and his colleagues toxicity was relatively mild. However, the cytotoxic efficacy of the drug may well be open to question.

In answer to the request for a higher-strength tablet, may we point out that we are in the process of developing a 10-mg tablet? In addition we can supply a formula from which a 2 mg/ml syrup preparation can be made. Preliminary pharmacological and stability data for this formulation have been published.⁴

G W R HILL

Medical Director

MARYANNE ROACH

Medical Information Manager,
Lederle Laboratories

Gosport, Hants

¹ Henderson, E S, *et al*, *Cancer Research*, 1965, **25**, 1018.

² Huffman, D M, *et al*, *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, 1973, **14**, 572.

³ Wan, S H, *et al*, *Cancer Research*, 1974, **34**, 3487.

⁴ McVie, J G, *British Journal of Cancer*, 1977, **36**, 417.

Intra-articular steroids

SIR,—Your recent leading article on this subject (11 March, p 600) presented highly agreeable and balanced advice to clinicians, since many previous reports concerning this subject have been paradoxical at least to some extent. However, it seems to us that the excess use of intra-articular corticosteroid injections in sports medicine as "pain-killers," especially in knee injuries, should be criticised.

A recent experimental study on rabbits¹ suggested that intra-articular betametasone seemed to have a protective effect against early articular cartilage degeneration in the knee joint when the rabbits were subjected to strenuous exercise. However, the protective effect of both intra-articular and intramuscular glycosaminoglycan polysulphate injections