reported a rise of 22 beats/min after a similar dose in acute asthma, while we have shown a rise of 28 beats/min one minute after salbutamol 200 µg injected over a one-minute period to convalescent asthmatics.⁵ Indeed, Mr Neville and his colleagues reported a rise of 31 beats/min on completion of their intravenous injection. It would seem likely that had Professor Femi-Pearse measured the pulse rate sooner after completion of the bolus injection of salbutamol a greater tachycardia would have been apparent. In view of these other reports we feel that salbutamol should be administered intravenously *slowly* (over at least five minutes) and that, with time, cardiotoxic effects or deaths will be observed if this effective bronchodilator is given rapidly as suggested.

ANDREW J JOHNSON
STEPHEN SPIRO
S W CLARKE

Brompton Hospital,
London SW3

¹ Tickner, T R, *et al*, *Thorax*, 1976, 2, 240.

² Taylor, M W, *et al*, *British Medical Journal*, 1976, 1, 22.

³ Goldberg, R, *et al*, *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, 1975, 51, 53.

⁴ Fitchett, D H, McNichol, M W, and Riordan, J F, *British Medical Journal*, 1975, 1, 53.

⁵ Spiro, S G, *et al*, *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 1975, 2, 495.

Obstetric flying squads and mobile resuscitation units

SIR,—You published a letter from us last year (13 March 1976, p 650) in which we supported the use of mobile resuscitation units (MRUs) for the early management of patients with myocardial infarction. We went on, however, to stress our conviction that measures for resuscitation and immediate care are similar irrespective of the nature of the emergency. We suggested that there was no need to restrict the use of MRUs to one type of emergency and that immediate care teams could provide skilled aid to patients whether for a myocardial infarction, road accident, or some other medical emergency.

We were therefore especially interested to read two recent articles on obstetric flying squads. While Mr I L C Fergusson and Miss J M Watson (21 February, 1976, p 446) concluded that "few if any circumstances in modern obstetric practice merit continuing the flying squad in the urban area," they reported that in three of the 25 calls in their series the patients were clinically shocked. Dr D K James (22 January 1977, p 217) reported a series of 81 calls, of which 36 were made to general practitioner units and 45 to patients' homes. He concluded that the service was still of great value and "represents a much safer method [than an emergency ambulance call] of transporting an obstetric patient in an emergency" (our italics). It was notable that in all the calls to patients' homes the patients were brought back to the base hospital after being treated by intravenous infusion with or without sedation.

We would like to reiterate our belief that all medical emergencies can be effectively handled in the first instance by a general purpose MRU. Immediate care teams who staff these MRUs can be trained in basic methods of resuscitation and such teams would be effective in handling obstetric emergencies since the objective is the same—safe transport to hospital. Obstetric help to general practitioner units would seem to be in a somewhat different

category since such units should be adequately equipped and only require specialist staff. The basis of an MRU is that it can convey both skilled help and equipment to the seriously and suddenly ill from whatever cause. Only by adhering to this principle will the widespread development of MRUs become economically possible.

JOHN ZORAB
PETER BASKETT

Department of Anaesthetics,
Frenchay Hospital,
Bristol

SIR,—While we do not wish to be critical of Dr D K James's excellent article (22 January, p 217) we do feel that some different conclusions may be drawn from his figures. We do agree with him that in assessing the value of a flying squad service certain facts concerning time and manpower are quantifiable but personal judgments are not. In assessing the whole future of the flying squad service we feel that it is these judgments that need reconsideration and that they should not be too greatly preconditioned by old obstetric ideology.

With reference to his figures for the West Berkshire area, we would accept that in general terms the calls to the GP maternity units were justifiable on the grounds that 40% of these patients subsequently required transfer to hospital and that 60% actually had an obstetric procedure carried out in the unit. In this sense time and hospital accommodation were saved in these cases. However, we would take issue as to the efficacy of the flying squad when called to the patient's home. All these patients required subsequent transfer to hospital and no obstetric procedures were carried out in the home. Indeed, the only treatment given before arrival at hospital was an intravenous infusion for some patients. It is clear to us that in view of the times quoted in Dr James's article these patients could have received their infusion earlier had they been taken directly to hospital by the ambulance service. The question that remains to be answered is whether any of them benefited by being assessed before transfer. Here the facts seem to speak for themselves in that, since transport was inevitable in every case, any assessment would be confined to whether an infusion was required, and since an infusion would have been effected more quickly had the patient gone straight to hospital we can only conclude that the expense and manpower involved in supplying a flying squad are not justified in calls to the patient's home.

IAN FERGUSSON
MARGARET WATSON

Department of Gynaecology,
St Thomas's Hospital Medical School,
London SE1

Allergy to diazepam—or vehicle?

SIR,—Dr Louis Milner's report (15 January, p 144) concerning a case of allergy to diazepam describes a local reaction in the buttock after an injection of Stesolid 10 mg. Diazepam is very slightly soluble in water and all injection formulations of this drug contain solubilisers such as propylene glycol, phenylcarbinol, or macrogoliricinoleas, which in their turn are known to cause allergic side effects.

In an investigation¹ we have used a new type of vehicle for diazepam. The drug is dissolved in soybean oil, which is then

emulsified in water in the same way as is used for the intravenous administration of fat for parenteral nutrition (Intralipid). About 1500 patients have been treated intravenously so far and we have not seen any case of allergic manifestations except one in which the connection with diazepam was doubtful as the patient was concomitantly treated with co-trimoxazole. This diazepam emulsion preparation has been found to be markedly free from side effects, thus confirming the opinion that diazepam per se is very well tolerated even in parenteral use.

O VON DARDEL
T MOSSBERG
C MEBIUS
B SVENSSON

Department of Anaesthesiology,
St Göran's Hospital,
Stockholm, Sweden

¹ Dardel, O von, Mebius, C, and Mossberg, T, *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*, 1976, 20, 221.

Growth in renal failure

SIR,—The interesting and valuable paper by Dr P R Betts and others (12 February, p 416) demonstrates the difficulty in assessing the importance of a single variable such as energy intake on growth in children with different degrees of renal insufficiency where other factors are involved. The majority of patients in their study were growing normally and did not have very marked impairment of renal function; thus any effect of energy supplementation could easily have been obscured. Of the 11 children who received supplements, only four had a height below the 3rd centile, and three a growth velocity below the 3rd centile. In addition, growth data were not available for one patient (an infant) and two children had entered puberty and therefore were not strictly comparable with the others.

The method of allocation of the children is unclear to us. If it was on the basis of one nutritional assessment at the start of the study, then analysis of the influence of diet on growth in the preceding year is precluded. On the other hand, if the dietary data refer to analyses during the preceding year rather than at the end it can be shown by a Wilcoxon rank sum test¹ that the five children (excluding the infant and pubertal children) who had energy intakes of less than 80% of recommended daily allowance (RDA) had significantly poorer growth velocities ($P > 0.02$). After energy supplementation when the energy intake improved in three of the five children, no difference in growth velocity is apparent. Only seven of the children (including the pubertal children) had a glomerular filtration rate (GFR) of less than 25 ml/min/1.73 m², which is the level the authors have previously reported to be associated with a reduction in growth velocity.² In the period before supplementation a significant correlation ($r = 0.82$, $P < 0.05$) exists between growth velocity and energy intake, whereas in the supplement period no significant correlation ($P > 0.1$) can be demonstrated.

The question is, do the authors provide enough data to suggest that the decreased energy intake of some children with chronic renal failure is not a causal as well as a related factor in the reduced growth velocity? Only three prepubertal children had both a low GFR (< 25 ml/min/1.73 m²) and a low energy intake ($< 80\%$ RDA) and growth velocity in all of them was greater when on supplements, although in one energy intake did not alter.