May I point out that many other areas would be within their rights in claiming greater allocation of funds because of special circumstances within their areas? Health authorities serving coastal areas can so claim because of a very high preponderance of elderly population and all the demand for medical care and the high morbidity and mortality that go with it. Regions and areas serving populations in the mining districts of the North and Wales can so claim because of the very high incidence of occupational diseases and, therefore, the increased demand for medical care. Industrial areas of the North, not only cities but towns and villages as well, also have problems of social deprivation: unemployment and an elderly population left on their own by younger relatives in search of education, jobs, etc. Dreary streets and pollution (industrial and/or traffic) are not unique to London, nor even to cities, but exist in wide areas of the North, the like of which Sir Francis would not have seen even in Brent.

Sir Francis, of course, is right to confess that the acute wards have a preponderance of elderly patients and the answer surely lies in transferring one-third to one-half of the general medical beds in each area to the geriatric units of those areas.

As for London, the sooner it learns to cut its coat according to its fair share of cloth, the better it will be.

S S H WASTY

Doncaster

BCG for handicapped children

SIR,—The letter from Dr D A Isenberg (16 October, p 939) draws attention to the unsatisfactory immune status of handicapped children with reference to tuberculosis. The situation is far more widespread and applies to all ages and other diseases. In the past few years more than 1100 patients of this hospital have been given a Heaf test. Many were found to be negative and these were all given BCG immunisation.

There are usually unsatisfactory records of previous immunisations against other diseases. I have looked through the records of about 340 patients under my care, and where there has been no record of immunisation against poliomyelitis I have immunised those under the age of 40 with three doses of polio vaccine. Patients under 40 who have had previous polio vaccine have not had a booster, so a booster dose was given. In the last months I have given about 340 patients a Schick test and 127 were positive, showing unsatisfactory immunity to diphtheria. These will be given two doses of PTAP.

I wonder whether it is widely known that following an outbreak of diphtheria in a mental subnormality hospital in Essex the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation agreed that any patient admitted to a hospital for the mentally subnormal or members of the staff, particularly the nursing staff for whom records of immunisation against diphtheria were lacking, should receive a course of diphtheria prophylaxis but not TAF. One or other of the preparations PTAP or PTAH should preferably be used. This course of action was recommended to all physician superintendents and medical administrators of mental subnormality hospitals in the South-west Metropolitan Regional Hospital Board by the then senior administrative

medical officer in a letter dated 15 January 1971. Should this procedure not still be followed?

R M VEALL

Botleys Park Hospital,
Chertsey, Surrey

Attempted prevention of neonatal thyrotoxicosis

SIR,—With reference to my recent short report under this title (6 November, p 1110) my attention has been drawn to an article by Maisey and Stimmler¹ on long-acting thyroid stimulator in which they described an attempt to prevent its effect on the fetal thyroid. Unfortunately they did not put that piece of information in the summary of the article! I should like to apologise to Dr Maisey and to Dr Stimmler for missing their original piece of work and thus not giving them the due credit for it. They gave 15 mg of carbimazole per day to a euthyroid pregnant woman who had had two partial thyroidectomies for Graves's disease. She gave birth to non-identical twins five weeks before the expected date of delivery. Both babies appeared to be normal at birth but developed neonatal thyrotoxicosis within a few days and were successfully treated with carbimazole.

It seems worth while, therefore, to administer carbimazole antenatally to a mother with high risk factors for the development of neonatal thyrotoxicosis—namely, its occurrence in previous pregnancies, exophthalmos, pretibial myxoedema, and recurrent thyrotoxicosis,¹ particularly if high concentrations of thyroid-stimulating immunoglobulins are found in the mother's blood.² This applies even if the mother is euthyroid or is receiving treatment for hypothyroidism. It may be wise to administer L-thyroxine to all mothers treated in this way in order to prevent hypothyroidism in the fetus.³

IAN RAMSAY

North Middlesex Hospital,
London N18

¹ Maisey, M N, and Stimmler, L, *Clinical Endocrinology*, 1972, 1, 81.

² Dirmikis, S M, and Munro, D S, *British Medical Journal*, 1975, 2, 605.

³ Ramsay, I, *British Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 1976, 15, 373.

Acute epiglottitis in an adult

SIR,—When I saw the title of Dr B D Linaker's report (30 October, p 1045) I supposed that there had been a printing error, but since the name "epiglottitis" is used consistently throughout the report it was presumably intended to be spelled that way. However, he was obviously referring to the condition usually known as epiglottitis (or as supraglottitis).

It is clearly established that in children this disease is usually caused by capsulated strains of *Haemophilus influenzae* belonging to capsular type b. The aetiology in adults is less clear, largely because bacteriological investigation has often been inadequate. Mere demonstration of the presence of *H influenzae* in the throat (as in Dr Linaker's case) proves nothing, since this species is common even in healthy throats; but identification of the organism as capsulated and of type b is much more informative since this type is carried by only 1% or so of healthy people.¹ However, blood culture is an even more convincing way of identifying

the causative organism and should be part of the investigation of any patient suspected of having epiglottitis; it will seldom produce results in time to guide treatment of the individual patient, but we need to know how confidently we can assume *H influenzae* to be the aetiological agent in such cases. The emergence of β -lactamase-producing strains of *H influenzae* type b means that ampicillin may fail to control this very serious condition² and my own recent laboratory studies have reinforced my belief that chloramphenicol is currently the drug of choice for life-threatening haemophilus infections.³

D C TURK

Bacteriology Department,
Radcliffe Infirmary,
Oxford

¹ Turk, D C, and May, J R, *Haemophilus influenzae: its Clinical Importance*. London, English Universities Press, 1967.

² *Lancet*, 1976, 2, 776.

³ Turk, D C, *Journal of Medical Microbiology*. In press.

* * * The spelling "epiglottitis" is in accordance with *BMJ* style, the authority for which is *Dorland's Illustrated Medical Dictionary*, 25th edn.—Ed, *BMJ*.

The hospitals we need

SIR,—Your leading article (25 September, p 713) on this subject seems to convey with ill-conceived triumph the message that community hospitals (CHs) are more costly to run than district general hospitals (DGHs), thus destroying "several widely held beliefs."

The research document¹ on which your article was based has at last come to my hands and certain facts should be made clear.

(1) The two experimental units studied were very small: Wallingford with 17 beds and Peppard with 15 beds.

(2) These units had a nursing structure heavily loaded with sisters and offered no place for student nurses.

(3) Staffing was far more costly than that at Abingdon Cottage Hospital, which, to quote the research document, "provides a service similar to that of a CH and has a nursing cost per inpatient week above the national average for that type of hospital." In fact the cost per bed in Abingdon Hospital was on a par with the lowest-costing ward in either of the two DGHs in Oxford and Reading (£752 and £736).

(4) The added cost of ambulances to convey preconvalescent patients to the CH is of course more noticeable for those patients who stay only a few days. It would not be so excessive with normal nursing costs.

(5) The optimum size of CH for nursing costs is about 35 beds. Units the size of Wallingford and Peppard, as judged from national statistics (quoted from the research document), cost some 22% more anyhow.

(6) The cost of larger general practitioner hospitals is difficult to compare and assess because they often have a wider scope, including operative surgery.

Although the possibility of CHs offering an economic alternative to total DGH care has been attractive, it has never been (and should never be) their *raison d'être*. You seem to forget that the main stimulus to the Oxford Region community hospital project was that the DGH alone could not satisfy six criteria of adequate hospital provision. You bemoan the fact that replacement of an old worn-out hospital by a new one leads to higher costs, "for the new structure allows and encourages a higher standard of nursing care and medical treatment." What a remarkable philosophy! Which is more important, quality or cash?

My greatest worry about your article is that it may have implanted in the minds of rapid readers an idea that all GP hospitals are costly. There has recently been a spate of closure threats from area health authorities seeking a simple solution to financial strictures. The busy members of these authorities rely on responsible sources for information on which to base their difficult judgment. They cannot be expected to read research documents in detail. It is the considered view of myself and many others that the closure of flourishing GP hospitals solves no financial problem.

Your suggested comparative trial and pilot scheme for different regions seems rational but is probably doomed before it starts because no two regions or areas are comparable and no GP hospital will allow itself to be closed for experimental reasons. To quote the Oxford document once more, "a full analysis has not been achieved mainly because of the enormity of the task of collecting data on so many outcome variables. . . . Doubts remain on qualitative aspects which are not capable of measurement. . . . Yet the qualitative aspects may ultimately be the critical factors in any decision."

MEYRICK EMRYS-ROBERTS
Chairman,
Association of General Practitioner
Hospitals

Walton-on-Thames,
Surrey

¹ Rickards, J A, *Cost-effectiveness Analysis of the Oxford Community Hospital*. Oxford, Department of the Regius Professor of Medicine, 1976

"Nurse consultants"

SIR,—I have just read an article (in another journal) by a lady whose official title was given as "clinical nurse consultant (anaesthetics)." When I had recovered my equanimity I felt I must write to ask you or your readers for clarification. To me "clinical" and "anaesthetics" do not marry well, nor do "nurse" and "consultant." I would be interested to discover just what grade on the Salmon scale such a person holds and what she actually does? I cannot conceive of any situation in which any nurse should call herself a consultant and if we allow these things to occur we shall very soon be in a position in which the nurses are at the same level as the senior medical staff. I may well be cantankerous and oldfashioned, but this I will fight to the end of my working life.

D EYRE-WALKER

Anaesthetic Department,
Staffordshire General Infirmary,
Stafford

Side effects of prazosin

SIR,—I am grateful to Professor C Rosendorff (6 November, p 1131) for clarifying the points which I raised about his paper on dose-related side effects of prazosin (28 August, p 508). I am sorry that he considered some of my assumptions to be sinister—they were not meant to be. However, in view of the lack of information in the original paper it was impossible to assess the full significance of his results. In this context one has to appreciate the limitations imposed by the "short report" format and clearly Professor Rosendorff has good evidence that these first-dose reactions are dose-dependent.

So far as the ethical context of this work is concerned, my comment is, of course, highly subjective. I accept that rechallenge is an acceptable technique in diagnosis and therapy and can be so in experimental work as well. My complaint is not a general one against the concept of rechallenge but a particular one in this case in view of the severity of some of the reactions to the drug. I am not sure that any further information has been gained from this study than could have been gained from a comparative trial of the drug using a smaller starter dose against placebo and against other established antihypertensive drugs.

M J BENDALL

Department of Geriatric Medicine,
St Mary's Hospital,
Colchester

Diagnosis of Down's syndrome at birth

SIR,—Your leading article (9 October, p 835) rightly emphasises the importance of improving the clinical diagnosis of Down's syndrome soon after birth but comments on the shortcomings of existing clinical methods in achieving this.

One particularly characteristic clinical finding deserves wider recognition—namely, the size and *grouping* of the facial features. The newly born infant with Down's syndrome has eyes, nose, and mouth which are not only individually relatively small but which are grouped more closely together towards the centre of the oval represented by the face and forehead. The figure illustrates this in an affected infant (left) compared with an infant with similar but differently spaced facial features (right).

This finding appears so consistently that, taken in conjunction with the other discriminating features described by Jackson *et al*,¹ it should reliably increase the accuracy of diagnosis. Surprisingly it is omitted from nearly all standard textbook descriptions. It may not, however, apply to chromosome mosaic Down's syndrome.

M KEITH STRELLING

Department of Paediatrics,
Plymouth General Hospital,
Devon

¹ Jackson, J F, North, E R, and Thomas, J G, *Clinical Genetics*, 1976, 9, 483.

Disappearing elderly

SIR,—Some 18 months ago a planning document circulated by one of our local authorities implied that the provision of residential accommodation and other services for the elderly were at higher levels per head of population than we believed them to be. Closer inspection revealed that this "improvement" had been achieved by a reduction of over

20% compared with 1971 Census data in the estimated number of people aged 65 and over resident in the local authority area. The new estimate had been obtained by counting the persons on the electoral register who had declared themselves as not liable for jury service by virtue of being aged 65 or over.

We have had an opportunity to investigate the accuracy of this method of estimating the size of an elderly population. The Whickham Survey, carried out from 1972 to 1974,¹ studied various aspects of health among the adults of a geographically defined area by taking a 1 in 6 sample from the appropriate electoral registers. Subsequently we attempted to identify in the electoral register published in 1975 the 557 persons who, from interview or medical records, were known to have been aged over 65 at the time of invitation to take part in the survey. Of the 514 so identified it was found that only 385 (75%) had declared themselves as not liable for jury service on account of age.

Inquiries among a sample of 20 persons who had not declared their age at electoral registration suggested that in this small group at least the fault lay with the design of the registration form rather than with any unwillingness among elderly people to declare their age. Whatever the reasons, however, it is clear that in present circumstances use of the electoral register to count the number of persons aged 65 and over in an area may lead to a 25% underestimate. We wish to draw the attention of your readers to this finding in case this method of estimating elderly populations is being used in other areas for planning purposes. Our analysis is reported in detail elsewhere.²

J GRIMLEY EVANS
MARY BREWIS

Department of Medicine (Geriatrics),
Newcastle General Hospital,
Newcastle upon Tyne

¹ Tunbridge, W M G, *et al*, Proceedings of the 7th International Thyroid Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, 1975.

² Evans, J G, Brewis, M, and Prudham, D, *Age and Ageing*. In press.

Educational placement of children with congenital rubella

SIR,—In 1964 Sheridan reported a follow-up at 8-11 years of 227 children whose mothers were considered to have had rubella during the first 16 weeks of pregnancy.¹ Of these, 206 (92%) were attending normal schools, seven of them with special provision such as hearing aids. It must be emphasised that the diagnosis of rubella was made during pregnancy on clinical grounds only, because serological tests were not then available.

In 1972 Gumpel reported on 83 children who had attended the Hospital for Sick Children, Great Ormond Street, and in whom congenital rubella had been retrospectively diagnosed.² She observed that only nine of the 72 school-age children (12.5%) were attending normal schools. Of the nine children, three were deaf, one of whom was being considered for a change to special education.

In March 1976 letters requesting follow-up information were sent to all doctors who had notified the Northern Registry of the National Congenital Rubella Surveillance Programme of children with confirmed or suspected congenital rubella.³ Information was requested about proposed or current schooling for 88 children of or approaching school age. Replies were received for 83 children, of whom four