Vaccination against smallpox

SIR,—On 26 August the Chief Medical Officer and Chief Nursing Officer at the Department of Health and Social Security sent a letter to all doctors telling them that, following the declaration by the World Health Assembly on 8 May 1980 that the world is now free of smallpox, the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation had recommended that routine vaccination against smallpox should be provided only for people working with smallpox virus and staff who have agreed to work with patients strongly suspected of having smallpox together with, conditionally, their families and those who are engaged in the manufacture of the vaccine or who perform vaccination.

The letter from the CMO and the CNO goes on to remind doctors that there is no medical reason for vaccination and that the procedure carries a small but recognised hazard. It recognises that some countries still officially require valid international certificates against smallpox and that some embassies will not issue visas until a valid international certificate has been produced. It finishes by saying that doctors "will therefore wish to satisfy themselves that the traveller requesting vaccination fully understands the position."

The doctors practising in my district probably are required to immunise more travellers than doctors in any other comparable area in this country. There has therefore been great interest in the contents of the CMO's letter. One of the practitioners in the City wrote to both the medical defence societies and received replies which I consider will be of the greatest interest to doctors throughout the country. In short, the defence societies now take the view that, if a doctor carries out a vaccination against smallpox and complications occur, the patient could allege that the doctor had carried out a procedure which was medically contraindicated, and further that it would be difficult to formulate a defence against such an allegation. The societies go on to say that it is their preference that doctors should refuse to vaccinate except in those cases set out in the letter from the CMO, but should as an alternative provide a certificate to say that vaccination is contraindicated.

It is important that doctors should realise that there are two different recommendations being made here, in that the CMO appears to consider that vaccination against smallpox is a matter for the personal opinion of the doctor, provided that he ensures that the traveller fully understands the position. The medical defence societies, on the other hand, say that doctors should refuse to vaccinate anyone. They do not specifically say that they will not cover doctors who insist on vaccinating but it appears to me, as to other doctors with whom I have discussed the matter, that the possibility cannot be ignored. The result has been a unanimous decision that it would be foolhardy to continue to vaccinate, whatever the clinical pros and cons of the matter.

Two questions emerge from all this: (1) Is it the proper function of the medical defence societies so to influence individual doctors in their clinical judgment? (2) If it is proper, should the defence societies not circulate all doctors who subscribe to them, setting out their decisions and the reasons for them?

DILWYN T JONES

Health Department,
Port and City of London,
London EC2P 2EJ

A better system for polio vaccination in developing countries?

SIR,—Dr Dion Bell in his comment on the eventual reasons for a low potency of polio vaccine stated (20 September, p 810), "It is well known that freezing polio vaccine largely inactivates it." To support his opinion, he refers to a statement by Wellcome that "freezing is harmful to the vaccine." It has to be stressed that in a recent investigation concerning this aspect of adverse storage on polio and other live vaccines Wellcome came to the conclusion that the consequences of such a storage "are not likely to be serious."¹ Lundbeck in a study of the same problem stated, "Freeze-dried and liquid living virus vaccines are not significantly reduced in immunising potency by freezing and thawing as many as five to ten times."²

W EHRENGUT

Institute of Vaccinology and Virology,
2000 Hamburg 26, West Germany

¹ Finter NB, Ferris R, Kelly A, et al. *Develop Biol Standard* 1978;41:271-6.

² Lundbeck H. *Weekly Epidemiological Record* 1977; 52:119.

The coronary care controversy

SIR,—I sincerely hope the excellent review of coronary care by Drs J M Rawles and A C F Kenmure (20 September, p 783) will jolt the profession and other relevant parties out of the unnatural vacuum of inactivity of recent years.

There has been an illogical and emotional overshoot to the Nottingham and Teeside survey results, with sweeping generalisations and condemnations of mobile coronary care and even the coronary care unit. Under critical analysis these surveys have never really tolled the death bell of coronary care but have simply served to demonstrate two basic truths. Firstly, there are great difficulties in studying the acute coronary attack and obtaining a suitable model for study with meaningful randomisations. Secondly, they confirm that coronary care is firmly a community problem and an early problem. From the latter view point as a family doctor interested in coronary care, I am painfully aware of the consequences of leaving the early coronary care patient at home, as is suggested or implied by the results of these surveys. The practical difficulties of diagnosis, adequate analgesia, and management of complications cannot be underestimated.

The treatment of premature electrical death in the early hours after infarction is what coronary care is all about and has proved to be a reasonable and effective exercise associated with good long-term survival. It is impractical for the majority of general practitioners to offer their patients defibrillation, be consistently available for the problem patient requiring repeated analgesia, and attend within minutes of an acute deterioration. Furthermore, the individual GP's experience of the early attack is relatively infrequent and inconsistent with the acquisition of expertise in treatment and emergency resuscitation, and is inappropriate in the home anyway.

In the final analysis, as doctors where would we want to be for our own coronary attack? On the assumption that we would take action fairly early, how many of us would retire to bed after analgesia by his family doctor, who promises to revisit some time later? The

answer is very few, I think—we would all be tucked up in our local coronary care unit just in case, as our patients should be. The early coronary patients should be stabilised by a mobile coronary team and transferred to a unit where expertise is concentrated.

K SHEARER

Baguley, Manchester 23

Atypical angina

SIR,—The reference of anginal pain exclusively to the left thenar eminence by Dr A Lahiri and his colleagues (20 September, p 782) is interesting in that there was no pain in the thumb. It is appreciated that the radial side of the hand is supplied by the C6 dermatome but never, so far as I know, has anginal pain been experienced in the thumb.^{1 2} The papers by Sampson and Cheitlin³ and McKenzie⁴ do not differentiate between the thumb and the thenar eminence. Indeed, paresthesia, sweating, and tingling in the area to which pain is referred invariably spare the thumb. The autonomic manifestations of "cardiac" pain are protean and hence it is quite useful in diagnosis to be aware of an area where none of these is experienced.

Bilateral finger, thenar eminence, forearm, and arm pain, especially if aggravated by exercise or anxiety, are almost exclusive to causes originating in the heart—the exception being disease, whatever the cause, in the mediastinum. Unilateral hand and arm pain may, of course, arise from cervical spondylitis and disorders of the shoulder or brachial plexus and the carpal tunnel and are not related to exertion. Thrombotic or embolic occlusion of the brachial artery will cause arm claudication and the pain will involve the forearm and the whole hand. Localised skeletal or musculoskeletal disorders of the hand should not enter into the differential diagnosis of angina.

RAYMOND DALEY

Faversham, Kent M13 0HY

¹ Daley R. *Br Med J* 1957;ii:173-9.

² Daley R. *Proc R Soc Med* 1960;53:26-8.

³ Sampson JJ, Cheitlin MD. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis* 1971;13:507-31.

⁴ McKenzie J. *Angina pectoris*. London: H Frowd and Hodder and Stoughton, 1923-31. (Oxford Medical Publications.)

Vomiting as a diagnostic aid in acute ischaemic cardiac pain

SIR,—In their recent interesting article (6 September, p 636), Dr D A Ingram and others stated in the final paragraph, "Although our findings fail to explain the cause of vomiting after myocardial infarction, the clear-cut relation with transmural necrosis suggests that the vomiting reflex, if such exists, might arise as a consequence of damage to the subpericardial tissue." The work of Abrahamsson and Thorén and others may help to elucidate this reflex.

Ventricular receptors with non-myelinated C fibre vagal afferents are found throughout the wall of the left ventricle¹ and are stimulated by mechanical and irritant events,² particularly distension and raised left ventricular end diastolic pressure.³ Their reflex effects include gastric dilatation and vomiting,⁴ cardiac slowing, hypotension, and a tonic effect on renin release.⁵ These ventricular C fibre vagal afferents are probably also responsible for the

Bezold-Jarisch reflex⁶ and help to explain the findings of this paper.

C I MEANOCK

Midhurst Medical Research Institute,
Midhurst, W Sussex GU29 0BL

- ¹ Sleight P, Widdicombe JG. *J Physiol* 1965;**181**: 235-58.
² Coleridge HM, Coleridge JCG, Kidd C. *J Physiol* 1964;**174**:323-39.
³ Thoren P. *Circulation Res* 1977;**40**:231-7.
⁴ Abrahamsson H, Thoren P. *Acta Physiol Scand* 1973;**88**:433-40.
⁵ Mancia G, Romero CJ, Shepherd JT. *Circulation Res* 1975;**36**:329-35.
⁶ Öberg B, Thoren P. *Acta Physiol Scand* 1972;**85**: 145-63.

Sulphinpyrazone in acute myocardial infarction

SIR,—The administration of sulphinpyrazone early after myocardial infarction was recently shown by Dr R G Wilcox and others (23 August, p 531) to be accompanied by a significant elevation of serum creatinine and urea. Moreover some of us had reported on four cases of acute renal failure within the first days after starting sulphinpyrazone therapy in patients with a recent myocardial infarction.¹

The mechanism of this renal functional deterioration has to be clarified. Little evidence supports the hypotheses of intratubular urate precipitation or of an immunologically induced interstitial nephritis. We propose that sulphinpyrazone impairs renal function by inhibiting synthesis of prostaglandins in the kidney, as it does in platelets.²

To test this hypothesis, we compared the effect of sulphinpyrazone and of indomethacin—a well-known inhibitor of prostaglandin synthesis—on the urinary excretions of prostaglandins E₂ (PGE₂) and F_{2α} (PGF_{2α}), which reflect the renal synthesis of PGE₂ and PGF_{2α}.³ Four healthy male volunteers with normal dietary salt intake collected their 24-hour urine during 10 consecutive days. Four doses of sulphinpyrazone 200 mg were taken on days 3 and 4 and three doses of indomethacin 50 mg on days 9 and 10; other days served as controls. Other medications, smoking, and sexual activity were withheld. Urinary PGE₂ and PGF_{2α} were measured by radioimmunoassay, as previously described.⁵ When compared with the mean of the values obtained during the two days preceding the drug therapies, the mean urinary PGE₂ concentration significantly decreased on the two days of sulphinpyrazone as well as of indomethacin therapy (see accompanying table). Both drugs produced a comparable effect on the urinary PGE₂. On the other hand, the mean urinary PGF_{2α} did not change under sulphinpyrazone therapy, but it was significantly reduced under indomethacin treatment. Neither drug produced a significant change in creatinine clearance; while sulphinpyrazone produced, as expected, an increase in the urate clearance.

The different handling of renal PGF_{2α} by the two drugs is not yet well understood. However, a drug such as sulphinpyrazone that reduces the formation of the vasodilating PGE₂ in the kidney and does not modify the formation of the vasoconstrictive PGF_{2α} could in certain clinical situations impair renal haemodynamics and even lead to acute renal failure. In the volunteers studied neither drug produced a consistent change in creatinine clearance. This contrasts with the decrease in renal function when sulphinpyrazone was prescribed soon after infarction reported by Dr Wilcox and his colleagues and by Boelaert *et al.*¹ It is possible, however, that sympathoadrenal activation and other vasoconstrictive stimuli characteristic of the post-infarction period lead to renal prostaglandin activation, withdrawal of which could result in decrease in renal blood flow and glomerular filtration. This is now under investigation.

P LIJNEN
L J VERSCHUEREN
A AMERY

Hypertension and Cardiovascular Rehabilitation Unit,
University Department of Pathophysiology,
B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

J BOELAERT
R DANEELS
M SCHURGERS
P VAN EEGHEM

Renal Unit,
Algemeen Ziekenhuis St Jan,
B-8000 Brugge, Belgium

- ¹ Boelaert J, Van Eeghem P, Daneels R, *et al.* *New Engl J Med* 1980;**303**:49.
² Ali M, McDonald WD. *J Lab Clin Med* 1975;**89**: 868-75.
³ Fröllich JC, Wilson TW, Sweetman BJ, *et al.* *J Clin Invest* 1975;**55**:763-70.
⁴ Lijnen P, Verschueren LJ, Fagard R, *et al.* *Arch Intern Physiol Biochim* 1980;**88**:236.

Salt and blood pressure in Scotland

SIR,—We read with interest the article by Dr D G Beevers and his colleagues concerning salt and blood pressure in Scotland (6 September, p 641). In the light of our results from a recent study of dietary salt intake and urinary sodium excretion in Swedish women with high and low blood pressure levels¹ we would like to comment on the results.

In our study 24-hour urine specimens were collected at five different occasions during a three-year period, and in connection with the last three collections food sampling was carried out by applying the duplicate portion technique.² Dietary sodium and potassium were highly correlated ($p < 0.001$) with the corresponding urinary excretion values in the two groups, indicating that the urinary excretion of sodium and potassium very well reflected the dietary intake of these substances. The reproducibility of the five different 24-hour

urinary collections was examined by analyses of variance for sodium and potassium excretion. These analyses did not show any significant differences between the five separate measurements of the 24-hour urinary excretion either for sodium or for potassium, despite the rather long period of time between the sampling occasions.

Thus it seems that urinary excretions of salt are highly reproducible and therefore that there is probably no need to "correct" for creatinine excretions. Like the data published by Dr Beevers and his colleagues, our data on salt intake do not support restriction of salt intake as a means of decreasing blood pressure in the population.

THOMAS THULIN
ÅKE NORDÉN
BENGT SCHERSTÉN

Department of Internal Medicine,
University Hospital of Lund,
S-221 85 Lund, Sweden

- ¹ Thulin T, Abdulla M, Dencher J, *et al.* *Acta Med Scand* (in press).
² Borgström B, Nordén Å, Åkesson B, Jägerstad M. *Scand J Soc Med* (Suppl) 10, 1975;**10**, suppl.

Prevention or cure for stress-induced gastrointestinal bleeding?

SIR,—A recent leading article (6 September, p 631) has suggested that impaired coagulation may compound local lesions in cases of stress-induced gastrointestinal haemorrhage. It follows therefore that impaired platelet function may also be disadvantageous.

In order to establish whether cimetidine treatment could influence platelet function we studied its effect on platelet aggregation *in vitro*. Platelet-rich plasma was prepared from seven healthy volunteers and 400 μ l incubated for 10 minutes with 50 μ l of various dilutions of cimetidine in physiological saline (see table). 50 μ l of ADP or adrenaline

Mean percentage fall in optical density at various concentrations of cimetidine

	Final concentration cimetidine (μ mol/l)					
	0	160	240	320	400	480
ADP	76	72	67	53	50	32
Adrenaline	74	70	64	52	48	23
p*		NS	NS	0.05	0.01	0.01

NS = non-significant.
*Paired Wilcoxon's test.

(final concentration 2-5 μ mol/l) was added to initiate aggregation. Details of methods have been previously described.¹

Other workers² have shown that the average peak blood levels of cimetidine are 2.8 μ mol/l after a 200 mg oral dose and approximately 30 μ mol/l after a 100 mg intravenous bolus injection. On the basis of these data our

Urinary prostaglandin E₂ and F_{2α} excretion, serum uric acid and creatinine excretion, and creatinine and uric acid clearance before and during sulphinpyrazone or indomethacin (values are means $\pm$ standard errors of means)

	Time (days)	PGE ₂ (nmol/24 h)	PGF _{2α} (nmol/24 h)	Serum urate (mmol/l)	Serum creatinine (μ mol/l)	Creatinine clearance (ml/min)	Uric acid clearance (ml/min)
Control 1	Average of 2 days	0.66 $\pm$ 0.05	3.05 $\pm$ 0.50	0.37 $\pm$ 0.01	91.0 $\pm$ 7.1	109.8 $\pm$ 3.8	9.01 $\pm$ 1.14
During sulphinpyrazone	Day 1	0.35 $\pm$ 0.07†	3.75 $\pm$ 0.82				
	Day 2	0.26 $\pm$ 0.05†	2.64 $\pm$ 0.66	0.10 $\pm$ 0.01*	86.6 $\pm$ 4.4	122.8 $\pm$ 10.4	42.17 $\pm$ 1.30*
Control 2	Average of 2 days	0.76 $\pm$ 0.14	2.82 $\pm$ 0.27	0.34 $\pm$ 0.02	88.4 $\pm$ 5.3	113.6 $\pm$ 9.8	9.11 $\pm$ 1.74
During indomethacin	Day 1	0.26 $\pm$ 0.04†	1.68 $\pm$ 0.18†				
	Day 2	0.30 $\pm$ 0.07†	1.55 $\pm$ 0.23†	0.35 $\pm$ 0.02	91.0 $\pm$ 2.6	106.6 $\pm$ 8.0	9.02 $\pm$ 0.77

Conversion: SI to traditional units—Urate: 1 mmol = 16.8 mg; creatinine: 1 μ mol/l = 11.3 μ g/100 ml.

* $p < 0.001$
† $p < 0.02$
‡ $p < 0.05$ } compared with the average of the values obtained during the two days preceding sulphinpyrazone or indomethacin.