the patient is receiving local botulinum toxin, with an excellent response. This treatment was chosen because its secondary effects are scarce and limited in time, and it is beneficial for a great proportion of patients. Also, systemic complications have not been described.² Undoubtedly, it is a symptomatic treatment based on the blockade of neuromuscular transmission. With respect to surgery, microvascular decompression is an excellent treatment when it is performed by an experienced team,³ although it poses potential complications and sequelae. Many patients, as in our case, are not willing to undergo such risks. For these reasons, we think that the treatment of choice in our patient is local injection of botulinum toxin.

R PEGO REIGOSA

- 1 Reigosa RP, Rios JP. Hemifacial spasm. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1998;64:687.
- 2 Elston JS. The management of blepharospasm and hemifacial spasm. *J Neurol* 1992;239:5-8.
- 3 Baker FG, Janetta PJ, Bissonette DJ, et al. Microvascular decompression for hemifacial spasm. *J Neurosurg* 1995;82:201-10.

Measuring the rate of progression and estimating the preclinical period of Parkinson's disease with [¹⁸F] dopa PET

Morrish *et al*¹ report in great detail the PET data on 32 patients with Parkinson's disease, from which they conclude that the mean preclinical period "is unlikely to be longer than 7 years". This conclusion is based on calculations using the [¹⁸F] dopa influx constant (Ki) of the putamen, although they acknowledge that other methods of analysis and extrapolation yielded estimates of anything between 2.8 and 37.2 years. The authors justify using putamen Ki because it was "more sensitive to increasing disability" than either total striatal assessment or using the alternative ratio approach, but fail to justify a much more fundamental and unwise assumption on which their arguments rest—that is, the intercorrelation between the PET index, clinical progression, and the UPDRS.

The paper gives little detail about how the UPDRS was administered, presumably only once, before each of the two PET scans an average of 18 months apart. A linear regression was then applied to the mean of each patient's two UPDRS and PET assessments, the gradient of which was expressed as a percentage change in the PET index for a change of 10 points "in the total UPDRS".

Some questions can be raised:

- (1) Did the same observer administer the UPDRS blinded to the clinical diagnosis, on their 16 normal controls as well as to each patient on both occasions and, if not, was interobserver reliability studied?
- (2) Presumably the "total UPDRS", judging by the scale shown on their figure A, was actually the total score from the 14 items in the motor subset of the UPDRS, which measures impairment rather than disability.
- (3) The UPDRS is neither a perfect nor a linear scale. Indeed two coauthors of this paper have pointed out elsewhere the low interrater reliability in some items and redundancy in others.² It is a composite multi-item index of severity of disease, each item being an ordinal rather than an interval 0-4 scale of one clinical feature. The key distinction is that an ordinal scale permits the recording of data in rank order (for example, mild, moderate, severe) but without uniform intervals. Thus tremor score 4 is not twice as

bad as 2, still less a total motor UPDRS score of 40/70 *v* 20/70. For these reasons, the use of simple arithmetic means as well as other parametric statistical methods is inappropriate, however tempting.

One illustration of the non-linearity of the UPDRS manifest to anyone who has used it regularly in clinical trials is the bias towards intermediate scores. Those with advanced disease and high scores are seldom if ever recruited, and some of the items scored as 1, indicating slight or mild impairment, "could be normal for some" according to the definition. In one study of Alzheimer's disease, 56% of 78 cases and 12 of the 20 age matched controls were found to have isolated extrapyramidal signs with motor UPDRS scores of 4.5 ($\pm$ 4.8) and 2.8 ($\pm$ 1.8) respectively using observers not blinded to the diagnosis.³ It would be interesting to know whether a UPDRS score >0 is sensitive to or predictive of preclinical parkinsonism and/or abnormal PET.

Furthermore, as it is acknowledged that Parkinson's disease may progress at varying rates between patients and possibly within the same patient at different ages and stages, it is perhaps not surprising that the authors found no significant correlation between change in UPDRS and change in any PET index over 18 months. Thus it seems unwise to draw such firm conclusions based on the assumption that both measures are linear and directly correlated.

RICHARD J HARDIE

St George's Healthcare, Wolfson Neuro-rehabilitation Centre, Regional Neurosciences Unit, Atkinson Morley's Hospital, Copse Hill, Wimbledon, London SW20 0NE, UK.

- 1 Morrish P, Rakshi JS, Bailey DL, et al. Measuring the rate of progression and estimating the preclinical period of Parkinson's disease with [¹⁸F] dopa PET. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1998;64:314-19.
- 2 Rabey JM, Bass H, Bonuccelli U, et al. Evaluation of the short Parkinson's evaluation scale: a new friendly scale for the evaluation of Parkinson's disease in clinical drug trials. *Clinical Neuropharmacology* 1997;20:322-37.
- 3 Merello M, Sabe L, Teson A, et al. Extrapyramidalism in Alzheimer's disease: prevalence, psychiatric, and neuropsychological correlates. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1994;57:1503-9.

Morrish replies:

We thank Hardie for his comments but are surprised that he finds difficulty in our assumption of a relation between PET index, clinical progression, and the UPDRS. Whether clinical severity is measured by UPDRS, bradykinesia scores, rigidity scores or Purdue pegboard scores^{1,2} such a relation has been a consistent finding in [¹⁸F]dopa PET imaging studies of Parkinson's disease. The UPDRS was administered on 57 of 64 occasions by one observer (PKM) and on seven occasions by a second observer (JSR). UPDRS scoring was not carried out on the normal volunteers. Gonera *et al* have identified some non-specific symptoms that may predate the development of Parkinson's disease³ but we know of no population study of the predictive value of UPDRS score in normal subjects. By total UPDRS score we mean the combined scores of sections I, II, III, and IV. Similar results were found when motor scores alone were examined.⁴ The UPDRS scale is the most widely used index of global disease severity in Parkinson's disease. We accept that a linear correlation between UPDRS and PET index may have been inappropriate. The PET index represents a figure of mean [¹⁸F] dopa metabo-

lism throughout the putamen, caudate, or total striatum whereas the clinical presentation and severity of parkinsonism is likely to depend on the distribution and severity of loss of dopaminergic function (and that of other neurotransmitters) within and outside the basal ganglia. It is unlikely that the relation is so simple yet this approach has allowed the demonstration of an aspect of the measurement of progression by PET that has not previously been considered, that of sensitivity to clinical severity. It should be noted that this discussion is not relevant to the major findings of the study (that measurement of progression is dependent on the PET method and that the average preclinical period is likely to be short), only to our explanation of these findings. However, it does suggest an important debate; should clinical indices or functional imaging indices be used independently in studies of progression in Parkinson's disease? When the reproducibility of both measurements is taken into account it is, as Hardie comments, not surprising that we found no significant correlation between change in UPDRS and change in PET index.

PAUL MORRISH

Department of Neurology, University Hospital of Wales, Heath Park, Cardiff CF4 4XN, UK

- 1 Takikawa S, Dhawan V, Chaly T, et al. Input functions for 6-[Fluorine-18] fluorodopa quantitation in parkinsonism: comparative studies and clinical correlations. *J Nucl Med* 1994;35:955-63.
- 2 Vingerhoets FJG, Schulzer M, Calne DB, et al. Which clinical sign of parkinson's disease best reflects the nigrostriatal lesion? *Ann Neurol* 1997;41:58-64.
- 3 Gonera EG, M van 't Hof, HJC Berger, et al. Symptoms and duration of the prodromal phase in Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 1997;12:871-6.
- 4 Morrish PK. A clinical and [¹⁸F]dopa study of the progression of Parkinson's disease and its treatment by embryonic implantation [DM thesis]. Oxford: Oxford University, 1997.

Utilisation and costs of profession care and assistance according to disability of patients with multiple sclerosis in Flanders (Belgium)

In their detailed cost of illness study, Carton *et al* estimate the total annual costs in their population of 5500 people with multiple sclerosis to be ECU 13 106 000 (£8.7m) for ambulatory care and ECU 26 581 000 (£17.7m) for hospital and institutional care.¹

They have adopted a "bottom up" approach which allows costs to be identified for different levels of disability, a distinct advantage from previous "top down" costs of illness studies.^{2,3}

They conclude, as have others,⁴ that the costs of multiple sclerosis rise with increasing disability and that the information is useful for cost effectiveness studies.

However, to be useful for such studies, the costs would need further description, in particular we would need to know which costs were fixed, and which were semifixed or non-fixed. In our own institution we know that 40% of the cost of a bed-day is fixed and at most 5% of costs are non-fixed. The remaining costs are semifixed—for example, staff salaries (Robert Hudson, Scottish Health Purchasing Information Centre, personal communication January 1998). The important point is that most of the costs in their paper are probably fixed or semifixed, and interventions to reduce disability are unlikely to have a significant impact on these costs as