does improve vision; whether the improvement is worth the cost district health authorities will have to decide for themselves.

P G BOLGER

West Berkshire Health Authority,
Reading RG3 4EJ

S STEWART-BROWN

Worcester and District Health Authority,
Worcester WR4 9RW

E NEWCOMB

A STARBUCK

Bristol Eye Hospital,
Bristol BS1 2LX

Bile duct stones and laparoscopic cholecystectomy

SIR,—We wish to respond to some of the points that correspondents have raised since our editorial on bile duct stones and laparoscopic cholecystectomy.¹

We do not accept the views of Colin Ainley and colleagues, who, based on outdated reports, state that intravenous cholangiography should not now be used and suggest that most radiologists should be allowed to speak for themselves.² Indeed, in addition to the studies we cited, B R Tulloh and colleagues and Fred J Mullan and S Terence Irwin put forward strong arguments advocating the preferential use of intravenous cholangiography,² and a recently published study also indicates that intravenous cholangiography is as good as intra-operative cholangiography.³ We accept that some surgeons may wish to adopt selective preoperative intravenous cholangiography² and that such a policy has some defined advantages.

We attempted to adopt an unbiased view about the treatment of bile duct stones (surgery or endoscopy), and we accept that the arguments are finely balanced. But the four papers cited to support Ainley and colleagues' argument in favour of preoperative endoscopic sphincterotomy betray them. Indeed, one of these papers concluded that the role of endoscopic sphincterotomy alone as the initial treatment for patients was not established.⁴ All of the clinical studies quoted are non-randomised and retrospective. Either criteria for selecting surgery are not clear or operative exploration of the common bile duct was reserved for patients in whom endoscopic retrieval of ductal stones had failed.

Only two randomised studies have addressed this issue. The study we quoted by Neoptolemos *et al* had a morbidity of 16.4% in patients treated endoscopically compared with 8.5% in those treated by surgical clearance of the duct.⁵ Stain *et al* found low complication rates in both of their groups, but the severity of the major complications was greater with endoscopic sphincterotomy.⁶ The results of this study did "not support preoperative endoscopic sphincterotomy as a technique for the clearance of the common bile duct of stones on the basis of efficacy, morbidity rate or cost."

We are pleased that Ainley and colleagues recognise the surgical and radiological skill in biliary disease at Hammersmith Hospital. Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography and interventional endoscopy have also been used at this hospital since 1979, with the advantage of them being performed by surgeons. This has enabled us to make rational decisions on the best treatment option for individual patients, independent of the sort of interspecialty rivalry illustrated in Ainley and colleagues' letter.

DAVID SCOTT-COOMBES

JEREMY N THOMPSON

Royal Postgraduate Medical School,
Hammersmith Hospital,
London W12 0NN

1 Scott-Coombes D, Thompson JN. Bile duct stones and laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *BMJ* 1991;303:1281-2. (23 November.)

- 2 Correspondence. Bile duct stones and laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *BMJ* 1991;303:1547-8. (14 December.)
- 3 Joyce WP, Keane R, Burke GJ, Daly M, Drumm J, Egan TJ, *et al*. Identification of bile duct stones in patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Br J Surg* 1991;78:1174-6.
- 4 Miller BM, Kozarek RA, Ryan JA, Ball TJ, Traverso LW. Surgical versus endoscopic management of common bile duct stones. *Ann Surg* 1988;207:135-41.
- 5 Neoptolemos JP, Carre-Locke DL, Fossard DP. Prospective randomised trial of pre-operative endoscopic sphincterotomy versus surgery alone for common bile duct stones. *BMJ* 1987;294:470-4.
- 6 Stain SL, Cohen H, Tsuchiya M, Donovan AJ. Cholelithiasis: endoscopic sphincterotomy or common bile duct exploration. *Ann Surg* 1991;213:627-33.

The EPIC study

SIR,—The EPIC Study Advisory Committee wishes to draw the attention of all specialists in intensive care to the European prevalence of infection in intensive care (EPIC) study (funded by Roussel Uclaf as part of its commitment to the control and management of hospital infection); the committee urges all intensive care units to participate in this study on 29 April.

Nosocomial infections in intensive care units have a considerable effect on morbidity and mortality and also result in major economic costs. In 1989 the average cost associated with a nosocomial infection was estimated at \$1800.¹ More recently, in Switzerland hospital infection has been estimated to cost Sw fr 100-300m a year.² To address the issue of nosocomial infection with specific reference to patients in intensive care units the EPIC Study Advisory Committee was formed with 17 members from western Europe, who realised that a study of this scale was required to provide data for assessing future infection control procedures in western Europe. The study, a one day point prevalence survey, will be the largest of its kind, and this will be the first time that the prevalence of infection in intensive care units has been related to the severity of illness of the patient on admission, combined with an assessment of the adequacy of treatment with respect to survival. The results should provide many new insights into the pattern of infection in susceptible patients and the probable impact on prognosis.

Comprehensive participation by intensive care units is important to ensure that the results are as representative as possible. For further information please write to the EPIC study coordinator, Medical Action Communications, Action International House, Crabtree Office Village, Eversley Way, Thorpe, Egham, Surrey TW20 8RY, United Kingdom (fax 0784 431323). Units already registered will receive information automatically.

D J BIHARI

Intensive Care Unit,
Guy's Hospital,
London SE1 9RT

- 1 Daschner F. Cost effectiveness in hospital infection control—lessons for the 1990s. *J Hosp Infect* 1989;13:325-36.
- 2 Geroulanos S, Attinger B. Nosocomial infections, risks and consequences. *Schweiz Rundsch Med Prax* 1991;80:291-6.

Auditing audits

SIR,—Oxfordshire Medical Audit Advisory Group discusses auditing audits.¹ In Kirklees all the members of the medical audit advisory group act as general practice audit facilitators and we employ an audit facilitator. With a relatively large number of people visiting practices and collecting data on audit activity we needed to standardise our impressions of the level of audit in the practices. Thus we required a tool to allow us to provide an assessment of audit in a practice that was precise enough to allow for our accountability to the family health services authority while maintaining confidentiality as required in the health circular HC(FP)(90)8. We

also required a tool that allowed us to measure our effectiveness in facilitating audit in general practices and to provide practices with an easily understood assessment of where they stand in developing audit compared with the rest of the practices in the area.

Kirklees Medical Audit Advisory Group advocates an audit cycle from the bottom up, starting with identifying a problem or topic, looking at what is happening, setting standards, and then making changes. The group also advocates that all members of the practice and primary health care team should be concerned in audit. Thus the group developed a simple stepwise 10 point scale against which the level of audit activity in a practice could be measured. Scoring a practice requires a yes/no answer at each point on the scale (box). We recommend this system of audit to others looking at audit activity.

Ten steps to audit

- 1 Practices not collecting data
- 2 Practices that collect data sufficient to meet annual report criteria
- 3 Practices collecting data over and above annual report criteria
- 4 Practices that have identified a problem
- 5 Practices that have identified a problem and started audit
- 6 Practices that have completed an audit that did not involve the full practice team
- 7 Practices that have completed an audit that involved the full practice team
- 8 Practices that have completed several audits, not involving the full practice team
- 9 Practices that have completed several audits involving the full practice team
- 10 Practices with a rolling programme of audit involving all members of the primary health care team

JUDITH PARKER

SUSAN BARNES

Kirklees Medical Audit Advisory Group,
Mill Hill Hospital,
Huddersfield HD5 9TT

1 Derry J, Lawrence M, Griew K, Anderson J, Humphreys J, Pandher KS. Auditing audits: the methods of Oxfordshire Medical Audit Advisory Group. *BMJ* 1991;303:1247-9. (16 November.)

Lessons of Chernobyl

SIR,—The findings of the International Atomic Energy Authority on the Chernobyl disaster should be treated with caution.^{1,2} Other studies have shown an increase in thyroid disease and congenital malformations in Byelorussia after the disaster.^{3,4} Moreover, the epidemiological framework of the International Atomic Energy Authority's study is questionable for several reasons.

The sample of villages was not chosen randomly, and the total sample size was under 1700, which was too small to detect any increase in diseases normally occurring in less than 10% of the population. In many of the studies the total sample size was only 500 and in some under 30. The control villages were selected from areas very near the contaminated zones (as close as 10 km); this was a serious flaw. These villages would also have experienced radioactive contamination from the food chain, and the contamination in the external environment would have been higher than elsewhere. Despite these facts the methodology of the study relied on showing differences between the control and contaminated zones, and the location of the controls may therefore have seriously biased the result.

The study did not attempt to follow up the substantial number of people who had moved away