three to four year course. Also, manipulative thrusts are seldom applied by Dutch manual therapists. Finally, Pearce's suggestion that traction or the McKenzie method is a valuable treatment for specific subgroups of patients with back complaints has still to be shown with properly designed randomised clinical trials.^{3,4}

T W Meade rightly points out that our randomised controlled trial is not totally flawless. Judged by our own criteria, it scores 55 on a scale of 100, which makes it still one of the best in the field. We also agree with Meade that a power of 60% is not spectacular, but in our opinion this influences only the interpretation of non-significant differences. We strongly disagree with Meade's suggestion that pooling data from all randomised controlled trials on manipulative techniques, no matter what their methodological quality is, would be a good idea.

In answer to Philip Brien and Michael J Brien's comments, our selection criteria were designed to select patients who were all suitable for physiotherapy, manual therapy, and continued care by their general practitioner. We thus included a relatively heterogeneous population of patients with persistent back and neck complaints. Of course this does not imply that all patients received identical treatment. Physiotherapists and manual therapists were free to adapt their treatment (within predetermined boundaries) to the perceived needs of each patient. We agree that within our population there could have been subgroups who were more suitable for treatment with manual therapy, but it was impossible to identify those subgroups successfully in advance. We have studied the outcomes in subgroups of patients labelled by the manual therapists as "very suitable" and "less suitable" during the first treatment session; there were no differences in outcomes between these subgroups (B W Koes *et al*, unpublished findings). Although we like the idea of defining clear indications for treatment with manual therapy, we think that much more research has to be conducted before this will be feasible.

Chris Deighton suggests that after six and 12 months we analysed the data in all four study groups and subsequently decided to report outcomes for only the manual therapy and physiotherapy groups. This is not true. About half the patients in both the placebo group and the general practitioner group sought other treatment after six and 12 months' follow up. Therefore we would have had great problems in interpreting the outcome in these two groups. The suggestion to analyse and present the data on patients who stayed in the allotted groups (placebo and general practitioner) would be invalid owing to the obvious (self) selection related to outcomes. In our opinion, the high proportion of patients originally allocated to the placebo and general practitioner groups who sought other treatment clearly indicates better results from active treatment. Although we agree with Deighton that a large part of the treatment effect might result from the contact with a caring therapist, we showed in our paper reporting the short term results of the study that active treatment had consistently better results than the placebo.⁵

BART KOES
LEX BOUTER
PAUL KNIPSCHILD
HENK VAN MAMEREN

University of Limburg,
6200 MD Maastricht,
Netherlands

1 Spitzer WO, Leblanc FE, Dupuis M, eds. Scientific approach to the assessment and management of activity-related spinal disorders. *Spine* 1987;7(suppl):1-59.

2 Assendelft WJJ, Bouter LM, Knipschild PG. *Chiropractie in Nederland*. Maastricht: Department of Epidemiology, University of Limburg, 1991.

3 Koes BW, Assendelft WJJ, van der Heijden GJMG, Bouter LM, Knipschild PG. Spinal manipulation and mobilisation for back and neck complaints: a blinded review. *BMJ* 1991;303:1298-303.

4 Koes BW, Bouter LM, Beckerman H, van der Heijden GJMG,

Knipschild PG. Physiotherapy exercises and back pain: a blinded review. *BMJ* 1991;302:1572-6.

5 Koes BW, Bouter LM, van Mameren H, Essers AHM, Verstegen GJMR, Hofhuizen DM, *et al*. The effectiveness of manual therapy, physiotherapy and treatment by the general practitioner for non-specific back and neck complaints: a randomised clinical trial. *Spine* 1992;17:28-35.

Perforation of gloves

SIR,—P W Richmond and colleagues' findings regarding punctures to gloves worn by accident and emergency staff are similar to results of a study in general surgery.² In both studies the perforation rate was 11% and there was a pre-disposition for punctures to occur on the non-dominant (left) index finger (38%¹ and 42%² of punctures respectively). Altogether 37%¹ and 49%² of punctures were not noticed by the wearer at the time of puncture, and there was no difference in puncture rate with seniority in either study.

Perhaps accident and emergency staff and staff of postmortem rooms, for whom similar findings have been reported,³ should consider wearing two pairs of gloves ("double gloving"); this reduces the number of incidents in which sharp objects penetrate as far as the skin from 11% to 2%.²

A M THOMPSON

Raigmore Hospital,
Inverness IV2 3UJ

1 Richmond PW, McCabe M, Davies JP, Thomas DM. Perforation of gloves in an accident and emergency department. *BMJ* 1992;304:879-80. (4 April.)

2 Matta H, Thompson AM, Rainey JB. Does wearing two pairs of gloves protect operating theatre staff from skin contamination? *BMJ* 1988;297:597-8.

3 Weston J, Locker G. Frequency of glove puncture in the postmortem room. *J Clin Pathol* 1992;45:177-8.

SIR,—We think that P W Richmond and colleagues may have underestimated the perforation rate of surgical gloves¹ by using the technique described by Church and Sanderson.²

The size of the perforation depends on the degree of distension of the glove. As either water or air is injected into the glove the palm distends more rapidly than the digits. The tip of each digit, where most perforations occur, distends least as the radius is least within this tip. This is an example of an important physical principle, the law of Laplace. This law states that the tension within the wall of a distensible hollow object is equal to twice the wall tension divided by the radius.

We suggest that perforations should be made at various points on the glove with a needle of known size and then either water or air should be injected into the glove to a known pressure, rather than volume, to detect these perforations. We assessed the accuracy of the technique described by Church and Sanderson² by perforating the tip of the index digit with a gauge 25 (diameter 500 µm) hypodermic needle. We were not able to show a leak.

This prompted us to modify the technique described by Ballbach *et al*.³ We improved the accuracy of the test by, firstly, perforating the palm of the glove (Regent Biogel) with a gauge 7/0 (diameter 220 µm) needle. It required about 500 ml of air, corresponding to a pressure of about 0.29 kPa, before perforations could be detected in the palm when it was submerged under water. Then 30-40 ml of air, corresponding to a pressure of about 0.74 kPa, had to be injected into each digit before perforations in the tip of the digit could be detected. We used this technique on 36 pairs of surgical gloves used during six cardiac surgical procedures. Twenty sites of leakage were found, 19 in the digits (eight in the tip) and one in the palm, when the first part of the test was performed. An additional 29 sites of leakage, however, were found during the second part of our test; 22 of these were in the tips of the digits. We used 10 pairs of unused gloves as controls, and they were all found to be intact in both parts of the test.

We suggest that both the technique to test for perforation of gloves in the clinical setting and its accuracy ought to be better defined, and the terms "perforation" and "leak" should not be used synonymously.

P S WONG
J E C WRIGHT

Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery,
London Chest Hospital,
London E2 9JX

P A WHITE

Department of Biomedical Engineering,
London Chest Hospital

1 Richmond PW, McCabe M, Davies JP, Thomas DM. Perforation of gloves in an accident and emergency department. *BMJ* 1992;304:878-80. (4 April.)

2 Church J, Sanderson P. Surgical glove punctures. *J Hosp Infect* 1980;23:84.

3 Ballbach RL, Beavin P, Walters SM. A study of testing methods for the detection of defects in disposable latex and plastic gloves. *J Assoc Off Anal Chem* 1972;55:1074-80.

Hospital admission and benzodiazepine use

SIR,—D Surendrakumar and colleagues rightly highlight the risk of subsequent dependence on benzodiazepines when these drugs are prescribed for hospital inpatients.¹

A recent audit of prescriptions for inpatients and at discharge undertaken in this acute geriatric department found that sedation at night as required had been prescribed for 18 of 40 patients: temazepam (nine patients), chlormethiazole (eight), and nitrazepam (one). Of these patients, six had used benzodiazepines previously (two regularly, four intermittently), including the patient prescribed nitrazepam. Twelve patients used some sedation at night during their inpatient stay, including three of the six previous users. Only two patients were prescribed benzodiazepines at discharge; both had used them long term previously.

Transient disturbance of sleep is common among elderly people admitted for acute illness, occurring in 30% of this sample. The hospital instituted a prescribing policy for benzodiazepines in 1990. In this department staff recommend using temazepam, chlormethiazole, or chloral hydrate if an elderly patient requires sedation at night and that any such prescription should be reviewed after five days. The audit suggests that a prescribing policy is effective in preventing patients being prescribed benzodiazepines at discharge unless they are long term users. I agree with Surendrakumar and colleagues that prescribing policies should be introduced more widely.

DUNCAN FORSYTH

Department of Geriatric Medicine,
Addenbrooke's Hospital,
Cambridge CB2 2QQ

1 Surendrakumar D, Dunn M, Roberts CJ. Hospital admission and the start of benzodiazepine use. *BMJ* 1992;304:881. (4 April.)

More injuries from "bouncy castles"

SIR,—In response to Gian Singer and Lawrence S Freedman's letter¹ I have analysed national figures for accidents involving "bouncy castles." The Department of Trade and Industry's leisure accidents surveillance system records all people injured in accidents other than home, industrial, or road traffic accidents who present to a sample of 11 hospitals throughout the United Kingdom, with 24 hour accident and emergency departments receiving at least 10 000 cases a year. One hundred and five such people were recorded, suggesting a national estimate of roughly 4000 people injured severely enough for them to present to hospital.