quent on ozone depletion,⁵ I estimate that the dose received by British people over the next 20 years will be about 6% higher than if stratospheric ozone was to remain at current levels. However, simple sun protection measures can readily modify these estimates. For example, staying indoors for one hour around midday during the period May to August can more than offset the expected increase in ambient solar ultraviolet radiation. Wearing a wide brimmed hat every day of a two week summer holiday, with no other changes to behaviour, can achieve the same reduction in exposure. Greater changes in behaviour, such as wearing a hat whenever outdoors at weekends during the summer, can lead to substantial reductions in cumulative exposure to the face and consequently in the risk of developing skin cancer.

These calculations show that by encouraging people to adopt minor changes to behaviour it should be possible to maintain, or even reduce, exposure of body sites to those levels currently encountered despite the expected increase in ambient solar ultraviolet radiation. It is to be hoped that public awareness about potential environmental and health effects of ozone depletion will achieve these changes, which could lead to a reduction—rather than the anticipated increase—in skin cancer incidence.

B L DIFFEY

Regional Medical Physics Department,
Dryburn Hospital,
Durham DH1 5TW

- 1 Godlee F. Ban on CFCs creeps closer. *BMJ* 1992;304:463. (22 February.)
- 2 United Nations Environment Programme. *Environmental effects of ozone depletion: 1991 update*. Nairobi: UNEP, 1991.
- 3 Mayers S, Haines A. Airs, waters, places, and doctors. *BMJ* 1992;304:502. (22 February.)
- 4 United Kingdom Stratospheric Ozone Review Group. *Fourth report: stratospheric ozone 1991*. London: HMSO, 1991.
- 5 Kellfens G, de Gruijl FR, van der Leun JC. Ozone depletion and increase in annual carcinogenic ultraviolet dose. *Photochem Photobiol* 1990;52:819-23.

Facilitating prevention in primary care

SIR,—I share David Mant's disappointment that primary care practitioners can be persuaded to adopt preventive interventions in the absence of convincing evidence of efficacy, acceptability, and cost effectiveness.¹ His view that it is as easy to facilitate the uptake of unproved interventions as interventions of proved preventive value, however, is largely unsupported by published reports.

I recently completed a structured review to analyse the impact of strategies directed at practitioners that had been designed to promote screening for cervical cancer, a worthwhile preventive test. I included only studies of postgraduates in outpatient clinics or general practice and excluded studies without a concurrent control group. I analysed reported changes in the rate of Papanicolaou testing after the intervention compared with before.

Of 14 studies that met the criteria for the review, only four showed a significant positive effect on screening for cervical cancer. Effective interventions included computer generated prompts attached to medical records, the introduction of a practice nurse, and attaching partially completed request forms for smear tests to medical records. Seven studies reported no significant change in the rate of screening after interventions such as giving reading lists, audit with feedback, and, again, attaching reminders to the medical record with or without concurrent reminders directed at patients. Unexpectedly, three studies showed a significant negative effect on screening. The interventions concerned were participation in a quality assurance programme²; introducing computer generated prompts attached to medical records, particularly when combined with a monthly audit providing

negative feedback about screening rates³; and introducing prompts attached to medical records (but without sending reminders to patients concurrently).⁴ A recently published study adds another non-significant result to this review.⁵

Given the conflicting and disappointing nature of these findings, I and a colleague are now examining the extent to which they are explained by inattention to adult learning theory, inadequate statistical power, failure to overcome inadequate undergraduate education in prevention, or a combination of these.

Like Mant, I despair of the limited resources available to evaluate the effectiveness of preventive interventions before they are widely advocated. My review suggests, however, that showing that a screening test is effective is insufficient to guarantee its uptake by clinicians. We must continue to develop and evaluate multifaceted, sustainable, and individualised strategies to disseminate preventive interventions that are worth doing. Only then will we have a rationale to underpin our efforts to improve preventive care through professional education and reform of health services.

JEANETTE WARD

Royal Australian College of General Practitioners
Family Medical Programme,
PO Box 197,
North Ryde,
NSW 2113,
Australia

- 1 Mant D. Facilitating prevention in primary care. *BMJ* 1992;304:652-3. (14 March.)
- 2 Palmer R, Louis T, Hsu L, Peterson H, Rothrock J, Strain R, et al. A randomized controlled trial of quality assurance in sixteen ambulatory care practices. *Med Care* 1985;23:751-70.
- 3 Tierney W, Hui S, McDonald C. Delayed feedback of physician performance versus immediate reminders to perform preventive care. *Med Care* 1986;24:659-66.
- 4 Ornstein S, Garr D, Jenkins R, Rust P, Arnon A. Computer-generated physician and patient reminders. *J Fam Pract* 1991;32:82-90.
- 5 Dietrich A, O'Connor G, Keller A, Carney P, Levy D, Whaley F. Cancer: improving early detection and prevention. A community practice randomised trial. *BMJ* 1992;304:687-91. (14 March.)

SIR,—As the trio responsible for the development and evaluation of the Oxford "facilitator" model,^{1,2} we read the findings of Allen J Dietrich and colleagues in the United States and Jill Cockburn and colleagues in Australia, as well as the accompanying editorial by David Mant, with special interest.³⁻⁵

An important feature of our model is the provision of continuing assistance to the practice team by the facilitator. This may partly explain the difference in outcome in the two studies reported. The facilitator in the American study, in which preventive services were improved, was closely analogous to ours, visiting the practice three times over three months and "providing additional assistance as needed." In the Australian study, on the other hand, the educational facilitator visited the practices twice only to instruct the practice in the use of the quit smoking intervention kit, with no offer or provision of additional assistance. As we reported, we regard the provision of continuing advice and support as an important feature of successful facilitation.²

We agree with David Mant about the need to confine facilitation to interventions of proved effectiveness. But, as pointed out by Nick Black in the same issue, uncertainty about the effectiveness of interventions applies to most medical practice.⁶ The facilitator approach offers an opportunity to steer general practice in the direction of scientifically validated activities rather than, as his analogy with the runaway train may seem to suggest, to encourage behaviour that causes disaster. Maintaining his analogy, we see the facilitator, rather than releasing the brake on the runaway train, as shifting the points on the track to enable validated clinical practice to proceed in a systematic way; without facilitation, clinical

practice sometimes resembles Brownian movement. We join Mant and Black in urging critical evaluation of many general practice activities and urge the development and funding of the research base which is necessary for this.

GODFREY FOWLER

University Department of Public Health and Primary Care,
Radcliffe Infirmary,
Oxford OX2 6HE

ELAINE FULLARD

National Facilitator Development Project,
HEA Primary Health Care Unit,
Churchill Hospital,
Oxford OX3 7LJ

MUIR GRAY

Directorate of Health Policy and Public Health,
Oxford Regional Health Authority,
Oxford OX3 7LF

- 1 Fullard E, Fowler G, Gray M. Facilitating prevention in primary care. *BMJ* 1984;289:1585-7.
- 2 Fullard E, Fowler G, Gray M. Promoting prevention in primary care: controlled trial of low technology, low-cost approach. *BMJ* 1987;294:1080-2.
- 3 Dietrich AJ, O'Connor GT, Keller A, Carney PA, Levy D, Whaley FS. Cancer: improving early detection and prevention. A community practice randomised trial. *BMJ* 1992;304:687-91. (14 March.)
- 4 Cockburn J, Ruth D, Silagy C, Dobbin M, Reid Y, Scollo M, et al. Randomised trial of three approaches for marketing smoking cessation programmes to Australian general practitioners. *BMJ* 1992;304:691-4. (14 March.)
- 5 Mant D. Facilitating prevention in primary care. *BMJ* 1992;304:652-3. (14 March.)
- 6 Black N. Research, audit, and education. *BMJ* 1992;304:698-700. (14 March.)

Care of asthma in general practice

SIR,—The stated aim of Cedrick R Martys's paper was to ascertain whether the asthma clinic improved care for his patients with asthma.¹ This question is vitally important to the future of the care of asthma in general practice, but caution should be exercised before the author's conclusion that "objective improvement in patients' asthma could not be detected" is accepted.

The conventional clinical audit cycle starts with measuring data against predefined standards. These data are then analysed and followed by appropriate intervention and re-audit or completion of the first cycle. The first audit established that only 15% of patients had had a measurement of peak flow recorded in the previous year (24 of 61 who had been "clinically reviewed"). Although there was strong evidence for an increase in the proportion of patients who had had at least one measurement of peak flow recorded during the past year, the 60% achieved post-clinic fell far short of the agreed standard of 100%. Analysis of the first audit before the clinic protocol was devised might have helped.

We are not told who ran the clinic. Was it a trained asthma nurse?

Aspects of the protocol are open to question: we should take advantage of the availability of prescribable peak flow meters to enable patients to monitor their acute attacks and therefore decide when their steroids are no longer required.^{2,4}

The absence of a definition of asthma and the inadequate description of the methodology make the study difficult for other general practitioners to duplicate. How were the 161 known asthmatic patients diagnosed in 1989? Does the increased proportion of asthmatic patients entered in the computer problem list (from 58% to 98%) signify a true increase in the prevalence of asthma in this practice? Alternatively, did the asthma clinic result in 77 new or previously undiagnosed asthmatic patients being recognised (238 minus 161)?

Labelled asthmatic patients are known to be appropriately treated,^{5,7} yet the audit did not attempt to identify the proportion of patients, prescribed prophylactic treatment before and after the introduction of the clinic.

Finally, the outcome measures used in auditing

asthma need to be appraised critically. For example, the number of admissions to hospital is often used as evidence of bad care of asthma in general practice. Admission to hospital may, however, often be appropriate. If we can remove the stigma attached to admissions for acute asthma generated by general practitioners junior hospital doctors may take our referrals for admission more seriously.

MARK LEVY

Chairman, GPs in Asthma Group,
Prestwood Avenue Surgery,
Kenton,
Middlesex HA3 8JZ

1 Martys CM. Asthma care in Darley Dale: general practitioner audit. *BMJ* 1992;304:758-60. (21 March.)
2 Beasley R, Cusley M, Holgate ST. A self management plan in the treatment of adult asthma. *Thorax* 1989;44:200-4.
3 Charlton I, Charlton G. New perspectives in asthma self-management. *Practitioner* 1990;234:30-2.
4 Hayward SA, Levy M. Patient self management of asthma. *Br J Gen Pract* 1990;40:166.
5 Anderson HR, Bailey PA, Cooper JS, Palmer JC. Influence of morbidity, illness label, and social, family, and health service factors on drug treatment of childhood asthma. *Lancet* 1981;ii:1030-2.
6 Speight ANP, Lee DA, Hey EN. Underdiagnosis and under-treatment of asthma in childhood. *BMJ* 1983;286:1253-6.
7 Levy ML, Bell LB. General practice audit of asthma in childhood. *BMJ* 1984;289:1115-6.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.—I did show an increase in the number of peak flow recordings obtained post-clinic, although these were well short of the agreed standard of 100%. We hope to achieve our agreed standard before the audit cycle is repeated.

The clinic is run by a trained asthma nurse. We now prescribe peak flow meters for all our asthmatic patients, but this was possible only after the clinic had started. We are educating our patients about how to manage an acute attack on the basis of their own serial peak flow readings.

I did not include a definition of asthma in my paper as it was adequately defined in one of my references, and this is the working definition that we use.¹ The term known asthmatic patients diagnosed in 1989 refers to those patients identified as asthmatic by one of the doctors in our practice at some previous time, based on commonly accepted criteria in the history and physical examination but not necessarily on more objective measurements such as serial peak flow readings and reversibility tests. The increased proportion of asthmatic patients entered in the computer post-clinic largely represents previously known asthmatic patients not clearly identified as such before the asthma clinic was started.

Finally, the numbers of admissions to hospital that I recorded pre-clinic and post-clinic are too small for any worthwhile comment to be made on that aspect of the audit, although I agree that no general practitioner should hesitate to recommend admission for patients with acute asthma if in his or her clinical judgment this is appropriate.

CEDRICK R MARTYS

Darley Dale Medical Centre,
Two Dales,
Near Matlock,
Derbyshire DE4 2SA

1 British Thoracic Society. Guidelines for management of asthma in adults. 1. Chronic persistent asthma. *BMJ* 1990;301:651-3.

Site for immunising infants

SIR,—I do not agree with Angus Nicoll about the accepted site for immunising infants in general practice.¹

I and colleagues conducted a most thorough search of published reports, both clinical and medicolegal, and consulted every leading authority during a dispute that we had with our local health authority over this matter in 1984.² Paediatricians advised us that this was not a matter for specialist

pronouncement but one in which general practitioners had most experience. The Medical Defence Union, after giving a knee jerk warning against using the buttock, consulted its records for instances of injury. It reported 22 cases: 17 injuries to the radial nerve and five to the sciatic nerve, none of which had occurred in infants. Baraff *et al* showed that local reactions, notably pain and swelling, were more common after immunisation in the thigh.³ Bergeson *et al* stated that the most common serious complications of intramuscular injections in children were muscle contractures and nerve injuries,⁴ most of which were radial nerve palsies. Some children have required excision of fibrous tissue and lengthening of the triceps.

How did the strong fear of the sciatic nerve arise? Gilles and French showed from studies on young animals that penetration of the sciatic nerve did not cause palsy.⁵ Nor was palsy due to ischaemia from interruption of the vascular supply or to intraneural haemorrhage. The final conclusion reached was that substances injected, such as streptomycin, antitoxins, bismuth, and quinine, were neurotoxic. But measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine is not neurotoxic, and in any case the sciatic nerve cannot be reached with the 16 mm needle used now, even in a test on a stillborn infant weighing 2000 g.

The infant prone across the mother's lap provides the most stable position for mother, baby, and doctor. Most important, the child does not observe the assault.

Finally, with regard to Nicoll's comment about effective absorption, we were given expert advice against rapid absorption: the child's immune system is immature, and, unlike a brush antigen without cells like hepatitis B vaccine, diphtheria, tetanus, and pertussis vaccine needs to be absorbed slowly. I hope that the buttock will become the preferred site for injections before the age of 1 year.

M KEITH THOMPSON

Croydon CR0 5QS

1 Nicoll A. Any questions. *BMJ* 1992;304:697. (14 March.)
2 Thompson MK. Needling doubts about where to vaccinate. *BMJ* 1988;297:779-80.
3 Baraff LJ, Cody CL, Cherry J. DTP associated reactions: an analysis by injection site, manufacturer, prior reactions, and dose. *Pediatrics* 1984;73:31-6.
4 Bergeson PS, Singer SA, Kaplan AM. Review article. Intramuscular injections in children. *Pediatrics* 1982;70:944-8.
5 Gilles FH, French JH. Postinjection sciatic nerve palsies in infants and children. *J Pediatrics* 1961;58:195-204.

High dose triazolam and anterograde amnesia

SIR,—In the context of the controversy surrounding the safety of the hypnotic benzodiazepine triazolam^{1,5} we report the findings of an unpublished study performed in 1977, which support a relation between the dose of triazolam and the incidence of anterograde amnesia.

We studied 44 psychiatric patients admitted to the emergency psychiatric department of Liège University Hospital with symptoms related to personality disorders (n=26), psychoses (n=10), and adjustment disorders (n=8). There were 20 men and 24 women aged 17-66 (mean (SD) 35.4 (12.8) years). With their informed consent patients received triazolam 2 mg at bedtime for their acute insomnia for 1-19 days (mean 4.2 (3.6) days). No other psychotropic drugs were given. The patients' behaviour at night was observed by the psychiatric resident on call (P-FP or DS) as well as by the nursing staff. An independent resident interviewed the patients the next morning to assess their memory of the behaviour observed during the night.

Twenty two patients did at least one thing at night that they could not remember subsequently. The most common event was nocturnal bulimia (n=13): patients ate some of their own sweets or

took their neighbours' supply or emptied the unit's fridge. Other motor behaviour was observed in six cases, from simple walking in the corridor or making telephone calls to leaving the unit and, in one case, driving a car and returning several hours later. Six patients showed increased anxiety with typical panic attacks, and five patients verbalised suicidal thoughts, which did not appear in their history or in the assessment performed the previous day or the next morning. Suicide attempts were noted in four patients concurrently with the suicidal ideation, and heteroaggressive acts in two patients. None of the patients recalled these adverse events during the interview the next morning. The adverse events stopped in 21 patients when triazolam was stopped.

This study shows an extremely high incidence of amnesic adverse events associated with high dose triazolam. Amnesic bulimia at night was so common that we called it "the triazolam fridge syndrome." Triazolam was first marketed in Belgium in 1977. The normal recommended dose then was 0.25-1 mg; we gave 2 mg. The recommended dose now is 0.125-0.5 mg.

Several previous reports have described anterograde amnesia associated with triazolam at lower doses, but with a much lower incidence.⁶⁻¹⁰ Our study suggests that the dose of triazolam is a crucial factor in the incidence of amnesic reactions.

MARC ANSSEAU
PIERRE-FRANÇOIS PONCELET
DIDIER SCHMITZ

University of Liège,
Psychiatric Unit,
CHU du Sart Tilman,
B-4000 Liège,
Belgium

1 Dyer C. Upjohn sues for libel. *BMJ* 1992;304:273. (1 February.)
2 Kingman S. Upjohn fails to get Halcion ban lifted. *BMJ* 1992;304:11. (4 January.)
3 Dyer C. Halcion daze. *BMJ* 1991;303:740.
4 Oswald I. Safety of triazolam. *Lancet* 1991;338:516-7.
5 Van der Kroef C. Triazolam. *Lancet* 1991;338:56.
6 Poitras R. A propos d'épisodes d'amnésie antérograde associés à l'utilisation du triazolam. *Union Med Can* 1980;109:427-9.
7 Shader RI, Greenblatt DJ. Triazolam and anterograde amnesia: all is not well in the Z-zone. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 1983;3:273.
8 Oswald I. Triazolam syndrome 10 years on. *Lancet* 1989;ii:451.
9 Bixler EO, Kales A, Nanfredi RL, Vgontzas AN, Tyson KL, Kales JD. Next day memory impairment with triazolam use. *Lancet* 1991;337:827-31.
10 Lieberherr S, Scollo-Lavizzari G, Battegay R. Dammerzustande nach Einnahme von kurzwirkenden Benzodiazepinen (midazolam/triazolam). *Schweiz Rundsch Med Prax* 1991;80:673-5.

Monitoring lithium treatment

SIR,—R F Kehoe and A J Mander report serum lithium concentrations in excess of 1.05 mmol/l in 56 of 458 patients taking lithium during a one year period and note that in one third of these cases the doctor did not make any response within six weeks.¹

These findings, while giving cause for concern, may in fact compare favourably with the practice in parts of the country where no lithium register is kept. Recently a lithium audit was carried out in the department of psychiatry, North Manchester General Hospital, a district general hospital serving a catchment population of 200 000. Of 201 patients identified as taking lithium, the case notes of 56 were selected at random for examination. Of 37 patients who had been taking lithium for three or more years, eight were found to have had, during the year of audit, a serum lithium concentration ≥ 1.3 mmol/l. In only five of these cases was there evidence in the case notes of the doctor having initiated any response.

Perhaps more worrying was the finding that, of the 31 patients who had been started on lithium within the previous five years, there was confirmation in the case notes of there having been a prior physical examination in 20, a medical history in 18,