EDITOR,—Nicholas J Wald and colleagues have provided valuable data concerning the introduction of maternal screening for Down's syndrome using three serum markers.¹ The benefits of serum screening as an alternative to a diagnostic test in mothers over 40 is still debated, and some argue that this group should still be offered a diagnostic test, with the possible benefit of a first trimester diagnosis, if available.

Wald and colleagues showed a false positive rate (number of mothers requiring amniocentesis) of 4.9% in women under 37 and 22% in those aged 37 or over.¹ This increase in the number of false positives obviously reflects the effect of maternal age on the incidence of Down's syndrome.

A similar screening programme was introduced in Chester six months ago with a risk of 1 in 250 or greater denoting a positive result. A total of 1820 mothers have been screened to date, with an overall false positive rate of 4.8% (88/1817) after correction for gestational age. The false positive rate in women over 37 was 34% (21/61), and in women over 40 was 69% (9/13). Overall screening detected three chromosomal abnormalities; two in women over 37 and one in women over 40.

The number of mothers screened in our population is small, which makes interpretation of the data difficult, but these results suggest that a diagnostic test may be more appropriate for women over 40. Further analysis of Wald and colleagues' data would be interesting for comparison.

J TOPPING M J McCORMACK
R T HOWELLS

Maternity Unit, Countess of Chester Hospital,
Chester CH2 1BQ

1 Wald NJ, Kennard A, Densen JW, Cuckle HS, Chard T, Butler L. Antenatal maternal serum screening for Down's syndrome: results of a demonstration project. *BMJ* 1992;305:391-4. (15 August.)

EDITOR,—In the paper by Nicholas J Wald and colleagues on antenatal maternal screening for Down's syndrome the term incidence is incorrectly used (in the summary table).¹

Down's syndrome occurs at the time of fertilisation of the ovum and incidence may be used only if it is known how many fertilised ova have trisomy 21. Between the moment of fertilisation and the performance of the screening test spontaneous abortion may occur, and it is well recognised that there is a disproportionately greater number of chromosome anomalies among spontaneous abortions. At the time of screening there may already have been a selective loss of affected fetuses. Therefore, what is being measured is prevalence of Down's syndrome at the time of screening. The incidence cannot be determined unless it is known how many affected fetuses were spontaneously aborted before screening was performed.

There is an arithmetic relationship between incidence and prevalence and, even if incidence remained constant, the prevalence at screening could vary considerably owing to any change in a variety of factors that affect the rate of spontaneous abortion.

As this principle applies to all congenital anomalies, in the current state of knowledge it is incorrect to refer to the incidence of any congenital anomaly. The differentiation between incidence and prevalence is not merely an academic exercise. If the aetiology of a disease is under consideration, it is essential to examine incidence. If prevalence is examined, it may be affected by either the incidence or the duration of the disease.

P O D PHAROAH

Department of Public Health,
University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX

1 Wald NJ, Kennard A, Densen JW, Cuckle HS, Chard T, Butler L. Antenatal maternal serum screening for Down's syndrome: results of a demonstration project. *BMJ* 1992;305:391-4. (15 August.)

EDITOR,—Our paper¹ and two other demonstration projects just published^{2,3} show that serum screening for Down's syndrome using the triple test is practical and has produced results consistent with previous estimates of screening performance. An important issue lost in some of the correspondents' comments is that serum screening detects twice as many affected pregnancies as age screening for the same false positive rate. If screening for Down's syndrome using maternal age is acceptable then so is serum screening since it simply achieves the same result more effectively.

We deal with the correspondents' points under nine headings.

The performance of the test. With only 25 affected pregnancies, an estimate of the detection rate is subject to considerable random error. We noted this in our paper, referring to the more reliable estimates of a 58% detection rate for a 5% false positive rate previously published.^{1,5} Combining the results of our demonstration project with those from the New England project² (38 000 screened women)² yields a detection rate of 54% and a false positive rate of 4%, close to that predicted. A demonstration project conducted in Tennessee among women aged less than 35 years detected four out of seven affected pregnancies with a false positive rate of 3%.³ Caution is needed in interpreting detection and false positive rates from individual programmes because of statistical variation arising from small numbers and the effect of local variation in the use of ultrasonography, repeat testing, and choice of risk cut off levels. Citing detection rates, as Macri and Clarke do, without corresponding false positive rates is unhelpful.

Costs of screening. The estimates of costs in our paper are valid. They were directly incurred in providing the service—about £15 per woman screened, which is the current charge for the service organised through antenatal clinics. Included is the provision of information leaflets, seminars, and specialist and counselling support as required. Undoubtedly, we could improve in this area, and this aspect of screening must not be neglected.

The choice of screening markers. Spencer again says that free β human chorionic gonadotrophin is a better second trimester screening marker for Down's syndrome than intact human chorionic gonadotrophin.⁶ As we and others have said before,^{7,8} he may be correct, but the question remains open and it was not our aim to investigate alternative markers. We have also responded to comments on the use of unconjugated oestradiol before, and estimated the gain in performance using this marker—an increase in detection of 9% and 4% for a 5% false positive rate, respectively with and without the use of ultrasound to estimate gestational age.

The women who were not screened. There were seven pregnancies with Down's syndrome in the unscreened women. Their median age was 36 years and three had amniocentesis.

Miscarriage rate due to amniocentesis. We did not quote a miscarriage rate because this would not reveal the risk related to the procedure. The best evidence on the fetal loss rate comes from the randomised trial performed by Ann Tabor and her colleagues, indicating that the risk is about 1%.⁹

Confirmation of abnormality in the fetuses aborted. All aborted fetuses had the diagnosis of Down's syndrome confirmed by chromosome or pathological analysis, usually by both.

Effect of the age distribution of women on screening performance. This is small and, regardless of variation in the age distribution of women, serum screening will yield a higher detection rate for a given false positive rate than maternal age screening alone.

Limiting serum testing to younger women. The disadvantage of this approach is that it is less efficient and less equitable than serum screening

for all women. More amniocenteses would need to be performed for the same number of detected cases. About half of women aged 40 years and over would be offered an amniocentesis even though a serum test would have indicated a low risk, while almost all affected pregnancies (95%) in these older women would still be detected.

α Fetoprotein screening for spina bifida. This should not be abandoned. If ultrasound scanning is used routinely to estimate gestational age, about 85% of open spina bifida cases can be detected using an α fetoprotein cut off level of 2.5 multiples of the median, with only about 2% of unaffected singleton pregnancies having α fetoprotein values this high.² It would need to be shown that screening for spina bifida using routine ultrasound scanning in antenatal clinics had a performance at least as good as this before a change in α fetoprotein screening was warranted.

There is no doubt that serum screening using the triple test is more effective than screening based on maternal age alone and can be readily applied in practice. Some of your correspondents' comments, if interpreted uncritically, may delay women's access to a screening service. It is important that this is not allowed to happen.

N J WALD

A KENNARD

J W DENSEM

Department of Environmental and Preventive Medicine,
Wolfson Institute of Preventive Medicine,
St Bartholomew's Hospital Medical College,
London EC1M 6BQ

T CHARD

Department of Reproductive Physiology,
Medical College of St Bartholomew's Hospital,
London EC1M 6EQ

L BUTLER

North East Thames Regional Cytogenetics Laboratory,
Queen Elizabeth Hospital for Children,
London E2 8PS

1 Wald NJ, Kennard A, Densen JW, Cuckle HS, Chard T, Butler L. Antenatal maternal serum screening for Down's syndrome: Results of a demonstration project. *BMJ* 1992;305:391-4. (15 August.)

2 Haddow JE, Palomaki GE, Knight GJ, Williams J, Pulkkinen A, Canick JA, et al. Prenatal screening for Down's syndrome with use of maternal serum markers. *N Engl J Med* 1992;327:588-93.

3 Phillips OP, Elias S, Shulman LP, Anderson RN, Morgan CD, Simpson JL. Maternal serum screening for fetal Down's syndrome in women less than 35 years of age using alpha-fetoprotein, hCG and unconjugated estriol. *Obstet Gynecol* 1992;80:353-8.

4 Wald NJ, Cuckle HS, Densen JW, Nanchahal K, Royston P, Chard T, et al. Maternal serum screening for Down's syndrome in early pregnancy. *BMJ* 1988;297:883-7.

5 Wald NJ, Cuckle HS, Densen JW, Kennard A, Smith D. Maternal serum screening for Down's syndrome: the effect of routine ultrasound scan determination of gestational age and adjustment for maternal weight. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 1992;99:144-9.

6 Macri JN, Spencer K, Anderson R. Dual analyte immunoassay—a new approach to neural tube defect and Down's syndrome screening. *Ann Clin Biochem* 1992;29:390-6.

7 Wald NJ, Densen JW, Haddow JE, Palomaki GE, Knight GJ, Canick JA. Prenatal screening for Down's syndrome. *BMJ* 1991;303:715.

8 Knight GJ, Cole LA. Measurement of choriogonadotropin free β -subunit: an alternative to choriogonadotropin in screening for fetal Down's syndrome? *Clin Chem* 1991;37:779-82.

9 Tabor A, Philip J, Madsen M, Bang J, Obel EB, Norgaard Pedersen B. Randomised controlled trial of genetic amniocentesis in 4606 low-risk women. *Lancet* 1986;i:1287-93.

Assisted conception on NHS

EDITOR,—We work in an assisted conception unit that has been trying to provide in vitro fertilisation and other infertility treatments within the NHS since 1984, and we welcome David T Baird's rational appeal for more NHS funding for assisted conception.¹ We recently surveyed 13 large assisted conception units, of which 11 functioned within or closely associated with NHS or university departments of obstetrics and gynaecology. Only five of the units have been treating NHS patients, and three of these charge the patients a fee of between £350 and £900 per treatment cycle (exclusive of drugs). Several units were hoping to