Fundholding practice's draft policy on ethical use of resources

Policy is inconsistent

EDITOR,—The Asbury draft policy on ethical use of resources, a document developed by a fundholding practice to clarify the ethical basis of decisions concerning rationing, contains many inconsistencies.¹ Two of these, in particular, must be challenged—namely, those to do with age and patients' responsibility for their conditions.

With regard to age, the authors seem to want to have it both ways. They first reject the view that treatment should be denied on the basis of age but later write, "the patients' ages may be considered and found relevant." They take this view not because of any medical criteria but because of the "fair innings" argument. In addition to being inconsistent in their views, the authors seem to ignore both the many persuasive arguments against the fair innings argument² and the difficulty of defining fairness (Rawls, for instance, tried to do so and failed³). They also imply that quality adjusted life years should not be considered in the treatment of patients who are terminally ill but seem to accept that they should be considered with regard to age. Why?

It is not only about age that the authors are in two minds: they take the same stance with patients' responsibility for their conditions. They first reject the idea that treatment should be denied on the grounds that the patient has brought the condition on himself or herself, but then they write, "the issue of a patient's responsibility for having induced the problem might be considered relevant." It is surprising that the authors have not realised the inconsistencies in their views here. It is even more important that they have not taken account of the fact that if we start allocating health care on the basis of personal responsibility there will be few people eligible for treatment.

MICHAEL M RIVLIN
PhD candidate

Department of Philosophy,
University of Leeds,
Leeds

1 Crisp R, Hope T, Ebbs D, Thomasma DC, Dormer P, Toon P. The Asbury draft policy on ethical use of resources. *BMJ* 1996;312:1528-33. (15 June.)

2 Rawls J. Justice as fairness. *Philosophical Review* 1958;67:164-94.

3 Rivlin MM. Protecting elderly people: flaws in ageists arguments. *BMJ* 1995;310:1179-82.

Policy is mechanism by which decisions might be reached

EDITOR,—The Asbury draft policy on the ethical use of resources, which was developed by a fundholding practice to clarify the ethical basis of decisions, includes a description of a fictional situation concerning rationing.¹ In this, only one patient can have lifesaving treatment: either patient A, a brilliant surgeon who saves hundreds of lives a year and is a single parent with three young children, or patient B who is unemployed and without dependants. It seems to me that most groups would give the treatment, without open discussion, to patient A, as is the implied outcome here. Clearly uncomfortable with this implied outcome, the authors seek to reassure us that it has nothing to do with the patient's value to society and everything to do with her three young children. What decision would have been made if the choice was as follows?

Patient A is a brilliant surgeon who saves hundreds of lives a year but has no dependants. She is personally known to one member of the practice. What is more, she successfully operates on an average of 10 patients from the practice each year. There is no other, equivalent surgeon locally.

Patient B is an unemployed single mother with three young children. There are no close relatives to take over the care of these three girls should she die. Her condition is self inflicted.

To spin a coin, as Peter Dormer suggests in his commentary,¹ might be morally neutral but evades responsibility in decision making and obviates the need for a policy other than that of using the coin. To discount the value of a patient to society would be of high moral principle but would be short on common sense, but to take full account of it would require the existence of an impossible scale on which societal worth could be gauged accurately. The problem is twofold: firstly, we would rather avoid than confront the moral dilemmas posed by the issue of health care rationing; and, secondly, if we decide to confront the dilemmas then we find that we have inadequate tools for doing so.

The inevitable conclusion is that more research is necessary. While this is undertaken, hard decisions continue to have to be made every day. All such decisions are compromises, but the Asbury draft policy at least outlines a mechanism by which such compromises might be reached.

D DE TAKATS
Clinical research fellow

Department of Human Metabolism and Clinical Biochemistry,
University of Sheffield Medical School,
Sheffield S10 2RX

1 Crisp R, Hope T, Ebbs D, Thomasma DC, Dormer P, Toon P. Asbury draft policy on the ethical use of resources. *BMJ* 1996;312:1528-33. (15 June.)

Advertisements in the *BMJ*

Advertisements for drugs used in disorders with a negative image never feature men

EDITOR,—It is a pity that advertisements in the *BMJ* for drugs that are used to treat disorders with a negative image, such as mental illness, should feature only women. For example, the clinical research edition of the issue of 20 July contains two advertisements for drugs used in depression, one for a drug used in obsessive-compulsive disorders, and one for a drug used in epilepsy. On the back cover (a prime advertising space) the advertisement for Lustral (sertraline)—"Established in treating depression"—has a picture of an older woman; opposite p 136 the advertisement for Cipranil (citalopram)—"Specifically treating depression"—features a young woman; and between p 146 and p 147 there is a double spread for Faverin (fluvoxamine)—"A positive step for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder"—featuring a stylised young woman. Furthermore, on the inside of the back cover (another prime location) we find an advertisement for Lamictal (lamotrigine)—"Monotherapy in epilepsy"—featuring a middle aged woman. Finally, opposite p 125 (which is the first page of the editorials and, therefore, also a key advertising position) an advertisement for Losec (omeprazole)—"Taking care of mild symptoms every day"—shows a young woman and implies that doctors do not take her complaints seriously. By contrast, when men are used in advertisements they are generally shown in a positive and decisive light.

It may well be true that women are more prepared than men to seek advice for disorders of the brain. Nevertheless, these advertisements give the impression that men are not prone to such disorders, the common denominator being the implication that these disorders carry a negative tag in society. Surely, a balanced and less typecast policy would be more fitting for the journal.

LARS BREIMER
Clinical research physician

24 Manor Park,
Richmond,
Surrey TW9 1XZ

BMJ should not carry advertisements for cars

EDITOR,—The general practice edition of the *BMJ* published on 22 June carried an advertisement for a particular make of car (between p 1562 and p 1563). Addiction to cigarettes and addiction to cars are analogous in that both result in large numbers of preventable deaths and injuries every year, involving both users and non-users. Children are particularly vulnerable as the "passive" victims of addiction to cars.¹

The *BMJ* does not carry tobacco advertising and is very ready to criticise the tobacco industry; the same does not seem to apply to the motor industry. Is this double standard explicable by a comparison of rates of use of cars and tobacco among doctors?

DOUGLAS SALMON
General practitioner

190 Aston Lane,
Birmingham B20 3HE

1 Roberts I. Safely to school? *Lancet* 1996;347:1642.

*The *BMJ* has discussed the health problems created by cars many times, and it will continue to do so. We think, however, that it would be excessive to refuse to carry advertisements for cars. Tobacco use is wholly bad for health, whereas cars are not. It is also true, as Douglas Salmon points out, that almost all doctors have cars while only a small minority smoke. Many doctors use cars in their daily work; it would thus seem ludicrous to ban advertisements for cars.—
EDITOR

Blood lead concentrations in United Kingdom have fallen substantially since 1984

EDITOR,—Shilu Tong and colleagues show that the effects of low level environmental exposure to lead, especially on the longer term cognitive development of children, are still of concern.¹ We have carried out the first major study for eight years to monitor lead concentrations in Britain. We report here our early results, which show a large fall in blood lead concentrations.

As part of the 1995 health survey of England, blood samples were collected for lead analysis from 6868 subjects from eight regions throughout England; the subjects were considered to be a geographically representative sample of the whole population. Most of the subjects (95%) were adults aged ≥ 16 , of whom 3139 (45.7%) were men and 3389 (49.3%) were women. The remainder were children aged 11-15 (180 (2.6%) boys and 160 (2.3%) girls). The blood samples were analysed for lead by atomic absorption spectrometry,² and the analyses were validated as described previously.³

Blood lead concentrations decreased in the order men, women, boys, girls. The median (95th centile) concentrations for these subgroups were respectively 0.17 (0.49), 0.13 (0.33), 0.11 (0.27), and 0.08 (0.16) $\mu\text{mol/l}$. Only 166 (5.3%) of the men and 41 (1.2%) of the women had blood lead concentrations of $\geq 0.48 \mu\text{mol/l}$; the concentration did not reach this value in any of the children. These data indicate that most (97%) subjects in the United Kingdom who are exposed only to environmental sources of lead will have blood lead concentrations below the action limit of 0.48 $\mu\text{mol/l}$ (10 $\mu\text{g/dl}$) proposed for other countries.⁴

The concentrations that we found recently are much lower than those found in the environmental monitoring programmes in the United Kingdom in 1984-7 (fig 1). The monitoring programmes compared groups at risk of increased lead uptake from traffic emissions with control subjects living in areas without heavy traffic.⁵ At that time the expo-