CORRESPONDENCE

Outpatient consultations

A Richardson, MRCP; I Taylor, FRCS..... 1796

Confidence intervals for relative risks

P Mock and G Berry; Julie A Morris, MSc, and M J Gardner, PhD..... 1796

Self help groups and professionals

Marcia A Ratcliffe, MRCP; Jacqueline M Atkinson; R A Logan, MRCP..... 1797

Dietary fibre and diabetes mellitus

M E J Lean, MRCP, and B R Tennison, MB; J Mann, DM; N W Read, FRCP, and V A Beattie, BSC..... 1797

Nonoxinol 9 and HIV infection

D J Jeffries, MRCPATH..... 1798

Hospital visiting hours

B Alderman, FRCOG..... 1798

Case-control study of cutaneous malignant melanoma

N S Broughton, FRCS; D English, PhD, and B Armstrong, FRACP..... 1799

Diet and inequalities in health

E L Lloyd, FFARCS..... 1799

Restraining infants in cars

E Baijal, MB..... 1799

Clinical carpal scaphoid injuries

M R A Young, FRCS..... 1799

Drug points Addendum to guidelines for reporting adverse drug reactions (Louise Glassner Cohen and J P Rovers); Neutropenia following intravenous immunoglobulin (P A Veys and others); Henoch-Schönlein purpura after influenza vaccination (U Patel and others)..... 1800

- All letters must be typed with double spacing and signed by all authors.
- No letter should be more than 400 words.
- For letters on scientific subjects we normally reserve our correspondence columns for those relating to issues discussed recently (within six weeks) in the *BMJ*.
- We do not routinely acknowledge letters. Please send a stamped addressed envelope if you would like an acknowledgment.
- Because we receive many more letters than we can publish we may shorten those we do print, particularly when we receive several on the same subject.

Outpatient consultations

SIR,—Messrs R S Kiff and P A Sykes (28 May, p 1511) outline the shortcomings of services at a district general hospital where "much of the large volume of work is performed by tired, incompletely trained doctors." Experience suggests that this inappropriate delegation of work is common throughout the United Kingdom.

As a general practitioner, when I refer a patient I expect a carefully considered opinion. It is unlikely that stressed, exhausted, and inadequately trained doctors are able to fulfil this obligation. The establishment defends this situation as "on the job training." Few benefit from this arrangement, least of all the patients. Training requires supervision and feedback so that mistakes can be corrected and behaviour modified. Who is tutoring the hapless junior doctor in these clinics? Certainly not the consultant.

Instead of excusing this by inadequate appointment times or referrals it is more appropriate to attack the root of the problem—the iniquitous career structure in hospital practice. An imbalance exists between the glut of experienced registrars in teaching hospitals and the inadequate number of consultants in district general hospitals. *Achieving a Balance* has hardly tipped the scales.¹

Why has this situation been allowed to continue? I suspect that lack of professional self respect allows junior doctors and patients to be used and abused in this way. This behaviour is likely to be perpetuated unless we shed our macho image and look after ourselves and our patients.

ADRIAN RICHARDSON

Hatfield,
Hertfordshire

1 Department of Health and Social Security, Joint Consultants' Committee, chairmen of regional health authorities. *Hospital medical staffing: achieving a balance: plan for action*. London: DHSS, 1987.

SIR,—Messrs R S Kiff and P A Sykes (28 May, p 1511) present a case for more time to be allocated to

the initial outpatient consultation and for a greater proportion of the work to be done by fully trained staff. One aspect of outpatient work is omitted from their equation—undergraduate teaching.

In the present climate of cost-benefit analysis it is easy to forget about our students. For surgical students in particular the reduction in acute surgical beds, the emphasis on day case surgery, and the reduction in clinical academic staff have necessitated ever increasing utilisation of outpatient departments for teaching. Adequate facilities, in terms of examination rooms and nursing staff, are essential to ensure a suitable environment for clinical teaching. It is difficult for a surgeon to see more than 15-17 new patients in a three and a half hour general surgical clinic and provide adequate tuition to medical students. As increasing numbers of students now receive training in district general hospitals these factors should be considered in all outpatient calculations.

Students can absorb a tremendous amount of clinical experience in general surgical clinics provided the atmosphere is reasonably relaxed and time is made available for teaching. This aspect should be considered when formulas are devised for improving efficiency in outpatient departments.

I TAYLOR

University Surgical Unit,
Southampton General Hospital,
Southampton SO1 6HU

Confidence intervals for relative risks

SIR,—Mrs Julie A Morris and Professor Martin J Gardner state in their paper (7 May, p 1313) that for the Mantel-Haenszel pooled estimate of the odds ratio, "no method of calculating confidence intervals has been developed for this estimate." Several large sample variances for the Mantel-Haenszel estimate have been proposed over the past 10 years in biometrics.¹⁻⁵

A general variance—that is, consistent in both

large strata and sparse data—for the log Mantel-Haenszel odds ratio has recently been derived by Robins *et al*;⁶ the formula for this variance using the notation of Morris and Gardner is:

$$\text{var}(\log_e \text{OR}_{MH}) = \frac{\sum P_i R_i}{2R \cdot S} + \frac{\sum (P_i S_i + Q_i R_i)}{2R \cdot S} + \frac{\sum Q_i S_i}{2S \cdot S} = V_{MH}$$

where $R_i = a_i d_i / n_i$, $S_i = b_i c_i / n_i$, $R = \sum R_i$, $S = \sum S_i$, $P_i = (a_i + d_i) / n_i$, $Q_i = (b_i + c_i) / n_i$, and the summations are taken over all strata (see p 461 of Armitage and Berry⁶). Hence a large sample 95% confidence interval for the Mantel-Haenszel odds ratio may be calculated as follows:

$$\exp(\log_e \text{OR}_{MH} - 1.96 \times \sqrt{V_{MH}}) \text{ to } \exp(\log_e \text{OR}_{MH} + 1.96 \times \sqrt{V_{MH}}).$$

It is noted that the above large sample variance for the Mantel-Haenszel estimate is appropriate in both unmatched and matched case-control studies.

PHILIP MOCK
GEOFFREY BERRY

Department of Public Health,
University of Sydney,
New South Wales, 2006,
Australia

- 1 Hauck WW. The large sample variance of the Mantel-Haenszel estimator of a common odds ratio. *Biometrics* 1979;35:817-9.
- 2 Breslow NE. Odds ratio estimators when data are sparse. *Biometrika* 1981;68:73-84.
- 3 Breslow NE, Liang KY. The variance of the Mantel-Haenszel estimator. *Biometrics* 1982;38:943-52.
- 4 Flanders WD. A new variance estimator for the Mantel-Haenszel odds ratio. *Biometrics* 1985;41:637-42.
- 5 Robins J, Breslow NE, Greenland S. Estimators of the Mantel-Haenszel variance consistent in both sparse and large strata limiting models. *Biometrics* 1986;42:311-23.
- 6 Armitage P, Berry G. *Statistical methods in medical research*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.

AUTHORS' REPLY—We agree with the contribution by Messrs Mock and Berry in that approximate large sample formulae for calculating confidence intervals for the Mantel-Haenszel combined