the scheme is to reduce drug related harm to health.

After discussions between general practitioners and the health board clinical standards were defined and a review body appointed to supervise the administration of the scheme. General practitioners seeking approval have to agree to register from five to 20 patients with opiate dependence and a current or recent history of injecting drugs; to provide a drug counsellor at clinics; to attend educational meetings; to use oral methadone mixture as the only opiate substitute treatment; not to prescribe dihydrocodeine or temazepam; to arrange for methadone to be consumed under the supervision of a local community pharmacist; and to complete contact forms for every consultation, and a six monthly opiate treatment questionnaire⁴ for each patient, to allow evaluation of the scheme.

The scheme started on 1 May last year, and during the first six months 42 general practitioners were approved and 759 patients registered. This represents 9% of the estimated population of injecting drug misusers in Glasgow and 6% of principals in general practice. The results of evaluation are awaited, but the scheme seems to be popular with general practitioners and patients. It provides an opportunity for raising the standard of management in general practice of this potentially difficult group of patients while compensating general practitioners for the costs of doing so.

ROBERT T A SCOTT
Medical director, Glasgow drug problem service

LAWRENCE D GRUER
Clinical director,
HIV and addictions clinical directorate

Ruchill Hospital,
Glasgow G20 9NB

PHILIP WILSON
General practitioner
Glasgow G42 9JT

S HINSHELWOOD
Director of practitioner services
Greater Glasgow Health Board,
Glasgow G1 1ET

it was routine in three units and done in high risk cases in eight; and for antibodies to hepatitis C it was routine in only one unit, with four other units requesting testing in some cases. Prophylactic procedures for hepatitis B and HIV infection after sharps injuries also varied. Hepatitis B specific immunoglobulin was given more widely than is recommended by the Public Health Laboratory Service,² including in circumstances in which the status of the source patient was not known (two units).

At the Royal Free Hospital all known source patients are approached for testing for hepatitis C antibodies, although this goes beyond recent guidelines from the Public Health Laboratory Service.³ We have found hepatitis C antibodies in 14% of source patients in reported incidents of exposure to blood, with a quarter of these infections being previously unknown.⁴ The decision whether to test source patients routinely for hepatitis C virus and other bloodborne viruses will depend on the rates of infection in each hospital and the resources available for counselling and testing. Many occupational health units in our region do not have access to testing for hepatitis C antibodies in source patients.

The audit exercise in the region has been helpful, allowing units to compare their practices and providing support for units requesting additional resources. The level of provision of occupational health care varies too much at present to allow the development of formal guidelines that all can follow, but we hope that this may be possible in the future.

ANNE COCKCROFT
Chair North Thames (East) Regional
Occupational Health Audit Group

JANE ZUCKERMAN
Research fellow

YVONNE ODEGBAMI
Regional occupational health audit facilitator
Occupational Health Unit,
Royal Free Hospital and School of Medicine,
London NW3 5UL

- 1 Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs. *AIDS and drug misuse update*. London: HMSO, 1993.
- 2 Farrell M, Ward J, Mattick R, Hall W, Stimson GV, de Jarlais D, et al. Methadone maintenance treatment in opiate dependence: a review. *BMJ* 1994;309:997-1001. (15 October.)
- 3 Wilson P, Watson R, Ralston GE. Methadone maintenance in general practice: patients, workload, and outcomes. *BMJ* 1994;309:641-4. (10 September.)
- 4 Darke S, Hall W, Wodak A, Heather N, Ward J. Development and validation of a multidimensional instrument for assessing outcome of treatment among opiate users: the opiate treatment index. *Br J Addict* 1992;87:593-607.

Auditing incidents of exposure to blood

EDITOR,—Ruth R White and Elisabeth J Ridgway highlight variations in the management of reported sharps injuries in Mersey Regional Health Authority.¹ The management of common conditions, especially when there is believed to be room for variation, is a good topic for audit. The North Thames (East) Regional Occupational Health Audit Group, which has representatives from all the occupational health units in the region, recently audited the management of reported incidents of exposure to blood.

Of the 17 occupational health units, 15 participated in the audit. All were involved in the management of reported exposure to blood in some way; four were not responsible for the initial management. Only one unit ran an out of hours service for such incidents; for several others this was provided by another department. Eleven units routinely stored a sample of blood from the staff member involved. The policies about approaching source patients to request tests for bloodborne viral infections varied considerably: for hepatitis B surface antigen this was routine in four units and done in high risk cases in eight; for HIV antibody

Treatment of myocardial infarction and angina

Review underestimated the benefit of early thrombolysis

EDITOR,—In their article on the treatment of myocardial infarction and angina John McMurray and Andrew Rankin perpetuate a serious error, underestimating the benefit of earlier thrombolysis in acute myocardial infarction.¹ Their figure 1 shows the loss of benefit within five weeks to be 1.6 per 1000 patients per hour of delay and is reproduced from the overview by the Fibrinolytic Therapy Trialists' Collaborative Group of all randomised trials of more than 1000 patients.² The graph shows the absolute reduction in mortality with thrombolytic treatment by delay from onset of symptoms to randomisation.

The severity of infarction, however, is negatively related to the delay by the patient, which constitutes a major portion of the time from onset of infarction to thrombolysis. The outcome of myocardial infarction treated at different times therefore depends on the balance between greater severity of infarction with earlier presentation and greater

efficacy of thrombolysis with earlier administration. Thus the benefit of earlier thrombolysis is underestimated when based on subgroup analyses of placebo controlled clinical trials in which patients are treated as they present.

The magnitude of the benefit of earlier thrombolysis can be determined only by a trial in which patients are randomly allotted treatment on presentation or after a delay. The three largest trials of this design are the European myocardial infarction project,³ the myocardial infarction triage and intervention study,⁴ and the Grampian region early anistreplase trial.⁵ Mortality at one month is reduced with prehospital thrombolysis by 1.7% absolute ($P=0.03$) when the results of all three trials are combined, though was not significantly reduced in any one of the trials.

The figure shows mortality at one month plotted against median times to the start of thrombolytic treatment in groups in whom it was started before and after admission to hospital; the lines linking the two groups represent gradients of benefit.

Mortality at one month plotted against median time at which thrombolytic treatment was started in prehospital and hospital groups in three trials. Figures in graph are benefit gradients. EMIP=European myocardial infarction project. MITI=Myocardial infarction triage and intervention study. GREAT=Grampian region early anistreplase trial

Although none of the comparisons is significant and there are large confidence intervals around each point, the figure gives three rough estimates of the magnitude of the time dependent benefit that are consistent with each other. Perhaps the best way to average these gradients is to draw the line of best fit between the six points: the resulting slope is 2.3% an hour. Over the period one to four hours from the onset of symptoms 23 more lives would be saved per 1000 patients treated per hour of earlier treatment. Giving confidence intervals for this estimate would give a spurious impression of reliability. Although tentative, this is so far the best estimate of the size of the time effect; it is more than 10 times that of the Fibrinolytic Therapy Trialists' Collaborative Group and substantially greater than that given in McMurray and Rankin's article.

Follow up of the Grampian region early anistreplase trial shows a separation of the survival curves, so that the reduction in mortality with prehospital thrombolysis is twice as great at one year as at one month. The true benefit of earlier thrombolysis may therefore be even greater than the estimate at one month given above.

JOHN RAWLES
Honorary senior lecturer in medicine

Medicines Assessment Research Unit,
University of Aberdeen,
Medical School,
Aberdeen AB9 2ZD

- 1 McMurray J, Rankin A. Cardiology. I. Treatment of myocardial infarction, unstable angina, and angina pectoris. *BMJ* 1994; 309:1343-50. (19 November.)
- 2 Fibrinolytic Therapy Trialists' Collaborative Group. Indications for fibrinolytic therapy in suspected acute myocardial infarction: collaborative overview of early mortality and major morbidity results from all randomised trials of more than 1000 patients. *Lancet* 1994;343:311-22.
- 3 European Myocardial Infarction Project Group. Prehospital thrombolytic therapy in patients with suspected acute myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med* 1993;329:383-9.