presence of a specific deletion that would include the tumour suppressor gene.

R MAARTEN EGELER
Consultant in paediatric oncology

Sophia Children's Hospital,
Paediatric Haematology-Oncology,
Rotterdam,
Netherlands

- 1 Cotter FE, Pritchard J. Clonality in Langerhans' cell histiocytosis. *BMJ* 1995;310:74-5. (14 January.)
- 2 Willman CL, Busque L, Griffith BB, Favara BE, McClain KL, Duncan MH, et al. Langerhans cell histiocytosis (histiocytosis X): a clonal proliferative disease. *N Engl J Med* 1994;331:154-60.
- 3 Knudson AG. Mutation and cancer: statistical study of retinoblastoma. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1971;68:620-3.
- 4 Dimenbergh RA, Brown KLB. Diagnostic evaluation of patients with histiocytosis X. *J Pediatr Orthop* 1990;10:733-41.
- 5 Egeler RM, de Kraker J, Voûte PA. Langerhans cell histiocytosis; 20 jaar ervaring in het Emma Kinderziekenhuis. *Ned Tijdschr Geneesk* 1993;137:955-60.
- 6 Gadner H, Heiger A, Ritter J, Göbel U, Janka GE, Kühl J, et al. for the Mitglieder der DAL-HX-Studie. Langerhanszell-Histiozytose im Kindesalter-Ergebnisse der DAL-HX 83 Studie. *Klin Padiatr* 1987;199:173-82.
- 7 Matus-Ridley M, Raney RB, Thawerani H, Meadows AT. Histiocytosis X in children: patterns of disease and results of treatment. *Med Pediatr Oncol* 1983;11:99-105.

Palliative care in terminal cardiac failure

EDITOR,—In their review of recent advances in cardiology John McMurray and Andrew Rankin have nothing to report on the neglected subject of terminal cardiac failure.¹ There is little research on this and apparently little perception of the need for palliative care. This is exemplified by a survey I performed of 10 hospices in north east London and Essex. All responded either to a questionnaire or to telephone contact. One hospice had no inpatient beds, and another was a specialist AIDS unit. Of the remainder, four would consider admitting patients with a primary diagnosis of end stage cardiac failure. Only two of these had admitted patients with this condition in the past 12 months: one had admitted one and the other "less than five" in the past year. This seemed to be matched, however, by the demand for hospice beds for patients with cardiac failure. The maximum number of requests was "less than five." Three other hospices had only one or two inquiries a year. The others had no applications at all.

There seems to be virtually no demand for palliative care beds for patients with cardiac failure in the area surveyed. This may be because these patients receive treatment to control their symptoms from their general practitioners, cardiologists, or general physicians. It may also be related, however, to a lack of appreciation of the poor prognosis of this condition in patients unsuitable for transplantation. Research is needed to ascertain whether palliative care in a hospice setting improves the quality of these patients' last days.

SARAH JONES
Registrar

Department of Medicine for Elderly People,
Whipps Cross Hospital,
London E11 1NR

- 1 McMurray J, Rankin A. Cardiology. II. Treatment of heart failure and atrial fibrillation and arrhythmias. *BMJ* 1994;309:1631-5. (17 December.)

Nutrition and lung health

EDITOR,—We agree with M K Sridhar that antioxidants may ameliorate lung disease caused by exogenous oxidants such as cigarette smoke but would contend that the focus needs to be shifted from individual antioxidants to a more global measure of antioxidant defences.¹ There are several antioxidant vitamins, and many other

compounds such as urate, bilirubin, albumin, and non-protein thiols, whose contributions to the body's antioxidant defences may be neglected by measurement of either the dietary intake or the plasma concentration of an individual antioxidant.²

The ability to measure the body's antioxidant defences directly rather than the contributions of some of its individual components may provide a more accurate picture, one example being the assessment of the total plasma antioxidant potential, which measures the ability of plasma to retard in vivo a reaction mediated by oxidants.² Thus while several studies have shown reductions in plasma ascorbate concentrations in smokers, these may be due to either dietary effects or consumption of the vitamin by the increased oxidant stress of smoking.³

We have directly measured both plasma ascorbate concentration and plasma antioxidant potential in smokers.⁴ While both were reduced in smokers compared with non-smokers, there was no correlation between the plasma antioxidant potential and ascorbate concentration in individual subjects.⁵ Measurement of a single antioxidant molecule in plasma would therefore seem unlikely to provide an accurate assessment of total plasma antioxidant defences. Similarly, the effect of a single dietary intervention (increased dietary intake of ascorbate, α tocopherol, or β carotene) may be masked by other, unidentified dietary changes with opposite effects. Furthermore, substances such as ascorbate may be pro-oxidant in high doses, at least in some groups of patients.⁶

Under such circumstances it would not be surprising, as Sridhar notes, if a given dietary intervention produced no benefit or was shown to be harmful. We urge that antioxidant defences should be considered as an integrated whole rather than as an incomplete sum of partially measured, fragmented parts.

D K MENON
Senior lecturer
P J BACON
Research assistant
J G JONES
Professor of anaesthesia

Department of Anaesthesia,
University of Cambridge Clinical School,
Addenbrooke's Hospital,
Cambridge CB2 2QQ

- 1 Sridhar MK. Nutrition and lung health. *BMJ* 1995;310:75-6. (14 January.)
- 2 Miller NJ, Rice-Evans C, Davies MJ, Gopinathan V, Milner A. A novel method for measuring antioxidant capacity and its application to monitoring the antioxidant status in neonates. *Clin Sci* 1993;84:407-12.
- 3 Kallner AB, Hartmann D, Homing DH. On the requirements of ascorbic acid in man: steady-state turnover and body-pool smokers. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1981;34:1347-50.
- 4 Bacon PJ, Pickworth AJ, Jones JG, Menon DK. Plasma antioxidant activity in smokers. *Br J Anaesth* 1994;73:721-2P.
- 5 Bacon PJ, Pickworth AJ, Jones JG, Menon DK. The relationship between plasma antioxidant potential and vitamin C concentration in smokers and non-smokers. *Respir Med* 1994;88:815-6.
- 6 Hunt JV, Bottoms MA, Mitchinson MJ. Ascorbic acid oxidation: a potential cause of the elevated severity of atherosclerosis in diabetes mellitus? *FEBS Lett* 1992;311:161-4.

Care in a midwife managed delivery unit

May not be the best option

EDITOR,—V A Hundley and colleagues state that their objective was "to examine whether intrapartum care and delivery of low risk women in a midwife managed delivery unit differs from that in a consultant led labour ward."¹ They conclude that "midwife managed intrapartum care for low risk women results in more mobility and less intervention." Since 38% of the midwifery group became at high risk antenatally and had their entire intrapartum care in the consultant unit, however,

this conclusion cannot be drawn with confidence and it is fair to state that the objective was not achieved. To compare correctly intrapartum care and delivery of low risk women it would be necessary to exclude all those women who became at high risk antenatally and concentrate solely on the remaining low risk women admitted to the respective delivery units.

The finding of greater mobility in the midwifery group was hardly surprising since the 46% who delivered in the midwives unit had no access to fetal cardiotocography or electrocardiographic monitoring or epidural analgesia. Furthermore, to state that there was "less intervention" in this group is meaningless since intervention is not defined and rates of induction, augmentation, and operative delivery were identical.

We were intrigued by the finding of a reduced incidence of fetal distress in the midwifery group: no attempt is made to define this term, and the Apgar score, cord pH, and rate of operative delivery were identical in the two groups. In fact, the authors state that more babies required resuscitation in the midwifery group, which they attribute to greater use of naloxone. Use of opiates in both groups was identical. These findings are inconsistent.

Also highlighted is a lower rate of episiotomy in the midwifery group, while an increased incidence of third degree tears is ignored. A similar association was recently commented on by Henriksen *et al.*² Of 31 outcome variables analysed, only two are identified as significant: episiotomy ($P=0.04$) and neonatal resuscitation ($P=0.05$). Simple statistics implies that at least one of these was probably a chance finding.

We would be interested to hear from the authors about the frequency of problems in the third stage in the low risk group who required transfer to the consultant unit.

On the basis of the data presented we question the authors' conclusion that a midwife managed delivery unit is "the more effective option."

DAVID SOMERSET
Senior house officer in obstetrics
EDWARD O'DONNELL
Registrar in obstetrics

Birmingham Maternity Hospital,
Birmingham B15 2TG

- 1 Hundley VA, Cruickshank FM, Lang GD, Glazener CMA, Milne JM, Turner M, et al. Midwife managed delivery unit: a randomised controlled comparison with consultant led care. *BMJ* 1994;309:1400-4. (26 November.)
- 2 Henriksen TB, Bek KM, Hedegaard M, Secher NJ. Methods and consequences of changes in use of episiotomy. *BMJ* 1994;309:1255-8. (12 November.)

Analysis is invalid

EDITOR,—V A Hundley and colleagues have missed the opportunity to contribute usefully to the debate about the safety of non-consultant intrapartum care because their analysis of their work is flawed.¹ They state that their objective was "to examine whether intrapartum care and delivery of low risk women in a midwife managed delivery unit differs from that in a consultant led labour ward." To achieve this they randomised low risk women at booking, provided all the women with the same standard antenatal care, and compared various maternal and fetal outcomes between the two groups on an "intention to book" basis. But such a comparison is invalid because the two groups were no longer comparable (that is, no longer consisted of only low risk women) at the time (the onset of labour) of the intervention.

An analogy might help. Say one wanted to investigate the antihypertensive effect of a new drug in women with newly diagnosed hypertension. Women are screened (a single measurement of blood pressure), classified as hypertensive on the basis of the result, and immediately randomised to receive a new drug or placebo three

months later. Their care over these three months is identical: they have their blood pressure checked monthly, and any women whose blood pressure returns to normal are transferred to the placebo group because they cannot benefit from the new drug. At three months those remaining in the group to have the new drug are treated and all other women have placebo. The outcome is compared on an intention to randomise/treat basis, and it is now clear that such a comparison is invalid because at the start of treatment the groups are no longer comparable.

Hundley and colleagues made the same mistake. They randomised the women some five months before the intervention (to different labour and delivery regimens), transferred women at high risk to consultant led care, and invalidly analysed groups on the basis of their original classification at booking. Such an analysis would have been valid if they were comparing two styles of care from booking onwards.

All is not lost. The study should be reanalysed, with those women in the midwife led group at the onset of labour being compared with those women at low risk at the onset of labour in the consultant led group. Such a comparison would be a valid investigation of midwife led care during labour and delivery versus consultant led care. Such reanalysis would lead to the debate about such care being better informed. I suspect that correct analysis may not show benefits from midwife led care in the biomedical outcome measures used by the authors. I look forward to seeing the assessment of outcome in psychosocial terms that the authors mention, which is to be published elsewhere. Such measures are equally important in assessments of care during pregnancy.

LINDSAY F P SMITH
General practitioner

Yeovilton,
Somerset BA22 8EZ

1 Hundley VA, Cruickshank FM, Lang GD, Glazener CMA, Milne JM, Turner M, *et al.* Midwife managed delivery unit: a randomised controlled comparison with consultant led care. *BMJ* 1994;309:1400-4. (26 November.)

Study shows interventionist nature of British obstetrics

EDITOR,—The high rate of antepartum and intrapartum transfer of women from the midwives unit to the labour ward (1030 out of 1900) requires further explanation than V A Hundley and colleagues give in their discussion of the trials of the midwives unit in Aberdeen.¹ Table V shows that there were only 374 medical interventions during delivery if one assumes that all the caesarean sections and forceps and ventouse deliveries come within this category. If one further assumes that placental removal under anaesthesia (n=26) was in addition to these then the total number of women requiring specifically medical intervention and hence transfer to a labour ward was 400. The clinical implication of this may not be that as many as half of low risk women booked into a midwives unit become high risk during pregnancy or labour, as stated in the paper, but that three fifths of these will be transferred unnecessarily.

Table V also shows that 245 (9%) of the 2734 low risk women followed up had a caesarean section—an incredibly high figure when one considers that the rate of caesarean section in a low risk service in the Netherlands was 1.4%² and in a teaching clinic in Vienna was 1% between 1976 and 1985.³ The cumulative frequency of the generally accepted conditions requiring caesarean section in developed countries is estimated to be 6-8%.⁴ These figures compare with the overall rates of caesarean section in Aberdeen Maternity Hospital of 13.5%, 14.9%, and 15.6% in 1991, 1992, and 1993 respectively.⁵

There is a widespread belief that Britain has for

many years been training midwives only to make them work as obstetric nurses. As a consequence many midwives are thought to have become de-skilled and less able to work independently. The high rate of unnecessary transfer in Hundley and colleagues' study, which was necessarily produced within this framework, provides further confirmation of this. The high rate of caesarean section in women initially classified as at low risk indicates the interventionist nature of current British obstetric practice.

IAN G JONES
Director of public health

Fife Health Board,
Cupar KY15 5UP

- 1 Hundley VA, Cruickshank FM, Lang GD, Glazener CMA, Milne JM, Turner M, *et al.* Midwife managed delivery unit: a randomised controlled comparison with consultant led care. *BMJ* 1994;309:1400-4. (26 November.)
- 2 Van Alten D, Eskes M, Treffers PE. Midwifery in the Netherlands. The Wormerveer study; selection, mode of delivery, perinatal mortality and infant morbidity. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 1986;96:656-62.
- 3 Rockenschaub A. Technology-free obstetrics at the Semmelweis Clinic. *Lancet* 1990;335:977-8.
- 4 Savage W. Technology-free obstetrics at the Semmelweis Clinic. *Lancet* 1990;336:178-9.
- 5 Information and Statistics Division. *Hospital and health board comparisons in obstetrics, 1991-93*. Edinburgh: Scottish Health Service Common Services Agency, 1994.

Conclusions are not supported by results

EDITOR,—V A Hundley and colleagues' randomised controlled trial comparing midwife led care with consultant led care¹ is welcome as there have been few such trials in this field.² We are concerned, however, at some of the conclusions reached—in particular, the conclusion that midwife led care is as safe as consultant led care is not supported by the results.

The authors do not explicitly define safety in their paper. Although they chose perinatal morbidity as the primary outcome measure, they do not explain the type of morbidity used in the estimation of sample size. To base a trial on an expected baseline morbidity of 30% in a group of women judged to be at low risk of complications of pregnancy suggests that the morbidity of interest was relatively minor; although leading to much distress, this is not life threatening to either the mother or the baby. Severe morbidity, however, occurred in only a small number of babies. For example, 119 (6.6%) babies were admitted to the special care baby unit for more than 48 hours in the midwifery arm of the trial compared with 54 (6%) of babies in the consultant led arm of the trial. To show a difference between these relatively well defined outcomes of perinatal morbidity would require a much larger randomised controlled trial than that undertaken in Aberdeen. If, for example, a difference between 8% and 6% of babies being admitted to the special care baby unit was considered to be clinically important then a trial of nearly 6000 women would be required.

This point reflects a much wider issue in many randomised controlled trials: when the primary outcome under investigation is rare, the trial often needs to be too large to be feasible. The amalgamation of several trials with meta-analysis may produce sufficient numbers of events for this question to be answered, but individual randomised controlled trials should be designed so that they can answer the question that they set out to answer. In this example, if the question is one of safety then the trial has to be of a sufficient size that if any clinically important differences in safety measures exist, it can detect them. If that size is impossible in the setting available then the report should state clearly that the study is sized to look at other outcome measures that are important and more common.

Despite our reservations about the ability of the Aberdeen trial to reach conclusions on safety, we

welcome its findings on other issues, particularly morbidity that is not life threatening, and look forward to the authors' papers on the other outcomes measured.

PETER BROCKLEHURST
Trials research fellow
ALISON MACFARLANE
Medical statistician

LELIA DULEY
Trials research fellow
JO GARCIA
Social scientist
DIANA ELBOURNE
Trials statistician

National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit,
Radcliffe Infirmary,
Oxford OX2 6HE

- 1 Hundley VA, Cruickshank FM, Lang GD, Glazener CMA, Milne JM, Turner M, *et al.* Midwife managed delivery unit: a randomised controlled comparison with consultant led care. *BMJ* 1994;309:1400-4. (26 November.)
- 2 Campbell R, Macfarlane A. *Where to be born? The debate and evidence*. 2nd ed. Oxford: National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit, 1994.

Pregnancy and delivery require a joint midwifery and medical approach

EDITOR,—We believe that V A Hundley and colleagues make observations about midwife managed versus consultant led care that are potentially misleading.¹ The assertion that there is no increase in adverse neonatal outcomes associated with midwife managed care is not justified by the neonatal mortality quoted; our calculation of the relative risk of neonatal death in the midwives unit compared with the standard labour ward is 2.2 (confidence interval 0.5 to 10). This confidence interval shows that the data are consistent with a large increase in neonatal mortality in the midwives unit.

Similarly, the incidence of important complications of labour such as shoulder dystocia (1.4% v 0.9%), undiagnosed malpresentation (0.7% v 0.4%), and third degree tear (0.8% v 0.3%) was higher in the midwives unit than the standard labour ward, but confidence intervals are not shown. Other complications of labour showed similar rates of occurrence in the two groups. A much larger study would be required to prove or disprove the authors' conclusion that midwife led care is as safe as standard care in a labour ward.

It is encouraging to note that the midwives unit held clear advantages for women in terms of their mobility and use of natural methods of analgesia. We would emphasise the need for an integrated joint midwifery and medical approach to pregnancy and delivery. This would avoid the largely artificial divide between midwifery led and consultant led delivery units and remove the need for antepartum and intrapartum transfer of women, which in this study was necessary for 54% of the women originally randomised to the midwives unit. The movement of women at such a critical time in their pregnancy is emotionally traumatic and potentially dangerous and must surely be against the spirit of woman centred care.

CHRISTOPH LEES
Research fellow

STUART CAMPBELL
Professor of obstetrics and gynaecology

LINDA CARDOZO
Professor of urogynaecology

DONALD GIBB
Consultant obstetrician

MAGGIE BLOTT
Consultant obstetrician and gynaecologist

Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology,
King's College School of Medicine and Dentistry,
London SE5 8RX

IAN WHITE
Statistician

Department of Epidemiology and Population Sciences,
Medical Statistics Unit,
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,
London WC1E 7HT

- 1 Hundley VA, Cruickshank FM, Lang GD, Glazener CMA, Milne JM, Turner M, *et al.* Midwife managed delivery unit: a randomised controlled comparison with consultant led care. *BMJ* 1994;309:1400-4. (26 November.)