Location	House dust ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Soil ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Estimated % of children with blood lead	
			> 10 $\mu\text{g/dl}$	> 25 $\mu\text{g/dl}$
Mean value in national survey†	561	266	26.9	0.5
Range	5-36 900	13-14 100		
London	1010	654	55.5	3.9
Range	5-36 900	60-13 700		
Birmingham	424	313	21.1	0.3
Derbyshire: old mining villages	1870	5610	97	50.1
Range	606-7020	1180-22100		
Brighton houses:				
Built 1870-1919	1874	1014	81.1	14.5
Built 1960-1986	241	131	8.3	<0.05

*Measurements in Brighton were taken in September 1986.

†Including London, but excluding old mining areas.

Source for dust and soil samples: ref 4. Dietary lead intake assumed to be 15.71 $\mu\text{g/day}$ on basis of figures provided by Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food.¹ Water lead concentrations were conservatively assumed to be on average 4 $\mu\text{g/l}$ and ambient air lead concentrations to be 0.1 $\mu\text{g/m}^3$.

consistently denied that British children are at risk from this source of exposure to lead, and we can find no evidence that survey work is taking place.³ Research suggests, however, that the concentrations of lead in dust and soil in Britain may be as high as, or higher than, those found in the United States.⁴ If the blood lead concentration was lowered to 10 $\mu\text{g/dl}$ changes would have to be made in the methods by which buildings constructed before 1945 are maintained and re-decorated; after that date the use of leaded paints in Britain diminished rapidly.

Despite the lack of available data on blood lead concentrations in Britain we have used the US Environmental Protection Agency's computer model of the uptake and biokinetics of lead to estimate probable concentrations in children aged under 6 years by inference from data on the levels of environmental contamination (integrated exposure uptake biokinetic model for lead in children, version 0.99d). The results, given in the table, suggest that appreciable numbers of young children have raised blood lead concentrations and that adverse effects are therefore occurring.

ERIK MILLSTONE
Lecturer

JOHN RUSSELL
Research student

Science Policy Research Unit,
University of Sussex,
Brighton BN1 9RF

- 1 Pocock SJ, Smith M, Baghurst P. Environmental lead and children's intelligence: a systematic review of the epidemiological evidence. *BMJ* 1994;309:1189-97. (5 November.)
- 2 Hydes OD, Hill CY, Marsden PK, Waite WM. *Nitrate, pesticides and lead 1989 and 1990*. London: Drinking Water Inspectorate, 1992:70.
- 3 O'Neill P. Lead paint: still a threat to children. *BMJ* 1992;305:440.
- 4 Thornton I, Davies DJA, Watt JM, Quinn MJ. Lead exposure in young children from dust and soil in the United Kingdom. *Environ Health Perspect* 1990;89:55-60.
- 5 Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. *Lead in food: progress report*. London: HMSO, 1989:13-5. (Food surveillance paper No 27.)

Authors' reply

EDITOR,—We endeavoured to include all relevant epidemiological studies in our meta-analysis and believe that others expert in this field would object to Herbert L Needleman's proposed deletions. The European multicentre study was one publication with consistent methodology relating to field work in several countries. In this complex epidemiological field, methodological concerns exist for many of the studies. In our view this is not best handled by deleting studies.

Regrettably, we had to exclude the two studies that measured circumcuspulpal dentine lead. They cannot be combined with other tooth lead studies, and one study's regression results were not available. This left insufficient material for systematic review.

Publication bias is of concern with all systematic

reviews. While Needleman's "file drawer analysis" is interesting, it should be noted that even a few negative unpublished studies inevitably contribute bias to inflate the magnitude of observed association. We appreciate Needleman's observations on selection biases in the Boston studies and regret that more studies do not undertake such inquiries.

Needleman's concern about whether covariates are confounders or partial surrogates for body lead burden is a valuable point. Besides simply debating the issue, however, it seems impossible to quantify such "shared variance."

Needleman's lack of enthusiasm for reverse causality is not surprising. But intelligence clearly affects children's behaviour, and how this contributes to differentials in lead uptake is a serious point. For instance, in Boston, who knows if children of exceptionally high IQ play outdoors less than others?

While animal studies contribute to biological plausibility, they cannot directly help in determining the existence and magnitude of neuropsychological links to low level exposure to lead in children.

We acknowledge that Needleman is more convinced by the observational evidence than we are. When inferring causality we argue that the studies of lead and IQ are on weaker ground than studies in many other areas of epidemiological inquiry. Full scale IQ is a marker only for less identifiable specific potential neuropsychological deficits, other determinants of IQ are difficult to quantify, their role as confounders is unclear, the markers of body lead burden contain substantial measurement error as regards true exposure, and the statistical magnitude of any putative causal relation is small. This is not a satisfying area for deriving firm causal conclusions, which is why debate continues so long. Far from being "worn caveats," we think our caution in interpreting statistical associations is an appropriate stance for scientific investigation.

Hence, in answer to Erik Millstone and John Russell, we do not acknowledge that there is convincing evidence that blood lead concentrations down to 10 $\mu\text{g/dl}$ produce adverse neurological effects in children. Such causal inference relating to such a specific threshold of effect is not well founded.

STUART J POCOCK
Professor of medical statistics

Medical Statistics Unit,
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,
London WC1E 7HT

MARJORIE SMITH
Deputy director

Thomas Coram Research Unit,
Institute of Education,
London WC1H 0AA

PETER BAGHURST
Principal research scientist

Division of Human Nutrition,
Commonwealth Scientific Industrial Research Organisation,
Adelaide,
SA 5000,
Australia

Emergency care in general practice

EDITOR,—Andrew Dicker's assertion that "there is an urgent need for a nationwide reactive and effective emergency service, staffed by properly trained paramedics, to respond to medical emergencies at home" encouraged us to collate and analyse some relevant data that we have been collecting.¹ We wrote to all chief ambulance officers in the United Kingdom seeking their views on tertiary education for paramedics. To date, 44 (86%) of 51 have responded. Forty supported the introduction of a nationally recognised degree or diploma in ambulance technology, while the concepts of a General Paramedical Council and state registered paramedics were both supported by 39. Reaccreditation and the provision of a national qualifying exam were both supported by 35 respondents. There was not support, however, for the regulation of entry numbers to protect career progression or for the suggestion that people should not be able to hold senior management positions in the service unless they had a paramedic degree.

These data show a willingness by the leaders of the ambulance service to formalise the acquisition of skills and to professionalise the service, thus bringing the United Kingdom into line with other countries such as the United States and South Africa. We believe that such developments should be encouraged. C Brittain and colleagues' statement that "other health care professionals such as those in the ambulance service... are only too keen to take on this work to enhance their status" puts them in danger of being accused of professional protectionism.² We are sure that this is not the position of the British Association for Immediate Care and that, like us, it sees the best interests of patients being served by the coexistence of a highly trained and skilled paramedic service with general practitioners who have benefited from the excellent courses that it and others run.^{3,4}

FRANCIS RICHARDSON
Senior registrar

Accident and Emergency Department,
Cardiff Royal Infirmary,
Cardiff CF2 1SZ

PETER DONNELLY
Clinical senior lecturer

CAROLINE LESTER
Research officer

Centre for Applied Public Health Medicine,
University of Wales College of Medicine,
Cardiff CF4 4XN

- 1 Dicker A. Emergency care in general practice. *BMJ* 1995;310:735. (18 March.)
- 2 Brittain C, Steggle BG, Eaton CJ, Holden JP, Fairhurst RJ. Emergency care in general practice. *BMJ* 1995;310:736. (18 March.)
- 3 Mann RG. Emergency care in general practice. *BMJ* 1995;310:736. (18 March.)
- 4 Murphy A, Bury G. Emergency care in general practice. *BMJ* 1995;310:736. (18 March.)

Nicotine patches

EDITOR,—May R Arnaot suggests that nicotine patches may not be safe.¹ I agree that nicotine could aggravate cardiovascular disease through the haemodynamic consequences of sympathetic neural stimulation or systemic release of catecholamines, or both.² I believe, however, that the risk of treatment with nicotine patches is negligible compared with that of cigarette smoking.

Cigarette smoking delivers many potentially toxic chemicals, including carbon monoxide. It produces a hypercoagulable state, which is thought to be a primary mechanism for acute cardiovascular events related to smoking. Use of nicotine patches seems not to enhance coagulation.³ Even though nicotine is potentially toxic, the