a persistent vegetative state remains unknown. Clearly, if any patient undergoing interventional ventilation survived in a vegetative state this would not be in the best interest of patient, his or her family, or society. This question needs a definitive answer before any point of law is addressed, if only to allow people to give more informed consent.

Secondly, admitting an incompetent patient to an intensive care unit and applying invasive support and monitoring solely to benefit others is a new concept that represents a substantial deviation from the way we practise and the way the public expects us to practise—that is, in the best interest of the individual. It is therefore not surprising that many people feel uncomfortable about interventional ventilation. It can be acceptable only if individuals have given prior informed consent not only to organ donation but specifically to interventional ventilation. They must understand that in these circumstances invasive treatment is not simply prolonged after brain stem death to allow organ donation. It is specifically started for no indication other than to allow the fulfilment of the criteria for brain stem death and organ donation. This may be a subtle difference, but it may matter to the people making a choice.

Thirdly, it is questionable whether many of the patients with stroke who would be considered suitable for the protocol would or should be routinely resuscitated and admitted to an intensive care unit simply because the resources are available. Offering futile treatment is undesirable and should be resisted, whether beds in an intensive care unit are available or not.

Finally, many people still consider that dying in a general ward is more peaceful and dignified than being admitted to an intensive care unit, intubated, and mechanically ventilated and then undergoing surgery to harvest organs. This argument, while emotive, is in our experience widely held by health care professionals and should not be simply dismissed. The fact that interventional ventilation was agreed with the patient's relatives does not refute this argument, for reasons discussed by Julia Neuberger.

ALEX MANARA
CLAIRE JEWKES

Consultants in anaesthesia and intensive care

Intensive Care Unit,
Frenchay Hospital,
Bristol BS16 1LE

1 Riad H, Nicholls A, Neuberger J, Williams SM, Sells RA, Jones MA, et al. Elective ventilation of potential organ donors. *BMJ* 1995;310:714-8. (18 March.)

Written protocols do not solve difficulties

EDITOR,—Much is made by the protagonists of interventional ventilation¹ of its approval by, among others, the BMA. The association's guidance included the recommendation that, in each unit, a comprehensive protocol should exist from which no deviation should be permitted.² It is therefore worrying that, in the study in Exeter on which the strategy is based, circumstances "made some deviation from the protocol necessary" in four of the nine patients admitted to intensive care.³ If this was the case in the ideal circumstances of the centre that pioneered the approach, considerable "bending of the rules" might well occur in less well organised hospitals.

Robert Francis proposes incorporating appropriately worded consent to interventional ventilation in the wording of the organ donor card as a means of overcoming existing legal barriers.¹ He argues that, if competent patients can decline lifesaving treatment, why should they not be able to consent to such a non-therapeutic procedure? This approach is flawed since doctors unhappy with the practice could not be compelled to ventilate patients for whom such treatment would be of no benefit.⁴

Finally, even if, as Hany Riad and Anthony

Nicholls hope, some legal formula can be found to allow them to resume interventional ventilation, it is difficult to see how the system could operate when, with current provision of beds, the rate of refusal for medically appropriate referrals to intensive care currently runs at 18%.⁵

M S NIELSEN
President

Intensive Care Society,
London WC1H 9HR

1 Riad H, Nicholls A, Neuberger J, Willatts SM, Sells RA, Jones MA, et al. Elective ventilation of potential organ donors. *BMJ* 1995;310:714-8. (18 March.)

2 British Medical Association. Ventilation for organ donation. *BMJ* 1992;304:719.

3 Feest TG, Riad HN, Collins CH, Golby MGS, Nicholls AJ, Hamad SN. Protocol for increasing organ donation after cerebrovascular deaths in a district general hospital. *Lancet* 1990;335:1133-5.

4 House of Lords; Airedale NHS Trust v Bland, 1993 AC 789.

5 Metcalfe A, McPherson K. Study of provision of intensive care in England, 1993. London: Department of Health, 1995.

Protocol balanced ethical principles

EDITOR,—I was the chairman of the working party that drew up the Exeter protocol for organ retrieval. The original protocol did not use the term "elective ventilation" because of the confusion this would cause. Last October the Department of Health issued guidance that the protocol was unlawful.¹ In view of the protocol's success in increasing the number of kidneys available for donation it is not surprising that Hany Riad and Anthony Nicholls have defended it vigorously and are pressing for a change in the law.² When the original protocol was drafted we recognised that for any medical intervention to be lawful it had to be for the patient's benefit. However, the case of *F v West Berkshire Health Authority* had not occurred,³ and we believed that the consent of the next of kin under the specific circumstances with which we were concerned was adequate.

Careful consideration was given to the four basic principles of medical ethics. Firstly, we were aware that starting mechanical ventilation in a patient with an intracranial haemorrhage on the point of death so that organs could be procured for transplantation was not for that patient's benefit. But then no intervention of any sort was in that patient's interest as the only possible outcome was death.

Secondly, we recognised that such patients are incompetent. They are unable to exercise autonomy. For this reason we brought the matter into the open by frank and honest discussion with the next of kin.

The next questions were, "Would the patient be harmed? Would death be rendered undignified for the patient and even more distressing for the relatives?" Our experience of caring for dying patients, including those with brain stem death, led us to conclude that this would not be the case. Furthermore, to prevent the harm of the persistent vegetative state, mechanical ventilation was not started before the moment of terminal respiratory arrest.

Fourthly, we considered the claims of justice: the needs of those awaiting transplantation and the cost benefits of getting patients off dialysis. We were clear that these claims supported our protocol.

As so often happens in medicine, we were trying to balance several ethical principles in the light of the clinical evidence at the time. For patients dying of intracranial haemorrhage death is inevitable. Nothing can be done to alter that; neither is it usual for their wishes to be known. The ethical basis for the Exeter protocol is openness with the next of kin, ensuring that the patient is not harmed, the welfare of those who need a transplant, and the compassionate and effective use of resources.

JOHN SEARLE
Consultant anaesthetist

Royal Devon and Exeter Hospital,
Exeter EX2 5DW

1 Acute Services Policy Unit. *Identification of potential donors of organs for transplantation*. London: Department of Health, 1994. (HSG(94)1.)

2 Riad H, Nicholls A, Neuberger J, Williams SM, Sells RA, Jones MA, et al. Elective ventilation of potential organ donors. *BMJ* 1995;310:714-8. (18 March.)

3 *F v West Berkshire Health Authority* [1989] 2 All ER 545, 551.

Increase in incidence of tuberculosis

EDITOR,—As Janet Darbyshire points out, the recent increase in notifications of tuberculosis may partly be due to a fall in undernotification.¹ However, the incidence of this condition probably has increased, particularly in areas of social deprivation.² At St George's Hospital, which serves a large area of south London, notifications have risen from 44 in 1988 to 118 in 1994.

In the United States, particularly in New York, where the incidence of both tuberculosis and infection with resistant organisms has risen, poor compliance has been a major contributory factor.³ The introduction of supervised chemotherapy has led to a considerable improvement.⁴ Supervision of treatment in Britain is often lackadaisical, and we could learn from the American experience. In a review of the situation in New York Bellin suggested that, in addition to the disease being notified, the satisfactory completion of treatment should be reported to a national authority.⁵ Doctors with a high proportion of patients who fail to complete treatment could be targeted and areas with low rates of completion investigated, and further resources could be made available if necessary.

JOHN MILLARD
Consultant physician
CHARLOTTE RAYNER
Senior registrar

Chest Clinic,
St George's Hospital,
London SW17 0QT

1 Darbyshire JH. Tuberculosis: old reasons for a new increase? *BMJ* 1995;310:954-5. (15 April.)

2 Bhatti N, Law MR, Morris JK, Halliday R, Moore-Gillon J. Increasing incidence of tuberculosis in England and Wales: a study of likely causes. *BMJ* 1995;310:967-9. (15 April.)

3 Brudney K, Dobkin J. Resurgent tuberculosis in New York City. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1991;144:745-9.

4 Weis SE, Slocum PC, Blais FX, King B, Nunn M, Matney GB, et al. The effect of directly observed therapy on the rates of drug resistance and relapse in tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med* 1994;330:1179-84.

5 Bellin E. Failure of tuberculosis control. A prescription for change. *JAMA* 1994;271:708-9.

Bottle feeding and the sudden infant death syndrome

EDITOR,—R E Gilbert and colleagues report that bottle feeding is not a significant independent risk factor for the sudden infant death syndrome.¹ We believe that they may have made a type 2 error (stating that there is no difference when in fact there is one). They report that the risk of the syndrome in breast fed infants was almost half that seen in bottle fed infants after adjustment for a small number of potential confounders. As the reduction in risk did not reach significance, however, they conclude that bottle feeding was not an independent risk factor.

The New Zealand cot death study, a large nationwide case-control study (485 cases and 1800 controls), found after adjustment for a wide range of potential confounders, that infants exclusively breast fed had a significantly reduced risk of the sudden infant death syndrome compared with infants who were bottle fed.² The reduced risk was of a similar magnitude to that reported in Gilbert and colleagues' study. Residual confounding due to social or cultural factors is unlikely to explain the results from the New Zealand study. We controlled for a wide range of potential con-

founders (selection effect—age of infant, region, season, time; sociodemographic background—marital status, occupation, age at which mother left school, age of mother; pregnancy variables—number of previous pregnancies, attendance at antenatal clinics and education classes; infant factors—sex, ethnic group, birth weight, gestation; and postnatal factors—admission to neonatal unit, maternal smoking, sleep position, and cosleeping). As can be seen, these include a wide range of socioeconomic variables and measures of health behaviour. Although breast feeding rates are much higher in New Zealand than in the United Kingdom,³ the risk factors for not breast feeding are similar in New Zealand⁴ to those reported from the United Kingdom.⁵

It is important to adjust not only for maternal smoking but also for mothers sharing a bed with their infants. Bed sharing is associated with breast feeding⁴ but increases the risk of the sudden infant death syndrome.² Adjusting for bed sharing will tend to increase the beneficial effect of breast feeding on the risk of the syndrome (New Zealand cot death study, not exclusively breast feeding at discharge from obstetric hospital; odds ratio after adjustment for confounders, including bed sharing=1.89 (95% confidence interval 1.35 to 2.64);⁵ odds ratio after adjustment for confounders but excluding bed sharing=1.76 (1.25 to 2.45)). Use of dummies may also be a confounder.

We conclude that the results of Gilbert and colleagues' study are consistent with those of our study; the very large national maternal and infant health survey,⁵ which also adjusted for socioeconomic factors and smoking; and other studies, which show that breast feeding halves the risk of the sudden infant death syndrome.

The New Zealand cot death prevention programme recommends that mothers should breast feed if possible. As breast feeding rates are lower in the United Kingdom than New Zealand the promotion of breast feeding may be even more important for the United Kingdom. We believe that breast feeding should be included in the "back to sleep" campaign.

E A MITCHELL

Associate professor of paediatrics

Department of Paediatrics,
University of Auckland Medical School,
Private Bag 92019,
Auckland,
New Zealand

A W STEWART

Biostatistician

Department of Community Health,
University of Auckland

R P K FORD

Community paediatrician

Community Child and Family Services,
Christchurch,
New Zealand

1 Gilbert RE, Wigfield RE, Flemeing PJ, Berry PJ, Rudd PT. Bottle feeding and the sudden infant death syndrome. *BMJ* 1995;310:88-90. (4 January.)

2 Ford RPK, Taylor BJ, Mitchell EA, Enright SA, Stewart AW, Becroft DMO, et al. Breastfeeding and the risk of sudden infant death syndrome. *Int J Epidemiol* 1993;22:885-90.

3 Office of Population Censuses and Surveys Social Survey Division. *Infant feeding*, 1990. London: HMSO, 1992.

4 Ford RPK, Mitchell EA, Scragg R, Stewart AW, Taylor BJ, Allen EM. Factors adversely associated with breast feeding in New Zealand. *J Paediatr Child Health* 1994;30:483-9.

5 Fredrickson DD, Sorenson JR, Biddle AK, Kotelchuck M. Relationship of sudden infant death syndrome to breast-feeding duration and intensity. *Am J Dis Child* 1993;147:460.

Authors' reply

EDITOR,—The estimated adjusted odds ratio for the sudden infant death syndrome for bottle fed infants (compared with those who were ever breast fed) in our study was 1.7 (95% confidence interval 0.7 to 3.7). We agree with E A Mitchell and colleagues that this is consistent with a protective effect of breast feeding of a magnitude similar to that reported in the New Zealand cot death study.¹ As the 95% confidence interval includes 1, how-

ever, the study does not provide strong evidence of an independent effect.

A similar but larger study of meta-analysis would increase the precision and might detect an independent effect. A multiregional study currently in progress in Britain will allow detailed analysis of the effects of infant feeding and bed sharing. Nevertheless, in such observational studies it may still be difficult to exclude an effect due to residual confounding by social and cultural factors.

Mitchell and colleagues suggest that the government of the United Kingdom should recommend breast feeding to protect against the sudden infant death syndrome. This suggestion is difficult to support, given the equivocal evidence, even though there might be benefits in terms of child morbidity and no significant risks. Pending full publication of the study by Fredrickson *et al* (currently only an abstract is available),² the study by Ford *et al*, in which only 8% of control babies were bottle fed from birth, is the only published study to show a significant protective effect of breast feeding after extensive adjustment for maternal smoking, social factors, prematurity, and sleeping position.¹

Sufficient evidence of the nutritional and immunological advantages of breast feeding already exist to justify more government action to increase the prevalence of breast feeding.

RUTH GILBERT

Lecturer in epidemiology

Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics,
Institute of Child Health,
London WC1N 1EH

PETER FLEMING

Consultant paediatrician

RUTH WIGFIELD

Research fellow

Department of Child Health,
St Michael's Hospital,
Bristol BS2 8EG

JEM BERRY

Professor of perinatal pathology

Department of Paediatric Pathology,
St Michael's Hospital

PETER RUDD

Consultant paediatrician

Bath Unit for Research into Paediatrics,
Royal United Hospital,
Bath BA1 3NG

1 Ford RPK, Taylor BJ, Mitchell EA, Enright SA, Stewart AW, Becroft DMO, et al. Breastfeeding and the risk of sudden infant death syndrome. *Int J Epidemiol* 1993;22:885-90.

2 Fredrickson DD, Sorenson JR, Biddle AK, Kotelchuck M. Relationship of sudden infant death syndrome to breast feeding duration and intensity. *Am J Dis Child* 1993;147:460.

Diabetes and breast feeding

EDITOR,—Considerable attention is justifiably given to controlling diabetes during pregnancy and parturition. Less attention, however, is paid to diabetes and breast feeding. My partner, who has insulin dependent diabetes, gave birth to a girl weighing 2778 g in a general practitioner obstetric unit and received high quality care from her care team, which included a specialist in diabetes. Diabetic control was maintained from the outset of pregnancy, and no important problems occurred; she had a minimal intervention delivery. At the time that the pregnancy was confirmed clear advice was given with regard to fetal growth during pregnancy and issues relating to delivery.

We appreciated the advice given. At no time, however, was the impact of breast feeding on a mother with diabetes addressed. It was only at this stage that problems with diabetic control occurred, leading to quite severe hypoglycaemic episodes. We obtained advice subsequently, after which breast feeding continued successfully. Interestingly, telephone contact with the British Diabetic Associated elicited the response that no information was available on diabetes and breast feeding.

Medical intervention is more complicated for prospective mothers with diabetes, although in our case a low intervention approach was followed, in accordance with our wishes. We looked forward to greater normalisation when it came to breast feeding. The hypoglycaemic episodes caused great distress and led us to consider stopping breast feeding.

It would be beneficial if all care professionals who help to manage pregnant women with diabetes approached management in three stages: pregnancy, delivery, and aftercare, including breast feeding. The problems associated with each stage should be addressed at the time that pregnancy is confirmed and at subsequent reviews. Brief protocols would be of benefit, as would simple information leaflets that could be provided to prospective mothers. The British Diabetic Association's lack of information on diabetes and breast feeding highlights the fact that this issue has been neglected. Although there may be examples of practice similar to that which I propose, they have not permeated sufficiently into all care settings.

D F O'SULLIVAN
Consultant psychiatrist

Sandwell Mental Health Service,
All Saints Hospital,
Birmingham B18 5SD

Vitamin A deficiency

Measurements of serum retinol may be misleading

EDITOR,—N J Watson and colleagues draw attention to the fact that vitamin A deficiency may occur in certain categories of patients in Britain.¹ As they report, treatment is readily available for patients with symptomatic vitamin A deficiency. I urge caution, however, in the use of measurements of serum vitamin A (retinol) concentration alone in assessing vitamin A status. Serum concentrations of retinol are related to age and may be much lower than those quoted in young children, depressed as part of an acute phase response, or increased as a result of renal failure. Of more importance in relation to gastrointestinal and hepatic disorders is the documented evidence of impaired release of hepatic vitamin A, with inappropriately low serum retinol concentrations—for example, in cystic fibrosis² and primary biliary cirrhosis.³

Inappropriate or excessive supplementation with vitamin A can significantly increase hepatic vitamin A reserves without increasing serum retinol concentrations and may suppress them.⁴ Prolonged consumption of therapeutic doses of vitamin A supplements has also resulted in irreversible liver damage.⁵ In patients receiving long term treatment the risk is not of acute toxicity, as seen in the early Arctic explorers, but of a more insidious chronic toxicity. Raised fasting retinyl ester concentrations in the absence of secondary causes may indicate that hepatic reserves are already approaching saturation with vitamin A.⁴

DAVID JAMES

Senior registrar in chemical pathology

Department of Medical Biochemistry,
University Hospital of Wales,
Cardiff CF4 4XW

1 Watson NJ, Hutchinson CH, Atta HR. Vitamin A deficiency in xerophthalmia in the United Kingdom. *BMJ* 1995;310:1050-1. (22 April.)

2 Underwood BA, Denning CR. Blood and liver concentrations of vitamins A and E in children with cystic fibrosis of the pancreas. *Paed Res* 1972;6:26-31.

3 Nyberg A, Berne B, Norlinder H, Busch C, Eriksson U, Löf L, et al. Impaired release of vitamin A from the liver in primary biliary cirrhosis. *Hepatology* 1988;8:136-41.

4 James DR, Owen G, Goodchild MC, Campbell IA. Vitamin A absorption in cystic fibrosis: risk of hypervitaminosis A. *Gut* 1992;33:707-10.

5 Geubel AP, De Galoscy C, Alves N, Rahier J, Dive C. Liver damage caused by therapeutic vitamin A administration: estimate of dose-related toxicity in 41 cases. *Gastroenterology* 1991;100:1701-9.