not surprising that they imply that there could be a causal relation between viral infection and exacerbations of asthma. They recognise that the argument that rhinoviruses could cause exacerbations of asthma is not new. They do not, however, mention that there have been multiple unsuccessful attempts in the past to show experimentally that these viruses can induce attacks of asthma (D A Tyrrel, W Busse, C Reed, J Gwaltney; separate personal communications). Indeed, the only model in which rhinovirus has been consistently shown to produce features of asthma in the lung is one combining viral infection with allergen challenge.^{2,3}

Johnston and colleagues do not state which of the children were allergic at the time of the study. Studies at Poole General Hospital (64 km from Southampton), however, showed that being allergic to dust mites was the strongest risk factor for developing asthma⁴ and for being admitted to hospital.⁵ Indeed, it has been reported that atopy in the cohort studied was associated with "lower FEV₁ [forced expiratory volume in one second], greater within day and between day variation in PEF [peak expiratory flow] and greater severity of respiratory symptoms."⁶

For at least two reasons it seems inevitable that allergy to common inhalant allergens and rhinovirus infection are cofactors for attacks of asthma in childhood—because of the results of the experimental studies and because these two risk factors are too common to be distinct. In our study of children presenting to the University of Virginia's paediatric emergency room with acute episodes of wheezing we found that the combination of rhinovirus culture and IgE antibody to common allergens was the strongest risk factor of wheezing.⁷ More recently, we have confirmed this association by using the polymerase chain reaction to detect rhinovirus.⁸ Thus, although the reported association between exacerbations of asthma and viral infections is striking, the group from Southampton should recognise that the children almost certainly have to be primed to respond in this way. The commonest well recognised cause of priming is exposure to a foreign protein to which the children have made an immediate hypersensitivity response, and this is the only model for which there is convincing experimental evidence.

THOMAS A E PLATTS-MILLS
Head, division of allergy and clinical immunology
GARY P RAKES
Assistant professor of paediatrics
PETER W HEYMANN
Associate professor of paediatrics

University of Virginia Health Sciences Center,
Department of Medicine,
Charlottesville, VA 22908, USA

- Johnston SL, Pattemore PK, Sanderson G, Smith S, Lampe F, Josephs L, et al. Community study of role of viral infections in exacerbations of asthma in 9-11 year old children. *BMJ* 1995;310:1225-9. (13 May.)
- Lemansky RF, Dick EC, Swenson CA, Busse WW. Rhinovirus upper respiratory infection increases airway reactivity in late asthmatic reactions. *J Clin Invest* 1989;83:1.
- Calhoun WJ, Dick EC, Schwartz LB, Busse WW. A common cold virus, rhinovirus 16, potentiates airway inflammation after segmental antigen bronchoprovocation in allergic subjects. *J Clin Invest* 1994;94:2200-8.
- Spork R, Holgate ST, Platts-Mills TAE, Cogswell J. Exposure to house dust mite allergens (Der p I) and the development of asthma in childhood: a prospective study. *N Engl J Med* 1990;323:502-7.
- Spork R, Platts-Mills TAE, Cogswell JJ. Exposure to house dust mite allergen of children admitted to hospital with asthma. *Clin Exp Allergy* 1993;23:740-6.
- Clough JB, Williams JD, Holgate ST. Effect of atopy on the natural history of symptoms, peak expiratory flow, and bronchial responsiveness in 7- and 8-year old children with cough and wheeze. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1991;143:755-60.
- Duff AL, Pomeranz ES, Gelber LE, Price GW, Farris H, Hayden FG, et al. Risk factors for acute wheezing in infants and children: viruses, passive smoke, and IgE antibodies to inhalant allergens. *Pediatrics* 1993;92:535-40.
- Rakes GP, Arruda E, Hoover GE, Hayden FG, Platts-Mills TAE, Heymann PW. Assessment of viral pathogens and eosinophil cationic protein in nasal washings from wheezing infants and children [abstract]. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 1995;151:362.

Sexual health, GU medicine, and a non-descriptive title are all appropriate names

EDITOR,—C Sonnex and colleagues voice concern that the use of the title sexual health clinic might further increase the stigma of genitourinary medicine clinics.¹ Although this is important to question, the reverse may equally be true.

Their survey of a small sample of clients already attending their clinic has limited potential to discriminate which of these possibilities is actually the case. It is not surprising that most clients attending a clinic called clinic 1A prefer it to have this title: after all, that is the clinic they have already chosen to attend. Also, as the survey includes neither demographic data nor information about sexual health needs, it is not possible to know whether the study group represents a population to whom we wish to target genitourinary medicine services. It is important to know about the preferences of those who are not already using these services as well as those who are. This is especially true for target groups.

The authors rightly suggest that terms such as "sex" and "genito" may cause clients embarrassment when they attend a clinic, but their survey showed that abbreviating "genitourinary" to "GU" made little difference to patients' choice. Furthermore, the nature of the potential stigma attached to each term may be different and will depend on culture and title—for instance, the word "sex" is far less taboo than it was just 10 years ago.

The search for an ideal title for genitourinary medicine clinics will be difficult as some degree of taboo will always be attached to such clinics. The terms "sexual health" and "genitourinary medicine" are not mutually exclusive. Wise providers will exploit each term to its best advantage—for instance, a clinic may use the term "sexual health" in its advertising, "genitourinary medicine" for liaison with other medical specialties, and a non-descriptive title on site.

The *Health of the Nation* placed sexual health firmly on the purchaser-provider map; genitourinary medicine would be wise to remember that it is not the only provider vying for its slice of the sexual health pie.

ANNA PALLECAROS
Clinical research fellow

Department of Genitourinary Medicine,
St Mary's Hospital,
London W2 1NY

- Sonnex C, Carne C, Edwards S. Rethinking sexual health clinics. *BMJ* 1995;310:1194-5. (6 May.)
- Department of Health. *The health of the nation. Key area handbook. HIV/AIDS and sexual health.* London: DoH, 1992.

Male partners of women with pelvic infection should be traced

EDITOR,—Minerva asks "Should the male partners of women with pelvic infections be referred for contact tracing?" and concludes that, although the concept "may seem a good idea," it is impractical.¹ We believe that, however difficult, it must be tackled.

The evidence is unquestionable. Kinghorn *et al* showed that, of 34 male contacts of women with acute salpingitis, 30 had urethritis.² They concluded that male contacts should be routinely investigated irrespective of the presence of symptoms or of the microbiological findings in women. Jacob *et al* referred to male partners as "a forgotten factor in pelvic inflammatory disease."³ In their study 46 of 58 men identified as partners of women with pelvic inflammatory disease had nongonococcal urethritis, of whom 36 were asymptomatic. Kamwendo *et al* reported an incidence of sexually transmitted infections of 59.7% in 200 male partners of 196 women with pelvic inflamma-

tory disease.⁴ No symptoms of urethritis (dysuria, urethral itching, or discharge) were volunteered by 96 of the 117 infected men.

To make a true impact on the epidemic of pelvic infection and the resultant morbidity we must examine and treat the male partner. The question is how to achieve this. Firstly, all clinicians who have a role in the management of women presumed to have pelvic infection must assume greater responsibility for detecting asymptomatic sexually transmitted disease in the male partners. Secondly, a public awareness campaign acknowledging that pelvic infection may be a complication of sexually transmitted diseases and addressing the asymptomatic nature of some of these diseases is long overdue. Sexually active men should understand that infection with *Chlamydia trachomatis*, the commonest identifiable cause of pelvic infection in the developed world, is asymptomatic in over half of men carrying the bacterium.⁵

Others have risen to the challenge. In Sweden an intensive education programme in which the importance of contact tracing was emphasised reduced the incidence of salpingitis by 40% over 10 years. In Britain the infrastructure (in the form of the genitourinary medicine service) already exists to screen for sexually transmitted diseases and to manage partners of men and women who might be infected. Clinicians should use it to its full potential.

ANGELA J ROBINSON
Consultant genitourinary physician

PHILIP KELL
Consultant, Archway Sexual Health Clinic

Camden and Islington
Community Health Services Trust,
London WC1E 6AU

- Minerva. *BMJ* 1995;310:1478. (3 June.)
- Kinghorn GR, Duerden BI, Hafiz S. Clinical and microbiological investigation of women with acute salpingitis and their consorts. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 1986;93:869-80.
- Jacob M, Shahmanesh M, Whatley J, Thin N. A forgotten factor in pelvic inflammatory disease: infection in the male partner. *BMJ* 1987;294:869.
- Kamwendo F, Johansson E, Moi H, Forslin L, Danielsson D. Gonorrhea, genital chlamydial infection, and nonspecific urethritis in male partners of women hospitalized and treated for acute pelvic inflammatory disease. *Sex Transm Dis* 1993;20:143-6.
- Zelin J, Robinson AJ, Ridgway GL, Allason-Jones E, Williams P. Chlamydial urethritis in heterosexual men attending a genitourinary medicine clinic: prevalence, symptoms, condom usage and partner change. *Int J STD AIDS* 1995;6:27-30.

Open herniorrhaphy is safer and cheaper than laparoscopic surgery

EDITOR,—R S Taylor and T M Loosemore write that I failed to make a case against laparoscopic inguinal hernia repair.¹ I maintain that we do not need the endoscopic method when we have an open mesh technique that can be performed under local anaesthesia, is suitable for patients with considerable comorbidity, and has a rapid recovery rate and the lowest recurrence rate reported. The patient is awake and feels safe during and after the procedure. What more would a patient wish for?

I am not against comparative trials, but there are sufficient data suggesting that prospective comparative trials might be unnecessary. Common sense is still needed in surgery. The most recent multicentre report of elective laparoscopic hernia repair in 3229 carefully selected patients, reports a rate of major complications of 1%; two deaths (due to myocardial infarction and liver failure); one case of vascular injury, 53 cases of neuralgia, 37 of urinary retention, 84 of haematoma, one of injury to the colon, five of small bowel obstruction, two of bladder injury, and two of hernia at the site of the trocar; and a recurrence rate of 2% (mean time to recurrence 22 months).² These are appalling results for elective correction of a benign condition. The long term risks of intestinal obstruction