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Screening and mortality from cervical cancer

Does screening really reduce mortality?

EDITOR—We were rather non-plussed to read that the conclusion of the paper by Quinn et al on screening for cervical cancer
1
is not supported by their data, and we wonder whether so called political correctness had anything to do with it.
The statement "300 deaths might have been prevented in 1997" is based on a projected mortality of a completely arbitrarily ( alas, not randomly) selected part of a subset of graphs showing trends in mortality. The opposite conclusion may be reached using the same graphs. For example, in women aged 35-44 mortality fell from 10 per 100 000 to 5 per 100 000 in the period 1990 to 1975, and it should have approached zero by 1997 assuming that the trend had continued. Similarly, with the same age groups as in the original paper, in women aged 25-34 mortality fell from 2.5 per 100 000 to 1.1 per 100 000 in the period 1955 to 1965, so by 1997 it should have again approached zero. Since the only new intervention has been screening, and the mortality is expressed as 100 000 deaths, screening may have caused up to 2900 extra deaths in 1997—by the same logic.

Javant S Vaidya honorary lecturer in surgery j.vaidya@uhl.nhs.uk

Michael Baum professor of surgery
Department of Surgery, Imperial College School of Medicine, University College London, London, London W1P 7LD


Authors' reply

EDITOR—The conclusions in our paper are not based solely on the analysis of mortality. We presented strong evidence that the introduction of national call and recall and of incentive payments to general practitioners led to a dramatic fall in the incidence of cervical cancer in women in all age groups from 30 to 74 and in all regions of England. Other evidence confirms the expected shift towards detection of earlier stages of disease. There is no other plausible explanation for these patterns. If women do not get cervical cancer, they will not die from it. In addition, it has been recognised for over 30 years that mortality from cervical cancer shows very strong cohort trends (reflecting those in incidence)2 and so Vaidya and Baum's simple extrapolation of age specific trends is totally inappropriate. We extrapolated the cohort rates for the relevant age groups. Our analysis and conclusions are supported by a similar study in Scotland3 and by the results from formal age period cohort models.4

We remain bewildered about the many well known problems with cervical screening which we mentioned in our paper: cervical cancer is a comparatively rare disease and its natural course is not well understood; the smear test has both low sensitivity and low specificity; many tests are technically unsatisfactory and the proportion of such tests varies widely across the country; the mix of three and five year screening intervals is inequitable; too many smear tests are opportunistic; and the programme costs four times as much as breast screening. Nevertheless, there is now conclusive evidence that cervical screening has markedly reduced both incidence and mortality.

M J Quinn director, National Cancer Registration Bureau

PJ Babb senior cancer epidemiologist

Jones cancer epidemiologist
Office for National Statistics, London SW1V 2QQ

Study shows importance of centralised organisation in screening

EDITOR—the paper by Quinn et al reporting the effects of screening on incidence of and mortality from cervical cancer in England5 highlighted the characteristics of successful programmes elsewhere6 and showed that the national screening programme had been effective.

The situation in Hong Kong, where there is no systematic population based cervical screening programme, shows the importance of central organisation. Hong Kong is a generally affluent community with a better health profile than most developed countries. Infant mortality is low (4.6 per 1000 live births in 1995, compared with 6.2 in the United Kingdom), and life expectancy is high (81.5 years at birth for women, compared with 79.4 years in the United Kingdom). Women in Hong Kong are at lower risk of developing many common cancers, such as those of the breast, lung, and liver, than are their counterparts in most Western countries yet the reverse is true for cervical cancer.7

The figure shows the trend in the incidence of and mortality from cervical cancer standardised to the European standard population (for age bands of five years). Although incidence has reduced gradually over time, it has not fallen dramatically as in the United Kingdom after organised screening achieved a coverage greater than 70%, and the death rate has changed little. The standardised incidence of 18.9 per 100 000 for invasive cancer in 1994 was higher than the baseline rates of disease before organised screening started in the United Kingdom. Cervical cancer is the second most common newly diagnosed cancer and accounts for 4% of deaths from cancer in local women, compared with 2% in the United Kingdom.8

One of us (PA) recently found that 56% of nearly 1800 women aged between 20 and 75 in Hong Kong had never had a cervical screening test.9 Coverage was lowest among
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Cognitive therapy is no better than supportive counselling in schizophrenia

Editor—Minerva is wrong to state that cognitive behaviour therapy can improve symptoms in people with schizophrenia, based on the findings of the latest study by Tarrier and colleagues. In fact, the results they present are similar to those that they published recently in the BMJ. They found that although cognitive behaviour therapy was significantly superior to "routine care," there was no significant difference between cognitive therapy and non-specific "supportive counselling." In fact, some of my patients receiving supportive counselling are part of their routine care.

As I pointed out in a letter regarding the earlier study, cognitive behaviour therapy is more expensive than supportive counselling. There seems to be a growing assumption that cognitive behaviour therapy is beneficial for patients with schizophrenia. The assumption is based on very little evidence, and it is unhelpful for Minerva to contribute to this trend. Larger studies need to be done to determine whether cognitive behaviour therapy actually has any specific effect other than the effects due to an increased quantity of therapeutic contact.

David Curtis consultant Royal London Hospital, London E1 1BB dcourts@rgnrc.ag Grund.web.uk

Use of guidelines should be evaluated in randomised controlled trials

Editor—It remains to be proved whether implementing guidelines for the prevention of corticosteroid induced osteoporosis will be of benefit overall. The editorial by Lips' encouraging the adoption of the UK Consensus Group's guidelines is based on the assumptions that following these guidelines will have no adverse effects, will achieve the benefits the group envisaged mostly by extrapolation of the results from limited studies, and will be worth the costs entailed.

On the contrary, it is easy to imagine that advice to take regular calcium and vitamina D, to review lifestyle, and to take bisphosphonates (or hormone replacement therapy or calcitriol) will add important problems of adherence to an otherwise simple regime of glucocorticoid treatment for example, 10 mg once a day for the early management of polymyalgia rheumatica.

Assertions that guidelines (even those which are well thought out) can be implemented without the potential for adverse outcomes and additional economic costs should not be accepted. The introduction of guidelines is seldom tested in randomised controlled trials; yet this is what is required if they are to be evaluated adequately.

John R Kirwan consultant and reader in rheumatology Rheumatology Unit, Bristol Royal Infirmary, Bristol BS2 8HW


Early trials of angiogenic factors have not targeted patients most at risk of ocular disease

Editor—In his clinical review on therapeutic angiogenesis Henry discusses the potential benefits of this treatment in relation to myoccardial and limb ischaemia. Vascular endothelial growth factor, fibroblast growth factor, and the angiopeptin receptors have already been evaluated in disease models and small clinical trials and shown to be beneficial. The use of these agents highlights a paradox of subspecialty medicine.

Henry briefly mentions the danger of pathological angiogenesis in other tissues, and this is of particular relevance to ocular disease. Vascular endothelial growth factor, fibroblast growth factor, and angiopoietin have been implicated in the pathogenesis of proliferative diabetic retinopathy, ischaemic central retinal vein occlusion, retinopathy of prematurity, and exudative age related macular degeneration. Ocular neovascularisation is common in all these conditions, and visual loss results from vitreous or subretinal haemorrhage. Retinal detachments have been described in patients with retinal vein occlusion, diabetic retinopathy, and age-related macular degeneration.

Door to needle times of 12 minutes are possible in one emergency department

Editor—Several correspondents have discussed call to needle times after acute myocardial infarction. Rapid referral to needle times are possible in accident and emergency departments in use of appropriate protocols and the availability of cover by senior medical staff during 24 hours a day.

In the emergency department of this hospital all adult patients with chest pain are taken immediately to a cubicle by nursing staff; before they see a doctor oxygen treatment and electrocardiographic monitoring are started and an intravenous line is inserted. A 12 lead electrocardiogram is taken to the attending emergency doctor even before it is labelled. When an acute myocardial infarction is diagnosable from this first electrocardiogram the door to needle times are around 12 minutes. Thus thrombolysis is routinely administered in this emergency department.

The key points are that the nurses do not require medical authorisation to instigate their protocol and that the first doctor to read the electrocardiogram has the competence to interpret it correctly and the authority to instigate thrombolysis.

This hospital has a tertiary cardiac surgical service, and its cardiologists envisaged from the outset that the emergency department would function in this way.

Ian Knox emergency physician Wesley Hospital, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia ian.knox@g2.com.au

1 Correspondence: Call to needle times after acute myocardial infarction. BMJ 1999;318:1550-4. (5 June)
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