ephedrine and/or phenylpropanolamine) among American adolescent students. They concluded there was little distortion in their estimates of stimulants due to the marked decline in the US of the annual prevalence of the use of diet pills (from 20% in 1982 to 9.6% in 1998), in the presence of an increasing trend in amphetamine use.[1] Also, regarding male–female methylphenidate ratios, the gap between males and females has been narrowing.[2] Safer and Krager showed a narrowing of the ratio from 1:12 in 1981 to 1:6 in 1993 in middle school.[3] Robison and colleagues reported a narrowing of the male–female ratio for children aged 5 to 18 years, from 5.4:1 in 1990 to 3.1:1 in 1995.[4]

Safer and Zito state that the prevalence of stimulant treatment in our study was 50% higher in 10th grade than in 7th grade. The estimate of past-month medical stimulant use, which is more likely to be accurate, shows no significant difference in the prevalence of medical stimulant use in 7th compared with 10th grade ($p > .05$). Of note, Zito and colleagues found that the largest increase in methylphenidate utilization had occurred among high-school aged youth of 15 to 19 years.[2] Our item on past-year medical use was analyzed primarily to determine the relationship between medical and nonmedical stimulant use. The medical and nonmedical drug use items, symmetrical by design, date back to 1991 in the Nova Scotia Student Drug Use Survey and earlier in the case of the Ontario Student Drug Use Survey. Due to the 12-month recall period and discontinued therapeutic regimens and trials of therapy, the past-year prevalence estimate can be expected to be less accurate than the past-month estimate. However, this should not invalidate the association between past-year medical and non-medical stimulant use. In effect, our study revealed a relationship between medical and non-medical stimulant use based on several indicators, including the past-year use items.

Finally, marked geographic variability has been observed in methylphenidate utilization.[2,5,6] Whereas the Nova Scotia Prescription Monitoring Program provides some insight into methylphenidate utilization in Nova Scotia, we do not have comparable information for the other 3 Atlantic provinces. We do know significant differences exist in prevalence of use of several substances among adolescent students in the 4 provinces.[7,8] Clearly, many factors could have influenced the age and gender ratios observed in our study.

Christiane Poulin
Department of Community Health/Epidemiology
Clinical Research Centre
Halifax, NS

References

1. Johnson LD, O'Malley PM, Bachman JG. *National survey results on drug use from the Monitoring the Future Study, 1975-1998*. Volume 1: Secondary school students. NIH Publication No. 99-4660. Washington (DC): US Department of Health and Human Services; 1999.
2. Zito JM, Safer DJ, dosReis S, Gardner JF, Boles M, Lynch F. Trends in the prescribing of psychotropic medications to preschoolers. *JAMA* 2000;283;1025-30.
3. Safer DJ, Krager JM. The increased rate of stimulant treatment for hyperactive/inattentive students in secondary schools. *Pediatrics* 1994; 94:462-4.
4. Robison LM, Sclar DA, Skaer TL, Galin RS. National trends in the prevalence of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and the prescribing of methylphenidate among school-age children: 1990-1995. *Clin Pediatr* (Phila) 1999;38 (4):209-17.
5. LeFever GB, Dawson KV, Morrow AL. The extent of drug therapy for attention deficit–hyperactivity disorder among children in public schools. *Am J Public Health* 1999;89:1359-64.
6. Safer DJ, Zito JM, Fine EM. Increased methylphenidate usage for attention deficit disorder in the 1990s. *Pediatrics* 1996;98:1084-8.
7. Poulin C, Van Til L, Wilbur B, Clarke B, MacDonald CA, Barcelo A, et al. Alcohol and other drug use among adolescent students in the Atlantic provinces. *Can J Public Health* 1999;90:27-9.
8. Poulin C. Medical and nonmedical stimulant use among adolescents: from sanctioned to unsanctioned use. *CMAJ* 2001;165(8):1039-44.

Provincial drug benefit programs

I hope that Andreas Laupacis' essay on provincial drug benefit programs will start an overdue debate on the decision-making processes involved in these programs.[1] As a rheumatologist practising in Ontario, I have often been frustrated by the inadequacy of limited use criteria for drugs that I wish to prescribe, for example, certain bisphosphonates. Even more frustrating is the slowness with which the program deals with new and important agents such as etanercept, for which, at the time of writing, special requests still have to be made under Section 8. For drugs in this category, physicians must submit a written request to the Drug Programs Branch of the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care indicating the reason why the drug is required for a particular patient.

If the Therapeutics Committee of the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care makes its decisions from a societal perspective, then it should welcome transparency and conduct open meetings. It must, at least, request the views of interested parties other than of just the pharmaceutical companies when considering submissions. We would all like to see better evidence that the committee usually makes reasonable decisions.

Manfred Harth
Division of Rheumatology
Department of Medicine
University of Western Ontario
London, Ont.

Reference

1. Laupacis A. Inclusion of drugs in provincial drug benefit programs: who is making these decisions, and are they the right ones? *CMAJ* 2002;166(1): 44-7.

Obstetrics in family medicine

I applaud Dr. Godwin and colleagues[1] for advancing our knowledge in this area of importance to the discipline of family medicine and to the provision of obstetrical services to our population. The findings of this study are congruent with what our group found several years earlier[2] and with results of the Janus Project[3] of the National College of Family Practice of Canada.

I would like to highlight several aspects to this issue that are critical in moving forward. One is the gender difference found in all above studies, with a preponderance of female practitioners intending to practise obstetrics on graduation. The second is the positive correlation between intent to have a rural practice and obstetrical interest. And finally, the strong positive correlation that we found between interest in obstetrics prior to residency and intent to practice obstetrics on graduation.

These findings have strong implications in how we structure our undergraduate and postgraduate programs. Exposure to family practice obstetrics in the undergraduate curriculum may enhance interest in this field for new residents. Those with an interest in rural practice may need to have customized programs to provide them with tools needed in that setting. This opens the discussion around increased streaming within the family medicine residency programs. Lifestyle issues related to balancing professional and personal responsibilities in an effective and sustainable manner are important and may become even more so with the "feminization" of obstetrical practice. We must model these effectively as teachers to empower our trainees for the future.

Jim Ruderman
Associate Professor
Department of Family and Community Medicine
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ont.

References

1. Godwin M, Hodgetts G, Seguin R, MacDonald S. The Ontario Family Medicine Residents Cohort Study: factors affecting residents' decisions to practise obstetrics. *CMAJ* 2002;166(2):179-84.
2. Ruderman J, Holzapfel SG, Carroll JC, Cummings S. Obstetrics Anyone? How family medicine residents' interests changed. *Can Fam Physician* 1999;45:638-47.
3. College of Family Physicians of Canada. The Janus Project. *The CFPC National Family Physician Survey—summary report*. Toronto: The College; 1998. Available: www.cfpc.ca/janusjanus sumcontents.htm (accessed 29 Apr 2002).

[One of the authors responds:]

My collegues and I agree with James Ruderman's assessment that several studies have now shown consistent results in the areas he mentioned. What we think was the most critical finding in our study is that while undergraduate experience is important and affected residents' stated intentions to practise obstetrics when they entered residency, something negative happens during the 2 years of residency. Fifty-two percent of residents planned to do obstetrics at the beginning of residency and only 17% by the end of residency. This needs to be addressed. We believe that streaming is one very important option, as Ruderman suggests. Rather than trying to get all residents to practise obstetrics, let's take the 50% who are so predisposed at the start of residency and make certain they have role models and mentors, experience continuity of care as practised by family physicians, and, most of all, get lots of experience in intrapartum obstetrics. As well, we should make certain this group has the opportunity to do the ALARM/ ALSO courses and, where available, a third year in obstetrics in which they learn to handle higher-risk cases and even do cesarian sections. Residents need to feel prepared to do obstetrics at the end of a 2-year residency. If we can keep the 50% of residents who start residency interested in obstetrics still wanting to deliver babies at the end of their residency, we will have increased the rate of new residents doing obstetrics by 3 times what it is now.

We thank Ruderman for his comments.

IF YOU WEAR A PACEMAKER, PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE

If you were implanted with pacemaker leads manufactured by Medtronic Inc. or Medtronic of Canada Ltd. ("Medtronic") between 1983 and 1993, you may be a member of a class action certified by the B.C. Supreme Court. Your rights may be affected by this notice. The class action relates to the quality and durability of the insulation used in the Medtronic pacemaker leads. Concerns regarding the insulation have been communicated to physicians since 1991. If you receive regular follow-up care, you have no reason to be concerned about this lawsuit from a health care point of view.

WHO ARE THE CLASS MEMBERS?

The class is all Canadian residents implanted with Medtronic pacemaker Pacing Lead Models 4004/4004M and 4012, who have not released Medtronic from any claims relating to the pacemaker leads.

HOW DO I TAKE PART IN THE CLASS ACTION?

Non-B.C. Residents

If you reside in Canada but outside B.C., and want to be part of the class action, you must opt in by notifying the class lawyers, Branch MacMaster. You can do this by email, fax or mail by October 31, 2002. Please provide your name and address and say that you want to be part of the Medtronic Pacemaker Class Action. Contact:

Branch MacMaster — Phone: (604) 654-2952
1210-777 Hornby Street — Fax: (604) 684-3429
Vancouver BC V6E 3G2 — Email: cbarzo@branmac.com

Website: www.branmac.com/pages/pacemaker.html

Class members who opt in will be bound by the court's judgment, whether favourable or not, and may benefit from the judgment of the court. Class members from outside B.C. who do not opt in cannot seek to recover any money in this class action.

B.C. Residents

If you reside in B.C. and want to be part of the class action, you are automatically included if you do nothing. All B.C. class members will be bound by the court's judgment, whether favourable or not, unless they opt out of the class action. If you are a B.C. class member but do not want to be part of the class action, you must opt out by completing a form available from Branch MacMaster by October 31, 2002. B.C. class members who opt out cannot recover any money in this class action.

WHO DO I CONTACT FOR MORE INFORMATION?

If you have questions or want to see a more detailed form of notice, visit Branch MacMaster's website (see above) or contact Branch MacMaster: (604) 654-2952; email *cbarzo@branmac.com.*