determine the level of services rather than to ration special services to particular patients, and it would be up to the government to decide the level of services offered to people. Smokers might argue that the revenue generated by their smoking sustains more than just the NHS budget.

Secondly, failure rates derived by statistics do not apply to individual people. It is unethical to deny a patient the benefit of any treatment simply to reduce failure rates. Even the authors admit that the success rate of the operation is not spectacular. Probably there is a stronger case to look at the operation itself than at the imperfect people who have it.

The third argument is that the damage caused by smoking is self inflicted. If we extend that argument we might be tempted to deny services to people who do not adhere to a "healthy" lifestyle or strict medical advice; we would end up with an NHS treating only saints.

EMPEE VITHAYATHIL

Shenley Hospital,
Shenley, Hertfordshire WD7 9HB

ALBERT MICHAEL

Department of Psychological Medicine,
St Bartholomew's Hospital,
London EC1A 7BE

1 Underwood MJ, Bailey JS, Shiu M, Higgs R, Garfield J. Should smokers be offered coronary bypass surgery? *BMJ* 1993;**306**: 1047-8. (17 April.)

Higher complication rate not confined to smokers

EDITOR,—Coronary artery disease is generally associated with one or more of the risk factors of smoking, obesity, underlying diseases like diabetes, and the all elusive genetic factors. Apart from patients who are genetically predestined to develop the disease (if such is really the case), most patients have a risk factor resulting from "a remedial cause."[1] Consequently, according to M J Underwood and J S Bailey, they should not be offered coronary bypass surgery since there is a higher risk of postoperative complications and the cause is remediable.[1] Unfortunately, the authors do not expand on what should be done in such cases, especially when a person is symptomatic and in urgent need of intervention. Their plea regarding resources does not hold as in the long run conservative management is just as expensive as surgery, even without quality of life being considered.

I am glad that general surgeons have not had similar ideas since they too often have to perform surgery in patients who have a remediable cause of their disease and a higher rate of postoperative complications. Fortunately, they believe, as I do, that life saving surgery should be performed despite the risks of postoperative complications in all groups of patients and that to disenfranchise certain groups would be unethical.

If all patients who had a higher risk of postoperative complications after coronary artery bypass grafting were eliminated cardiothoracic surgeons would have a lot of spare time on their hands to carry on debates like this one.

S BHATTACHARYA

D-6237 Liederbach,
Germany

1 Underwood MJ, Bailey JS, Shiu M, Higgs R, Garfield J. Should smokers be offered coronary bypass surgery? *BMJ* 1993;**306**: 1047-50. (17 April.)

Inform, don't punish

EDITOR,—The issues in the controversy over whether smokers should be offered coronary artery bypass surgery[1] may be better understood if the option of denying treatment is considered in a group that is not dissimilar—patients with peripheral vascular disease.

Smoking is the single most important risk factor in the onset and progression of peripheral vascular disease, with a correlation higher than that for ischaemic heart disease.[2] Ninety per cent of patients with peripheral vascular disease smoke, and in those who continue to smoke there is an increased incidence of occlusion of the graft after reconstructive surgery[3] and possibly an increased incidence of amputation. But although smoking may worsen peripheral vascular disease, few data suggest that stopping smoking improves it.[2] The uptake of advice to stop smoking is low even after targeted counselling[4]; and at least some smokers may have a different psychoneurotic profile from that of non-smokers.[5]

On the basis of this information, what treatment should we deny or offer to someone with arterial disease who continues to smoke against advice? Should we deny all surgical and medical treatments for peripheral vascular disease; deny all surgical treatments and offer only medical ones; deny reconstructive surgery but offer amputation when needed; in amputation deny reconstructive procedures and offer only emergency techniques like guillotine amputation; deny prosthetic rehabilitation after amputation and offer only wheelchair mobility; in providing a wheelchair deny expensive cushions; deny treatment for any complications related to smoking such as chest infection; and, finally, in the event of death deny burial but offer cremation so that it can all end up how it started—in a puff of smoke?

I agree with Matthew Shiu.[1] In self inflicted health damage, clinicians should warn their patients against all possible risks and try to persuade them to contribute actively and fully to their wellbeing. It should not be in clinicians' remit to dish out punishments—in different degrees and by arbitrary decrees—to the recalcitrant many for indulging in acts that may be prejudicial to their health but are not illegal.

S MULLICK

Limb Fitting Centre and Rehabilitation Clinic,
Luton and Dunstable Hospital NHS Trust,
Luton LU4 0DZ

1 Underwood MJ, Bailey JS, Shiu M, Higgs R, Garfield J. Should smokers be offered coronary bypass surgery? *BMJ* 1993;**306**: 1047-50. (17 April.)
2 Clyne CAC. Non-surgical management of peripheral vascular disease: a review. *BMJ* 1980;**281**:794-7.
3 Myers KA, King RB, Scott N. The effect of smoking on the late patency of arterial reconstruction on the legs. *Br J Surg* 1978;**65**:267-71.
4 Power L, Brown NS, Makin GS. Unsuccessful outpatient counselling to help patients with peripheral vascular disease to stop smoking. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 1992;**74**:31-4.
5 Haines AP, Imeson JD, Meade TW. Psychoneurotic profiles of smokers and non-smokers. *BMJ* 1980;**280**:1422.

Heartsink hotel revisited

EDITOR,—As the consultant ophthalmologist whose resignation Brian McAvoy blames for "the patients of non-fundholding practices hav[ing] no ophthalmology service . . . at . . . local hospital and hav[ing] to travel up to 50 miles to . . . regional (sic) hospital,"[1] I can say that this is untrue.

The local service continues. For eight years I fought for its survival. Failing in the prevailing financial climate to achieve proper staffing, I resigned because the consultant rota was one in two with no juniors, which caused difficulty replacing my sole colleague, who retired. Nurses' comprehensive skills were fragmented and replaced by untrained or inexperienced staff to save money for managers.

Weekend closure of the department (despite my resignation threat) was imposed. There is no nurse with eye experience in hospital; I chase keys for every casualty referral. I offered to stay on as sole consultant, with continuous first on call (provided weekend emergencies were referred to the nearest properly staffed district department, 40 (not 50) miles away), but the offer was deemed "unacceptable."

I stayed, but later, with a long term locum employed, heard that an earlier applicant for my job was now accredited, so I resigned immediately. He was appointed. He came.

Liberation brought fresh rewards: time, job satisfaction. The "caravan" is a personally designed, purpose built mobile clinic, equipped as I choose, without delays. I employ a skilled nurse, on a proper grade, providing comprehensive, personal, continuity of patient care. Soft option?—we tow our mobile clinic through the wildest parts of England in all weathers at all seasons.

I take issue with McAvoy over his inappropriate use of the emotive word "privately." Work as an independent provider without charge (except through taxation) to NHS patients of fundholding general practitioners is NHS work, not private practice. The fees charged to the fundholder compete with those charged by NHS hospitals.

Unhappy with even a temporarily two tier NHS, I fought the reforms but have to live with them. Unhappy that I cannot help patients of non-fundholding general practitioners directly, I help them indirectly by reducing waiting lists.

If ever any local health authority wishes to purchase services for patients of non-fundholding general practitioners from me as an independent provider, I hope to oblige.

R BEVIS CUBEY

Lorton,
Cockermouth,
Cumbria CA13 9UD

1 McAvoy BR. Heartsink hotel revisited. *BMJ* 1993;**306**:694-5. (13 March.)

Upper age limit for cervical screening

EDITOR,—In our study on the smear histories of all women in the Dundee and Angus areas diagnosed as having cervical neoplasia in 1989 and 1990 we concluded that women over the age of 50 were unlikely to develop this disease if they had had at least two consecutive smear tests at three yearly intervals with negative results, with the last no more than two years previously.[1] To substantiate these conclusions further we repeated the same exercise for 1991 and 1992. Altogether 47 461 smears were taken during this period from a population of about 170 000 women aged 16-59 (1991 census report). Twenty four cases of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia and 21 cases of microinvasive and invasive carcinoma of the cervix were detected in women over the age of 50. Again, most of these women had not been adequately screened.

On case analysis on the basis of three yearly screening we found two cases in which the patient had an adequate screening history (two or more smear tests done at three yearly intervals, with the last at least two years before the abnormal result leading to diagnosis). One woman (aged 54) had grade III cervical intraepithelial neoplasia; the other (aged 58) had microinvasive squamous cell carcinoma of the cervix (stage Ia_1) and, on review, had had a false negative result on smear testing four years before diagnosis.

Analysis on the basis of five yearly screening identified one case of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (grade III) in which the woman had an adequate history of negative results of smear tests (two or more negative results at intervals of four to five years with the last at least three years before the result leading to diagnosis). Seven women with cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (two with grade I, two with grade II, and three with grade III disease) and one woman with adenocarcinoma of the cervix stage Ib had a history of negative results of smear tests which on analysis seemed to be adequate for