distress. This test, with a positive predictive value of less than 3%,[4] will generate many false positive results. Women who receive a positive result from a screening test are entitled to much greater support than they now receive. The costs of such a service would, however, outweigh the benefits of routine screening. Districts now considering the introduction of such a programme should bear in mind the maxim quoted by Marteau: "first do no harm."[5]

GERRY WALDRON

East Surrey Health Authority,
Redhill,
Surrey RH1 5RH

E S WILLIAMS

Croydon Health Authority,
Croydon CR9 2RH

1 Statham H, Green J. Serum screening for Down's syndrome: some women's experiences. *BMJ* 1993;**307**:174-6. (17 July.)
2 Williams ES, Waldron GJ. Screening, ethics, and the law. *BMJ* 1992;**305**:1433.
3 Connor M. Biochemical screening for Down's syndrome. *BMJ* 1993;**306**:1705-6. (26 June.)
4 Wald NJ, Kennard A, Densem JW, Cuckle HS, Chard T, Butler L. Antenatal maternal serum screening for Down's syndrome. *BMJ* 1992;**305**:391-4.
5 Marteau TM. Psychological consequences of screening for Down's syndrome. *BMJ* 1993;**307**:146-7. (17 July.)

...but time consuming and expensive

EDITOR,—Like Michael Connor, I welcome biochemical screening for Down's syndrome and look forward to newer tests with higher detection rates.[1] I agree that the NHS should fund and provide screening. My concerns are what constitutes informed consent for people who undergo screening tests, especially tests with low detection rates; the extra work needed to counsel people to gain their full informed consent; and the threat that this extra work poses to other educational tasks in the antenatal consultation.

As a general practitioner, I have had to visit distraught families who have been informed of a positive result of a screening test and who—despite knowing vaguely what the test was—really knew nothing. In counselling a woman who is to have a screening test for Down's syndrome a doctor must explain what Down's syndrome is and how it varies, how it is detected by the test, and what probability is and what the positive predictive value of a positive result is, and must discuss what options exist if the result is positive. It can take more than 45 minutes to explain the test properly. Anything less than an understanding of these issues does not enable the woman to give informed consent and leads to unnecessary anxiety in the event of a positive result. The alternative to a full explanation is to give limited information, hope that the woman does not inquire too closely, and hope too that her result is negative. Is that the kind of informed consent we would want for ourselves?

Cost-benefit analysis of biochemical screening programmes usually compares the savings from the care of affected children with the tertiary costs of the screening programme but does not estimate the effect on workload.[2]

If counselling is not resourced adequately other tasks in antenatal care must be neglected in order to include it. Either informed consent is not gained—which lowers compliance, detection rates, and the success of the new screening programme—or assertive middle class patients, who rightly wish to know exactly what such tests do and mean, are counselled at the expense of unassertive single young mothers (an example of the inverse care law). Alternatively, all women are counselled at the expense of other activities in the consultation. Thus the true costs of offering the test may include less advice about smoking or less time to discuss breast feeding. Such prioritisation will undermine other aspects of health education, with expensive sequelae, such as increased rates of premature delivery, which are not considered in the simple cost-benefit analyses described above.

Resources are scarce—so we are told—and must be used efficiently and wisely. There is no room for new services if they are resourced inadequately and stop us from providing the old ones with no professional or public debate about which is the more economically, quantitatively, and qualitatively valuable.

J M IBISON

London SW12 9HE

1 Connor M. Biochemical screening for Down's syndrome. *BMJ* 1993;**306**:1705-6. (26 June.)
2 Bhatti N, Mackie A. Antenatal screening for Down's syndrome. *BMJ* 1992;**305**:770.

Private screening is problematic

EDITOR,—In his editorial on biochemical screening for Down's syndrome Michael Connor says that NHS screening is preferable to private screening because of the inequality of access inherent in private medicine.[1] Although this is a major socio-political consideration, there are more serious concerns about the provision of screening tests for Down's syndrome.

Screening for Down's syndrome is relatively new and uses the concept of risk.[2] Interpreting risk is difficult and highly personal—for example, people may be prepared to risk money in a transaction that has a 95% chance of making a profit but would be unlikely to risk flying if there was a 5% chance of crashing. It is therefore important that the obstetric services to which a woman who has been tested privately presents herself know what the estimate of the risk of Down's syndrome means and are able to perform any further investigations that are required.

If screening is organised locally clinics can be reorganised so that results suggesting a high risk are not given out at the end of a week—as recommended by the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists working party on Down's syndrome screening.[3] This may not be possible if the result of a test performed privately is returned direct to the patient. Further problems may arise when a patient has both NHS and private tests: what procedure should be followed if the results are discordant?

The gestational age is crucial to the accurate determination of risk.[4] It is easier for the laboratory in a local NHS programme to contact the antenatal clinic to confirm the gestational age when results are unusual than for a remote private laboratory to do so. It is also easier for the antanatal clinic to contact a local laboratory if the gestational age is revised and the risk must be recalculated.

T M REYNOLDS

Royal Gwent Hospital,
Newport,
Gwent NP9 2UB

1 Connor M. Biochemical screening for Down's syndrome. *BMJ* 1993;**306**:1705-6. (26 June.)
2 Reynolds T, Penney M. The mathematical basis of multivariate risk analysis: with special reference to screening for Down's syndrome associated pregnancy. *Ann Clin Biochem* 1990;**27**: 452-8.
3 Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists Scientific Advisory Committee Working Party. *Biochemical detection of Down's syndrome.* London: RCOG, 1993.
4 Reynolds T. Practical problems in Down syndrome screening: what should we do about gestation dating? What is the effect of laboratory imprecision? *Communications in Laboratory Medicine* 1992;**1**:31-8.

Widening the programme would be costly

EDITOR,—Michael Connor rightly calls on the Department of Health to coordinate screening for Down's syndrome within the NHS[1] as the resource implications of offering serum screening for this condition to all expectant mothers extend beyond the cost of the biochemical reagents.

The aim of the screening programme is to find affected fetuses and offer abortion. A recent study showed that a substantial proportion of parents refuse the screening test, decline definitive investigations if the result of the test is positive, and refuse abortion if the fetus is cytogenetically abnormal.[2] While these ethical decisions must be respected, they raise the question of whether current methods of pretest counselling are adequate.[3]

In my district an analysis of the costs and benefits of changing from a selective policy (based on age) to a screening programme for all expectant mothers showed that an adequate counselling service would be the greatest single cost (followed by the increased resources needed for accurate gestational dating). The marginal opportunity costs of such a change would be greater than suggested,[2] and as all districts already offer age related screening,[4] careful consideration must be given to the efficient use of resources when only marginal benefits can be expected.[5]

Providing a service with inequality of access need not be an issue as it is a duty of all who work in the NHS to ensure that resources are used effectively. In this instance the biochemical screening tests that are used currently are more sensitive in older mothers.[2]

The identification of biochemical markers as risk factors for Down's syndrome has been a major development in obstetric care, but their place in antenatal diagnosis needs to be established in the context of advances in the availability and techniques of ultrasound scanning. We now need to consider how to combine these screening tools efficiently without denying resources inappropriately to other NHS users.

ADRIAN PHILLIPS

Department of Public Health Medicine,
Dudley Health Authority,
Dudley DY1 2DD

1 Connor M. Biochemical screening for Down's syndrome. *BMJ* 1993;**306**:1705-6. (26 June.)
2 Wald NJ, Kennard A, Densem JW, Cuckle HS, Chard T, Butler L. Antenatal maternal serum screening for Down's syndrome: results of a demonstration project. *BMJ* 1992;**305**:391-4.
3 Parsons L, Richards J, Garlick R. Screening for Down's syndrome. *BMJ* 1992;**305**:1228.
4 Wald N, Wald K, Smith D. The extent of Down's syndrome screening in Britain in 1991. *Lancet* 1992;**340**:494.
5 Cuckle H. Maternal serum screening policy for Down's syndrome. *Lancet* 1992;**340**:799.

Existing tests not good enough

EDITOR,—Michael Connor suggests that the NHS should provide biochemical screening for Down's syndrome and describes the controversies surrounding the issue.[1] But he reaches his conclusion only by ignoring some of the crucial problems, although these have been documented in extensive correspondence in the *BMJ* and elsewhere.[2-5]

In particular, Connor trivialises the psychological and emotional costs, making only a passing reference to the difficulties with counselling experienced by all districts and health boards. Counselling is essential: "failure to obtain informed consent for a screening procedure is not only ethically unacceptable but also exposes the health authority to the risk of litigation." It is necessary to inform patients, before blood is taken, of the false positive rate (about 65 false positive results for every true positive result, or about one pregnancy in 20), the false negative rate (around 40%), the necessity for amniocentesis to make diagnoses, and the ultimate aim of termination. The practical difficulties of doing this have disrupted antenatal services. If counselling is done properly most women reject the offer of biochemical screening.[5] If counselling is not done properly many women reject the offer of amniocentesis.[5] In this case patients' autonomy leads to results not desired by the advocates of screening; we suggest that the values of the patients should have priority.

These values may reasonably be shared by