

and, frequently, by severe symptoms. Their uncertainty is not alleviated by prolonged investigations that delay palliation and generally fail to answer their questions about the origin of the tumour and the prognosis. Patients deserve prompt palliation, appropriate investigation, and adequate support and counselling through what is too often a terminal illness.

ALAN RODGER

Department of Clinical Oncology,
Western General Hospital,
Edinburgh EH4 2XU

1 Bradley C, Selby P. In search of the unknown primary. *BMJ* 1992;304:1065-6. (25 April.)

SIR,—We were dismayed by Christopher Bradley and Peter Selby's implication that, in the search for an unknown primary, a biopsy specimen of a cervical node should be obtained, and if it is found to contain squamous cell carcinoma an otolaryngologist should be requested to evaluate the upper aerodigestive tract.¹

It has long been taught in ear, nose, and throat surgery that a diligent search for a possible primary tumour should be undertaken when a patient presents with a neck mass thought to be metastatic in origin. Martin and Romieu wrote 30 years ago: "The immediate removal of a lymph node for diagnosis is never in the best interests of the patient."²

Premature open biopsy of a cervical lymph node leads to increased morbidity with a higher rate of fungation and wound sepsis³ and may even result in reduced life expectancy.⁴ Incisions used for open lymph node biopsy may compromise subsequent radical surgical excision if not planned to be readily incorporated into an incision suitable for radical neck dissection. Cytological examination of fine needle aspirates, on the other hand, can provide useful histological information and is free of the complications associated with open lymph node biopsy.⁵

We believe that lymph node biopsy (excluding cytological examination of fine needle aspirates) should be undertaken only after the aerodigestive tract has been examined thoroughly, including by rigid endoscopy and "blind biopsies," by an ear, nose, and throat surgeon. If this fails to detect a primary focus of carcinoma an open biopsy of the neck mass may be undertaken, but only by a surgeon who is able subsequently to perform a radical neck dissection if indicated.

M P J YARDLEY
P D BULL

Department of Otolaryngology,
Royal Hallamshire Hospital,
Sheffield S10 2JF

1 Bradley C, Selby P. In search of the unknown primary. *BMJ* 1992;304:1065-6. (25 April.)

2 Martin H, Romieu C. The diagnostic significance of a "lump in the neck." *Postgrad Med* 1952;11:491-500.


3 Goeder P, Palmer M. Cervical lymph node biopsy—a study of its morbidity. *J Laryngol Otol* 1984;98:1031-40.

4 Snow GB, Anzas AA, Van Shooter EA. Prognostic factors of neck node metastasis. *Clin Otolaryngol* 1987;7:185-92.

5 Smallman LA, Young JA, Oates J, Proops DW, Johnson AP. Fine needle aspiration cytology in the management of ENT patients. *J Laryngol Otol* 1988;102:909-13.

Oesophageal cancer in Britain

SIR,—We fully support the letter from K K Cheng and N E Day drawing attention to the increase in oesophageal cancer, particularly in Britain.¹ We recently showed that this increase is almost entirely due to an increase in adenocarcinoma since, in the west midlands, there has been little, if any, increase in squamous cell carcinoma (figure).² This analysis was based on cases registered in the west midlands regional cancer registry during 1962-86. Incidence data of this type include much more detailed information than is available from death certifi-



Incidence of squamous cell carcinoma and adenocarcinoma per 100 000 in west midlands, 1962-86

cates. In particular, we could examine trends by both histology and subsite.

Subsite analysis suggests that cancers of the lower third of the oesophagus increased fivefold from 1982 to 1986. Furthermore, the increase in oesophageal adenocarcinoma is paralleled by an increase in adenocarcinoma of the gastric cardia, which contrasts with a decrease in pyloric antral cancers.³ Similar aetiological factors may therefore be operating for these two sites. Dietary factors reflecting socioeconomic factors may be important, as the west midlands data showed a relatively higher risk of adenocarcinoma of both the oesophagus and the cardia in social classes 1 and 2 compared with classes 3 and 4.

Mortality data are invaluable in comparing overall rates between countries. They can rarely, however, be analysed for subsites and almost never for histology. It is therefore vitally important that case-control and incidence studies include information on both histology and subsite. Only then can the differing aetiological factors be fully evaluated.

J POWELL

Department of Public Health and Epidemiology,
University of Birmingham,
Birmingham B15 2TT

W H ALLUM

St Bartholomew's, Hospital,
London EC1A 7BE

1 Cheng KK, Day NE. Oesophageal cancer in Britain. *BMJ* 1992;304:711. (14 March.)

2 Powell J, McConkey CC. The rising trend in oesophageal adenocarcinoma and gastric cardia. *European Journal of Cancer Prevention* 1992;1:265-9.

3 Fielding JWL, Powell J, Allum WH, Waterhouse JAH, McConkey CC. *Cancer of the stomach. Clinical cancer monographs*. Vol 3. London: Macmillan, 1989.

Medical abortion

SIR,—R C Henshaw and colleagues claim to have costed surgical abortion in the NHS at £480 and medical abortion at £400.¹ For the past decade a day care surgical abortion unit has been operating in the Women's Hospital in Liverpool; it performed 1798 procedures in the year ended 31 March 1991 at a cost of £206 per procedure, which is similar to that charged for abortion by the charitable sector. This service includes specialised counselling and dedicated social work and is rapid and efficient, currently averaging 10 days between the first contact with the patient and the procedure. All women are under 12 weeks pregnant at the time of the procedure. Two per cent of the patients stay in overnight, not always for medical reasons; this is similar to the figure that I would estimate for those who fail to abort or have incomplete abortions with medical techniques.

Where an efficient and properly organised surgical abortion service is available, mifepristone can only add to the costs. When costing medical abortion account must be taken of the two additional visits required, although there has been

some suggestion that mifepristone can be given on the day of counselling. At the Women's Hospital, however, 11.5% of women either cancel their appointment for the procedure or fail to attend for operation, and we regard this as a positive aspect of our counselling service. There is also the requirement for a follow up visit after a medical termination, and these visits I cost together at £35. In addition, the costs of mifepristone and the gemeprost vaginal pessary amount to £65.

The only saving that will be made with mifepristone is that of theatre time, which for a dedicated theatre using safe but low technology I cost at £55. Obviously the costs of counselling, laboratory tests, and nursing time for both types of procedure remain similar. Therefore, I estimate that abortion with mifepristone, rather than costing less than surgical abortion, will cost £45-50 more. This takes no cognisance of an increased requirement for ultrasound scanning, currently running at 19.8%, which will almost certainly occur owing to the constraints imposed on use of mifepristone.

I suggest that the issue of provision of abortion is being side tracked and that those districts that do not provide a dedicated service should consider this alternative rather than seeing medical abortion as a panacea for their problems.

G M KIDD

Women's Hospital,
Liverpool L8 7NJ

1 Henshaw RC, Templeton AA, Naji SA, Russell IT. Medical abortion. *BMJ* 1992;302:914. (4 April.)

Treatment of depression in primary care

SIR,—Allan I F Scott and Christopher P L Freeman¹ quote our controlled trial of amitriptyline versus placebo in general practice as having shown milder forms of depression in primary care.² In doing so they omit the more important positive finding. What the study showed was highly significant superiority of the antidepressant over placebo in most cases of depression in primary care, extending well into the mild range but with a clear threshold in the mildest. Only patients scoring below 13 on the Hamilton scale or failing to satisfy criteria for probable major depression (a threshold well below that for major depression in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Third Edition, Revised*) failed to show benefit. An American study in patients with mild depression treated by psychiatrists has given similar findings.³

Scott and Freeman found that patients with depression who received amitriptyline from the psychiatrist had improved significantly more at four weeks than those receiving antidepressant as part of routine general practitioner care. The distinguishing feature was the dose: the group treated by the psychiatrist received at least 150 mg daily while the group treated in general practice received a lower dose. Several studies in general practice have found antidepressant in the standard dose range of 125-150 mg daily for six weeks to be superior to placebo,^{4,5} and several studies of doses of 50-75 mg daily⁶ or a short treatment period⁷ have not done so.

The conclusion is clear. Tricyclic antidepressants should be used in standard rather than low doses in general practice. They will then produce worthwhile benefit, at least in terms of more rapid emission, in patients with moderate to mild depression but not those with the mildest forms. Such treatment is entirely suitable for general practitioners and does not require psychiatric referral. The general practitioner, of course, must see the patient regularly during treatment.

The design of Scott and Freeman's study did not permit measurement of the benefits of combining