

every drug and who have responsibility for each company's medical information department. I understand that the Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry, including its medical committee, was treated in a similar cavalier fashion.

We in the AMAPI are wholeheartedly in favour of better prescribing—including not prescribing when it is not necessary—and were more than disappointed by not being asked to contribute our views at the conference. The conference was clearly a non-event. How much better it would have been if the opinions of doctors working in the drug industry had been sought or acknowledged.

IAN LENOX-SMITH
Chairman,
Association of Medical Advisers
in the Pharmaceutical Industry

Roche Products Ltd,
Welwyn Garden City,
Herts AL7 3AY

Antihypertensive treatment in pregnancy

SIR,—In their comparison of oxprenolol and methyldopa in pregnancy Dr E D M Gallery and colleagues concluded that the β blocker tested had "no adverse effects on fetal outcome" (31 August, p 563). Similarly, Dr M de Swiet stated in his recent leading article on the use of antihypertensive drugs in pregnancy that "the short term safety of β blockade has been proved" (10 August, p 365).

Leaving aside the question of whether proof of safety is ever possible in principle, reliable evidence is obviously necessary on whether such treatment might produce increases in serious adverse effects that are large enough to be of practical importance. Dr de Swiet supports his claim of safety chiefly by referring to the randomised study of Rubin *et al.*¹ But this study was small and, although one of its aims was to find out whether β blockers were effective in decreasing fetal loss associated with hypertensive pregnancy (Rubin PC, Reid JL, unpublished protocol), the number of perinatal deaths was far too small (two controls and one treated) to establish either efficacy or short term safety. For example, even if β blockade actually doubled the probability of perinatal death, the play of chance could well produce such apparently favourable results in a study as small as this. Likewise, in the study by Dr Gallery and colleagues, there were far too few serious events to justify any claims that either efficacy or safety had been shown.

A recent review of randomised trials of diuretics in pregnancy has pointed out that reliable assessment of the effects of antihypertensive treatments on fetal loss (and other serious but rare end points) might require the randomisation of several thousand women.² De Swiet *et al.*³ and Rubin⁴ have suggested that, since this would be difficult, the value of such treatment should instead chiefly be assessed on other measures of outcome, such as birth weight. This suggestion is not wholly satisfactory, however, for the medical relevance of moderate changes in such measures may be disputed.⁵

Moreover, although Rubin's study has been claimed to show an advantage for the treated group,⁶ there was no significant improvement in any of the prospectively stated end points. (The unpredicted observation that respiratory distress syndrome was less frequent in the treated group generated, but did not test, a hypothesis.)

There are substantial commercial pressures to use β blockers widely, and experience with diuretics (which were once widely used in pregnancy) suggests that they could result in many millions of mildly hypertensive pregnant women being prescribed β blockers without any good evidence for, or against, the practice. One way to get such evidence would be through widespread collaboration in multicentre randomised trials of sufficient size^{7,8} to detect any clinically significant differences in the frequency of important, prospectively stated end points.

If β blockers do materially reduce the net risk of an important adverse outcome then a clear result

from really large trials should greatly increase the extent to which they are used. If, however, β blockers have no material net effect (or an adverse net effect) then such studies could protect millions of pregnant women from unnecessary or harmful medication.

RORY COLLINS
IAN CHALMERS
RICHARD PETO

Radcliffe Infirmary,
Oxford OX2 6HE

- Rubin PC, Clark DM, Sumner DJ, *et al.* Placebo controlled trial of atenolol in treatment of pregnancy associated hypertension. *Lancet* 1983;ii:431-4.
- Collins R, Yusuf S, Peto R. Overview of randomised trials of diuretics in pregnancy. *Br Med J* 1985;290:17-23.
- De Swiet M, Fayers P. Overview of randomised trials of diuretics in pregnancy. *Br Med J* 1985;290:788.
- Rubin PC. Overview of randomised trials of diuretics in pregnancy. *Br Med J* 1985;290:788-9.
- Ounsted M, Redman CWG. Overview of randomised trials of diuretics in pregnancy. *Br Med J* 1985;290:1079-80.
- Reynolds B, Butters L, Evans J, Adams T, Rubin PC. First year of life after the use of atenolol in pregnancy associated hypertension. *Arch Dis Child* 1984;59:1061-3.
- Yusuf S, Collins R, Peto R. Why do we need some large, simple randomised trials? *Statistics in Medicine* 1984;3:409-20.
- Lindheimer MD, Katz AI. Hypertension in pregnancy. *N Engl J Med* 1985;313:675-80.

Is the distribution of training practices appropriate?

SIR,—Dr T S Murray makes several statements that must not go unchallenged (21 September, p 789). The question he asks is an interesting one that he fails to answer. He bases his arguments on two assumptions: that practices in deprived areas are substandard and that those in areas with a high concentration of training practices provide high quality care. At best these views are naive; at worst they are patronising and likely to give offence to practitioners who work in deprived areas and are not concerned in training. Where has it been shown that the criteria used for selecting training practices also guarantee high standards of care for the patients of the practices that are chosen?

Dr Murray suggests several reasons why there are fewer trainers in deprived areas: fear of rejection, ignorance of training standards, and anxiety that trainees will be more knowledgeable. These paint a gloomy picture of insecure colleagues with limited knowledge, awareness, and self esteem. He offers no evidence to support any of these assertions, and what limited evidence there is—for example, from the Manchester study—would tend to refute them.^{1,4}

Dr Murray implies that since doctors who work in grossly deprived areas have low standards of practice then it follows that the young principals who join them will become disillusioned and adopt similar professional standards. To counteract this he suggests, firstly, that all trainees should be attached to such a practice for one month. To do what? He maintains that the practice would benefit from having the trainee attached. How? Again we are not told.

Secondly, he suggests, "An educative programme is required in the deprived areas to identify the practices of potential and advise them how to reach the necessary standards." If Dr Murray equates socially deprived areas with deprived general practice does he really understand the nature of either? There is no systematic relation between the indices of social and economic deprivation and the pattern of care provided by general practitioners.⁴ Does he have an adequate grasp of the day to day problems faced by people who are forced to live in these areas and by the general practitioners who care for them? Before sending his trainees across the Styx for a month perhaps Dr Murray should make the journey

himself. He may then have a clearer idea about what objectives he wants his trainees to achieve.

All, I presume, would agree that those living in areas of social and economic deprivation need high standards of medical care. The provision of that care will not be aided by indiscriminate statements, which, to say the least, are not very helpful.

DAVID BLANEY

Edinburgh EH7 4DT

- Metcalfe D. No excuses. In: Gray DJP, ed. *The medical annual*. Bristol: Wright, 1985:184-205.
- Wood J. Are the problems of primary care in inner cities fact or fiction? *Br Med J* 1983;286:1109-12.
- Wood J. Are general practitioners in inner Manchester worse off than those in adjacent areas? *Br Med J* 1983;286:1249-52.
- Wilkin D, Metcalfe D, Hallam L, Cooke M, Hodgkin PK. Area variations in the process of care in urban general practice. *Br Med J* 1984;289:229-32.

Trident versus health

SIR,—The activities of the Medical Campaign Against Nuclear Weapons described in your news item (5 October, p 976) and in the campaign's letter (p 973) will expose patients to direct political propaganda by doctors.

It is a legitimate responsibility of the medical profession to lobby the government for increased expenditure on health services and to this end inform the public (our patients) of the inadequacies of current funding. To assume that high defence spending is the cause of inadequate health care resource allocation is political opinion, and it is improper to subject patients to the political opinions of doctors under the guise of "professional concern for patients." Doctors should consider carefully the consequences of introducing their personal political opinions into their professional relationships with their patients.

W WHITROW

Raigmore Hospital,
Inverness IV2 4AG

"Medical Directory (Retrospective)"

SIR,—There must be many besides myself who are irritated and frustrated by the now regular failure of the *Medical Directory* to appear until the year is almost ended.

Longman's troubles seem to date from the time they decided to move its nerve centre from Bentinck Street to Harlow. Hearsay has it that formerly it was managed by two middle aged ladies with a card index, knitting needles, and prodigious memories who declined to move to Harlow. Moved it was, nevertheless, and computerising it apparently caused a six month delay that has never been made up; since the move the directory has appeared consistently about six months late each year—that is, nearly a year after the updating forms go out to the profession. It might well these days be entitled *Medical Directory (Retrospective)* because, with such a lengthy lead time, those parts of it that are relatively ephemeral have already ephemed by the time it appears.

Can anyone suggest how pressure can be brought on such a monopolist? Had any alternative publisher the interest and resources to start up an alternative directory appearing by March each year one would imagine he would make a killing: he would certainly have my yearly £45 or whatever. Short of this one can but fume impotently and write letters to the medical press.

H DE GLANVILLE

Weybridge,
Surrey KT13 9EQ