

services on a larger scale. Several groups led by specialists have attempted to redress the balance,^{1,3} but the political will to debate or adopt their recommendations has been missing. The publication last year of the report from the Association of Cancer Physicians was opportune.⁴ Its proposals for a countrywide network of services, linking cancer units in selected district general hospitals with specialist cancer centres in major hospital complexes, have now been echoed with full authority in a report prepared by the Chief Medical Officers' Expert Advisory Group on Cancers.

A Policy Framework for Commissioning Cancer Services emphasises the roles of the many groups involved in the care of patients with cancer and how they should interrelate.^{5,6} Professional bodies, health departments, purchasers, providers, royal colleges, university departments, and charities are all given a role in implementing the report's proposals. The report calls for more non-surgical oncologists and minimum workload requirements for cancer surgeons. Many hospitals have already established the recommended pattern of care; in others, surgeons with smaller practices will have to stop doing cancer surgery. The report encourages purchasers to foster this change through contracts specific for each tumour site. But such a move would certainly fragment the purchasing and almost certainly the provision of care, by shifting the emphasis towards specific cancers rather than providing an integrated service to all those with cancer.

All parties will find much to welcome in the report,

although purchasers and providers will be concerned by the accompanying letter from the chief executive of the NHS Executive. It advises that the recommendations should be funded from "within available resources." But idealism and available resources are unlikely to be enough. Although reorganisation may result in some overall savings, extra costs are likely to be substantial in the short term. The need for more staff and the long term underinvestment in cancer services make some financial commitment unavoidable if the proposals are not to be stillborn. Equally important will be the creation of a supraregional coordinating body with executive authority: an enforceable national strategy must exist to prevent the inappropriate self recognition of hospitals as "centres" or "units" and to ensure the proper establishment of the network.

MICHAEL WHITEHOUSE
Professor of medical oncology

Wessex Medical Oncology Unit,
Southampton General Hospital,
Southampton SO16 6YD

- 1 Study Group on Radiology and Oncology. *Report*. London: London Health Planning Consortium, 1979.
- 2 Standing Subcommittee of Standing Medical Advisory Committee. *Report on cancer services*. London: SMAC, 1984.
- 3 Royal College of Radiologists. *Medical manpower and workload in clinical oncology in the UK*. London: RCR, 1992.
- 4 Association of Cancer Physicians. *Review of the pattern of cancer services in England and Wales*. London: ACP, 1994.
- 5 Chief Medical Officers' Expert Advisory Group on Cancers. *A policy framework for commissioning cancer services*. London: Department of Health and Welsh Office, 1995.
- 6 Dillner L. Equality guaranteed in cancer care shake up. *BMJ* 1995;310:1090.

Management of first trimester spontaneous abortions

May be expectant treatment for up to three days in selected cases

Many procedures in obstetrics and gynaecology are ripe for re-evaluation. On the basis of a recent paper,¹ surgical evacuation of the uterine contents after all miscarriages in the first trimester may be one of them.

The rationale for curettage as the correct management is based on a series of cases published when parity, general health, and the incidence of criminal abortion differed greatly from now.² Doctors reported infection (due to retained products of conception after criminal abortion) and bleeding against a background of anaemia, multiparity, and poor nutrition. Although the incidence of severe adverse events was low, their severity warranted complete evacuation of the uterus. In addition, immediate curettage was thought to decrease the duration of convalescence and avoided the need for routine follow up. All curettings were sent for pathological examination, and procedures were introduced to flag up abnormal reports and recall patients when necessary.

We do not know the natural course of a first trimester clinical spontaneous abortion in current populations because of universal curettage. But a recent prospective randomised trial offers some insight: 81 of 103 patients randomly allocated to expectant management had no ultrasonographic evidence of retained products of conception three days after enrolment to the trial.

The study group was selected from 550 consecutive patients attending the outpatient clinic at Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Sweden. One hundred and sixty patients fulfilled the entry criteria: human chorionic gonadotrophin concentrations above 50 IU/l, incomplete or inevitable spontaneous abortion at less than 13 weeks' gestation, and ultrasonographic assessment of intrauterine tissue of over 15 mm but less than 50 mm anteroposterior diameter. Of the 103 patients, 19 had

retained tissue greater than 15 mm at the three day follow up and subsequently had curettage. The control group (comparable in terms of intrauterine volume, and progesterone and human chorionic gonadotrophin concentrations on entry) had the traditional curettage immediately. Short term complications, infection, bleeding, duration of convalescence, and packed cell volume at follow up (day 14) did not differ significantly between the groups. This trial therefore shows that in a carefully selected group of healthy, motivated, well informed women with incomplete or inevitable abortion a substantial proportion will avoid the need for curettage without additional risks in the short term.

Gynaecological units should evaluate their practice in the light of this study and an earlier one in the *BMJ*, which reported the successful medical management of incomplete and inevitable spontaneous abortions.³ Before moving to non-surgical management of selected women they should review the availability of ultrasonography, their ability to follow up patients, and their current use of theatre time. The best management is not as yet known; further comparative trials seem to be the way ahead.

KEVIN FORBES
Senior lecturer

Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology,
University of Queensland,
Royal Brisbane Hospital,
Herston 4029,
Australia

- 1 Nielsen S, Hahlén M. Expectant management of first-trimester spontaneous abortion. *Lancet* 1995;345:84-6.
- 2 Russell PB. Abortion treated conservatively: a 12 year study covering 3739 cases. *South Med J* 1947;49:314-24.
- 3 Henshaw RC, Cooper K, El-Refaei H, Smith NC, Templeton AA. Medical management of miscarriage: non-surgical uterine evacuation of incomplete and inevitable spontaneous abortion. *BMJ* 1993;306:894-5.