BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL

7 0 -

SATURDAY 19 FEBRUARY 1972

LEADING ARTICLES	
The Computer and Thyroid Disease page 457	Genetic Counselling page 458 Deaths from
Asthma in Young People page 459 Cannu	lation of Papilla of Vater page 459 Status
Epilepticus page 460 Bone Disease after Ga	astrectomy page 461 Next Step in Scotland
page 461	
PAPERS AND ORIGINALS RE	CEIVE D
Drug Interaction: Inhibitory Effect of Neuroleptics on Metal	polism of Tricyclic Antidepressants in Man
LARS F. GRAM, REASTIN FREDRICSON OVERV	1
Effect of Sustained Maternal Hyperglycaemia on the Fetus in N. W. OAKLEY, R. W. BEARD, R. C. TURNER. Syndrome of Rapid Irregular Movements of Eyes and Limbs	n Normal and Diabetic Pregnancies
N. W. OAKLEY, R. W. BEARD, R. C. TURNER.	466
	in Childhood G. Pampiglione, maria maia
Measles Virus Antibody in Cerebrospinal Fluids from Patier	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	477
Adriamycin in the Treatment of Acute Leukaemia	
	J. S. MALPAS
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	A. G. STANSFELD
Motor Disorder in "Normal Pressure" Hydrocephalus JAGDIS	SH C. CHAWLA, JOHN WOODWARD
MEDICAL PRACTICE	
	- T 1 1
Survey of Home Visiting by General Practitioners in North-	east England487
	rism J. D. N. NABARRO
	Iltifactorial Familial Disease CHARLES SMITH
	ey and Impaired Resistance to Infection K. W. WALTON 498
Personal View GEORGE BIRDWOOD	503
CORRESPONDENCE—List of Contents 504	OBITUARY NOTICES 514
BOOK REVIEWS	SUPPLEMENT
NEWS AND NOTES	From the Committees—Scottish G.M.S.; Armed Forces 45
Medicolegal—G.M.C.: Appeals to the Privy Council 518	Industrial Relations Act—Reply from Permanent Under
Epidemiology—Infectious Mononucleosis	Secretary 46
Parliament—Royal Society on Research and Development 520	Was it a Drug?

Association Notices.....

BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL 19 FEBRUARY 1972

CORRESPONDENCE

Correspond	lents are	asked	to	be	briet
------------	-----------	-------	----	----	-------

Gynaecological Illness after Sterilization
J. S. Scott, F.R.C.O.G.; B. Alderman,
M.R.C.O.G504
Institutional Neurosis
R. W. A. C. Barton, M.R.C.P., D.P.M505
Diuretic Dependence
C. Davidson, M.B., and J. T. Silverstone,
D.M., D.P.M505
Rights of Next of Kin
H. A. F. Mackay, M.B505
Skin Reactions to Ampicillin
C. Hendriksen, M.D.; R. N. Allan, M.R.C.P505
Trial of Clofibrate
H. A. Dewar, F.R.C.P., and M. F. Oliver,
F.R.C.P506
Huntington's Chorea and the Adrenal
G. W. Bruyn, M.D., and others506
Generalized Pustular Psoriasis
H. Baker, M.D506
Clofazimine in Leprosy
S. G. Browne, F.R.C.P506
Mobile Coronary Care Unit
J. S. Geddes, M.D., and others507
Cost and Speed of Medical Publication
D. K. C. Dickens507
Pharmacologically Active I.U.D.s
M. Elstein, M.D., and Karen Ferrer, B.SC.;
R. M. Pearson, M.R.C.P507

Removal of Extrauterine Saf-T-Coil
through Laparoscope
R. S. Ledward, M.B., and others508
Contact Dermatitis from Xerumenex
Katherine Grice, M.D., and C. I. Johnstone,
м.в508
Ganglion Cysts of Bones
F. N. Ghadially, Ph.D., M.D
Wandering Spleen with Complete
Procidentia
Z. Minhas, M.R.C.O.G., and L. R. Malik,
M.R.C.O.G509
Rumination
D. M. F. Batty, F.R.C.P.ED., and D. N. Williams,
M.R.C.P509
The Queen's Shilling
J. R. Kirkpatrick, F.R.C.S509
Hazard to Fetus from Safety Harness
D. B. B. Whitehouse, F.R.C.O.G510
Recovery of Catheters Lost in Vascular
System
D. J. Delany, F.F.R., and F. Starer, F.F.R510
Selective Proximal Vagotomy
H. W. Burge, F.R.C.S510
Inaccurate Tourniquet Gauges
D. E. Fry, f.f.A. R.C.S511
Hospital Staffing
Mary M. Anderson, M.R.C.O.G., and others 511

Place of Vasectomy
J. J. Slome, D.P.H511
Plasma Amino-acids of Infants
D. P. Davies, M.R.C.P512
Poisoning from Delayed Release Tablets
S. R. Meadow, M.R.C.P512
Exchangeable and Total Body Potassium
F. P. Muldowney, M.D512
Compression of Coeliac Axis
J. L. Provan, F.R.C.S512
Intravenous Glucagon
W. I. H. Shedden, м.D512
Destroying Used Syringes
G. H. Jantet, F.R.C.S512
Canada's Example
R. D. P. Eaton, Ph.D., D.T.M. & H513
"Academic" G.P.s
W. A. Ball, L.R.C.P513
Hospital Waiting Lists
N. H. Harris, F.R.C.S
Hospital Appointment Systems
B. Pollak, M.R.C.S513
New Record Folder for General Practice
Gillian Strube, M.B513
European Communities Bill
A. J. Rowe, L.M.S.S.A51
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Gynaecological Illness after Sterilization

SIR,—Like my friend Professor H. C. Mc-Laren (29 January, p. 307) I wish to congratulate Mr. M. J. Muldoon on his report (8 January, p. 84) on subsequent gynaecological illness in sterilized patients. Unlike Professor McLaren, however, I would support Mr. Muldoon's thesis without reservation. These illnesses could have been prevented. As he points out, the commonest reason for these patients presenting again for gynaecological treatment is menstrual symptomatology. This is not to say that tubal ligation in some mysterious way predisposes to menstrual disorder. After this procedure each period becomes an irritating reminder of the presence of a functionless organ. The threshold of menstrual symptomatic tolerance is consequently lowered. The gynaecologist has little to offer but hysterectomy or oestrogen-progestogen therapy. The reason for the initial sterilization almost always involves unsuitability for "the pill" so hysterectomy is usually needed.

Professor McLaren's questions are not strictly relevant. Regardless of how many of these women would have presented with gynaecological conditions over the past ten years without prior sterilization, the gynaecologist missed an opportunity to prevent these troubles. What would have been their gynaecological morbidity rate on the pill or with the intrauterine device is even less pertinent. Most of these women, as stated, would be sterilized because pill or device were for various reasons unsuitable.

Mr. Muldoon's figures underline what can readily be deduced from available data—that most women who come to have sterilizing operations are ones at high risk of cancer of the cervix. Professor McLaren has contributed a great deal to our knowledge of

the epidemiology and prevention of this disease and sterilizing hysterectomy involves applying that in a practical way.

Our approach to this matter was influenced by an unpublished survey of our patients undergoing gynaecological surgery. Liberal sterilization had been our practice for some years when it became evident that many of our patients with uterine symptomatology or pathology had been sterilized. These women were not dissatisfied with their sterilization, but it was appreciated that with a different procedure their further gynaecological trouble could have been prevented.

No one form of sterilization is universally applicable but our preference is for vaginal hysterectomy. In a patient without prolapse this takes no longer than a laparoscopy. The following day the patients are more mobile and are home within the week. In our experience significant complications are fewer and efficacy is certainly higher. In cases where no other gynaecological factors exist and a decision about a sterilizing procedure has been made, our practice is to explain the advantages of vaginal hysterectomy as a means of achieving sterilization (100% efficacy, removal of all risk of uterine cancer, freedom from menstrual symptoms and inconvenience but continued ovarian hormone activity). The decision as to which procedure -tubal ligation or vaginal hysterectomy-she prefers is then left to the patient. Some, for psychological reasons, are averse to hyster-Where other gynaecological ectomy. pathology or symptomatology is present, of course, we recommend whatever procedure will be likely to deal with that problem and achieve sterilization at the same time.

The implications of Mr. Muldoon's paper also apply to sterilization in association with

induced abortion. A recent Lancet editorial said "neither hysterotomy nor hysterectomy can be justified on the grounds that sterilization is required at the same time as termination..." Such a view is hard to maintain in the light of observations such as Mr. Muldoon's; a sterilizing hysterectomy in such circumstances may be preventing two other operative procedures and much long-term morbidity.—I am, etc.,

J. S. Scott

Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Leeds

1 Lancet, 1971, 2, 1239.

SIR,—I read with interest the article by Mr. M. J. Muldoon (8 January, p. 84) on "Gynaecological Illness after Sterilization."

Unfortunately, in common with most reports on the subject, no attempt was made to correlate the results against the incidence of similar gynaecological disease in nonsterilized women of similar age and parity. Thus no conclusions whatsoever can be drawn. I appreciate that Mr. Muldoon did not imply that the sterilization was in any way responsible for the subsequent gynaecological disease, but others have done so-for example, Williams et al.,1 who attempted to compare their poststerilization series with a group of presumably normal women who had attended the antenatal clinic and whose case records were reviewed retrospectively. It is obviously grossly fallacious to make such a comparison, especially when leading questions about menstrual dysfunction had been put to the first group but not to the second.

One has only briefly to review the literature to observe the gross variations in reported incidences of menstrual dysfunction