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The unit has received 889 patients with myocardial infarction, of whom 159 have been delivered directly by paramedics. Altogether 495 of the patients have received thrombolytic treatment, including 131 of those delivered by the paramedics. The mean (median) times from arrival in hospital to thrombolysis (door to needle times) were 89 (107) minutes for all patients with acute myocardial infarction yet only 42 (43) minutes for those delivered by paramedics. Altogether 171 patients given thrombolysis who were admitted to the coronary care unit direct from the accident and emergency department had mean door to needle times of 80 (76) minutes.

At present we do not give thrombolysis in the accident and emergency department, although this policy is under review. The door to needle time that we achieve with our paramedic direct admission service is similar to the Sheffield model of thrombolysis in the accident and emergency department. This model should also be considered as a means of improving thrombolysis more quickly than traditional methods of admission to hospital. If thrombolysis starts to be given in the accident and emergency department in Chesterfield we will have to compare this service with the existing paramedic service and determine if the model proposed by Edhouse et al is even quicker.

David A Sandler  Consultant physician
Chesterfield and North Derbyshire Royal Hospital, Chesterfield S44 3BL
DoctorDAS@aol.com
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Letters

GP s are encouraged to rely on ambulance service

Enntror—I was interested to see that the letters criticising the paper by Rawles et al on call to needle times after acute myocardial infarction were written by trust employees.1,2 As a general practitioner practising immediate care and offering domiciliary thrombolysis I wonder whether they have a genuine wish to improve patient care, or are they influenced by a powerful conflict of interest?3

As Edhouse et al and Ahmad et al confirm,1,4 in an emergency most patients make a 999 call for an ambulance in the belief that an ambulance offers the quickest route to hospital care and therefore the best outcome. This need not be the case. As Rawles et al show, at least in the case of acute myocardial infarction, general practitioners can offer an improved clinical outcome but only if they are adequately equipped, readily available, and mobilised in time.4

Few general practitioners currently offer domiciliary thrombolysis or indeed any other emergency medical care. Most receive financial inducements to delegate out of hours care to the cooperative deputising services. Unfortunately, this means that in many cases a doctor cannot be provided in time to influence the clinical outcome when one is genuinely needed. Delays in visiting of

more than an hour are now common, so it is no surprise to learn that the corporatist NHS hierarchy, in the form of the Sandwell NHS Trust, encourages acutely ill patients to bypass their general practitioner and dial 999 instead.5

Although official ambulance response times in Suffolk often exceed 30 minutes and the trust is under investigation by the region for its poor performance, local general practitioners are encouraged to rely on the ambulance service in all acute cases rather than provide a comprehensive service themselves. On one occasion the ambulance trust initially refused to contact me for a patient in pulseless ventricular tachycardia after its receipt of a 999 call, although I had been asked for by name and was readily available. In fact, I arrived well before the ambulance and initiated treatment and the patient survived. In a more recent but identical case I was called belatedly, only to confirm death.

The provision of quality medical care by general practitioners is greatly hampered by unreasonable patient demand and trust corporatist philosophy. In consequence there has been a reduction in general practitioners’ involvement and an increase in the use of the ambulance service and accident and emergency departments. I have yet to be convinced, however, that patients receive better treatment in consequence.

P D Thomas  General practitioner
Gipping Valley Practice, Barham, Ipswich IP6 9AS pat@gippingvalley.demon.co.uk
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New standard of 60 minutes has been proposed but may be too rigorous

Enntror—Since our paper was published1 and the responses to it were written,2 a new standard call to needle time of 60 minutes has been proposed.3 This supersedes the 90 minute standard set by the British Heart Foundation.

In relation to these standards the table shows up to date call to needle times from the Grampian audit, comparing prehospital thrombolysis by general practitioners in rural areas with scoop and run in the city and suburbs of Aberdeen and in rural areas 25 km or more from Aberdeen. In the scoop and run cases, patients taken to hospital after a 999 call were given thrombolytic treatment either in the accident and emergency department or in the coronary care unit to which they were directly admitted. No doctor to doctor referrals occurred in these cases, so these times are about the shortest that are achievable with this approach.

These results suggest that the rigorous 60 minute call to needle standard is unlikely to be achieved in most cases unless thrombolysis is initiated in the community before patients are transported to hospital.

John Rawles  Honorary senior lecturer in medicine
Medicines Assessment Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, Royal Infirmary, Aberdeen AB25 ZNZ

Emerging tobacco hazards in China

Is assumption of no association between smoking and other causes of death valid?

Enntror—Liu et al used the term “proportional mortality study” to describe their method of comparing the smoking habits of 0.7 million adults who died of neoplastic, respiratory, or vascular causes with those of a reference group of 0.2 million who died of other causes in China.1 The term can be confusing as it is used only for proportional mortality ratio analysis in standard epidemiology textbooks.2 We suggest that the study can be more easily understood if it is described as a case-control mortality study.

An important assumption in such analyses is that the other causes of death should be unrelated to the exposure “not only in the sense of causation but also in terms of ‘self-selection’ for the exposure and the diagnosis and certification of the underlying cause of death.”3 Liu et al validated this assumption by showing that the smoking rates of the male and female reference groups were only slightly higher than those of the surviving spouses of the people who had died. However, they did not elaborate whether this similarity was true for each city or rural area in China, and, if it was not, why.

Could this similarity be a feature of populations in which the tobacco epidemic is at an early stage? The authors’ assumption may not be valid in other contexts (such as our Hong Kong study4) or future studies that use a similar design. One potential confounding factor is social class, which is often associated with both smoking and mortality, and it may lead to an association between smoking and other causes of death. Studies elsewhere have observed some association between smoking and other causes of death (for example, in the American Cancer Society’s cohort the mean annual mortality from other medical causes was 30/100 000 men
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I don't want to be invited to invest in the tobacco trade

Entrie—The British Heart Foundation was criticised by the Independent on Sunday last year for using pension funds that invested in tobacco companies. A spokesperson for the BMA commented that charities promoting health should, as a matter of principle, avoid investment in tobacco companies and that “charities campaigning against tobacco should certainly not invest in tobacco stock.” However, the BMJ and the BMA (through its financial services subsidiary) could be criticised on similar grounds as both promote saving and pension funds investing in tobacco stocks. Last year the BMJ carried a full page advertisement for the Royal National Pension Fund for Nurses promoting “an outstanding investment opportunity.”¹ I would have hoped that saving and pension funds designed for health professionals would avoid tobacco investment, but the Royal National Pension Fund for Nurses was unable to provide reassurance on this when I wrote to it. As the Independent on Sunday has shown, pension and savings funds, unless specifically screened, commonly invest in tobacco stocks because they are profitable.¹

The BMA Services also continues to promote funds that have no screening to exclude tobacco investment. Indeed, when I wrote to the company about this it replied that “many doctors require consistent growth in preference to investing ethically.” At a time when pension and savings funds that offer both consistent growth and tobacco-free investment do exist, I find it disturbing to receive promotional literature tucked in my BMJ inviting me to invest in the tobacco trade.

¹ Woolf M. Heart charity invests in tobacco industry. Independent on Sunday 1998 Dec 6:1 (cols 1-2).
² BMJ 1998;317:advert facing page 1490 (clinical research issue) (28 November.)