

ty pharmacists; of the 90 who responded 24.4% estimated they were 'hardly ever consulted'.

It appears that the inclusion of a pharmacy within a health centre results in increased frequency of consultation. Where two professionals work so closely together each acquires an appreciation of the other's function, so that they work for their mutual benefit and ultimately that of the patient.

GEOFFREY HARDING
KEVIN TAYLOR

School of Pharmacy
University of London
23/39 Brunswick Square
London WC1N 1AX

Reference

1. Committee of Inquiry into Pharmacy. *Pharmacy: a report to the Nuffield Foundation*. London: Nuffield Foundation, 1986: 38.

Referral of women with chronic pelvic pain

Sir,

Chronic pelvic pain in women is one of the most difficult problems faced by general practitioners and gynaecologists. Although many gynaecologists feel that a gynaecological problem is unlikely in the majority of these cases, large numbers of investigations, including laparoscopies, continue to be performed. I have reviewed 200 cases of chronic pelvic pain of more than one year's duration referred to three teaching hospitals.

Apart from tenderness on abdominal and/or vaginal examinations clinical assessment failed to produce any positive findings in 142 cases (71%). In 38 patients (19%) vaginal discharge was noticed, ovarian cysts were felt in four (2%) and the uterus was enlarged in 14 (7%). Investigations were performed in 102 cases (51%). Positive results were obtained from cultures of high vaginal swabs and/or urine specimens in 38 cases (19%) — all were treated for infection, but only seven patients reported partial improvement in their pain and only two that the pain had gone completely. Twenty six patients (13%) were scanned — eight (4%) had ovarian cysts, 10 (5%) had an enlarged uterus and no abnormality was detected in the remaining eight (4%). Of the 174 patients (87%) who underwent laparoscopy, no abnormality was detected in 150. There was evidence of endometriosis in nine patients, pelvic inflammatory disease in five, adhesions from previous operations in eight, ovarian cysts in four and periappendicular adhesions in two. Only half of these positive

laparoscopic findings were considered to be a possible cause for the pelvic pain. Of the 200 patients only 26 (13%) improved as a result of gynaecological treatment.

Gynaecological assessment failed to reach a diagnosis in the majority of the cases, in spite of the fact that 87% of the patients underwent laparoscopy. This suggests that chronic pelvic pain has a psychological rather than an organic origin in the vast majority of cases. Even those who support organic causes for pelvic pain admit that a substantial number of patients improve after a period of psychological counselling.^{1,2}

Too many cases are referred to gynaecologists, too many laparoscopies are being performed and the possibility of a psychogenic origin for the pain is not adequately explored. The referral letters were too brief in 78% of the cases with no assessment of the patient's background. General practitioners are well placed to assess the psychological and social background of patients.

The majority of these patients are seen in the gynaecology clinic by junior or middle grade staff who worry about missing an organic cause for the pain. Thus, in many cases the gynaecological opinion is given by a hospital doctor who may be less experienced than the referring general practitioner. The decision to perform a laparoscopy should not be taken lightly, because the procedure has a definite morbidity and mortality.³ Such an invasive procedure should not be the method used to differentiate between patients who have an organic or psychogenic cause for their pain. The financial cost of these unnecessary procedures and the burden on the waiting lists and hospital staff should also be considered. In 1974, over 10 000 laparoscopies were performed to investigate pelvic pain in 382 hospitals all over the UK.³ Laparoscopy has become a more familiar operation, so the figure is probably now much higher.

Assessment of chronic pelvic pain in general practice should include a search for possible psychological factors as well as physical examination and bacteriological tests for urinary tract or pelvic infection. If a gynaecological cause is suspected, ultrasound scanning of the lower abdomen is a useful non-invasive investigation. Referring such patients to a gynaecology clinic without this assessment may result in patients undergoing an unnecessary procedure involving general anaesthesia. In the gynaecology clinic, these patients should be assessed by an experienced gynaecologist.

RIFKY R. GUIRGIS

Saint Mary's Hospital
Milton Road, Portsmouth

References

1. Beard RW, Highman JH, Pearce S, Reginald PW. Diagnosis of pelvic pain in women. *Lancet* 1984; 2: 949.
2. Reginald PW, Kooner JS, Samarage SU, et al. Intravenous dihydroergotamine to relieve pelvic congestion with pain in young women. *Obstet Gynecol Surv* 1988; 43: 180-181.
3. Working party of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (Chamberlain GVP, Chmn). *Gynaecological laparoscopy: a report on the confidential enquiry into gynaecological laparoscopy*. London: RCOG, 1974.

Triglyceride screening in the surgery

Sir,

Despite earlier controversy, a raised triglyceride level is accepted as a coronary artery disease risk factor in its own right and its measurement is necessary to type the hyperlipidaemia. Fasting samples are not required for cholesterol concentrations and are necessary only in those with raised triglyceride values. Opportunistic screening for hyperlipoproteinaemia is appropriate in primary care¹ and target blood lipid concentrations for general practice have recently been published by the British Hyperlipidaemia Association.²

We use Reflotron test strips (Boehringer) to determine cholesterol and triglyceride levels in the surgery. The accuracy of the strips is monitored by the hospital laboratory and a quality assurance scheme for test-strip cholesterol has been organized by the Wolfson Research Laboratory, Birmingham. Good correlation between the surgery and the hospital laboratory for both analytes has been achieved.

The levels of triglyceride requiring intervention remain controversial and the risk for coronary events is probably not linear. Mild hypertriglyceridaemia (3.0–6.0 mM) is usually due to obesity or alcoholism and is associated with significant hypercoagulability.³ Below 3.0 mM specific treatment is usually unnecessary. Levels above 5.0 mM⁴ or 6.0 mM² require vigorous dietary control and sometimes drug therapy as there is also an increased risk of pancreatitis.

Of 215 patients screened opportunistically in the surgery, 14 (6.5%) had moderately or seriously raised triglyceride levels. Two patients had triglyceride levels above 5.0 mM, both of whom were seriously overweight, consumed excess alcohol and had cholesterol levels above 6.5 mM. There were 12 patients with triglyceride levels between 3.0 and 5.0 mM, eight of whom had cholesterol levels of less than 6.5 mM.