quired. We believe that this cost is relatively small and is good value for money, if a clear diagnosis is made, and appropriate management is initiated. That after all, is what specialist departments are for.

We accept the convenience of general practice management, but until diagnostic ability improves, we suggest that many patients are being badly and unnecessarily treated. Training in minor surgical technique is only a small part of the necessary education — diagnosis and application of technique is equally important. The costs may make treatment in general practice appear attractive but the person who bears the expense, in the form of inappropriate treatment, is inevitably the patient.

JULIA STAINFORTH
M J D GOODFIELD

Department of Dermatology
The General Infirmary at Leeds
Great George Street
Leeds
West Yorkshire LS1 3EX

**References**

1. O'Cathain A, Brazier JE, Milner PC, Fall M. Cost effectiveness of minor surgery in general practice: a prospective comparison with hospital practice. *Br J Gen Pract* 1992; **42**: 13-17.
2. Cox NH, Wagstaff R, Popple AW. Using clinicopathological analysis of general practitioners skin surgery to determine educational requirements and guidelines. *BMJ* 1992; **304**: 93-96.
3. Pitcher R, Gould DJ, Bowers DW. An analysis of the effects of general practice minor surgery clinics on the workload of a district general hospital pathology and dermatology department. *Br J Dermatol* 1991; **125** (suppl 38): 93.
4. McWilliam LJ, Knox F, Wilkinson N, Oogarah P. Performance of skin biopsies by general practitioners. *BMJ* 1991; **303**: 1177-1179.
5. Williams RB, Burdge AH, Jones SL. Skin biopsy in general practice. *BMJ* 1991; **303**: 1179-1180.
6. Hillan KJ, Johnson CP, Morton R. Effect of general practitioner contract on referral of specimens for histological examination. *BMJ* 1991; **303**: 1180.

## Care of patients with psychiatric problems

Sir,

I read with interest the editorial by Elizabeth Horder on care for patients discharged from psychiatric hospital.[1] The essential message to come out of the editorial was the importance of communication between general practitioners and psychiatric services. At present, care is often fragmented and information is not exchanged between the general practitioner and psychiatric services concerning their roles and the provision of ongoing care.

Continuity of care is important when dealing with patients who have chronic psychiatric problems. This continuity can be provided by close links between community psychiatric teams and the general practitioners in their area. Link workers can telephone or visit general practitioners on a regular basis. They can then receive information or referrals at an early stage and give an appropriate response.

Shared care has worked well in obstetrics for many years. The differing roles of the obstetrician, midwife and general practitioner have been utilized to the benefit of the patient. By cooperation, we can also provide broader and better care for chronic psychiatric patients.

AMANDA KIRBY

Links Centre
60 Newport Road
Cardiff

**References**

1. Horder E. Care for patients discharged from psychiatric hospital [editorial]. *Br J Gen Pract* 1991; **41**: 399-400.

## Coronary heart disease

Sir,

We read with interest the editorial by the chairman of the International Task Force for the Prevention of Coronary Heart Disease (February *Journal*, p.47) and share his concern that the mortality rates in the United Kingdom from coronary heart disease are among the world's highest. We too are anxious that all appropriate measures are used to help normalize cholesterol levels. However, Professor Lewis' comment that 'after 20 years of research there is no persuasive evidence that reducing plasma cholesterol to 4.9–5.0 mmol $l^{-1}$ causes any untoward effect' is directly contradicted by a recent editorial in the *British Medical Journal*[1] in which it was suggested that multiple interventions in middle aged men with a moderate risk for coronary heart disease may do more harm than good. In the same issue there was also a call for a moratorium on the use of cholesterol lowering drugs.[2] In 1991, an overview of 16 published controlled trials of diet designed to lower serum cholesterol levels suggested that they were much less effective than once supposed.[3]

If our interpretation of the various studies is correct, only the Oslo study[4] has shown that the level of serum cholesterol and the risk of fatal coronary events can be definitely reduced without an associated increase in overall mortality. However, this study was carried out on a selected group of men with very high cholesterol levels (7.5–9.8 mmol $l^{-1}$) and very high dietary fat intake (average 44% of total energy, compared with an average of 35–37% in British men[5]). In addition, the diet was remarkably strict and there was also a concurrent reduction in cigarette smoking in the intervention group. As Ramsay and colleagues point out,[3] the study's results cannot be extrapolated to those with less severe hyperlipidaemia, to those with a more typical dietary fat intake, to women, or to the outcome with a standard cholesterol reducing diet. This latter diet,[6] in which total fat accounts for less than 30% of total calories, where the ratio of polyunsaturated fat to saturated fat is 1.0, where cholesterol intake is less than 300 mg daily and where calorific intake is reduced to achieve a desirable weight, has little effect on serum cholesterol concentration in subjects not living in institutions (mean reduction in cholesterol level of 2%, range 0% to 4%, over six months to six years).[5,7,8] At this level of efficacy the cost per life year gained through the use of such a diet would be about £62 000 for men and £310 000 for women; the use of effective lipid lowering agents would apparently increase costs approximately 10-fold.[9]

But it is over the safety of these drugs that there is most controversy. Although most of the available lipid lowering drugs are known to influence lipid levels favourably,[10] there is a lack of long term data showing them to reduce overall mortality rates. The increased overall mortality associated with clofibrate in the World Health Organization study[11] is well known and consequently this group of drugs is regarded with caution. On the other hand, the newest group of drugs, the 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl coenzyme A reductase inhibitors, such as lovastatin and simvastin, would appear to be more hopeful, having a satisfactory side effect profile and showing up to 32% reductions in cholesterol levels within weeks (data on file, Merck Sharp and Dohme Limited). Up to 25% of the UK population may be eligible to commence treatment with these drugs (*Monthly index of medical specialities*, January 1992). However, in the first year of a study clinically evaluating lovastatin,[12] a worrying trend has appeared: it would seem that there is already an excess mortality rate in the treatment group.

In summary, the evidence suggesting that general practitioners may usefully reduce the cholesterol levels of those at moderate risk of coronary heart disease is conflicting and inadequate. The resulting confusion has been compounded by the many sets of guidelines for the management of hypercholesterolaemia, published by national and international advisory