and contraceptive method, regardless of the presence or absence of symptoms' is confusing and needs clarification. The term screening is only appropriately used when applied to the testing of asymptomatic women with no clinical evidence of infection. When symptomatic women or women with clinical evidence of infection are to be tested, the issue becomes one of investigation rather than screening.

Women at highest risk of chlamydial infection in Canada are sexually active women between 15 and 25 years of age who use non-barrier contraceptive methods.[1] Additional risk facors include intercourse with two or more partners per year, a new partner within the preceding year, low socioeconomic class, intermenstrual bleeding, cervical friability and purulent cervical discharge.[1]

Screening asymptomatic sexually active young women who have new partners and who do not use barrier contraception makes a lot of sense for Canadian family doctors. Screening asymptomatic sexually active older women in stable mutually monogamous relationships arguably makes no sense whatsoever because the probability of a false positive test is high — test predictive values are dependent on disease prevalence. Symptomatic women and asymptomatic women with clinical evidence of infection need investigation and treatment, not screening.

The possibility of a false negative chlamydia test can be virtually eliminated in asymptomatic women with no clinical evidence of infection if a gram stain of endocervical secretions shows fewer than 10 pus cells per high power microscope oil-immersion lens field. If tests are negative for gonorrhea and chlamydia, the presence of 10 or more pus cells suggests either a false negative chlamydia test or undiagnosed ureaplasma infection.[2]

JAMES MCSHERRY

Victoria Family Medical Centre
60 Chesley Avenue
London
Ontario N5Z 2C1
Canada

References

1. Gully P. Chlamydial infection in Canada. *Can Med Assoc J* 1992; **147:** 893-896.
2. Brunham RC, Paavonen J, Stevens CE, *et al.* Mucopurulent cervicitis — the ignored counterpart in women of urethritis in men. *N Engl J Med* 1984; **311:** 1-6.

Glaucoma screening

Sir,

Sheldrick and Sharp's paper on glaucoma screening is a timely reminder of the importance of glaucoma as a cause of visual loss and the need for a national screening programme (December *Journal,* p.561).

In 1992, a postal questionnaire was undertaken of general practitioners within the catchment area of a district general hospital in North Yorkshire, in order to assess their beliefs about glaucoma screening. A total of 99 replies were received from 120 questionnaires (83%) with at least one reply from every practice. A total of 85 respondents (86%) were aware that it is possible to screen for glaucoma, while (14%) were not aware that this is possible.

Three practices reported performing some form of screening, using a variety of techniques, such as direct applanation tonometry, fundoscopy and visual field analysis using oculokinetic perimetry charts. The screening was performed by doctors, all of whom held appointments as clinical assistants in ophthalmology or who had a special interest in the eye. Diabetic patients were screened in all three practices, with other groups at risk being screened either opportunistically (one practice) or in an organized fashion.

The main barriers to screening in the other practices were reported to be lack of equipment, mentioned by 56 respondents (72%), lack of knowledge 33 (42%), a perception that it was someone else's job 32 (41%), and lack of time 31 (40%). When all respondents were asked whom they thought should screen for glaucoma, optometrists were suggested by 83 general practitioners (84%), ophthalmologists by 24%, and general practitioners by 24%. Eighty respondents (81%) said that they would consider setting up a glaucoma screening clinic if it could be shown to be of benefit.

Although there is little in the way of organized screening happening at present, most general practitioners seem willing to consider it. There findings support the view that if a national screening programme based within general practice is set up, issues concerning education and training, equipment and time must be addressed if it is to succeed.

RICHARD D NEAL

Centre for Research in Primary Care
University of Leeds
30/32 Hyde Terrace
Leeds LS2 9LN

Living up to expectations?

Sir,

I was interested to read your editorial about the current state and status of the *Journal* (January *Journal,* p.3) and I applaud the achievements outlined. However, I would like to draw attention to one aspect of the *Journal* which I believe reflects badly on the rest of the contents: ironically, the forum for this point of view, the correspondence columns.

The content, quality and scientific worth of published letters are extremely variable. What form of control is exerted over publication in this section? Your editorial mentions correspondence only in the context of it being somewhere to publish material which cannot justifiably be published elsewhere in the *Journal.* Is this why the correspondence columns occasionally come across as a dustbin for unscientific whimsy?

A letter on cervical screening is a case in point.[1] This letter seemed manifestly unscientific, perpetuated medical mythology and reached an invalid conclusion, as has already been commented upon.[2] Publishing material such as this sits uncomfortably with a journal which 'gives scientific respectability to general practice' and which has a 'responsibility for scientific vigour'.

I accept that the correspondence columns can, and should, provoke controversy and stimulate debate. It should not, however, devalue the rest of the *Journal.*

KEITH HOPCROFT

Laindon Health Centre
Laindon
Basildon
Essex SS15 5TR

References

1. Arnot AM. Cervical screening [letter]. *Br J Gen Pract* 1994; **44:** 478-479.
2. Seamark C. Vaginal examination [letter]. *Br J Gen Pract* 1995; **45:** 110-111.

Sir,

Your editorial (January *Journal,* p.3) raises some interesting questions. By the yardstick of scientific quality the *Journal* makes steady progress and has obviously established itself in its field. If this should simply be its purpose then you are entitled to feel satisfied but I have reservations about whether you are adequately fulfilling the needs of the wider membership of the Royal College of General Practitioners. In its present form, *Connection* magazine is rather forlorn and in addition has left the *Journal* with an even narrower appeal. A plate of roast beef may be succulent and nutritious but without the trimmings is relatively unappealing to all but the starving.

Over the years I have been intrigued by the piles of unopened issues of the *Journal* and *British Medical Journal* of many of my colleagues and have pondered on what stimulates me to remove the wrappers. You may argue you are not prim-