

finding, and parents were reassured and advised to give paracetamol and ensure adequate fluid intake. After presentation to the hospital, one child turned out to have a viral illness, while the other had pneumococcal meningitis and required a prolonged hospital stay. The helplines have since addressed the issue by updating their protocol and providing further training for their nurses.

In both these cases an important sign, that is the bulging fontanelle, was missed, and parents were falsely reassured. In medical school, presentation of meningitis in children is well-rehearsed, including all rare and non-specific presentations, to ensure this disastrous condition is recognised early. I doubt that any doctor would have missed this sign. I would encourage all primary care trusts to review their out-of-hours service, and to review protocols and guidelines they hold on children presenting with non-specific febrile illness, and in particular, include this subtle but important sign. I would like to advocate a low threshold for babies and infants to be reviewed by a doctor in any case.

#### Christian de Goede

*SpR in paediatric neurology,  
Royal Manchester Children's Hospital.  
E-mail: cdegoede@doctors.org.uk*

## An observational study of escalator ambulation

In an age of increasing overweight and obesity it is important that we perform purposeful exercise and promote it to our patients. I attended the American College of Cardiology meeting in Orlando held over 6–9 March 2005. To see if physicians would 'practice what they preach', I sat at the bottom of an escalator and recorded the activity of attenders on the escalator over a 1 hour period of time (11:47 am to 12:47pm 8 March 2005). Two-thirds of the 234 users of the escalators made no movement other than getting on or off the

escalator despite there being no obvious impediment to them doing so. We ask our patients to change their lifestyles and yet clearly fail to do so ourselves.

#### Mark R Nelson

*Professor, discipline of general practice,  
School of Medicine, University of Tasmania,  
Hobart 7001, Australia  
E-mail: Mark.Nelson@utas.edu.au*

## Homeopathy — a response

I hope I may be allowed to reply to the several letters<sup>1–4</sup> commenting on my deliberately provocative personal column on homeopathy.<sup>5</sup> All four authors assert their belief that homeopathy 'works', two of them making the claim that the fact that it works in babies and animals proves that this is more than a placebo effect. None of them cites any objective source of evidence for their beliefs, nor do they address the main point of my piece, which was to try to lay out the extraordinary, and to me still literally incredible, rationale that lies at the heart of homeopathic practice.

I agree wholeheartedly with Peter Hanrath and Andrew Hillam regarding the direction of much of our current target- and contract-driven practice, as I hope my more recent piece on statins illustrates.<sup>6</sup> I have no quarrel with the use of complementary therapies per se, but I do think that such therapies should be subject to the same scientific scrutiny as is now expected of conventional therapies. As a novice in acupuncture I am well aware that much of its benefit is likely to be due to non-specific effects, and I don't agonise too much over its probable additional specific, neurologically-mediated mechanisms — but I welcome research that explores both these areas. It is my firm belief that the scientific approach can be brought to bear on the still mystifying power of such factors as suggestion, the personality of both doctor and patient, the nature of the relationship between them and so on.

Nigel Williams (in his letter)<sup>1</sup> mentions

a meta-analysis<sup>7</sup> in the *Lancet* in 1997. More recently *Bandolier*<sup>8</sup> published a 'systematic review of systematic reviews' of homeopathy and concluded as follows: 'Much of the argument about homeopathy ends up being about trivial differences of little or no clinical relevance. Until large well-conducted trials tell us differently, the conclusion is that homeopathy does not work ...'. A search of the *Bandolier* website<sup>9</sup> leads to a number of commentaries on trials of homeopathy, not one of them showing any clear evidence of benefit. *Clinical Evidence*<sup>10</sup> contains only one reference, that being a negative report of two RCTs for homeopathic treatment of warts. The *Cochrane* collaboration<sup>11</sup> adds nothing further.

Finally — and hot off the press — Shang *et al* from Switzerland<sup>12</sup> report on a comparison of 110 homeopathy trials and 110 matched trials of conventional treatments. They found insignificant evidence for a specific effect of homeopathic remedies, and strong evidence for specific effects of conventional interventions. They conclude that, 'This finding is compatible with the notion that the effects of homeopathy are placebo effects'.

It is this absence of evidence for any specific effect of homeopathic remedies that led me to use the word 'deception' in the title of my column; it is the absence of harm, and the apparent non-specific beneficial effects of the homeopathic approach that made me qualify it as 'benign'. None of your correspondents has convinced me that this is an unfair description.

#### Dougal Jeffries

*General practitioner, Scilly Isles.  
E-mail: Dougal.jeffries@ioshc.cornwall.nhs.uk*

#### REFERENCES

1. Williams N. Letter: Homeopathy is where the heart is. *Br J Gen Pract* 2005; 55: 556.
2. Hanrath P. Letter: Homeopathy — a benign deception? *Br J Gen Pract* 2005; 55: 556.
3. Doney D. Letter: Homeopathy. *Br J Gen Pract* 2005; 55: 638.
4. Hillam A. Letter: The merits of homeopathy. *Br J Gen Pract* 2005; 55: 716.