Is globus hystericus?

Sir: The Journal Club at this hospital met recently to discuss "Is globus hystericus?" by Wilson et al (Journal, September 1988, 153, 335–339). The exercise seemed to offer considerable educational rewards, which other readers may wish to share if they have not already done so. An initial difficulty was that the promisingly quizzical title of the piece obscured its evident lack of scientific objectives beyond "the use of psychological inventories in globus patients". Its potential value paled further as no adequate description was to be found of how the patients included in the study were selected for it, let alone of how they compared with co-attenders at the same department who were not. The reasons for choosing the instruments used, the GHQ and the EPI, were not given; the choice seemed inadequate for most purposes, given the well-known problems of interpretation of the former in the context of physical illness, and the lack of discriminatory value exhibited by the EPI in the only comparable psychological study of hysteria the authors quote. (The authors hardly increase confidence in their objectivity when they opine, in anticipation of criticism of the GHQ, that "we do not agree . . . that most cases of globus have a physical basis").

The interpretations they place on their questionnaire findings, that they "support the inclusion of conversion disorder with dysthymic disorders", prompted much surprise, the study being notable for the absence of any specific measure of affective symptomatology, or any independent attempt at psychiatric diagnosis of its sample.

We appreciate that the publication of any study that fails, as this one does, to acknowledge related psychiatric research (e.g. previous studies of other discrete hysterical syndromes such as pseudoseizures), and whose own design is flawed, may inspire more satisfactory successors. However, our meeting did feel that the value of such a study is otherwise limited, and that it should not be taken as a model for others.
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Sir: How striking that six workers at the National Hospitals for Nervous Diseases (NHND) should take exception to one of the few empirical reports on the personalities of globus patients. We selected the Eysenck Personality Inventory, the best-known and best-validated personality test in Britain—long perceived by its author, Hans Eysenck, to distinguish individuals suffering from hysterical disorders. We reported simply that female globus patients were markedly neurotic and introverted and that our small sample of male patients were decisively low in emotionality.

The study had clear scientific objectives beyond the use of psychological questionnaires—indeed, these are stated in the first few lines of the abstract. The patients were investigated with a wide range of physical tests—radiology, haematology, endoscopy, and specialised tests of oesophagogastric function. That these were somehow overlooked by your correspondents from the NHND brings out an important point about globus pharyngis, namely that the background literature, current aetiological theories, and clinical experience of the condition are, with a few exceptions, confined to departments of otolaryngology.

The patients were diagnosed using the standard clinical criteria for globus, and they were consecutive attenders at the globus clinic in our ENT department. Otherwise they were unselected. We accept that the data from this exploratory psychological assessment, which was performed in conjunction with extensive physical investigations, would have benefited from the inclusion of an ENT control group. We were, however, able to compare our patients with matched British norms, such as are furnished currently by no other form of personality assessments, and to show an unexpected and interesting result.

Our statement of disbelief in the physical basis of globus was not a subjective opinion intended to deflect criticism of GHQ scores. Rather, it was our conclusion after the negative results of our extensive physical investigations. These are reported in the text and are, as also stated in the paper, published elsewhere.

We are criticised for suggesting, on the basis of the globus model, that conversion disorder be included within the dysthymic group. Readers beyond the first half sentence of this paragraph will see that the term dysthymic was used in the way that Eysenck has used it for over 40 years—to refer to a group of neurotic disorders where patients' personalities tend to be introverted and high on neuroticism. Nevertheless, the workers from NHND appear to be unaware of the finding that neuroticism scores are strongly
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