validity as an outcome measure is not as good as that of the Threshold Assessment Grid (Slade et al, 2000), Global Assessment of Functioning (Jones et al, 1995) or HoNOS. This correlation exercise confirms that it can be used as an outcome measure with reasonable validity. It is useful in terms of consultant appraisal discussions, evaluation of workload of community and ward mental health teams and local and regional assessment of outcomes in different patient groups. Given the above correlation, benchmarking is also possible with other services, especially in England, where HoNOS is established. The conclusions of Salvi et al (2003) in the last paragraph of their article are absolutely valid.

Given the great difficulty in implementing and coordinating any single outcome assessment, I hope that the above comparison of CANNAS and HoNOS scores, in combination with the results of Salvi et al (2005), will assist those running mental health services.


Publication of case reports

Several letters advocating the reinstatement of case reports in the Journal have been published recently (Williams, 2004; Enoch, 2005). I believe that it would be useful to make a distinction between two substantially different kinds of such reports. The first group includes discussions with difficult clinical implications and interesting phenomenological descriptions, with the only aim to improve the readers’ diagnostic and therapeutic skills. Typical examples are the ‘Grand Rounds’ that used to be published in the BMJ. I agree with Dr Enoch and Dr Williams’ point of view and I would personally welcome the publication of these case reports in the Journal.

However, another group of reports have a substantially different objective. Their aim is to allow clinicians to share their anecdotal experience of unusual outcomes in clinical practice. These reports are a self-selected group of unlikely cases because only ‘man bites dog’ stories reach publication. The conclusions of sophisticated randomised trials with good statistical analyses are difficult enough to interpret because of biases such as unmasking, file drawer problems, etc. Anecdotal care reports can be confusing and misleading because the subjective data are often interpreted as objective, creating even more noise where the signal is already faint. The publication of a one-off case report of an adverse effect can profoundly influence clinical practice on the basis of a freak event. Infamous examples include the widely followed recommendation not to use haloperidol and lithium in combination (Cohen & Cohen, 1974) and the reluctance to use intravenous thiamine for the prevention of Korsakoff syndrome on the basis of a few reports of adverse reactions (Thomson & Cook, 1997). The cases of the hundreds of thousands of people who have been safely and successfully treated with these medications are not published because no one wants to state the obvious. I believe that the past editor’s decision to move on from publishing this latter group of case reports was extremely wise.


M. Procopio Priory Hospital, Hove BN3 4FH, UK. E-mail: marcoprocopio00@hotmail.com

Editor’s response: We do publish case reports if they have, or could have, important general implications. The paper by Boddaert and her colleagues in this issue (Boddaert et al, 1995) is a good example of this.

ECT for acute mania

In his excellent review of the management of acute mania, Professor Keck does not mention an additional form of available treatment, no doubt because it is archaic and anecdotal.

In the early 1950s, when the only drugs available to treat mania were paraepihy and barbiturates, patients were ill for months, and sometimes even died of exhaustion. In those days ‘electroplexy’ was given for everything, but a standard course of treatment of seven sessions of electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) over 3 weeks proved ineffective in manic patients. However, it became apparent that ECT applied twice daily, over 3 or at the most 4 days, usually brought the manic attack to an end.

I last used this treatment over 20 years ago, in circumstances where prompt restoration to health was vital. It was completely successful. The real difficulty was in obtaining anaesthetic cover twice daily. In drug-resistant cases such an approach might still have a place, with considerable savings in the time spent in hospital.


A. C. Gibson Royal College of Physicians, 9 Queen Street, Edinburgh EH2 2JQ, UK. E-mail: alangibson@transformingeducation.co.uk

Variations in involuntary commitment in the European Union

The recent article by Salize & Dressing (2004) reported that frequencies of compulsory admissions vary remarkably among countries in the European Union, from 6 per 100 000 citizens in Portugal to 218 per 100 000 in Finland. These findings are not surprising given the large differences in the laws, mental health acts, and legal instruments of the countries but they are astonishing given the much smaller differences in psychiatric morbidity. These differences show that the number of involuntary admissions is a result of a complex set of still poorly understood legal, political, economic, social and multiple other factors.