Acute otitis media after forceps delivery

While running an ambulatory paediatric clinic, the mother of a crying baby wondered whether forceps delivered babies were more prone to otitis than other babies. To our knowledge, this association has not been reported. But, on the other hand, facial nerve injury is more common among those delivered by forceps; it is caused by compression of diploic bone of the mastoid process where the facial nerve is located superficially. It is already known that VA is at least as safe as forceps for the mother and the neonate. Long term consequences of operative vaginal delivery need to be explored: a prospective study should be undertaken to find if this association really exists.
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Table 1  Patient characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Non-operative delivery (n=754)</th>
<th>Forceps delivery (n=217)</th>
<th>Vacuum delivery (n=52)</th>
<th>Caesarean section (n=426)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth weight mean (SD)</td>
<td>3315.2 (400.7)*</td>
<td>3429.3 (388.2)</td>
<td>3496.2 (416.7)</td>
<td>3383.4 (467.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male female sex</td>
<td>24 (3.1)*</td>
<td>11 (5.0)*</td>
<td>8 (15.3)*</td>
<td>25 (5.8)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborns admitted to special care (%)</td>
<td>18.2 (12.9)</td>
<td>17.4 (10.8)</td>
<td>23.7 (12.6)*</td>
<td>18.9 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05.
We appreciate the comments of Batty and Deary on our paper reporting on the explanations of educational inequalities in mortality. We agree with them that there is evidence linking early cognitive ability to later health outcomes and that inclusion of education and early life intelligence may be important for studies of health inequalities. However, the latter seems to be dependent on the purpose of the study. It was the aim of our study to contribute to the debate on the importance of different mediating factors in the causal pathway of educational inequalities in health, and to provide more guidance to policy recommendations to reduce these inequalities, and it is less clear if inclusion of early life intelligence would have contributed much to these aims.

We believe that the most appropriate position for early life intelligence in our conceptual model would be preceding educational achievement. In this position early life intelligence could contribute to the understanding of differences in educational achievement. In contrast, its contribution to the understanding of causal pathways from education to health would be limited. Inclusion of intelligence in a study like ours would increase understanding of the “core” roots of inequalities in health and should therefore be supported. Using the same arguments as the authors did however, this can be also be said from other factors, such as birth weight, parental socioeconomic position, and neighbourhood deprivation. These factors are also related to educational achievement, and do have mediating and interactive effects.

Finally, the connection of early life intelligence to policy recommendations is less straightforward than this is for education: recommending improvement of an individual trait as early life intelligence may be more difficult than recommending improvement of educational achievement, for example by policies that maximise the chance that children will remain at school. 

**Authors’ reply**

I thank Dr James for his letter. He may well be correct for the citations of the related studies and also the estimation of the sample size. However, I wish to make some comments.

Not only in my report, but also in other reports the sample size was much lower than that estimated by James. Among published data, the article of Gubaran et al was based on 1781 births (508 and 1273 births from exposed and unexposed pregnancies, respectively), which is a comparatively large sample size and it is near to the required sample size, calculated by James. Gubaran et al found that there was no statistically significant difference between exposed and unexposed pregnancies for offspring sex ratio. 

I agree that offspring sex ratio at birth is partially controlled by parental hormone levels at the time of conception. In my letter I cited evidence that exposure of men to EMF is associated with fatigue, headaches, dizziness, impaired memory, nausea, loss of strength in limbs, respiratory difficulties, sleep disturbances, and reduced libido. Such reports may be dismissed as subjective. However I also cited reports that exposure to EMF was associated with reduced sperm counts in men and rats and of reduced testosterone levels in rats. More recently, men’s exposure to electromagnetic fields was significantly reduced; while in men exposed to the fields the ratio did not show significant difference. On the other hand, experimental design studies showed that when rodents (mice and rats) were exposed to electromagnetic fields, the offspring sex ratio significantly increased or remained unchanged, compared with their own control groups.

**References**

12. James WH. Evidence that mammalian sex ratios at birth are partially controlled by parental hormone levels at the time of conception. J Theor Biol 1996;180:271–86.

**Floor V A van Oort, Frank J van Lenthe, Johan P Mackenbach**

Department of Public Health, Erasmus MC, University Medical Centre, Rotterdam, Netherlands

Correspondence to: Dr F V van Oort, Department of Public Health, Erasmus MC, University Medical Centre Rotterdam, PO BOX 1738, 3000 DR Rotterdam, Netherlands. F.van.oort@erasmusmc.nl

**References**


**Offspring sex ratios of people exposed to electromagnetic fields**

Saadat1 wrote that there has only been one study on the association between human offspring sex ratio (proportion male) at birth and parental exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMF). He substantiated this claim with a reference to Irungu et al. However, I cited six other such studies. These studies, although not unanimous, cumulatively suggest that both exposed men and exposed women tend to produce significant excesses of daughters. This suggestion is not much changed by the comparatively small samples adduced by Saadat.1 The point may be illustrated by considerations of standard power analysis. Suppose that you wished to test that exposure has the effect of reducing the offspring sex ratio by, say, 10% (viz from an expected value of 0.515 to 0.465). Then, to stand 8 chances in 10 of detecting a difference at the 0.05 level (one way), you would require equal sized samples of (offspring of exposed and non-exposed subjects) each numbering 1236. The number of offspring of Saadat’s sample of exposed subjects was 1781.

In my letter I cited evidence that exposure of men to EMF is associated with fatigue, headaches, dizziness, impaired memory, nausea, loss of strength in limbs, respiratory difficulties, sleep disturbances, and reduced libido. Such reports may be dismissed as subjective. However I also cited reports that exposure to EMF was associated with reduced sperm counts in men and rats and of reduced testosterone levels in rats. More recently, men’s exposure to electromagnetic fields was significantly reduced; while in men exposed to the fields the ratio did not show significant difference. On the other hand, experimental design studies showed that when rodents (mice and rats) were exposed to electromagnetic fields, the offspring sex ratio significantly increased or remained unchanged, compared with their own control groups.
controls. Taken together it seems that the published data are not sufficient to conclude that the offspring sex ratio tends to produce significant excesses of daughters when parents are exposed to electromagnetic fields.
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Public health policy


“Advancing the public’s health has always been the stated goal of healthy policy, even if in practice a systematic bias in favour of responding to ill health and tackling disease has remained all pervasive and remarkably impervious to change”.

While this quote doesn’t appear until halfway through Public Health Policy, it is from this perspective that Hunter approaches his analysis. The text details the history of the public health sector in the United Kingdom as well as the problems and issues that have faced and will continue to face the policy makers who enjoy responsibility for the public’s health, from the House of Commons to the NHS. While historically confining his analysis to the UK, the well organised history of the struggles faced in the UK parallel those faced by developed and developing countries. The pitfalls of the competing priorities of the “downstream” focus on current health care offerings (treatment) compared with the “upstream” positive effects of shifting focus to a public health perspective (prevention) are analysed on many levels and from varying viewpoints. Hunter offers potential solutions to some of the difficulties that face decision makers struggling to formulate health policy that reflects a shift in priorities. The book is well written and offers insights useful for all who have an interest in improving the public’s health, whether in the UK or elsewhere.

S Goldie

Ethics for health care, 2nd edition


Oxford University Press has recently published a second edition of this popular and widely read primer on medical ethics. Designed as a teaching tool for a broad range of health care professionals, the text draws upon a series of contemporary problems as the author illustrates the key features of ethical thinking.

The chapters are designed in a sequential rather than encyclopaedic fashion, developing themes through a series of over 50 suggested tasks for the reader to engage in before moving further. Almost half of these individual and group exercises incorporating tutorial/problem based triggers are new to this edition, reflecting the author’s emphasis on helping the reader understand the material by placing it within their own context. Subsequent text then explores the issues, guiding the reader on the process of analysing everyday health care issues in an ethical framework, while focusing on the health care worker to client interaction.

Although many examples considered in the text are drawn from contemporary Australian sources, they are presented in an inclusive fashion for an international readership. In particular, the author considers the cultural, religious, and sociological contexts that inform ethical considerations, rather than limiting herself to any one theoretical framework.

In summary, this book provides an excellent programme of instruction for health care workers in applying ethical reasoning to the problems they encounter in everyday practice, leaving the reader with workable tools they can use on a daily basis.

S Margolis