LETTERS

May I join the debate between Drs Ness and Segall on the above subject? The suspicion that excessive milk consumption was associated with increased coronary mortality arose in the 1950s when it was customary to treat peptic ulcer with large quantities of milk. The practice was discontinued when it was found that many of the so treated patients died of coronary heart disease. Extensive investigations at the time in American and British hospitals seem to have confirmed the suspicion.

Naturally, it would be interesting to see whether in the long run the consumption of non-excessive quantities of milk was also connected with heart disease. One method of finding out, as Ness and colleague have done, is to recruit a number of volunteers, establish their milk consumption and wait 20 years to see whether the high consumer fared worse than he low consumers.

Apart from the long wait a disadvantage is that a significant part of milk consumption is hidden in milk products, like chocolate, ice cream, etc, tends to be discounted and make the results unreliable.

An alternative method is to take advantage of the fact that developed countries have published both mortality and food consumption statistics for the best part of the century. It is, therefore, possible to correlate coronary mortality in various countries with their very different average milk consumption.

I carried out several such studies in the 1980s invariably showing a strong correlation between them.

Statistical studies also produce evidence regarding the critical constituent of milk. There is no connection between fermented milk products, like cheese, and coronary disease. When milk is fermented, milk sugar, lactose, is converted into lactic acid, strongly in favour of Dr Segall’s discovery of the crucial importance of lactose.
Making sense of data

This is a book for learning epidemiology. It is oriented to understand what data tell us (and what data do not tell us). It seems that the authors’ intentions are directed to change the way of thinking, in order to adequately comprehend scientific approaches to public health issues and to develop a critical mind. This is especially important in the first steps taken in this field because basic concepts are easy but minds are not naturally qualified for appraising certain types of (abstract) problems. But for this training a personal effort is unavoidable and authors make it explicit by emphasising that it is a workbook. But the investment is worthwhile.

The book is structured in sections containing short exercises, comments on previous questions, and explanatory text. Each section ends with a self test. The seven sections are adequately ordered (this is not trivial) and cover all the relevant issues of most textbooks of epidemiology. The book goes beyond the introductory level; it includes stratification and concepts on the interpretation of multivariate methods mostly commonly used in epidemiological studies, like logistic regression and proportional hazards models. One section deals with meta-analysis and the last one covers important and complex aspects related to what to do with the findings of epidemiological studies, with published data, information from the media, etc, before a decision is to be made.

Making sense of data is an excellent book. It is perfect for those determined to learn epidemiology and also for those determined to teach epidemiology and are comfortable with the proposed orientation. I would like to underline the authors’ suggestion that working in collaboration with others will be helpful in some cases. Although it is not practical as a textbook (authors recognise this) because of its structure, there is no doubt that thoughtful, sound concepts and methods are in there.

J Damián
National Centre for Epidemiology and National School of Public Health, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid

Computer programs for epidemiologists. PEPI v. 4.0

The book is the manual of PEPI version 4.0, a collection of programs that includes a variety of programs for use in statistical analysis and planning of epidemiological studies, covering sample size estimation, contingency tables, standardisation, logistic regression, survival analysis—although no Cox regression—.
smoothing of curves, and much more. Each program offers a number of options and outputs (the authors claim that “The programs may offer more options than you need, and most will display more results that you need”); this enlarges the range of possible users. The manual is clearly written and provides the main uses of each program as well as some mathematical details.

Logistic regression programs read data files. All the other programs work on elaborated data (for example: rates or number of observations in each cell of a table); therefore, primary data must be tabulated or counted using other statistical software before using PEPI, and then elaborated data must be entered at the keyboard.

Users of statistical packages (such as Stata, SPSS, or SAS) can find PEPI rather tedious because of this two phase procedure (tabulation in another program, analysis in PEPI). Furthermore, many programs in PEPI require reinitialisation each time you want to introduce new data. Nevertheless, my initial scepticism was modified after using it: when I needed to estimate the sample size for a matched case-control study, I could compare several packages and found that PEPI provides an output richer than others do. This feature is common to other programs in PEPI: they cover a variety of epidemiological tests wider than general purpose statistical packages.

Epidemiologists can use PEPI with two main purposes when analysing data: as an alternative to statistical programs that are more expensive, or as a complementary toolbox when other programs are available. Teaching and learning purposes are also possible.

**Correction**

An editorial error occurred in the paper by Dr A Page and colleagues (2002; 56:766–72). Both the male and female suicide rates in each category of the Gross Domestic Product variable (tables 1, 2, and 3) are not correct. The correct male and female suicide rates by GDP change category are shown in the accompanying data. These minor numerical translocations do not affect the analysis, results, or conclusions in any way.

**Corrected data for GDP variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Annual change in GDP</th>
<th>Men (Age adjusted)</th>
<th>Women (Age adjusted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minus 10%</td>
<td>34.47</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus 5–9%</td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus 4% to plus 4%</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus 5–9%</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus 10%</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>