Child abuse—consequences for health services

Sir.

During the course of a study on the work pattern of health visitors we have observed the effect the rise in the number of cases conferences (table) for child abuse has had on their work. The notification and follow up of possible child abuse takes precedence over all else. Some health visitors in this district are finding their attendance at case conferences is ranging from one a week to daily. Moreover each child placed on the register is made the subject of extra visiting, often requiring as many as three additional weekly visits. Each newly registered case of child abuse can add anything from two to 12 hours to a health visitor’s weekly workload, depending on its complexity. A senior health visitor estimated that four hours represented either 24 hearing tests, seeing 20 mothers and babies in a clinic, or six home visits. The very small amount of visiting to other important ‘at risk’ groups, such as the elderly, is further eroded. Only the effect on the work of health visitors has been directly observed but this is paralleled by similar effects on the work of general practitioners, child psychiatrists, paediatricians, and social workers, as many as 10 or more of whom may be involved in a case conference.\(^1\) Staff shortages in social work departments and in the health visitors establishment are compounding the problem.

Insufficient cognisance is being taken of the cost for clients and professionals of the disruption to planned health programmes because of the crisis imperatives of child abuse and in particular the time devoted to attendance at case conferences. It has already been pointed out that little attempt has been made to evaluate their effectiveness.\(^2\)

In consultation with other agencies every district should look anew at the number of professionals involved in case conferences and their particular contribution. This would allow ‘agencies to place more emphasis on the earlier provision of services to children and families who need help’ as recommended by the DHSS.\(^3\)
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**Table: Data from Tower Hamlets Youth and Community Section**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All case conferences</th>
<th>New case conferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided by Youth and Community Section Metropolitan Police Tower Hamlets.
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**Validity of forced expiratory flow volume loops in neonates**

Sir.

We are concerned that the methodology described in the paper of Hoskyns et al regarding the forced expiratory flow volume technique used in infants is flawed and that the conclusions reached by the authors may be misleading.\(^1\)

Our first concern is that these workers have not provided evidence that maximal expiratory flow was achieved in the infants they studied. They used a single narrow range of compression pressures and did not evaluate the transmission of pressure from the jacket to the pleural space in each subject. We have recently reported that a single jacket pressure will not reliably achieve maximal expiratory flow in all infants, as the transmission of pressure varies between different jackets and between different infants.\(^2\) Thus a wide range of jacket pressures must be used in each
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The colour of light for neonatal phototherapy

Sir,

In a recent paper by Ayyash et al comparing green and blue light for the phototherapy of neonatal jaundice the summary stated 'A total of 262 neonates were treated with green (350-650 nm) or blue (300-600 nm) light . . . . .1 We feel this statement is not only incorrect but potentially hazardous.

Firstly, the spectral ranges quoted by the authors are puzzling as green light is normally accepted to lie within the wavelengths interval 500-570 nm, and blue light within 440-500 nm.2 More importantly, the statement that the
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Figure. The relative spectral power distribution from a Sylvania F20T12B (blue) lamp (top), T20T12G (green) lamp (middle), and Wolff Helarium (ultraviolet) lamp (bottom).