LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Alternative and complementary medicine for asthma

Readers of the review by D J Lane and T V Lane (November 1991;46:787–97) might conclude that hypnosis has little to offer asthmatic patients. Although the report of Ewer and Stewart1 is quoted as showing improvement in symptom scores and some peak expiratory flow rates and decreased use of bronchodilators, no mention is made of a 74-9% improvement (p < 0.01) in the degree of bronchial hyperresponsiveness to a standardised methacholine challenge test. These authors state that “while our hypnotic technique does not eliminate bronchial hyperresponsiveness it does provide a clinically useful and non-toxic adjuvant to drug treatments that might benefit about half of the asthmatic population.” This approach could well reduce the use of the toxic drugs, such as troleandomycin, gold, azathioprine, and methotrexate, mentioned by Shiner and Geddes.2

The British Tuberculosis Association’s study3 did not report negative results as stated in the review. On the contrary, “independent clinical assessors considered the asthma to be much better in 59% of the hypnosis groups and in 43% of the control group, the difference being significant.” These results were obtained by using only direct suggestion units, hypnosis alone and autohypnosis jointly; more advanced methods, such as reciprocal inhibition, were not used.

In my own study1 it was possible to withdraw oral prednisolone or to reduce the dose in 14 of the 16 patients treated by hypnosis. The number of hospital admissions during the first year of hypnothepapy fell to 13, compared with 44 during the previous year. This represented a reduction of 249 hospital days, which, at 1988 costs (£170 per day), saved the NHS £24 330. As some 55 000 adults are admitted each year for asthma, savings to the NHS could be considerable if hypnothepapy were to be used more widely.

JOHN B MORRISON
Consultant physician,
78 Starcross New Road,
Southport, Merseyside PR8 6PJ


AUTHOR’S REPLY We thank Dr Morrison for his interest in our article. On the question of bronchial hyperresponsiveness, he seems to have missed our discussion of this on page 794. The changes recorded by Ewer and Stewart, though significant statistically, are unlikely to make much difference clinically. We know of no work on the use of hypnosis in the sort of chronic persistent asthma that might be treated with the “toxic drugs” he mentions.

Perhaps we were unfair to dismiss the British Tuberculosis Association’s study of 1968 as producing “negative results.” In fact, the details of the recorded wheezing score, use of bronchodilators, and forced expiratory volume, divided by sex (their table IV), showed a difference between treated and control groups only for wheezing score in females (that is, five out of six comparisons showed no difference). The paper does not detail all the methods used for the independent clinical assessments other than that they “were made by a physician unaware of the patient’s treatment.”

Dr Morrison’s own study gave impressive results, but it is a pity that the comparative control period had to be retrospective. Careful attention to many aspects of the care of asthmatic patients can produce a reduction in corticosteroid treatment and admissions. As we stated in our review, if hypnosis is to be advocated as a means of obtaining these ends there is a need to establish both a reliable method of screening and to show likely to be effective in the symptomatic improvement likely to be obtained from the use of this method. Our study showed that hypnosis is more effective than the control group and that hypnosis might be useful in patients with respiratory symptoms.

We read the editorial entitled “Alternative and complementary medicine for asthma” by Dr DJ Lane and TV Lane (November 1991;46:787–97) with interest. The patients suffering from asthma often demand complete relief of their symptoms and therefore are not satisfied with present medications, which although highly effective are not curative. We have also observed an interest in alternative medicine among asthmatic patients in Turkey. We summarise the findings of an investigation into asthma in the British Medical Journal in 1991. Of the 205 patients who were included in this study, 92 (45%) reported that they had either tried or were still using one or more of the alternative therapies recommended for asthma. Herbal medicine (48), speleotherapy (treatment based on visiting caves: 10), wearing bracelets (6), Turkish baths (5), rubies vaccine (3), and syrups containing various trace elements (3) had been used by these patients. Acupuncture was practised by only two patients; and other methods, such as yoga, hypnosis, and homeopathy, were not used by any.

We have collected 33 different prescriptions for herbal medicine for 48 patients. Numerous types of plants, leaves of trees, fruits, plant roots, and spices have been used either alone or in combination, usually mixed with honey. Though benefit to the patient is questionable, they are regarded as harmless except for one containing cleanser. Quail eggs, the only animal derived protein in these prescriptions, had been used by almost half of the patients.

Speleotherapy, the second most commonly used method, is used not only in Turkey but also in centres in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, and Italy. Though there have been international meetings and an increasing number of articles on speleotherpay, there have been a few controlled studies.4 Some articles have discussed the temperature, humidity, volume, electrical characteristics, types of air flow, and gas content of the indoor environment, but no objective benefit of speleotherapy has been documented.5 Ten patients in our study group visited Damlatas cave in the south of Turkey for three to four weeks in the summer, and all stated that they had felt comfortable for several months after being able to decrease their bronchodilator drug dosage. Further controlled and objective studies are needed on this subject.

Welets and Turkish6 are two methods of alternative medicine that have not previously mentioned in published reports. The “bracelet” epidemic spread from south east Asia to Turkey, and asthmatic patients as well as those with rheumatological problems began using bracelets. Six patients in the study group were wearing bracelets for the relief of their pulmonary symptoms.

Alternative medicine has emerged as a consequence of conventional medicine. It appears to offer effective treatment for breathlessness. Some practices have arisen through experience that has accumulated over hundreds of years and have become traditional. Others have resulted from individual therapists or a public interest in alternative medicine will diminish in time with both progress in research for more efficient treatments and the realisation by patients of the effectiveness of conventional treatment.

AFIAT KALYONCU
Department of Thoracic Diseases,
Hacettepe University School of Medicine,
06100 Ankara, Turkey


Air pollution and respiratory morbidity

We read with interest the article by Dr J Britton (May 1992;47:391–2). This raises a number of important points but perpetuates confusion over EC limit values, EC guide values, and WHO air quality guidelines; this confusion has arisen partly from the number of Sunyer et al1 to which Dr Britton refers. EC limit values and guide values are often expressed in terms of percentiles, with which individual measurements should not be compared. For example, the EC limit value for
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