vertising of prescription drugs. These changes are badly needed and would go a long way toward preventing similar future harm. Canada is of course not the only country in which drug regulation needs a radical overhaul: regulatory agencies in Europe and the United States also fail to adequately consider the public interest.[4]

Andrew Herxheimer
Emeritus Fellow
UK Cochrane Centre
London, UK
Barbara Mintzes
Postdoctoral Fellow
Centre for Health Services and Policy Research
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC

References

1. Herxheimer A, Mintzes B. Antidepressants and adverse effects in young patients: uncovering the evidence [editorial]. *CMAJ* 2004;170(4):487-9.
2. Jureidini JN, Doecke CJ, Mansfield PR, Haby MM, Menkes DB, Tonkin AL. Efficacy and safety of antidepressants for children and adolescents. *BMJ* 2004;328:879-83.
3. Brown B, chair. *Opening the medicine cabinet. First report on health aspects of prescription drugs.* Report of the Standing Committee on Health. Ottawa: House of Commons; 2004 Apr. Available: www.parl.gc.ca/InfocomDoc/Documents/37/3/parlbus/commbus/house/reports/healrp01/healrp01-e.pdf (accessed 2004 Apr 13).
4. Medawar C, Hardon A. *Medicines out of control? Antidepressants and the conspiracy of goodwill*. Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers; 2004.

Competing interests: None declared.

DOI:10.1503/cmaj.1040647

[Dr. Garland responds:]

Mark Voysey has summarized the challenge facing physicians who treat depressed children. Two additional and more detailed critiques of the published and unpublished evidence[1,2] are now available, and these reports underscore the fact that our evidence base has been distorted by selective publication and interpretation of data. However, as Voysey points out, a practical approach is required, and this may include judicious prescription of medication in individual cases, particularly in the presence of anxiety disorders, with appropriate monitoring.[3] However, evidence-based psychological treatments such as cognitive behavioural therapy and interpersonal therapy[4] need to be made more available.

E. Jane Garland
Clinical Professor, Psychiatry
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC

References

1. Jureidini JN, Doecke CJ, Mansfield PR, Haby MM, Menkes DB, Tonkin AL. Efficacy and safety of antidepressants for children and adolescents. *BMJ* 2004;328:879-83.
2. Whittingdon CJ, Kendall T, Fonagy P, Cottrell D, Cotgrove A, Boddington E. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors in childhood depression: systematic review of published versus unpublished data. *Lancet* 2004;363:1335, 1341-5.
3. Garland EJ. Facing the evidence: antidepressant treatment in children and adolescents [editorial]. *CMAJ* 2004;170(4):489-91.
4. Lewinsohn PM, Clarke GN. Psychosocial treatments for adolescent depression. *Clin Psychol Rev* 1999;19:329-42.

Competing interests: Dr. Garland has received research funding from Pfizer and GlaxoSmithKline. A current CIHR-funded study has requested supplemental funding from Lundbeck.

DOI:10.1503/cmaj.1040687

The best type of trial

James Wright[1] asks why we do not do more large simple randomized controlled trials (RCTs) in Canada. To support his point, Wright alludes to the differing results in observational studies on hormone replacement therapy and the results obtained in the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) clinical trial.[2] However, as pointed out in a recent article by Garbe and Suissa,[3] there were some serious methodological concerns with the WHI trial. In particular, the high rate of unblinding of gynecologists in the study introduced the potential for detection bias.

Clinical trials are important and have their place. However, we should not neglect the power of observational studies in determining drug outcomes. There is longstanding evidence that the results of careful observational research are very close to those obtained in clinical trials.[4] The power of a clinical trial is its ability to control for unknown confounders through randomization. But randomization is not a guarantee — it merely means that on average the unknown confounders will be balanced.

In an era of limited resources for health research, we must realize that not every study can be a clinical trial and that observational studies can provide accurate answers to questions much faster than RCTs. This can be important for conditions that require lengthy periods of follow-up. The key is to ask the right question and then use the appropriate type of study to answer it.

J.A. Chris Delaney
Statistician
Division of Clinical Epidemiology
Royal Victoria Hospital
Montréal, Que.

References

1. Wright JM. Why don't we initiate more large simple randomized controlled trials? [editorial]. *CMAJ* 2003;169(11):1170-1.
2. Writing Group for the Women's Health Initiative Investigators. Risks and benefits of estrogen plus progestin in healthy postmenopausal women: principal results from the Women's Health Initiative randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2002;288:321-33.
3. Garbe E, Suissa S. Issues to debate on the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) study. *Hum Reprod* 2004;19(1):8-13.
4. Hlatky MA, Califf RM, Harrell FE Jr, Lee KL, Mark DB, Pryor DB. Comparison of predictions based on observational data with the results of randomized controlled clinical trials of coronary artery bypass surgery. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1988;11(2):237-45.

Competing interests: None declared.

DOI:10.1503/cmaj.1040320

James Wright[1] is mistaken in thinking that postmarketing conduct of a large simple RCT is the best way to resolve controversies associated with the introduction of new drugs. Such trials add more to the controversy than they resolve, as was the case with the ALLHAT study.[2]

Wright has missed fundamental deficiencies in megatrial methodology. The real-world RCT that he advocates would recruit a large and heterogeneous population, with few inclusion and exclusion criteria. The required simplicity is typically accomplished by not collecting clinical data that would allow analysis of important subgroups. The only outcome variable that can be better assessed in these heterogeneous conditions is eventual mortality, which may be low in some patient groups and of limited relevance in others.

Prior knowledge from both RCT