

EDITORIAL • RÉDACTION

Editor-in-Chief • Rédacteur en chef
John Hoey, MD

Associate Editor-in-Chief • Rédactrice en chef associée
Patricia Huston, MD, MPH

Book Review Editor • Rédactrice, recensions de livres
Catherine Younger-Lewis, MD

News and Features Editor • Rédacteur, informations générales
Patrick Sullivan

Editors • Rédactrices
Carolyn Joyce Brown, Jill Rafuse, H. Kate Schissler,
Anne Marie Todkill

Editorial Assistant • Assistante à la rédaction
Shirley M. Waddell

Manuscript Coordinators • Coordonnatrices des manuscrits
Carole Corkery, Lorna Lang

Translation Coordinator • Coordonnatrice de la traduction
Marie Saumure

Scientific Consultants • Conseillers scientifiques
Mary L. Chipman, BSc, MA, Thomas J. Elmslie, MD,
Derek Gellman, MD, Bart J. Harvey, MD, PhD,
David Moher, MSc, Linda Pederson, PhD

Contributing Editors • Rédactrices invitées
Gloria Baker, Charlotte Gray

**University-based Editorial Consultants
Conseillers universitaires en rédaction**
Leonello Cusan, MD, Université Laval
Christopher J. de Gara, MD, McMaster University
Kenneth M. Flegel, MD, McGill University
Candace Gibson, PhD, University of Western Ontario
Paul Hébert, MD, University of Ottawa
Norman M. Kneteman, MD, University of Alberta
Thomas J. Marrie, MD, Dalhousie University
Tewfik Nawar, MD, Université de Sherbrooke
J. Curtis Nickel, MD, Queen's University
William E.M. Pryse-Phillips, MD, Memorial University of Newfoundland
Margaret L. Russell, MD, University of Calgary
Yves R. Talbot, MD, University of Toronto
C. Peter W. Warren, MD, University of Manitoba
Thomas W. Wilson, MD, University of Saskatchewan
Robert F. Woollard, MD, University of British Columbia

**Associate Director, New Media
Directrice associée, nouveaux médias**
Ann Bolster

PRODUCTION

Production Manager • Gestionnaire de production
Kathryn A. Freamo

Production Assistants • Assistantes à la production
Nicole Barbeau, Julie-Line Danis, Lianne Johnson

Graphics Consultant • Conseiller graphique
Raymond Rocan

**Canadian Medical Association Journal
Journal de l'Association médicale
canadienne**

1867 prom. Alta Vista Dr.
Ottawa ON K1G 3Y6
613 731-9331, 800 267-9703
fax 613 523-0937
E-mail • Cour. élect. : pubs@cma.ca

<http://www.cma.ca/journals/cmaj>

Français à la page suivante



Should women aged 40–49 undergo annual screening mammography? Anthony B. Miller and associates tackled this question in a large randomized controlled trial¹ and found no evidence of benefit. The considerable controversy that ensued centred on the randomization strategy: Were women at higher risk of breast cancer more likely to have been randomized to the mammography arm of the study, thus accounting for the poor results of screening? Epidemiologists John Bailar and Brian MacMahon were asked by the National Cancer Institute and the University of Toronto to review the study's enrolment and randomization protocols; their report is published in this issue (page 193). In his review of their report, Norman F. Boyd (page 207) concludes that although Bailar and MacMahon present convincing arguments that name alterations in the allocation books could have had only a trivial effect on the trial results, they are far less compelling in excluding other opportunities for the deliberate subversion of randomization.

Multicentre randomized trials are essential to resolve pivotal questions in medicine, but they are difficult to design and even more difficult to carry out. The randomization procedure adopted for the National Breast Screening Study 20 years ago would not be used today. Effective randomization is not as simple as a flip of a coin, and many studies continue to suffer from difficulties with randomization.²

What should physicians do about screening mammography? Heather Bryant reminds us of the critical dis-

inction between screening and case-finding (page 213). On the one hand, screening recommendations must be based on clear evidence that the benefits of screening far exceed the harms. On the other, physicians and patients can determine whether mammography would be useful in a particular case. For some women aged 40–49 years, annual mammography makes sense.

Price increases on cigarettes make a difference, as Vivian H. Hamilton and colleagues show (page 187). As we go to press the irascible tobacco industry is lobbying hard against Health Minister David Dingwall's rather tame legislation to reduce the exposure of young lungs to the cancer-causing agents in cigarettes. Do not wobble, Mr. Dingwall.

Also in this issue, Logie Prize winner Tara Young describes her experiences with lying and deception in residency program applications (page 219). David M. Patrick describes a new, aggressive protocol for HIV prophylaxis after needle-stick injury (page 233). And, lastly, we draw your attention to Pulse, a new feature of *CMAJ*. Each instalment will contain an interesting piece of data and a brief interpretation. Look for it on the back page.—JH

References

1. Miller AB, Baines CJ, To T, Wall C. Canadian National Breast Screening Study: 1. Breast cancer detection and death rates among women aged 40 to 49 years. *Can Med Assoc J* 1992;147:1459-76.
2. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Grimes DA, Altman DG. Assessing the quality of randomization from reports of controlled trials published in obstetrics and gynecology journals. *JAMA* 1994;272:125-8.