



deed serve as a blank, not a negative control. Both positive and negative controls were routinely performed for each ELISA assay, with sera from patients with and without biopsy-proven celiac disease respectively. Furthermore, serum from a borderline serologically positive patient was also used, to verify inter-assay variability.

The optimal cutoff points were established previously by pilot studies in a similar pediatric population at our institution. Our paper describes a cohort of 176 children studied prospectively between 1992 and 1995 to test the discriminative ability of those cutoff limits.

Clearly if another laboratory used our assay and altered the conditions in any way (e.g., use of another manufacturer's ELISA plates, antibodies or substrate), new cutoff points would have to be established and validated for the population under study. We routinely check the variation in results obtained whenever the lot of immunoglobulins is changed and even when a new batch of buffers is prepared. Moreover, we stress that our results pertain to children. The cutoff points we established might not apply to adults.

The sensitivity of our ELISA (as presented in Table 2) was 93%, not 70%. Furthermore, clinicians normally consider the negative predictive value of a screening test when decid-

ing to terminate investigations in a particular patient. In our study, the negative predictive value for IgA and IgG antigliadin antibodies was 98%. Nevertheless, duodenal biopsy should always be performed when there is a strong suspicion of celiac disease. No laboratory test is 100% accurate.

**Ernest G. Seidman, MD**

Chief, Division of Gastroenterology  
Hôpital Sainte-Justine  
Professor  
Department of Pediatrics  
Université de Montréal  
Montreal, Que.

**Lucie J. Chartrand, RD, MSc**

Research Associate  
Centre de recherche  
Hôpital Sainte-Justine  
Montreal, Que.

## BC's physician-patient ratio

Lynda Buske's article, "Physician supply: A change in direction?" (*Can Med Assoc J* 1997;157[3]:348), was interesting. However, because elderly patients make more visits to the doctor, it might be useful to rework the data to show the number of doctors relative to older patients — say those older than 60 years. In the case of British Columbia, we might find that there has not been an increase in the number of physicians relative to the number of elderly patients and

that the province did not have more than its share of physicians.

**J. Donald Longley, MD**

Salt Spring Island, BC

### [The author responds:]

I calculated the proportion of the population over age 60 as of July 1, 1996.<sup>1</sup> BC's proportion stood at 16.8%, which is close to the national average of 16.4% and lower than the proportion in 4 other provinces. Interprovincial migration statistics<sup>2</sup> (see *Can Med Assoc J* 1997;157[10]:1492) indicate that BC has traditionally recorded higher net gains of active physicians than other provinces. From 1990 to 1995, BC's average annual gain was 118 active physicians who had moved from other provinces or territories, which represents a net gain of 707 physicians for the period.

**Lynda Buske, BSc**

Chief  
Physician Resources Information  
and Planning  
Canadian Medical Association  
Ottawa, Ont.

### References

1. *Health reports*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada; Autumn 1997.
2. Canadian Institute for Health Information. *Southern medical database: international and interprovincial migration of physicians, Canada, 1970 to 1995*. Ottawa: The Institute; 1997.

### Submitting letters

Letters must be submitted by mail, courier or email, not by fax. They must be signed by all authors and limited to 300 words in length. Letters that refer to articles must be received within 2 months of the publication of the article. *CMAJ* corresponds only with the authors of accepted letters. Letters are subject to editing and abridgement.

### Note to email users

Email should be addressed to [pubs@cma.ca](mailto:pubs@cma.ca) and should indicate "Letter to the editor of *CMAJ*" in the subject line. A signed copy must be sent subsequently to *CMAJ* by fax or regular mail. Accepted letters sent by email appear in the Readers' Forum of *CMA Online* immediately, as well as being published in a subsequent issue of the journal.

### Pour écrire à la rédaction

Prière de faire parvenir vos lettres par la poste, par messenger ou par courrier électronique, et non par télécopieur. Chaque lettre doit porter la signature de tous ses auteurs et avoir au maximum 300 mots. Les lettres se rapportant à un article doivent nous parvenir dans les 2 mois de la publication de l'article en question. Le *JAMC* ne correspond qu'avec les auteurs des lettres acceptées pour publication. Les lettres acceptées seront révisées et pourront être raccourcies.

### Aux usagers du courrier électronique

Les messages électroniques doivent être envoyés à l'adresse [pubs@cma.ca](mailto:pubs@cma.ca). Veuillez écrire «Lettre à la rédaction du *JAMC*» à la ligne «Subject». Il faut envoyer ensuite, par télécopieur ou par la poste, une lettre signée pour confirmer le message électronique. Une fois une lettre reçue par courrier électronique acceptée pour publication, elle paraîtra dans la chronique «Tribune des lecteurs du *JAMC*» d'*AMC En direct* tout de suite, ainsi que dans un numéro prochain du journal.