



3. Harris MI. Undiagnosed NIDDM: clinical and public health issues. *Diabetes Care* 1993;16:642-52.
4. Coutinho M, Gerstein HC, Wang Y, Yusuf S. The relationship between glucose and incident cardiovascular events: a metaregression analysis of published data from 20 studies of 95 783 individuals followed for 12.4 years. *Diabetes Care* 1999;22:233-40.
5. Tan MH, MacLean DR. Epidemiology of diabetes mellitus in Canada. *Clin Invest Med* 1995;18:240-6.
6. Harris MI, Flegal KM, Cowie CC, Eberhardt MS, Goldstein DE, Little RR, et al. Prevalence of diabetes, impaired fasting glucose and impaired glucose tolerance in US adults: the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1988-1994. *Diabetes Care* 1998;21:518-24.
7. Blake PG, Bloembergen WE, Fenton SS. Changes in the demographics and prescription of peritoneal dialysis during the last decade. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1998;32:44S-51S.
8. Fenton S, Desmeules M, Copleston P, Arbus G, Froment D, Jeffery J, et al. Renal replacement therapy in Canada: a report from the Canadian Organ Replacement Register. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1995;25:134-50.
9. Klein R, Klein BEK. Vision disorders in diabetes. In: Harris MI, Cowie CC, Stern MP, Boyko EJ, Reiber GE, Bennett PH, eds. *Diabetes in America*, 2nd ed. Bethesda (MD): National Institutes of Health; 1995. p. 293-338.
10. Reiber GE, Boyko EJ, Smith DG. Lower extremity foot ulcers and amputations in diabetes. In: Harris MI, Cowie CC, Stern MP, Boyko EJ, Reiber GE, Bennett PH, eds. *Diabetes in America*, 2nd ed. National Institutes of Health; 1995. p. 409-28.
11. Kannel WB, McGee DL. Diabetes and cardiovascular disease: the Framingham study. *JAMA* 1979;241:2035-8.
12. Fuller JH, Shipley MJ, Rose G, Jarrett RJ, Keen H. Mortality from coronary heart disease and stroke in relation to degree of glycemia: the Whitehall study. *Br Med J Clin Res Ed* 1983;287:867-70.
13. Barrett-Connor E, Cohn BA, Wingard DL, Edelstein SL. Why is diabetes mellitus a stronger risk factor for fatal ischemic heart disease in women than in men? The Rancho Bernardo Study. *JAMA* 1991;265:627-31.
14. Goldbourt U, Yaari S, Medalie JH. Factors predictive of long-term coronary heart disease mortality among 10 059 male Israeli civil servants and municipal employees. A 23 year mortality follow-up in the Israeli Ischemic Heart Disease Study. *Cardiology* 1993;82:100-21.
15. Manson JE, Colditz GA, Stampfer MJ, Willet WC, Krowleski AS, Rosner B, et al. A prospective study of maturity-onset diabetes mellitus and risk of coronary heart disease and stroke in women. *Arch Intern Med* 1991;151:1141-7.
16. Morrish NJ, Stevens LK, Fuller JH, Keen H, Jarrett RJ. Incidence of macrovascular disease in diabetes mellitus: the London follow-up to the WHO multinational study of vascular disease in diabetics. *Diabetologia* 1991;34:584-9.
17. Stamler J, Vaccaro O, Neaton JD, Wentworth D. Diabetes, other risk factors, and 12-year cardiovascular mortality for men screened in the Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial. *Diabetes Care* 1993;16:434-4.
18. ETDRS investigators. Aspirin effects on mortality and morbidity in patients with diabetes mellitus. Early treatment of diabetic retinopathy study report 14. *JAMA* 1992;266:1292-300.
19. Damsgaard EM, Froland A, Jorgensen OD, Mogensen CE. Eight to nine year mortality in known non-insulin dependent diabetes and controls. *Kidney Int* 1992;42:731-5.
20. Dinneen SF, Gerstein HC. The association of microalbuminuria and mortality in non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *Arch Intern Med* 1997;157:1413-8.
21. Meltzer S, Leiter L, Daneman D, Gerstein HC, Lau D, Ludwig S, et al. 1998 clinical practice guidelines for the management of diabetes in Canada. *CMAJ* 1998;159(8 Suppl):1S-29S.
22. Curb JD, Pressel SL, Cutler JA, Savage PJ, Applegate WB, Black H, et al., for the Systolic Hypertension in the Elderly Program Cooperative Research Group. Effect of diuretic-based antihypertensive treatment on cardiovascular disease risk in older diabetic patients with isolated systolic hypertension. *JAMA* 1996;276:1886-92.
23. Hansson L, Zanchetti A, Carruthers SG, Dahlof B, Elmfeldt D, Julius S, et al, and the HOT Study Group. Effects of intensive blood-pressure lowering and low-dose aspirin in patients with hypertension: principal results of the Hypertension Optimal Treatment (HOT) randomized trial. *Lancet* 1998;351:1755-62.
24. Pyorala K, Pedersen TR, Kjekshus J, Faergeman O, Olsson AG, Thorgeirsson G. Cholesterol lowering with simvastatin improves prognosis of diabetic patients with coronary heart disease. *Diabetes Care* 1997;20:614-20.
25. UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). *Lancet* 1998;352:837-53.
26. UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Tight blood pressure control and risk of macrovascular and microvascular complications in type 2 diabetes: UKPDS 38. *Br Med J* 1998;317:703-13.
27. Marshall KG. The folly of population screening for type 2 diabetes. *CMAJ* 1999;160(11):1592-3.
28. Gerstein HC. Preventive medicine in a diabetes clinic: an opportunity to make a difference. *Lancet* 1999;353:606-8.

Correspondence to: Dr. Hertzyl C. Gerstein, Department of Medicine, Rm. 3V38, 1200 Main St. W, Hamilton ON L8N 3Z5; fax 905 521-2100, ext. 3371; gerstein@fhs.csu.mcmaster.ca

Controversy

Rebuttal

Dr. Marshall responds:

The issue under discussion is not whether diabetes is the serious health problem that Drs. Gerstein and Meltzer have so lucidly described but whether screening the general population for this disease is a reasonable recommendation. Screening would be reasonable if benefits actually accrued from it and if these outweighed any harm. However, 3 important considerations lead me to conclude otherwise.

- No large clinical trials have been conducted to determine whether screening the general population for diabetes is beneficial. The recommendation of the Canadian Diabetes Association is based on opinion, not evidence.¹

- Should future trials prove that screening actually does have benefits, the chances of any one person achieving those benefits is small.²
- Screening is never innocuous, and the harm it induces may affect both individuals and society as a whole.

Physical harm from diabetes screening is related to venipuncture and is rarely serious. Being labelled as "diabetic" is a psychological trauma even if those concerned decide it is "worth it." Participating in screening programs takes time away from family, friends or work; this too is harm.³ A particularly serious adverse effect of screening is the influence it has on our society's value



system. Our collective concern with health has become obsessional.^{4,11} Phrases used to describe this attitude include: “death-denying culture,”⁶ “an unhealthy obsession with health,”⁷ “tyranny of health,”⁸ “coercive healthism,”⁹ “war on death”¹⁰ and “cultural imperialism.”¹¹ Meador states that the search for disease may lead to the elimination of wellness,⁵ while Barsky points out that, even though our health has improved immeasurably over the last few decades, our subjective conception of being well has diminished.⁴ Adding yet another screening program to the many already in existence will surely aggravate this problem.

The World Health Organization defines health as “physical, mental and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease and infirmity.”¹² There is no proof that screening the adult population for diabetes will improve well-being, but the process of doing so will almost certainly diminish it.

References

1. Canadian Task Force on the Periodic Health Examination. *The Canadian guide to clinical preventive health care*. Ottawa: Health Canada; 1994. p. 602-9.
2. Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. *Int J Epidemiol* 1985;14:32-8.
3. Marshall KG. Prevention. How much harm? How much benefit? 3. Physical, psychological and social harm. *CMAJ* 1996;155(2):169-76.
4. Barsky AJ. The paradox of health. *N Engl J Med* 1988;318:414-8.
5. Meador CK. The last well person. *N Engl J Med* 1994;330:440-1.
6. Annas GJ. Reframing the debate on health care reform by replacing our metaphors. *N Engl J Med* 1995;332:744-7.
7. Thomas L. Notes of a biology-watcher. The health-care system. *N Engl J Med* 1975;293:1245-6.
8. Fitzgerald FT. The tyranny of health. *N Engl J Med* 1994;331:196-8.
9. Scrabanek P. *The death of humane medicine and the rise of coercive healthism*. Bury Saint Edmunds (UK): Crowley Esmonde; 1994. p. 37-41.
10. Herman J. The ethics of prevention: old twists and new. *Br J Gen Pract* 1996;46:547-9.
11. Førde OH. Is imposing risk awareness cultural imperialism? *Soc Sci Med* 1998;47:1155-9.
12. World Health Organization. *Basic documents*, 35th ed. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1985.

Address for correspondence: see page 1593

Controversy

Rebuttal

Drs. Gerstein and Meltzer respond:

Dr. Marshall is correct to point out that there are no studies demonstrating the benefits of screening the general population for diabetes, or of comparing the benefits to the possible harms. It is precisely for that reason that the clinical practice guidelines specifically recommended *against* mass screening for type 2 diabetes (recommendation 13).¹ The guidelines did recommend that people over age 45 should have a fasting plasma glucose test every 3 years and that this be done more frequently in those at high risk for diabetes (recommendations 14-16). The reason for this seems clear: it is to identify people at risk for poor health outcomes and to institute simple interventions to mitigate these risks. That is, to practise preventive medicine.

Whereas it is true that unfortunate incidents such as needle-stick injuries can occur as a consequence of drawing blood for the fasting plasma glucose test, the risk of testing to any one patient is extremely small. Conversely, the benefit to that patient of preventive interventions, such as being taught to take better care of the feet (which has been shown to prevent subsequent amputation), or being referred for a

careful eye exam to detect retinopathy (which can be treated to prevent vision loss) are clearly greater.

Most people see their family physicians at some point during a 3-year period. Because something can be done to prevent the serious consequences of diabetes, the case for measuring a fasting plasma glucose level every 3 years is certainly as strong as the case for measuring blood pressure or taking a smoking history. We do agree that more research is needed to determine the harm of being labelled with a diagnosis of diabetes or, for that matter, being labelled as “hypertensive” or as “a smoker.” In the meantime, a process of judicious case-finding during routine visits of patients at high risk for diabetes is clearly justified.

Reference

1. Meltzer S, Leiter L, Daneman D, Gerstein HC, Lau D, Ludwig S, et al. 1998 clinical practice guidelines for the management of diabetes in Canada. *CMAJ* 1998;159:(8 Suppl) 1S-29S.

Address for correspondence: see page 1595