Screening for type 2 diabetes

It seems that an examination of clinical practice guidelines while chanting the mantra of evidence-based medicine could provide endless fodder for your recently initiated Controversy section. Kenneth Marshall's contribution[1] on one of the Canadian Diabetes Association's guidelines,[2] in which all recommendations have been carefully rated according to the available evidence, demonstrates how easy it is to fuel such a discussion.

Marshall,[1] and Hertzel Gerstein and Sara Meltzer in their reply,[3] cite the UK Prospective Diabetes Study[4] as a critical trial. Marshall failed to recognize that the population recruited to this study reflects those who would be identified by a "screening" process (i.e., patients with newly diagnosed diabetes). They were subsequently managed in a very practical fashion that is replicated daily in physicians' offices and diabetes centres. Furthermore, the trial demonstrates the insidious progression of glucose intolerance with time, suggesting a potential benefit of early intervention. Glycemic control deteriorated in the UK Prospective Diabetes Study, even in patients in the intensive treatment policy group, whose glycosylated hemoglobin level had returned to pretreatment values by 6 years, yet a clear difference in the rate of microvascular complications still emerged. Treatment strategies were constrained by the goals of the study to examine effects of diabetes monotherapy until marked hyperglycemia developed. Surely a "ray of hope," to borrow Marshall's phrase, is the possibility that better control than this can lead to even greater reductions in complication rates. The effects of antihypertensive therapy in these newly diagnosed patients were equally impressive.[5]

Labelling an individual as having diabetes undoubtedly has adverse psychological potential that we should attempt to avoid. An enlightened approach to patient education, based on the accepted interpretation of clinical trial results for glycemic control, lipid-lowering and antihypertensive therapies in diabetes, should help to bring a more positive attitude to the diagnosis. Marshall's harsh denial that these therapies can improve the quality of life for a person diagnosed with diabetes is unjust, as is his unsupported contention that "screening will do a great deal of harm."

In our practice of medicine we remain in a state of overall evidence deficit. Taking a nihilistic approach while waiting for this deficit to be completely remedied hampers the progress of clinical research and the process of patient care. The Canadian Diabetes Association's guidelines recognize this with their careful rating of evidence to support recommendations.

Alun Edwards, MB
Medical Director
CRHA Regional Diabetes Centre
Calgary, Alta.

References

1. Marshall KG. The folly of population screening for type 2 diabetes. *CMAJ* 1999;160(11)1592-3.
2. 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):S1-S29.
3. Gerstein HC, Meltzer S. Preventive medicine in people at high risk for chronic disease: the value of identifying and treating diabetes. *CMAJ* 1999;160(11):1593-5.
4. UK Prospective Diabetes Study 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.
5. UK Prospective Diabetes Study Group. Tight blood pressure control and risk of macrovascular and microvascular complications in type 2 diabetes. *BMJ* 1998;317:703-13.

This is in response to the Controversy articles concerning type 2 diabetes.[1,2] I agree with Kenneth Marshall that screening for type 2 diabetes is largely unnecessary. Insulin resistance, which is at the early end of the spectrum of type 2 diabetes, is marked by features that are easily observed, including a tendency to be shaped like an apple despite exercise or unsupervised calorie restriction or both, bloating, indigestion, shakiness before meals, sleepiness after meals, intermittent swelling of the hands and feet with ring tightening, and frequent momentary light-headedness when standing up from a reclining position.

The North American epidemic of "diabesity" (type 2 diabetes plus obesity, otherwise known as the insulin resistance syndrome) is affecting a growing proportion of the population. This disorder, which is fully reversible in its early stages, is not being adequately acknowledged or dealt with in a unified manner by the health care system. I do not agree with the assumption that very few people are able to achieve and maintain weight loss. If there was a consensus among physicians to get serious about helping patients to lose weight the profession would be well on the way to dealing with roots of problems rather than tips of icebergs.

Unfortunately, physicians have been provided with guidelines for disease management of a condition that is totally reversible. Clinical practice guidelines need to be completely rethought. Experts in this field inadvertently per-

petuate the disease-management industry by quarreling (entertaining controversies and rebuttals) over mostly self-serving conceptual differences instead of aiming for some consensus that can be readily accepted and applied to improve public health. This is highly unbecoming of medical science.

Wally Shishkov, MD
Guelph, Ont.

References

1. Marshall KG. The folly of population screening for type 2 diabetes. *CMAJ* 1999;160(11)1592-3.
2. Gerstein HC, Meltzer S. Preventive medicine in people at high risk for chronic disease: the value of identifying and treating diabetes. *CMAJ* 1999;160(11):1593-5.

[The author responds:]

I agree with Wally Shishkov that the most common precipitant of type 2 diabetes is obesity and that it would be a major public health triumph to reverse its ever-increasing prevalence in our society. Shishkov believes that long-term weight loss is achievable for many people. I hope he is right, but evidence published to date does not support this view.[1]

Alun Edwards objects to my "harsh denial" of the value of controlling glucose, lipids and hypertension in diabetic patients; in fact, I wrote that such patients should be "vigorously treated for all detected risk factors." He also suggests that my statement that "screening will do a great deal of harm" is unsupported, yet I provided numerous supporting references in my article.

Edwards appears to be ambivalent about evidence-based medicine. The phrase "chanting the mantra of evidence-based medicine" in his opening sentence suggests a pejorative view of the subject, yet in his closing sentence he lauds the Canadian Diabetes Association's "careful rating of evidence to support recommendations." If he is in favour of evidence he should know that the Canadian Diabetes Association gave a grade of D to screening for diabetes.[2] This grade means that the recommendation is supported by opinion, not randomized clinical trials.

Edwards considers me a nihilist. I think a more accurate description of my attitude would be "snail," as used by Sackett and Holland[3] to describe physicians who in uncertain situations avoid interventions that may cause harm. In contrast to "snails," "evangelists" intervene in similar circumstances because it is possible that doing so will prove beneficial. Stephenson[4] uses the terms "minimalist" and "maximalist" for these opposing views. Those of the minimalist school believe that patient care must be based on evidence and that the detrimental effects of interventions must be seriously weighed in order to avoid harming patients; those of the maximalist school believe that one should always try to prevent the worst possible eventuality, that interventions are beneficial and that they do not have serious side effects. Both "snails" and "evangelists" want to help their patients, but their ways of doing so follow different paths.

Kenneth G. Marshall, MD, MSc
Professor of Family Medicine (Retired)
University of Western Ontario
London, Ont.

References

1. Foreyt J, Goodrick K. The ultimate triumph of obesity [editorial]. *Lancet* 1995;346:134-5.
2. 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):S1-S29.
3. Sackett DL, Holland WW. Controversy in the detection of disease. *Lancet* 1975;2:357-9.
4. Stephenson MJ. Gestational diabetes mellitus [editorial]. *Can Fam Physician* 1993;39:745-8.

Difficult decisions for long-term tube-feeding

We read with interest the recent article by Susan Mitchell and Fiona Lawson on decision-making for long-term tube-feeding in cognitively impaired elderly people.[1] We have made similar observations,[2–4] mostly with elderly or cognitively impaired people, and we have interviewed substitute decision-makers prospectively. We have attempted to study situations in which substitute decision-makers declined tube-feeding, as suggested by Margaret Brockett in the accompanying editorial,[5] but we were unable to identify any such circumstance in 18 months of study at 2 large urban hospitals.

The need to improve the decision-making process is underscored by the observation that some substitute decision-makers regret their decision after they have experienced the long-term outcome and that a substantial number would not choose the same intervention for themselves if they were in a similar situation. Emotional factors and deeply ingrained societal values play an important role in these situations. Providing food is a core value in a nurturing society, and the decision to forgo nutritional support is tantamount to deciding that a loved one will die. There is often a desperate hope for a miraculous recovery or that some new medical breakthrough will eventually result in a cure.

Nutritional support is less easily per-

Pour écrire à la rédaction

Prière de faire parvenir vos lettres par la poste, par messager, par courrier électronique ou 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**. 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* (**www.cma.ca**) tout de suite, ainsi que dans un numéro prochain du journal.