

Length of injecting career and choice of drug were not associated with an inadvertent injection. These findings suggest that a significant number of injection drug users in Montreal, particularly women and older users, are at risk for toxin-mediated fatal infections if contaminated heroin enters the market, even if only intravenous injections are planned.

Because smoking is a less cost-effective route of heroin administration than injection, many users are unlikely to follow the advice to switch to smoking. Serious consideration should be given to encouraging physicians to prescribe sterile injection equipment,<sup>4</sup> to increasing treatment slots, to setting up injection rooms staffed by nurses who can provide advice on safe injection techniques, to conducting clinical trials of medical-quality heroin in people for whom methadone substitution has failed and to instituting strictly supervised

heroin, diamorphine or buprenorphine prescription programs for long-term injectors.<sup>5</sup> This would reduce the risk of life-threatening infection from nonsterilized drugs, prevent overdose from heroin of unknown purity, break the link between drug use and criminal activity to acquire drugs and decrease the number of injections in public places.

**Catherine Hankins**

**Darlene Palmer**

**Ravinder Singh**

Montreal Regional Public Health  
Department  
Department of Epidemiology  
and Biostatistics  
McGill University  
Montreal, Que.

#### References

1. Unexplained illness and death among injection drug users — Glasgow, Scotland, Dublin, Ireland and England, April–June 2000. *MMWR* 2000;49:489-92.
2. Update: *Clostridium novyi* and unexplained illness

among injecting drug users — Scotland, Ireland and England, April–June 2000. *MMWR* 2000;49:543-5.

3. Ahmed S. Unexplained illness among drug injectors in Glasgow. *Eurosurveill Wkly* 2000;4(20):000518. Available: [www.euroserv.org/2000/000518.htm](http://www.euroserv.org/2000/000518.htm) (accessed 2000 Oct 24).
4. Burris S, Lurie P, Abrahamson D, Rich JD. Physician prescribing of sterile injection equipment to prevent HIV infection: time for action. *Ann Intern Med* 2000;133:218-26.
5. Uchtenhagen A, Gutzwiller F, Dobler-Mikola A, editors. *Medical prescriptions of narcotics research programme: final report of the principal investigators*. Zurich: Institute for Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Zurich; 1998.

## An author by any other name

I enjoyed the commentary describing the revised author-declaration rules in the Sept. 19th issue.<sup>1</sup> From the description of Attila Lorincz's contribution to the article on human papillomavirus DNA testing in the same issue,<sup>2</sup> I am uncertain of the justification for Lorincz's inclusion as a coauthor.

Did I overlook a key piece of information? Or were you just testing to see if your readers are paying attention?

Of course, this raises another question: Are journal editors and their staff (and peer reviewers) now going to be expected to review the authors' contributions and decide whether each of the proposed authors should be listed, or will this responsibility fall to the group of proposed authors (an honour system)?

#### Bart Harvey

Department of Public Health Sciences  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ont.

#### References

1. Hoey J. Who wrote this paper anyway? [commentary]. *CMAJ* 2000;163(6):716-7.
2. Lytwyn A, Sellors JW, Mahony JB, Daya D, Chapman W, Ellis N, et al. Comparison of human papillomavirus DNA testing and repeat Papnicolaou test in women with low-grade cervical cytologic abnormalities: a randomized trial. *CMAJ* 2000;163(6):701-7.

#### [The editor of *CMAJ* responds:]

A tip of our hat to Bart Harvey — we missed that one. Attila Lorincz did in fact meet the revised authorship criteria of the Vancouver Group.<sup>1</sup> However, he neglected to inform us that he participated in the design and analysis of the study as well as providing a critical review of the manuscript,<sup>2</sup> thus qualifying him for authorship.

We will be more vigilant; editors can and should raise questions when they suspect that authorship criteria have been violated. But, as Harvey suggests, the main responsibility for ensuring that the authorship criteria are met lies with the authors.

#### John Hoey

#### References

1. Hoey J. Who wrote this paper anyway? [commentary]. *CMAJ* 2000;163(6):716-7.
2. Lytwyn A, Sellors JW, Mahony JB, Daya D, Chapman W, Ellis N, et al. Comparison of hu-

man papillomavirus DNA testing and repeat Papnicolaou test in women with low-grade cervical cytologic abnormalities: a randomized trial. *CMAJ* 2000;163(6):701-7.

#### Corrections

Because of an autohyphenation problem, some readers may have been misled by a URL that appeared in a recent On the Net column.<sup>1</sup> The correct URL for Healthy PalmPilot is [www.healthypalmpilot.com](http://www.healthypalmpilot.com).

#### Reference

1. O'Reilly M. Worshipping at the altar of the Palm Pilot. *CMAJ* 2000;163(8):1036.

Staff Barootes attended medical School at the University of Toronto. Incorrect information appeared in a death notice in the Sept. 19 issue.<sup>1</sup>

#### Reference

1. Deaths. *CMAJ* 2000;163(6):795.