principles” or “social determinants of health” strike us as romantic but impracticable notions. To quote Kingsley Davis from 1956:

[It] seems clear that the great reduction of mortality in underdeveloped areas since 1940 has been brought about mainly by the discovery of new methods of disease treatment applicable at reasonable cost [and] by the diffusion of these new methods ... The reduction could be rapid because it did not depend on general economic development or social modernization ... Though in the literature on public health there is still great lip service paid to the necessity of general economic improvement and community welfare in the control of disease, the truth is that many scourges can be stamped out with none of this...
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The study of NOELs

As a member of the Biological Lecturers of Western Ontario (BLOW), I must respond to the study by Kenneth Rockwood and colleagues.1

I was frankly appalled at the aspersions cast upon the venerable tweed jacket. I can state categorically that while lecturing over many years, I have observed frequent NOELs (nod-off episodes per lecture) in my classes — whether or not I was wearing tweed! Nor should the authors seek to discredit our little friends, the insect-like creatures (ILC), who so nobly inhabit our tweed vestments.

The authors know (or ought to know) that there have been no well-defined, published studies (single-, 1/2- or double-blinded) linking ILC dander to cerebral dysfunction. In fact, I am aware of a preliminary report (personal communication) using an innovative “triple-blinded” study design (both researchers and subjects were blinded, while the ILCs were fitted with bilateral, opaque compound-eye patches) that suggests for the first time that the dander is actually linked to vasodilatation in the basal ganglia, corpus callosum and elbows of those exposed. The implication for the study of upper-extremity, crossover movement disorders in tweed-wearing BLOWs is, of course, enormous.

Blame for NOELs should be placed squarely where it belongs: on the backs (or more precisely, on the back of the necks) of those in our audiences who persist in nodding off.

My own personal theory is that this tendency is actually due to hyperactive stretch reflexes (HSR) in the posterior paracervical musculature (PCM) of those in the medical community who are given to nodding off. Therefore, rather than sacrificing BLOWs or ILCs, it might be far more beneficial to sacrifice a few of the more compulsive nodders among our medical students — perhaps circumventing the thorny issue of ethical approval. Information thus obtained might allow the scientific evaluation of the twitch capabilities (TC) of the affected posterior muscle spindles (PMS).

Establishing the appropriate control group for this study will of course be critical. I agree with Rockwood and colleagues that it would be most appropriate to use as control subjects physician-blaming nodders. Perhaps a prospective, longitudinal trial should be undertaken to determine whether administrators, politicians or lawyers would be best suited. Ideally this study would last for 20 years or more; if well publicized, it could have the added benefit of reducing the frequency of nodding off within those groups. Yet such an outcome may be pure fantasy if the protocol fails to distinguish between simple nodders and those administrators and politicians who can sleep with open eyes and still heads (OESH). Under these circumstances any available data would be classed as superficial, unnecessary clinical knowledge (SUCK).

Finally, funding for such a trial could be pursued through the Canadian Medical Protective Association — at arms’ length of course, lest any of the associated tweed-wearing lawyers (TWL) also demonstrate upper-extremity, crossover movement disorders during their closing arguments.

John C. Clifford
Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
University of Western Ontario
London, Ont.
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Kenneth Rockwood and colleagues are to be congratulated for highlighting the problem of nodding off during scientific sessions, an unfortunate condition common among doctors.
and health care professionals that has until now been ignored in the medical literature. The authors have, however, overlooked 2 issues related to dress: the sex of the lecturer (and thus the location of high-risk fabrics such as tweed) and the presence of a bow tie.

In the interests of science, I attempted to test the theory of Rockwood and colleagues by creating a high risk of NOELs for undergraduate students at King’s College London attending a lecture on the role of dietitians in the media. The wearing of a tweed skirt (gored panels, slimming design, midcalf length) failed to generate a NOEL response, despite postprandial timing and a warm environment. Anecdotally, therefore, the wearing of tweed below the waistband cannot be considered a high risk factor for NOELs.

The presence of a bow tie — a not-uncommon occurrence among British general surgeons, psychiatrists and the occasional rheumatologist (thankfully confined to consultant grades) — is a variable risk factor, representing either a character of whimsy (low NOEL risk) or an über-bore (high NOEL risk). As such, this easily visualized appendage requires consideration as a confounding factor (although it may be a uniquely European sartorial aberration).

Catherine Collins  
Chief Dietitian  
St. George’s Hospital  
London, England
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[One of the authors responds:]

I contacted my coauthors about replying to these letters, but Christopher Patterson nodded off shortly after I began speaking to him, and David Hogan, who lives in Calgary, appears to have been kept awake only by his sense of grievance at other Canadians.

To be fair, he shares these fulminations with his compatriot Albertans; apparently it is the chief consequence of their daily increasing wealth. I thus write on my own.

I could not understand why John Clifford should be so appalled at our conclusions about the deleterious effect of tweed wearing; surely he appreciates the difficulty in generalizing from clinical studies, so there is no need to take it personally. On the other hand, as a bow tie wearer myself, I find Catherine Collins’s suggestion that such sartorial splendor somehow signals that I am an über-bore appalling and outrageous. I’d say more, but as a lowly Canadian geriatrician I know that I could never scale the height achieved by a British consultant to look down on others, so I will leave it at that.

Thomas Fuhrman’s suggestion of an electrical device, especially one that is bothersome to subjects and might be vaguely dangerous, is excellent. Such instrumentation would be an important advance in making this area of inquiry respectable. Indeed, it might even lead to a billable procedure, which is of course the fantasy of all geriatricians, especially if we could begin by studying interventionists or hostile reviewers.

Kenneth Rockwood  
Dalhousie University  
Halifax, NS
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