lowing myocardial infarction was firmly established, like the causal association of oncogenic HPV strains, high-grade lesions and cervical cancer. Moreover, certain antiarrhythmic drugs were shown to suppress this ventricular ectopy, much as the HPV vaccine has been shown to decrease the risk for high-grade cervical lesions. However, later randomized trials showed that these antiarrhythmic drugs were associated not with an improved survival rate, but rather with a worsening one. These points would appear to reinforce the sagacious message of the commentary by Abby Lippman and colleagues that careful evaluation of the evidence, much still lacking, is required before intelligent decisions regarding public policy can be made.[2]

James M. Brophy MD PhD
Associate Professor of Medicine
McGill University
Montréal, Que.

Competing interests: None declared.

REFERENCES

1. Rambout L, Hopkins L, Hutton B, et al. Prophylactic vaccination against human papillomavirus infection and disease in women: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *CMAJ* 2007;177:469-79.
2. Lippman A, Melnychuk R, Shimmin C, et al. Human papillomavirus, vaccines and women's health: questions and cautions. *CMAJ* 2007;177:484-7.

DOI:10.1503/cmaj.1070128

The debate surrounding the HPV vaccine[1] might be characterized by 2 slogans: "Just do it" versus "What's the hurry?" The HPV vaccination program's supporters see any potential reductions in cervical cancer deaths as sufficient justification for starting the program immediately. Others point to unanswered questions about the real-world costs and the effectiveness and safety of a vaccination campaign, and they caution that we need to wait for better data.

There is a natural quasi-experiment on which Canada can capitalize, with 4 provinces (Ontario, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland and Labradour) serving as the early intervention group and the remaining provinces and territories as the delayed control group. As health authorities across the country set up patient registries to systematically track and monitor the results of their HPV vaccination programs, we can start to answer vital real-world questions about the uptake of vaccination programs, the rates and severity of adverse effects and the impacts of the new vaccination initiatives on rates of Pap smear screening. Jurisdictions in the delayed control group can use the lessons learned by the early intervention group to refine their programs before they are launched, and we will be able to compare the experiences of the 2 groups on a number of factors.

Using controlled delays to evaluate the effectiveness of health programs is not new. In 1946, when faced with a dire shortage of streptomycin and a large number of patients with tuberculosis, British authorities randomly assigned patients to early or delayed intervention groups.[2] The drug shortage coupled with the scientific uncertainty about the overall benefits and risks of streptomycin, created an experimental situation and thus produced vital information to optimize treatment.

Implementing HPV vaccination programs at different times in Canada may not be the ideal "organized implementation infrastructure"[3] for which some in the oncology community have called, but why not let pragmatism rule the day? We can learn from the experience of early adopters and gather and analyze new real-world data on the vaccination programs as they become available. For any rigorous evaluation program to be successful, health planners must coordinate their activities and set up the right data systems to capitalize on Canada's natural quasi-experiment.

Alan K. Cassels MPA
University of Victoria
Victoria, BC

Competing interests: None declared.

REFERENCES

1. Lippman A, Melnychuk R, Shimmin C, et al. Human papillomavirus, vaccines and women's health: questions and cautions. *CMAJ* 2007;177:484-7.
2. Hart DP. A change in scientific approach: from alternation to randomized allocation in clinical trials in the 1940s. *BMJ* 1999;319:572-3.
3. Fung-Kee-Fung M, Rosen B, Murphy J, et al. HPV vaccine: a new era in cervical cancer prevention. *Globe and Mail* [Toronto] 2007 Sep 11;Sect A:21.

DOI:10.1503/cmaj.1070129

The commentary by Abby Lippman and colleagues on the planned vaccination of Canadian girls aged 9–13 years with the HPV vaccine raises "questions and cautions"[1] for physicians, parents and citizens of Canada. As a physician who trained in the late 1970s with gynecologic-oncologist Hugh Allen, I have witnessed both the devastating effects of advanced cervical carcinoma[2] and the dramatic reduction in the incidence of this disease with Pap smear screening.[3] As a parent, I would worry that if I had a daughter aged 9–13 years (I have sons) she could not give informed consent to HPV vaccination by herself.[4] Predicated on my expectation that she could be educated about the importance of Pap smear screening and safe sexual practices and would comply at least with Pap smear screening, I would advise her that HPV vaccination was not necessarily in her best interest. As a citizen, I believe that funding for women's health promotion should be directed to improving educational initiatives about Pap smear screening and safe sexual practices and to starting a public education campaign concerning the largely preventable breast and ovarian cancers related to the *BRCA* gene mutations,[5] which are much more common killers of women than cervical cancer.

As a physician, parent and citizen, I support vaccination for herd immunity;[6] however, my obligation to my daughter would supersede my obligation to others. When one of my patients asks, "What would you do if I (or my daughter) was your daughter?" I usually respond, "But you are not my daughter (or wife or sister)." In this case, however, I would respond, "I would be uncomfortable with you being vaccinated against HPV at this time."

Jeff Nisker MD PhD
Professor
Departments of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Oncology
Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry
University of Western Ontario
London, Ont.

Competing interests: None declared.