Response to: Vision and drivers—a South Wales survey

Dear Sirs,

In an increasingly mobile and ageing population road safety considerations are vital to reduce deaths and injuries resulting from road traffic accidents. Anuradha et al. have recognized the potential benefits of measuring visual acuity at the roadside as a method of assessing true levels of impaired vision in motorcar users. We acknowledge the difficulties facing a small department when undertaking such a survey and the authors recognized many of the methodological limitations caused by the setting and a cross-sectional survey. However, the randomized recruitment of drivers could have been defined more clearly. For example, the investigators may have introduced selection biases by choice of vehicle type, colour and condition.

The extrapolation figures should have been quoted more cautiously because the sample had 7.5% more people aged 60 or over and 12.6% fewer people aged less than 39 years than the general licence holder population in Wales. A larger study is required to address such issues as different times of day, months of the year and driving conditions. More fundamentally, we question whether the DVLA guidelines should be under reconsideration to include not only visual acuity but reaction times, ability to anticipate events and other factors related to experience.
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Causal pathway analysis of mothers’ responses to government advice on peanut avoidance

Sirs,

In 1998, the UK Government’s Chief Medical Officer’s Committee on Toxicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (COT) recommended that women who are atopic may wish to avoid peanuts during pregnancy and lactation. In a previous paper, we presented findings produced by the first school cohort study (2003–2005) undertaken after the advice was issued. In two UK cities, 1072 mother–child pairs were studied by means of maternal interview and skin prick testing (SPT) of children in school. Formal peanut challenges were offered to children with positive SPTs to peanut. About 44% of mothers and 37% of fathers were atopic. Our results showed that the UK government’s advice had no clear impact on peanut allergy prevalence at school entry, which was 1.8% (peanut sensitisation was 2.8%) by 2003–2004, the highest prevalence estimate for peanut allergy in children yet recorded. According to our findings, peanut allergy now affects one child in 55 of British children at school entry.

It remains uncertain if peanut avoidance during pregnancy and breastfeeding has any effect on the prevalence of peanut allergy in children. This uncertainty partly stems from our finding that although 61% of mothers recalled hearing the advice, only 3.5% of mothers stopped consuming peanuts while pregnant or breastfeeding.

In the present study, we further analysed previous data to explore (i) what, if any, are the major barriers to compliance with government advice, (ii) possible moderating variables in the pathway between receiving advice and compliance. Path analysis was conducted using MPlus, which can accommodate dichotomous variables (Fig. I).

We found no differences between high risk and low risk mothers in recall of advice or on level of peanut consumption before pregnancy or breastfeeding (z = −1.21 to −1.43, P > 0.05). A causal pathway (only significant predictors following a series of logistic regression analysis were retained) clearly shows a direct impact of level of peanut consumption before pregnancy on consumption during pregnancy and breastfeeding. Thus, there is compliance with advice only if peanut consumption is already low before the first antenatal appointment.

The model shows that prior level of peanut consumption is the most important barrier to compliance with COT advice. The direct effects of PNC before antenatal appointment on peanut consumption during pregnancy (0.54) and breastfeeding (0.35) can be compared to the product of the indirect effects, through COT advice, of peanut consumption during pregnancy (0.005) and the indirect effects through COT advice, delivered by a midwife or health visitor (0.017). The total causal effects of PNC before antenatal appointment on peanut consumption during pregnancy is 0.55 and on peanut consumption during breastfeeding is 0.37.

One of the key points in an intervention is its delivery/communication. In the pathway between recommendation and outcome there were two critical points worth noting.
The first occurred during pregnancy when mothers initially encountered advice. Since the level of consumption of peanuts before pregnancy has the strongest direct impact on compliance with COT advice during pregnancy, uncertainty concerning the benefits of avoiding peanuts completely (low response efficacy), may have resulted in mothers calculating the costs as exceeding the benefits. When communicating the information, GPs themselves may not have been convinced of the relevance and effectiveness of the COT recommendations.

At the second critical point in the intervention trajectory, following birth of the child, the information was particularly relevant, and meaningful. Emotive factors may also have amplified the perceived risk. Delivery of the COT recommendations was enhanced by its communication by midwives to mothers who intended to, and did, breastfeed exclusively.

The data used in this study is retrospective and based on self-report. However, our findings suggest future research on risk advice should incorporate the following: (i) the incorporation of a conceptual model based on disease-specific empirical research so that the appropriate variables can be measured and the optimal interventions can be tested; (ii) the inclusion of psychological and social factors that influence the ways in which patients respond to risk information; (iii) careful measurement of relevant moderator and mediator variables, in order that responsive subgroups become known.
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