Alcohol dependence affects 4% of people aged between 16 and 65 years in England (6% of men and 2% of women), and over 26% of all adults (38% of men and 16% of women) consume alcohol in a way that is potentially or actually harmful to their health or wellbeing. Yet currently only 6% of people who are alcohol dependent receive treatment. Alcohol dependence is characterised by withdrawal, craving, impaired control, and tolerance of alcohol and is associated with a higher rate of mental and physical illness and a wide range of social problems. Harmful drinking is a pattern of alcohol consumption that can lead to psychological problems such as depression, accidents, injuries, and physical health problems such as pancreatitis. Alcohol misuse is also an increasing problem in children and young people, with over 24,000 treated in the NHS for alcohol related problems in 2008 and 2009. Hospital admissions related to alcohol consumption increased by 81% between 2003 and 2009. Harmful drinking and alcohol dependence therefore represent a considerable burden to individuals, their families, and wider society.

This article summarises the most recent recommendations from the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) on the diagnosis, assessment, and management of harmful drinking and alcohol dependence. This should assess multiple areas of need, be structured in a clinical interview, and cover:

- Alcohol use, including consumption and patterns of drinking; severity of dependence (using the severity of alcohol dependence questionnaire (SADQ) or Leeds dependence questionnaire (LDQ); and alcohol related problems (using the alcohol problems questionnaire (APQ))
- Misuse of other drugs, including over the counter medication
- Physical health problems
- Psychological and social problems
- Cognitive function (using, for example, the mini-mental state examination)
- Readiness and belief in ability to change.

All interventions for harmful drinking and alcohol dependence

- All interventions for harmful drinking and alcohol dependence should be delivered by appropriately trained and competent staff. Drug interventions should be administered by specialist and competent staff. Base psychological interventions on a relevant evidence based treatment manual, which should guide the structure and duration of the intervention.
- Carry out a motivational intervention as part of the initial assessment to help engage the person in treatment from first contact. The intervention should include helping people to recognise problems related to drinking and resolve ambivalence; encouraging positive change; and adopting a persuasive and supportive rather than argumentative and confrontational position.
- For all interventions, staff should:
  - Receive regular supervision from individuals competent in both the intervention and supervision
  - Routinely use outcome measurements to ensure that the person who misuses alcohol is involved in reviewing the effectiveness of their treatment
  - Monitor and evaluate the person’s adherence to the treatment and their own practice competence—

### Recommendations

NICE recommendations are based on systematic reviews of best available evidence and explicit consideration of cost effectiveness. When minimal evidence is available, recommendations are based on the Guideline Development Group’s experience and opinion of what constitutes good practice. Evidence levels for the recommendations are in the full version of this article on bmj.com.

### Identification and initial assessment

- Staff working in services provided and funded by the NHS should be competent to identify harmful drinking and alcohol dependence and to initially assess the need for an intervention; if they are not competent, they should refer people who misuse alcohol to a service that can provide such an assessment. Validated tools such as the alcohol use disorders identification test (AUDIT) (figure) are effective in identifying harmful drinking and alcohol dependence in non-specialist settings such as primary care and acute hospitals.

- Consider a comprehensive assessment for all adults referred to specialist alcohol services who score more than 15 on the identification test (figure). This should include:
  - Alcohol use, including consumption and patterns of drinking; severity of dependence (using the severity of alcohol dependence questionnaire (SADQ) or Leeds dependence questionnaire (LDQ)); and alcohol related problems (using the alcohol problems questionnaire (APQ))
  - Misuse of other drugs, including over the counter medication
  - Physical health problems
  - Psychological and social problems
  - Cognitive function (using, for example, the mini-mental state examination)
  - Readiness and belief in ability to change.

All interventions for harmful drinking and alcohol dependence

- All interventions for harmful drinking and alcohol dependence should be delivered by appropriately trained and competent staff. Drug interventions should be administered by specialist and competent staff. Base psychological interventions on a relevant evidence based treatment manual, which should guide the structure and duration of the intervention.
- Carry out a motivational intervention as part of the initial assessment to help engage the person in treatment from first contact. The intervention should include helping people to recognise problems related to drinking and resolve ambivalence; encouraging positive change; and adopting a persuasive and supportive rather than argumentative and confrontational position.
- For all interventions, staff should:
  - Receive regular supervision from individuals competent in both the intervention and supervision
  - Routinely use outcome measurements to ensure that the person who misuses alcohol is involved in reviewing the effectiveness of their treatment
  - Monitor and evaluate the person’s adherence to the treatment and their own practice competence—
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Alcohol use disorders identification test (AUDIT), self report version, with interpretation guidance based on the current NICE guideline on diagnosing, assessing, and managing harmful drinking and alcohol dependence and on NICE’s public health guideline on preventing the development of hazardous and harmful drinking, An interview version of the AUDIT is also available for example, by using videotapes and audiotapes and external audit.

**Psychological interventions for harmful drinking and mild alcohol dependence**

- For harmful drinkers and people with mild alcohol dependence, offer a psychological intervention (such as cognitive behavioural therapies, behavioural therapies, or social network and environment based therapies) focused specifically on cognitions, behaviour, problems, and social networks that are related to alcohol.

**Interventions for moderate and severe alcohol dependence**

- After a successful withdrawal for people with moderate and severe alcohol dependence, consider offering acamprosate or oral naltrexone in combination with an individual psychological intervention (cognitive behavioural therapies, behavioural therapies, or social network and environment based therapies) that focuses specifically on alcohol misuse. At the time of publication (mid-February 2011), oral naltrexone did not have UK marketing authorisation for this indication. Obtain and document informed consent before prescribing.

**Interventions for children and young people aged 10-17 years who misuse alcohol**

- For those with limited comorbidities and good social support, offer individual cognitive behavioural therapy.

- For those with significant comorbidities and/or limited social support, offer multicomponent programmes (such as multidimensional family therapy, brief strategic family therapy, functional family therapy, or multisystemic therapy).

**Assessment for assisted alcohol withdrawal**

- For those who typically drink over 15 units of alcohol a day and/or score 20 or more on the identification test, consider offering:
  - Assessment for and delivery of a community based assisted withdrawal, or
  - Assessment and management in inpatient care if you have safety concerns (see below) about a community based assisted withdrawal.

- Consider inpatient or residential assisted withdrawal if the person meets one or more of the following criteria:
  - Drinks over 30 units of alcohol a day
  - Has a score of more than 30 on the severity of alcohol dependence questionnaire
  - Has a history of epilepsy or of withdrawal related seizures or delirium tremens during previous assisted withdrawal programmes
  - Needs concurrent withdrawal from alcohol and benzodiazepines
  - Regularly drinks 15–20 units of alcohol a day and has psychiatric or physical comorbidities (for example, chronic severe depression, psychosis, malnutrition, congestive cardiac failure, unstable angina, chronic liver disease) or a learning disability or cognitive impairment.

---

### Alcohol use disorders identification test (AUDIT), self report version, with interpretation guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scoring column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Monthly or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 How many drinks containing alcohol do you have on a typical day when you are drinking?</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 How often do you have six or more drinks on one occasion?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 How often during the last year have you found that you were not able to stop drinking once you had started?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 How often during the last year have you failed to do what was normally expected from you because of drinking?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 How often during the last year have you needed a first drink in the morning to get yourself going after a heavy drinking session?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 How often during the last year have you had a feeling of guilt or remorse after drinking?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 How often during the last year have you been unable to remember what happened the night before because you had been drinking?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Have you or someone else been injured as a result of your drinking?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but not in the last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Has a relative or friend, or a doctor or other health worker been concerned about your drinking or suggested you cut down?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but not in the last year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total score**

- A total score of more than 8 indicates hazardous drinking
- A total score of 16 to 19 indicates harmful drinking or mild or moderate dependence; the current NICE guideline recommends people with a score of more than 15 should be considered for comprehensive assessment
- A total score of 20 or more indicates severe dependence; the current NICE guideline recommends people with a score of 20 or more should be considered for assessment for assisted alcohol withdrawal

**Interpretation of AUDIT scores**

- For those with significant comorbidities and/or limited social support, offer multicomponent programmes (such as multidimensional family therapy, brief strategic family therapy, functional family therapy, or multisystemic therapy).
A disorder of eating or of values?

JM and DS were struggling to find a shared perspective on the management of patients with eating disorders. JM, a middle-aged consultant, was educated in the West, in all-female schools and colleges, where dieting and body image disparagement are norms. She has worked for decades with patients who lose weight obsessively and who defend their weight loss as the most important thing in their lives. She has also seen patients die or live spoiled lives as a result of their disordered eating or of iatrogenic damage.

DS, a male medical student, was brought up in a family where anorexia was a family-wide problem. He is horrified by the many months patients spend in the ward resisting renutrition.

A patient’s spontaneous account of her difficulties shed some light for both on the paradox. RML told us that each time she has relapsed into the depths of anorexia, she has been aware that losing weight takes over as the most important thing in her life—even more important than the people she loves most as a devoted mother and daughter. The awareness that this dreadful perversion of her values has occurred only adds to her dread. She asks, “How will I live to the day of my death? What will I do with the rest of my life?”
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A PATIENT’S JOURNEY

Alcoholism

Anonymous, Adrian M Raby

This man’s drinking habits nearly destroyed his marriage. He recounts how, with help from his wife, family, general practitioner, and other healthcare professionals, he got his life back on track.

My wife was shattered and our marriage was nearly shattered, not by my drinking but by the deceit in which I had wrapped it. I am 78. All my adult life I have drunk alcohol, heavily, increasingly. Some years after retirement in 1995, to conceal my drinking I started on vodka. My day became triangulated around alcohol: are the pubs open, does this shop sell half-bottles, dare I ask for another Scotch?

Too often, my wife came home to find me incapable. Once, not understanding, and fearing that I had had a stroke, she took me to the emergency department, and once she called an ambulance. She felt humiliated by the pity the staff showed her and their contempt for me. A crisis erupted around Christmas 2009 when she noticed how frequently I was making large cash withdrawals. I had to tell the truth.

Addiction is selfishness. Having been afraid of the effect on me if my wife found out about my drinking, I had never imagined the devastating effects on her. Suddenly, I seemed to her a fraud. She shrank from family and friends. She developed shingles. She is diabetic: her blood sugar went haywire. Her unhappiness and confusion were palpable. She stated that she could not bear another drunken spell but would leave, and she told our children (each of us had been widowed previously).

At our wedding, her eldest son had expressed gladness that she had found me to look after her. I had not done so. I had devastated her. Nevertheless, he and his siblings were far more supportive than I deserved. My sons were my misbehaviour.

My track record gave my wife good reason to doubt me. However, she rejected breathalysers and warily took me on trust. My expenditure, blood pressure, and weight fell sharply. I guess my comportment gradually improved from when I had been drinking.

At social events I would state that I was taking a holiday from booze. Some probably muttered, “Aha, I thought he was an alcoholic,” but most, no doubt, had their own concerns and barely noticed. Our children felt that nobody should drink in my presence. They took some convincing that I did not want them penalised by my misbehaviour.

My specialist nurse referred me to a psychiatrist. He carried out a cognitive intelligence test, although I did not realise that’s what it was. Presumably he also evaluated whether I needed chemical help or had yet done myself serious physical or mental damage. Undeservedly, I seemed not to have. He urged me to see a psychologist. I did not want anybody fossicking about in my psyche (there is nothing to find), but I did want to convince my wife that I was tackling things seriously, so I accepted.

The psychologist was easy to talk to and always constructive. She said to me, “Tell your wife that you are the same chap but that the alcohol takes over.” The structure of my eight sessions with her was largely based on research. She wondered why I drank—for example, was it
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to overcome insecurity or improve my chances sexually? The answer was always “No.”

We discussed the meaning of the word “craving.” To me, craving is sharp, physical yearning, hard to resist. I still feel a craving for tobacco, decades after giving up, if somebody lights up nearby. I have never felt it for alcohol. To the psychologist, craving is merely a wish for something.

She remarked, “There is still a piece of the jigsaw missing.” I do not feel any craving for alcohol, so why did I become alcoholic? I regard myself as intelligent and honest. Nevertheless, for decades I drank to an extent that was downright stupid, and that led to downright dishonesty.

Although every drunkard has something in common with every other drunkard, not all drunkards are the same. We are not all “fighting our demons.” I have no demons. Although uncomfortable and ashamed when hung over, I am otherwise quite at ease with myself. I suffered no secret childhood harm. I loved and respected my parents and cherish their memory. Admittedly, I went to boarding school, but in war time this seemed normal.

A DOCTOR’S PERSPECTIVE

Alcohol

Health problems caused by alcohol use are becoming increasingly common as a result of changing patterns of alcohol consumption. One recent report by the National Audit Office estimates that more than 10 million people in the United Kingdom drink consistently more than the amount recommended by the Department of Health. This correlates with a doubling in the number of deaths related to alcohol use during the 15 years up to 2006.

Practitioners in all fields of medicine therefore need to be able to detect problematic patterns of drinking and intervene to prevent the harms that may result from them.

Detecting the problem

As a profession the evidence suggests that generally we are not effective at detecting or managing patients with alcohol problems. Data on practice populations from the NHS Information Centre for 2009 combined with estimates of drinking prevalence from the National Audit Office 2008 suggest that a general practitioner with an average list size of 2000 in England can expect to have around 230 registered men and 160 women who drink excessively. However, a survey of general practitioners in England found that two thirds reported managing only one to six patients a year. Common reasons for not screening for alcohol may include feelings of being inadequately trained, fear of upsetting patients, and the belief that interventions are unlikely to be effective.

Several screening tools are available, such as the AUDIT (PC) (www.alcohollearningcentre.org.uk/ library/ AUDIT-PC.doc), which takes about two minutes to complete. It requires little training and can be carried out by a nurse or a healthcare assistant. Screening can be conducted at the initial contact with a patient such as at registration at a general practice. Clinicians should also screen opportunistically when a patient presents with a problem to which alcohol could be a contributory factor (such as discovery of abnormal liver function, or hypertension). In the case of the patient in this article, his presentation with falls was directly related to his drinking.

Interventions

The evidence suggests that even brief interventions (taking as little as 10 minutes to complete) may be effective in reducing the overall level of alcohol use, changing drinking patterns, preventing future drinking problems, improving health, and reducing healthcare costs. Several tools are readily available, such as through the screening and intervention programme for sensisble drinking (SIPS) (see resources box). Such tools help clinicians to structure feedback about alcohol use and to develop treatment goals with the patient. Critical to the success in helping patients is the ability to call on the expertise of other health professionals, in this case an experienced specialist nurse and an extended team.

One of the most important lessons that I have learnt from this and other cases is the need to adopt a non-judgmental approach where the plan is tailored to the needs and goals of the individual patient. There is no “one size fits all” approach. Some people may just need simple advice about how to keep drinking within sensible limits; for others, abstinence may be the only option. In the case of my patient a period of abstinence with a return to controlled drinking has proved effective. As with all patients, however, his journey continues with follow-up and support.

Adrian M Raby, general practitioner

PATTERNS OF PROBLEM ALCOHOL USE

Hazardous alcohol use—Drinking above the Department of Health’s recommended level with no current evidence of physical, psychological, or social harm (estimated 18% of the population in England)

Harmful alcohol use—Drinking at a level that is already causing harm (7% of the population in England)

Alcohol dependence—A cluster of symptoms including a subjective compulsion to drink, physical withdrawal symptoms, and continued drinking despite evidence of harm

USEFUL RESOURCES

Screening and Intervention Programme for Sensible Drinking, SIPS (www.sips.iop.kcl.ac.uk)—Supports the National Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy for England; screening and intervention tools are available on the website Drinkaware (www.drinkaware.co.uk)—Aims to “increase awareness and understanding of the role of alcohol in society” through “campaigning, educational, and partnership work.” The website has advice for drinkers

NHS Choices: Drinking and Alcohol (www.nhs.uk/Livewell/alcohol)—NHS website giving advice for drinkers

I associate alcohol with freedom and manliness, perhaps thanks to the fictional heroes of my adolescence— Bulldog Drummond’s pints, James Bond’s martinis—but mostly I drank because I enjoy the taste and effect. However, alcohol rots your judgment—”one more won’t hurt.” The first “one more” may not. Later comes the one that does—and you are gone.

Once you acknowledge and then understand the problem, you can control it. I left it late. Happily, my wife had the generosity to trust me once more and the persistence to stay with me.

My six months’ abstinence would have ended in mid-July 2010. We were in France, out of range of Dr Raby’s support system, and my wife feared moderation would be impossible. I extended the abstinence period until our return home in September and then for a further few weeks because of another trip abroad.

In October 2010, after nine months’ abstinence, I started drinking occasionally. For me the rule “maximum four units a day, two dry days a week” feels wrong—a maximum easily becomes a norm. Rather than be a steady drinker who takes the odd glass. It seems to be working.
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RATIONAL IMAGING
Role of brain imaging in early parkinsonism

David P Breen,1 James B Rowe,2 Roger A Barker1

Imaging can be helpful in the differential diagnosis of Parkinson’s disease, providing it is used in appropriately selected patients and the limitations of the techniques are fully understood.

The patient
A 67 year old man presents with an eight month history of tremor and “lagging behind” when walking with friends. He had labyrinthine symptoms in the past and has taken prochlorperazine for the past four years. Neurological examination confirms a rest and postural tremor affecting the left hand, as well as slight bradykinesia on repetitive fine finger and hand movements, worse on the left. No rigidity, gait disturbance, or postural instability are seen.

What is the differential diagnosis?
Parkinson’s disease is a clinical diagnosis, but even specialists are only 90% accurate. The first step is to decide whether the patient does in fact have parkinsonism. This relies on looking for four cardinal features: bradykinesia, rest tremor, rigidity, and postural instability. The diagnosis of parkinsonism requires the presence of at least two of these motor features. Our patient has evidence of bradykinesia and tremor, together with a degree of asymmetry, and therefore fulfils the criteria.

Prochlorperazine is one of several drugs that can induce parkinsonism; others are neuroleptics, metoclopramine, calcium channel blockers, methylxthyla, sodium valproate, lithium, and certain antidepressants. Parkinsonism usually presents soon after the offending drug is started, with bilateral signs and no tremor, so our patient is atypical in this regard. In some patients the drug can be stopped and the response observed, but this is not always straightforward—for example, in those with severe mental health disorder who rely on neuroleptics—and the effect of the drug may take months to wear off.

Our patient has no clinical features pointing towards specific neurodegenerative syndromes that in their early stages can resemble Parkinson’s disease. These include multiple system atrophy, progressive supranuclear palsy, and corticobasal degeneration. Although sometimes called “Parkinson plus” syndromes, they are rather different in pathology, clinical features, prognosis, and response to drugs. Classic signs of progressive supranuclear palsy and multiple system atrophy include bilateral disease at onset and less rest tremor. Patients with progressive supranuclear palsy also develop a supranuclear gaze palsy, recurrent falls, apraxia, and a frontal dementia. In contrast, patients with multiple system atrophy have early autonomic dysfunction or cerebellar signs, or both. Corticobasal degeneration is extremely variable, but common presentations include asymmetric rigidity and dystonia with apraxia (a “useless hand”), cognitive deficits, and a poor response to treatment with levodopa.

The diagnosis of Parkinson’s disease should be based primarily on clinical features. The UK Parkinson’s Disease Society Brain Bank Clinical Diagnostic Criteria are commonly used in routine practice and research trials. These criteria do not incorporate brain imaging, which is unnecessary in patients with typical Parkinson’s disease. This approach is supported by the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence and Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network. In this case, however, imaging is likely to be helpful because it remains unclear whether the patient’s symptoms are due to Parkinson’s disease or drug induced parkinsonism.

Clinical imaging modalities
Single photon emission computed tomography
The dopamine transporter (DAT) is an 80 kDa protein located on the plasma membrane of axonal nerve terminals, where it regulates dopamine concentration in the synaptic cleft. Single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) uses the density of a ligand radiolabelled with DAT as a marker of dopamine terminal innervation, thus helping to differentiate Parkinson’s disease from alternative diagnoses (in this case, drug induced parkinsonism).

In Parkinson’s disease, radiotracer uptake is markedly reduced in the putamen and to a lesser extent the caudate (often asymmetrically). Uptake is normal in controls and patients with essential tremor and drug induced parkinsonism (fig 1). Striatal DAT imaging with SPECT differentiates between clinically probable Parkinson’s disease and essential tremor with a sensitivity of 79-100% and specificity of 80-100%.

The diagnostic accuracy of DAT imaging depends on the patient population being tested—DAT imaging is more likely to be abnormal in patients with Parkinson’s disease with an akinetic-rigid presentation than in patients with tremor dominant disease. Reproducibility of scans is also contentious; one small study of 123I-β-CIT-SPECT showed that radiotracer uptake varied by up to 40% from one day to the next. A different tracer produced better reproducibility, and better measurement of radioligand binding may further reduce variability. Some drugs can affect the DAT scan; these include stimulants and some selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors but not levodopa (for a comprehensive list see...
DAT imaging cannot effectively differentiate between Parkinson’s disease, progressive supranuclear palsy, multiple system atrophy, and corticobasal degeneration, so it should never be a substitute for careful clinical assessment. Given the exposure to radiation that is required and problems with interpretation, it should be requested only by a specialist.

Magnetic resonance imaging

When clinical features are not typical for Parkinson’s disease (young patients with acute or stepwise progression of symptoms, for example), structural brain imaging should be considered to rule out other conditions. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is preferable to computed tomography because of superior resolution and diagnostic sensitivity (especially in the posterior fossa), unless there are contraindications such as severe claustrophobia or metal in the brain or eye. Our case study patient has no atypical parkinsonian features, so MRI is unnecessary.

Structural MRI is generally unremarkable in patients with Parkinson’s disease. In vascular parkinsonism (which typically presents in the lower body without tremor), MRI shows ischaemic lesions in the white matter. In elderly patients, however, it can be difficult to know if these lesions are sufficient to account for their parkinsonism. Space occupying lesions, normal pressure hydrocephalus, and lesions of the basal ganglia can also cause parkinsonism with characteristic MRI appearances.

MRI can be helpful in identifying other specific neurodegenerative syndromes. Although not pathognomonic, atrophy of the midbrain tegmentum is seen in virtually all patients with progressive supranuclear palsy (the “hummingbird sign” on sagittal MRI or “Mickey Mouse” midbrain on axial slices; fig 2). Putaminal abnormalities are more common in multiple system atrophy and progressive supranuclear palsy than in Parkinson’s disease, but they may be detected only by an experienced neuroradiologist (or not at all) and rarely change clinical management. In corticobasal degeneration, MRI shows asymmetric cortical atrophy in clinically affected areas, especially frontal and parietal association cortex.

Outcome

The patient reported no improvement in symptoms after stopping prochlorperazine for three months. He was seen by a different neurologist in the follow-up clinic, and a DAT scan showed reduced uptake bilaterally (worse on the right side). He was diagnosed with idiopathic Parkinson’s disease and started taking ropinirole, and his motor symptoms improved considerably.

Research imaging modalities

Research into neuroimaging in Parkinson’s disease may lead to facilitation of early accurate diagnosis, prediction of complications such as dementia, a better understanding of the pathophysiology of the condition, and analysis of the mechanisms of cognitive and motor phenotypes in the disease.

Functional MRI

Patients with early Parkinson’s disease typically have difficulty in planning, organising, and regulating goal directed
 behaviours—so called frontal executive dysfunction. Functional MRI (fMRI) measures the blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) signal, a function of the changes in cerebral blood flow and oxygenation after neural activity.

Previous fMRI studies have found abnormal frontostriatal activity in early Parkinson’s disease. Studies have also suggested that there is a U shaped relation between dopamine concentrations in the prefrontal cortex and neural function, with different optimal dopaminergic states for motor and cognitive functions.

One of the limitations of this imaging technique (and others) is that we do not fully understand the pathological basis of Parkinson’s disease. Therefore, fMRI remains an indirect measure of pathology in Parkinson’s disease.

**Positron emission tomography**

Up to 80% of patients with Parkinson’s disease may develop a dementia. PET studies of resting brain function in such dementia show an Alzheimer-like pattern of reduced glucose utilisation; posterior parietal and temporal association areas are most affected. Up to a third of non-demented, but cognitively impaired, patients with Parkinson’s disease also show reduced metabolism in the parietal and temporal lobes; longitudinal follow-up is needed to assess whether they too develop dementia. In an effort to elucidate the pathophysiology of Parkinson’s disease and its evolving dementia, PET ligands have also been used to study amyloid β plaque load ($^{11}$C-PIB-PET; fig 3) and binding to peripheral benzodiazepine receptors on activated microglial cells as a marker of cerebral inflammation ($^{11}$C-PK11195; fig 4).

Moreover, PET can differentiate between normal and abnormal nigrostriatal innervation. In a study of 167 patients with parkinsonism of unknown cause followed up for a mean of 2.6 years, FDG-PET was able to differentiate between Parkinson’s disease, multiple system atrophy, and progressive supranuclear palsy (positive predictive value >90% for each condition).

Despite this, the future role of PET outside of research trials remains uncertain, given that this type of imaging is expensive, is not widely available, requires low dose exposure to radiation, and relies on specialist interpretation.

Prospective, longitudinal imaging studies are needed to identify patients with early Parkinson’s disease, who are at increased risk of cognitive impairment and dementia. The ICICLE-PD study (Incidence of Cognitive Impairment in Cohorts with Longitudinal Evaluation—Parkinson’s Disease; http://public.ukcrn.org.uk/search/StudyDetail.aspx?StudyID=5643) is addressing this important research question using MRI (structural and functional) and PET alongside clinical markers.

We thank David Brooks (MRC Cyclotron Unit, Hammersmith Hospital, London) and Nature Publishing Group for permission to use figures 4 and 5.
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**Fig 3** PET imaging with $^{11}$C-Pittsburgh Compound B, a thioflavin based marker of amyloid β plaque load: (A) elderly patient without Parkinson’s disease; (B) patient with Parkinson’s disease dementia with no significant plaque deposition in the brain; (C) patient with Alzheimer’s disease in whom amyloid β is extensive.

**Fig 4** Assessment of microglial activation by use of $^{11}$C-PK11195 PET: (A) only mild microglial activation seen in the thalamus of healthy control; (B) raised activation in the midbrain and striata (arrows) of patient with Parkinson’s disease, with normal levels of thalamic activation.


**CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

Obituary: James Mourilyan Tanner

In the obituary for James Mourilyan Tanner (BMJ 2010;340:c3187, print publication 19 June 2010, p 1335) we introduced an error into the first author’s affiliation address. We should have said University of Washington, Seattle, Washington State (not University of Washington, Washington, DC).

Communicating with deaf people: risk of ill health is increased

During the editing of this letter by Jeetesh V Patel (BMJ 2010;341:c5986, print publication 30 October 2010, p 905) we converted the author’s use of “Deaf” (capital D) to “deaf” (lower case d), thus losing some of his intended meaning. The author had used Deaf to indicate he was talking about profoundly deaf people who use sign language. The BMJ article that had prompted his letter to the BMJ (BMJ 2010;341:c4672, doi:10.1136/bmj.c4672) contains a clarification (in box 1) of the distinction between Deaf and deaf: “People who call themselves Deaf (with an upper case ‘D’) usually use sign language as their first language and consider themselves ‘culturally’ deaf (that is, they regard deafness as a difference in human experience rather than a disability). They usually have profound deafness, which may be congenital. They may use some lipreading but often prefer to communicate directly in sign language; they may gain little benefit from written material.”

**Endgames: Statistical question**

In this question about z scores, the numbers of patients given in the example study were incorrect (BMJ 2010;341:c6746, print publication 4 December, p 1335) and the authors have alerted us to an error in the second sentence of the fifth paragraph. It should have read: “Of the 25 studies included in their quantitative synthesis, only seven [not ‘six’] met at least three of the five validity criteria and only one of these [not ‘and none of these’] was based in the United Kingdom, despite the fact that UK studies represented over half of those scrutinised.”