that there is financial benefit in allowing individual firms which have occupational sickness benefit schemes to take over the entire responsibility for paying the sickness benefits now paid by the Department of Health and Social Security as is done in the Civil Service.

This is a useful pamphlet for the occupational physician—and his management.

P. A. B. RAFFLE

Units, Symbols and Abbreviations. A Guide for Biological and Medical Editors and Authors. Edited by George Ellis. (Pp. 36; £0.54, from the Editorial Office, The Royal Society of Medicine, 1 Wimpole Street, London, W1M 8AE, or £0.36 to members of the R.S.M. or the Biological Council.) London: The Royal Society of Medicine. 1971.

It is obvious that this little book will be every editor's, assistant editor's, and sub-editor's *vade mecum* for a long time. It is to be hoped that it will also become one for authors. That it is written with a sense of humour and is in consequence a pleasure to read, should help.

This guide contains the recommendations of a working party set up at a conference of medical editors in December 1968. It deals with the introduction of SI units (Système International d'Unités); the list of acceptable abbreviations; and how to set out references. The SI units are clearly tabulated and defined, along with prefixes (m for milli and so on) and derived units. There are also lists of units which it is hoped will disappear, including the kilocalorie, defined as 4186.8 J (Joule). It is, however, recommended that measurements should be quoted in the units in which they are made, e.g., mmHg for blood pressure when a mercury manometer is used, as well as in SI units. The table of abbreviations is straightforward and, for biological sciences, exhaustive. Its use will simplify typing and save much space. Authors will no longer have the excuse for submitting manuscripts, with inappropriate abbreviations, that they did not know what was expected of them. As for the recommended lay-out of references—of the 2 632 (approximately) possible ways the Committee has chosen one, which is as logical as any. May it be used!

D. F. HEATH

Arbeit und Gesundheit: Chronische Bronchitis und Lungenemphysem By Hermann W. Beckenkamp.

(Pp. 207; 38 figs; 80 tables; no price stated.) Stuttgart: Georg Thieme Verlag. 1970.

This thesis is a festschrift honouring the 65th birthday of Professor H. J. Symanski, director of the Institute of Occupational Medicine in the University of the Saarland, who wrote the preface. It describes the surveys of chronic lung disease in industry carried out by the author in the last decade; and, incidentally, it illustrates how work of a similar nature can proceed simultaneously and independently in the scientific institutes of countries which are separated by a language barrier. Because he was unaware of the British Medical Research Council's standard questionnaire on respiratory symptoms, Dr. Beckenkamp devised his own. It is interesting to note, too, how statistical and epidemiological ideas and methods are now influencing the manner and direction of research in industrial medicine in Germany.

The author recognizes the difficulty of proving in any conclusive way that occupation *per se* has any influence on the onset and evolution of chronic bronchitis and emphysema. As his own early studies emphasized, high morbidity or mortality rates may simply be the result of the curious way in which young people of poor physique choose or find themselves in the dustiest jobs, e.g., in mines or steel foundries. Again, the routinely kept statistics of incapacity were found in the Saarland, as elsewhere, to be grossly inaccurate in their description of the jobs actually done. These considerations led to the conduct of field surveys in eight occupational groups ranging in exposure to potential respiratory hazards from clerks to limestone miners working underground. The clinical procedures used included radiography and testing of lung function and detailed job descriptions were available.

The data were subjected to a comprehensive statistical analysis, but it proved difficult to distinguish a specific effect of occupational exposure on respiratory symptoms or function from the general influence of smoking and social conditions. Only in men working in excessively hot and dusty conditions in lime burning could any additional hazard be detected with confidence.

There is a useful summary in English, and the clear tables and diagrams combine with a comprehensive review of the literature to allow the British investigator some insight into current German thought and practice in the investigation of occupational factors in chronic lung disease.

D. D. REID