
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Sir

8 September 1994 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the death (from a cerebral haemorrhage) of the German physiologist and physicist Hermann Ludwig Ferdinand von Helmholtz (1821–1894). This anniversary has already been marked by the scientific community¹ but also merits the attention of clinicians, and particularly ophthalmologists, for Helmholtz's influence on medical practice is chiefly remembered for his invention of the ophthalmoscope.

Although pre-eminent as a physicist, Helmholtz's first training was in medicine at the army medical school in Berlin, and thereafter he served as a surgeon in the Prussian army. The invention of the ophthalmoscope, and hence the direct method of ophthalmoscopy, occurred during his subsequent tenure of the chair of physiology in Königsberg. Based on principles similar to Galileo's telescope, familiar to Helmholtz from his seminal work on physiological optics, the first report of the *Augenspiegel* ('eye mirror') was presented to the Physikalische Gesellschaft in Berlin on 6 December 1850, and published the following year.² This instrument, apparently designed to demonstrate to students how light is reflected from the retina, permitted physicians to observe the ocular media by transillumination through the pupil, investigation of the eye prior to this being limited to visual inspection with or without a magnifying glass. Many changes and improvements were subsequently incorporated in the ophthalmoscope to produce the instrument familiar today.³

Andrew J. Larner, MRCP

Department of Anatomy
University of Cambridge
Downing Street
Cambridge CB2 3DY
UK

References

1. Cahan D, editor. Hermann von Helmholtz and the foundations of nineteenth-century science. University of California Press, 1994.
2. von Helmholtz H. Beschreibung eines Augenspiegels zur Untersuchung der Netzhaut im lebenden Auge. Berlin: Förstner, 1851.
3. McMullen WH. The evolution of the ophthalmoscope. Br J Ophthalmol 1917;1:593–9.

Sir,

Whilst interesting changes in respiratory function were reported by Diggory *et al.*¹ in the patients changed from timolol, we wish to express concern about the way in which the study was performed and the conclusions and recommendations drawn, in particular the assumptions made regarding the grouping of the patients, the data obtained and the choice of equipment.

Using the mean values obtained from a group of patients with a wide range of ages and of unspecified distributions of height and smokers between males and females is not appropriate. The results obtained from each patient should be compared with the predicted values available from internationally accepted tables according to the individual's sex, height, age and race and whether they are smokers or not.² The minimum volume of expired air during the FVC should be 2 litres to reduce the errors in recording low volumes. The results should be expressed as a percentage change from predicted values and the mean percentage change used to assess any change in therapy.

The treatment group in the paper by Diggory *et al.*¹ had a greater proportion of males than the control group, who are more likely to be taller and to have obstructive airways disease of a more severe nature.³ In the group changed to betaxolol or pilocarpine, the increase in FVC is difficult to explain in terms of the effect of beta-blockade causing bronchoconstriction of the smaller bronchi. Patients with emphysema have 'air-trapping' on forced expiration which decreases the FVC and which may increase if timolol has an effect other than bronchoconstriction on the more distal airways.

The recommendations regarding the apparatus for respiratory function suggest the spirometer should be calibrated daily to a tolerance of $\pm 2\%$ for both volume and timing measurements.² The Wright Mini Peak Flow Meter⁴ has a tolerance of between 2% and 12%, and so whilst useful for the clinical situation of monitoring patients' progress, it is not the best choice for basic respiratory function investigations.

If the data are presented as the percentage change in individual patients from predicted values in peak flow, FEV₁ and FVC before and after stopping timolol, a subgroup of patients responding in an unusual manner could be identified. For example, some patients with known chronic obstructive airways disease attending a respir-