is sufficiently up to date to mention some of the new pharmacological preparations such as timolol, and the modern forms of drainage operations are reviewed. The text is completed with a useful bibliography. Professor Leydhecker is to be congratulated on this revision of his previously published handbooks on glaucoma, and this book should make interesting reading for all wanting to learn about the subject.

T. J. Ffytlce


Now that the initial romance of fluorescein angiography and laser therapy has begun to die down there has been a need, for the past few years, for an ophthalmic textbook which would take a reasoned and well-informed look at macular disease and provide guidelines for both the investigation and therapy of these important conditions. The Macula by three co-authors who have worked together on several other projects fulfils this role admirably and is to be highly recommended.

The book incorporates the contributions of many other authors with international reputations and is divided into a series of chapters on the macula and its diseases. The illustrations rely not surprisingly a great deal on fluorescein angiograms, though colour photographs and red-free pictures are used frequently. The selection of the illustrations is excellent throughout, and simple diagrams are used to augment the information derived from some of the pictures.

The subject of macular disease is dealt with in very broad terms, and most of the clinical manifestations of retinal disease are discussed. This leads at times to repetition, but many readers would find this a useful attribute. There are very few faults in the text itself—a line missing on p. 118, an inverted colour photograph on p. 321, and wrong numbering of Figs. 25.18 and 25.20—but everywhere the text is lucid and the illustrations relevant. A special mention should be made of the final chapter on the evaluation of photocoagulation therapy. Anyone about to embark on a clinical trial of this type of therapy is advised to read it carefully and be reminded of the pitfalls that occur along every step of therapeutic research.

This book makes essential reading for all ophthalmologists, not only those concerned with retinal disease, since macular function performs such an important role in the life of each one of us. The authors and their co-workers are to be congratulated on a very fine achievement.

T. J. Ffytlce

Correspondence

Usher's syndrome

Sir, Fishman et al. attempt to correlate age-related loss of central visual acuity in the Usher syndrome with 'quantitative' estimates of 'contributing factors' such as foveal lesions and cataracts in hopes of generating data for the purposes of counselling patients 'as to the potential for visual loss with age'. These authors may have overlooked the most useful and reliable predictor of age-related visual loss in the Usher syndrome, namely, the degree of congenital neurosensory hearing loss. Several investigators have suggested that the Usher syndrome is genetically heterogenous, with approximately 90% of patients having profound congenital deafness, vestibular dysfunction, and onset of retinal dystrophy before age 10 years, and 10% having some residual hearing with normal vestibular function and onset of retinal dystrophy after adolescence. Although both forms are inherited in an autosomal recessive way, they appear to be two genetically distinct entities that show little overlap between families.

Degree of sensorineural hearing loss and age of onset of symptoms of retinal dystrophy would appear to be better predictors of age-related visual acuity than foveal lesions, since there was not an invariable correlation between decreased visual acuity and foveal lesions in the study of Fishman et al. nor was there an attempt to determine the predictive value of a given foveal appearance for visual acuity over time.

Prospective studies to define the natural history of genetic disorders such as the Usher syndrome are badly needed. A 'sampling' of larger numbers of patients will not clarify the natural history unless all possible factors that may predict rate of age-related visual loss are studied.

ROBERTA A. PAGON
Division of Medical Genetics,
Children's Orthopedic Hospital
and Medical Center,
4800 Sand Point Way NE,
Seattle, Washington 98105, USA.
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Sir, Dr Pagon's remarks refer to our findings on 48 patients with Usher's syndrome. The data which we presented documented central visual loss, quantitatively listed the extent of lens opacities, and described the presence or absence of foveal lesions in each patient.
Practical points of note were observations that: most patients maintained central visual acuity of 20/60 or better until their middle thirties; an atrophic-appearing foveal lesion was, with 2 exceptions, accompanied by a significant degree of reduction in central acuity; in the absence of an atrophic foveal lesion the majority of patients showed visual acuity of 20/30 or better; there was a trend for more extensive atrophic foveal lesions and more dense lens opacities to occur in older patients, which was not surprising.

Dr Pagon suggests that we may have overlooked what, in her interpretation, is the most useful and reliable predictor of age-related visual loss in the Usher's syndrome, that being the degree of congenital neurosensory hearing loss. There are no data, however, which support her contention. The references which she cites are useful in illustrating the clinical and presumed genetic heterogeneity within Usher's syndrome with which we fully concur. We do not, however, agree that the cited figure, of 90% having profound congenital deafness is an accurate assessment. Our most recent data show that only one-third of 62 patients with Usher's syndrome showed profound neurosensory hearing loss.1 Most relevant is our observation that the level of hearing impairment was not a good predictor of central visual acuity. There was, as other investigators have noted, a tendency for those with profound neurosensory hearing impairment to manifest an earlier onset of nystagmus and show earlier and more profound losses in peripheral visual field. We are concerned that erroneous counselling of patients may result if the degree of congenital neurosensory hearing impairment is used as an indicator of future central visual loss.

Finally, we still maintain that a larger sampling of cases over the age of 50 would be helpful to establish the spectrum of visual loss in older age groups more reliably. We join our colleague in her concern for optimally accurate and meaningful advice for this most unfortunate group of patients.

GERALD FISHMAN
VICTORIA VASQUEZ
MARLENE FISHMAN
DALE BERGER
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Notes

Irish Ophthalmological Society

The Annual Meeting of the Irish Ophthalmological Society will be held in Dublin on 25-26 April 1980. Proceedings on the latter date will be conducted as a joint meeting with the Hellenic Ophthalmological Society. The Montgomery lecture will be given on 26 April by Professor A. Bouzas, of Athens. Visiting ophthalmologists are invited to participate. Inquiries should be addressed to Dr G. P. Crookes, Hon. Secretary, Irish Ophthalmological Society, 18 Fitzwilliam Place, Dublin 2, Ireland.

Ultrasound symposium

The International Society for Ultrasound in Ophthalmology (SIDUO) will hold its eighth symposium from 16-19 September 1980 at Nijmegen, Holland. It will have an educational emphasis. Details from Department of Ophthalmology, c/o Secretary SIDUO VIII Symposium, University of Nijmegen, PO Box 9101, 6500 HB Nijmegen, The Netherlands.