

EDITORIAL

PERSONAL

As is recorded in our last issue, a new Editor is now responsible for this Review. The Editor wants to make this Review as good as he can, which means that it must be of real practical value to those actively engaged in leprosy work. At the same time less practical aspects of the subject should not be ignored. A new editor likes to take over and find a stock of suitable manuscripts of original material awaiting his attention. That is not the new editor's lot, for the cupboard is bare.

THE MADRID CONGRESS

Fortunately for the present issue the reports on the Madrid Congress are now coming in. These provide most of the material in the present issue, for our pages contain a personal report on the conference, a review of the Madrid Congress number of the *International Journal of Leprosy* and also some notes on interesting points in the papers presented at the Congress. Thus it is aimed in the present number to cover the Madrid Congress fairly fully in broad outline. Many readers will however want more detail than we can give here, but for this they must consult the *International Journal of Leprosy* or the Congress Proceedings when they are published.

THE LATE RESULTS OF SULPHONE TREATMENT

On the whole it is surprising that although sulphone treatment has now been used in certain centres for up to thirteen years, very few reports have appeared on the later results of treatment, and on the question of relapse and its frequency and severity. There are various reasons for this. In some centres the treatment has not been used long enough; in some centres the number of cases has not been sufficient; sometimes it is not possible to get patients to come for re-examination after discharge; sometimes records of cases treated years ago are inadequate; sometimes changes of staff or shortage of staff have made the long continued observation and records difficult to maintain. Nevertheless, it is felt that there

must be those who have the records of a sufficient number of cases treated for a long enough period, and examined after discharge for relapse. Analysis of these records should give information of value. Our present issue contains a report based on such an analysis of such records; the findings are most encouraging.

The report itself tries to make clear that the work recorded has been done under very favourable conditions, which are hardly likely to be duplicated elsewhere. Moreover, the work has been done under the very close personal supervision of the writer for nearly the whole of the time of the study—eight years.

There are a few other reports available on the late results of sulphone treatment. While it is generally agreed that the results are a great improvement on those obtained with previous forms of treatment, these other reports are less favourable than the present one. Two of these reports are discussed in the present report. We are trying to gather more information on this subject for presentation and discussion in future issues.