

Reports from 18 cities, one month after the list was issued, also indicate that most people are unaware of the list's existence and are continuing to rely on the advice of private physicians on which drugs to take.

"In the end I think the average patient relies more on the opinions of his physician than on public releases by F.D.A.," said Dr. William A. Limberger, president of the Pennsylvania Medical Association. "However, this at times injudicious release by F.D.A., does not enhance confidence in the medical profession."

SOME WITHDRAWN

Last week, the agency released a list of 173 drugs which had also appeared on its previous list of 369. This time the F.D.A. said the 173 drugs had been withdrawn from the market over the last two and one half years.

The original list of 369, which received wider circulation nationally than last week's release, did not distinguish between drug products still being sold and those the F.D.A. had withdrawn from the market. The new list was made available, on request, to newspapers and interested individuals and organizations.

Many doctors, pharmacists and hospital administrators who were interviewed were irate that they had not been informed of the F.D.A.'s list. Many had never heard of it. Most of these were in areas where newspapers did not carry the full list, including such major cities as Los Angeles, Detroit and Baltimore.

In Detroit, a spokesman for a drug store chain said that F.D.A. announcements often had the reverse effect of that intended.

"DON'T TRUST F.D.A."

"Quite often, as soon as the F.D.A. comes out with a list of drugs they've banned, we get a run on them," said Mel Richards, operating manager for the Michigan Revco Drug Chain with 21 branches in the Detroit area. "People get attached to certain drugs, and they don't want to give them up. Really, it shows that people don't trust the F.D.A. Neither do I."

"I think people are just getting used to them crying wolf," said Wallace Nelson, head pharmacist at Harold Meyer Drug Stores in Tacoma, Wash.

In Oregon, the only newspaper in the state to publish the list was The Eugene Register-Guard in Eugene. An official of the Lane County Medical Society, which covers the city and environs, did not receive any calls from physicians, patients or hospitals as a result of the publication.

In Akron, Ohio, The Akron Beacon Journal published the full list, and in nearby Wooster, Dr. James Robertson, senior clinician at Wooster Clinic, reflected the concern of many of his colleagues in other cities that the publication of the F.D.A. list in the form it took bordered on the unethical.

"BREACH OF ETHICS"

"I had to read it in the newspapers," said Dr. Robertson. "I think any agency that goes to the public forum for its endorsement is [involved in] a breach of professional confidence and ethics."

But the reaction of most individuals who had seen the list was to continue to rely on the judgment of their physicians.

Dr. Eugene Upanaveage, a pharmacist at Green's Pharmacy in Philadelphia, said a typical reaction of many of his customers was "My doctor told me this [item] is the best." He said his store had not stopped carrying the items listed. "Most of the physicians think the F.D.A. is 'side-effect conscious,'" he said.

More concern was expressed in the survey over one drug that did not appear on the F.D.A.'s list—the oral diabetic drug tolbutamide, marketed by the Upjohn Company under the trade name Orinase. It is taken orally and widely used by diabetics as an alternative to insulin, which requires injection.

The F.D.A., as well as the American Medical Association and the American Diabetes Association, said in October they concurred with findings of a study that cast serious doubt on the value of Orinase. At that time, F.D.A. urged caution in its use.

Dr. John M. Rumsey of San Diego, who has many diabetic patients, said, "Most [diabetics] continued to thumb their nose at the Government and continued to use it, if their doctors felt there was no danger to them."