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Aldehyde disinfectants and health in endoscopy units

Editor,—I read with interest this report and would accept that those performing the procedures in endoscopy units are aware of the implications of their work in an effective and commonsense way. I would, however, question the statement that where an employee develops occupational asthma after exposure to glutaraldehyde and continues to work in the environment, the employer cannot be held responsible, because the employee must be made aware of the risks of continuing exposure. The implication is that the worker is left to choose as to whether they can continue being exposed to glutaraldehyde. In these cases, the occupational health department has a responsibility to advise on fitness for work. In a case where asthma has been shown to be caused by glutaraldehyde it is not reasonable to leave the decision about continuing exposure with the employee, however well informed. The employer has the responsibility for protecting an employee’s health. In these circumstances redeployment and retraining may be the best outcome that an employer can expect. The report drew attention to the need for preemployment health assessment suggesting enquiry about asthma and other conditions. The authors did not comment on whether subjects where their asthma showed up only when employed in jobs where exposure to glutaraldehyde may occur. This is a difficult issue that seems to have been avoided.

A B STEVENS
Occupational Health Services, The Royal Hospitals, Governors Road, Halifax HX1 2DR

Reply

Editor,—Dr Stevens makes two main points in his letter. Firstly—what is the management of a member of the endoscopy staff who develops glutaraldehyde related asthma?—secondly—what is the recommendation of the working party regarding employment of people with pre-existing asthma who will be required to work with glutaraldehyde?

We would like to point out that it was not within the remit of the working party to produce a manual detailing how health and safety policies might be implemented. It was assumed that individual hospitals will take steps to comply with COSHH regulations.

With regard to the first point, Dr Stevens has interpreted the report as leaving it up to the subject to decide whether he or she should continue to work with glutaraldehyde. We feel this is an extreme interpretation of what has been said. The report states quite clearly that where employees believe they are being exposed to glutaraldehyde, they should be advised, but recognises that there may be circumstances when this is not possible or desirable. We have to assume that the development of occupational asthma in a member of staff working in an endoscopy unit will inevitably involve the local occupational health department, which will make an appropriate risk assessment and also inform the hospital management. This would take away the decision from the affected subject and give the responsibility to management.

It is reasonable to assume that any such decision will not be made in a vacuum. If the diagnosis of occupational asthma resulting from glutaraldehyde exposure is not a work-related condition, an employee should be made aware of the pros and cons of doing so, we believe this is a suitable plan of action. The final decision would have to rest, however, with the manager of that department.

With respect to the issue of employing people with pre-existing asthma in jobs where exposure to glutaraldehyde may occur, we believe it would have been inappropriate for the working party to report that it has not been, consistent with its stated intention to formulate recommendations rather than instructions. Once again a risk assessment would have to be carried out to take account of the situation. If one is going to be made aware of the pros and cons of exposure to glutaraldehyde. The final judgement about fitness to work is the responsibility of an occupational physician and we did not think it was the role of the working party to preempt this.

R E COWAN
J HARRISON
On behalf of the working party of the BSG Endoscopy Committee
Colchester General Hospital
Turner Road
Colchester
Essex CO4 5JL

Correlation of PCNA with bromodeoxyuridine

Editor,—We noted with interest the paper by Weigertshcr et al (1993; 34: 1587–92) on proliferation cell nuclear antigen (PCNA) and its correlation with bromodeoxyuridine (BrdU). We would like to express our reservations about their conclusions. The most important one is the working party’s decision to only count the ‘strongly stained nuclei’ in the PCNA assay. This necessarily makes the assay highly subjective because of the difficulty of maintaining an identical standard for every nucleus that is assessed. The assay could only become reproducible in large numbers if either all stained nuclei were counted as positive, or if some form of extremely sophisticated imaging technique that could differentiate stained nuclei on the basis of intensity and colour of their staining was used.

While a significant correlation between the two methods assessed has been shown, such analysis has been performed on only 17 values. The correlation coefficient of 0·6 and Figure 1 shows the rather vague interrelation between PCNA and BrdU in this context. This is more important than the non-significant difference seen between the mean proliferation indices for two reasons. Firstly, there is ongoing debate about which fraction of the replicating population of cells PCNA measures—that is, the growth fraction, as in Ki67 labelling, or the S phase fraction as in tritiated thymidine or BrdU labelling. It may be dependent on the form of tissue fixation. 1,2 This study cannot identify which proliferating component has been labelled with which particular assay. Secondly, if there was a strong numerical relation between the two measured values for a given sample, then some form of paired statistical test is called for as an approximation to the latter rather than the null hypothesis. No evidence is given that this sort of test has been performed in this study.

We do not feel that this paper does show a close relation between the PCNA and BrdU assays. We believe it is necessary to assess a greater number of biopsy specimens taken from a much greater number of subjects; to score all PCNA stained nuclei; and place more emphasis on the correlation between the assays rather than the actual numerical values measured.

M S WILSON
P F SCHOFIELD
Department of Surgery,
Christie Hospital NHS Trust,
Manchester M05 9BX

Reply

Editor,—We appreciate the critical evaluation of our paper by Schofield and Wilson. We agree with most of their comments, some of which have already been considered in the discussion of our article.

In an attempt at trying to mimic an S phase marker only strongly stained nuclei in the PCNA assay, the evaluation procedure certainly has to be highly standardised and the best way is by use of image analysis. If this standardisation cannot be achieved, it may be worth considering whether to include all labelled cells in the PCNA analysis. The inclusion of all labelled cells in the PCNA assay, however, does not result in a significant correlation between the two markers in our study. We could possibly show such a correlation with a greater number of subjects, as suggested by Wilson and Schofield, and we agree that this correlation is.....