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KI-1 positive anaplastic large cell lymphoma of skin

Dr Banejee, Heald, and Harris make an important contribution to our understanding of cutaneous Ki-1 positive anaplastic large cell lymphoma (ALCL). Their comment that lymphomatoid papulosis (LYP), regressing atypical histiocytosis (RAH), and cutaneous Ki-1 positive ALCL, however, are the same disease under different names requires critical comment. They describe both LYP and RAH as diseases presenting with cutaneous lesions which regress and recur, and indeed most authorities would regard these clinical features as essential to their diagnosis. Accordingly, the authors' belief that cases 2, 8, 9, 11 and 12 could be regarded as examples of LYP or RAH is illogical; regression was absent in these cases.

LYP, following its original description by Macaulay, continues to define success fully its position as a specific disease entity.2 Macaulay's description of LYP representing a continuing self-healing eruption, clinically benign but histologically malignant, still cannot be bettered; although it is now acknowledged that other diseases (including RAH and some of Ki-1 positive ALCL) belong to this characteristic spectrum of "rhythmic paradoxic eruptions,"2 Macaulay's original patient with LYP remains alive without clinical evidence of disease 25 years after his initial diagnosis, and transformation to systemic lymphoma rarely occurs in more than 20% of patients. In view of these clinicopathological correlates and its wide acceptance to both dermatologists, it would be tragic to abandon LYP as a diagnostic label.

Furthermore, the authors comment that monoclonality in LYP only partially reflects the true situation. For example, some genotypic monoclonality has only been able to show monoclonality in 53% of cases.1 Whether or not nonclonal cases of LYP represent malignant lymphoma, benign lymphoma, or a polyclonal lymphoproliferative disorder, has been discussed elsewhere.3 Because of this current uncertainty, however, it seems inappropriate to apply the encompassing term ALCL for LYP at this point.

The rearrangement of T cell receptor β and γ chains in the cases of RAH investigated to date is indicative of a monoclonal T cell lineage, and RAH seem to have a substantially higher risk than LYP for development of systemic lymphoma. Most cases of RAH seem to relate more to ALCL than LYP, and I am sympathetic to the implied views of Banejee that the continued use of the term RAH serves little useful purpose. In view of its characteristic clinical feature of regression, however, the recent suggestion that RAH be renamed "regressing phase anaplastic lymphoma" seems sensible.4

There is undeniable clinical, histopathological, and immunohistochemical overlap between ALCL, LYP, and so-called RAH. To dismiss them as the same disease under different names, however, is clearly erroneous. Banejee paraphrases Chan et al and Kaudewitz et al as sharing their opinion with regard to terminology. My own reading of the papers, however, is that Chan regards LYP as "a form of cutaneous ALCL that shows a propensity to pursue peculiar clinical course". Likewise, Kaudewitz regards them as "variants of the same disease entity". Chan also concludes with the crucial comment, however, that it is very important to convey biological meaning to the clinician. Ki-1 positivity in ALCL may (but not always) be a favourable diagnostic variable. With respect to LYP, however, use of the term ALCL would fall well short of Chan's requirement.

D SLATER
Department of Histopathology, Rotherham District Hospital, Moorgate Road, Oughtwood, S60 2UD


Dr Banejee et al comment:
We are grateful for Dr Slater's interest in our paper. We agree that the interpretation between cutaneous Ki-1 positive anaplastic large cell lymphoma (ALCL), lymphomatoid papulosis (LYP), and regressing atypical histiocytosis (RAH) is confusing, not least semantically. Slater maintains that, "it would be tragic to abandon LYP as a diagnostic label," but as the morphological and immunohistochemical features of LYP remaining localised to skin and some of Ki-1 positive ALCL are identical with cases of cutaneous ALCL that develop extracutaneous disease we suggest that the distinction is impractical. Furthermore, we have seen similar histological features in cases remaining localised to skin but which did not regress.

Dr Slater's plea for the retention of LYP as a diagnostic label is based on clinical grounds—that is, spontaneous regression—this phenomenon occurs occasionally in many tumours. Would Dr Slater recommend calling spontaneously regressing non-metastasising malignant melanoma by another name, perhaps melanocytic papulosis?

We do not agree that we have misrepresented the views of Chan et al and Kaudewitz et al to support our opinion that "... RAH, lymphomatoid papulosis, and cutaneous Ki-1 ALCL are the same disease under different names". To avoid misunderstanding we quote the relevant statements in full: Chan et al: "The existing evidence therefore suggests that it [LYP] is a form of cutaneous anaplastic large cell lymphoma that has a propensity to pursue a peculiar clinical course".

Kaudewitz et al: " Morphologic and immunophenotypic identity of the atypical cells found in primary cutaneous ALCL lymphoma, in regressing atypical histiocytosis (RAH) and in lymphomatoid papulosis (LYP) of type A, together with the protracted clinical courses in all three conditions, suggests that primary cutaneous ALCL lymphoma, RAH, and lymph type A represent clinical variants of the same lymphoma entity."

We agree with Chan et al that it is important to convey biological meaning to the clinician, but we submit that this is precisely what the confusion term lymphomatoid papulosis does not do. We prefer to label cutaneous tumours of these appearances and phenotype as Ki-1 ALCL, with an explanatory note about their likely behaviour.

Measurement techniques for melanoma: a statistical comparison

The main disadvantage of eye-piece graticules is that they get lost and tend not to be used. It would be usual for there to be an eye-piece graticule permanently installed in the microscope in a histopathology laboratory. Bernier scales4 are at least attached to the microscope, although some pathologists choose to avoid a mechanical stage, and not all pathologists have a Vernier scale on their microscope.

By far the quickest method of measuring to within the limits of accuracy necessary for diagnostic histopathology was taught to me by Dr Keith Blenknap, now of Watford Hospital. As a preliminary calibration he used either an accurate ruler, or the Vernier scale, to measure the width of field of vision with the lower power objective (×2 5 and × 6 3), and calculated the corresponding field widths of vision with the higher power objectives. The Vernier scale could be used to check the latter. This exercise generates a tabulated list to stick on the wall next to the microscope, showing field widths of vision for each objective.

The proportion of a field width occupied by a tumour is easily estimated to within 20% of a field width by eye-ball, thereby covering 50 instant measurements down to about 50 microns, which is well within the shrinkage and sampling error of histological preparations. The overwhelming advantage of this method is that it is quicker and easier than any other, and so it is more likely to be used.

JWB BRADFIELD
Department of Pathology and Microbiology, Bristol Royal Infirmary, Marlborough Street, Bristol, BS2 8HW


Survey of GPs' attitudes to microbiology services

We were interested to read the article on user views by Pedler and Bint.1 We, too, have carried out a survey of user views directed at general practitioners who generate 40% of our workload.

Individual GPs have expressed dissatisfaction with a number of areas of the service, including the level of chlamydia investiga-

Downloaded from http://jcp.bmj.com/ on June 22, 2017 - Published by group.bmj.com
Correspondence

It is hoped that the scheme will be launched live in late 1991, with visitations being scheduled initially on a three to four year cycle, accreditation being continued in the intervening years by the completion of a questionnaire.

GW PENNINGTON
Chairman,
Steering Group on Laboratory Accreditation,
The Royal College of Pathologists,
2 Carlton House Terrace,
London, SW1Y 5AF
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This 43rd annual volume continues the series which is based on a selection of articles by a group of editors from 850 journals, with an abstract by the author and comments by an editor. This year the dominant theme is the application of new techniques in genetics, particularly the polymerase chain reaction, to general pathology and clinical pathology with its subspecialties. The general pathology papers as a group make fascinating reading for all pathologists and will enhance their ability to subject comprehensible to the non-geneticist. Apart from molecular genetics, there are review articles on the pulmonary-renal syndrome, classification of small cell carcinoma of the lung, and on fine needle aspiration of tumours. The book concludes with a list of selective new reviews, particularly in haematology. While in no way replacing a computed literature search of a specific topic, this year book gives an excellent overall review of pathology as we enter the last decade of the 20th century.

NK SHINTON


This is a simple short book illustrating the spectrum of techniques involved in clinical immunology. There are nine chapters covering antibody and cellular deficiencies, neutrophil function tests and complement measurements, cellular and immunohistochemical investigations, lymphotoxin malignancy, autoantibodies and allergy. A strength of the book is the inclusion of appendices on how to

Accreditation of clinical pathology laboratories in the United Kingdom: The story so far

In 1988 an ad hoc committee of the Royal College of Pathologists was set up to consider how an accreditation scheme for the assessment of NHS and private laboratories in the United Kingdom might be developed. The impetus for such a scheme was derived from discussions in Winnipeg following a meeting of the International Liaison Committee of Professional Associations in 1986. A senior pathologist from both the College and the Association of Clinical Pathologists met with their American counterparts.

In 1989 a grant was obtained from the United Kingdom Health Authority to set up a pilot scheme in South Yorkshire, and Dr John Lillieyman was asked by the Committee to establish both the documentation and the methods by which such a pilot scheme could be conducted.

Subsequent development has led to an expansion of the Standards Group to include laboratory and other professionals from the ACP, ACB and IMLS, Independent Health Care Association and NHS management with observers from the Department of Health, Scottish Health Department, the North of Ireland Health and Social Services Department and the Kings Fund. By this time the White Paper on health services had been published, giving an added impetus to the idea of medical audit, with the provision of finance for the development of such schemes.

In 1990 a phase 2 study was conducted in four regions during which more than 50 departments were involved. The lessons learned from the two schemes has led to a continuing revision of the documentation, together with the compilation of lists of potential inspectors, and a detailed itemisation of all clinical pathology laboratories in the United Kingdom. In the near future the prototype inspection for the permanent Accreditation Scheme will take place in Scotland and elsewhere.

It was quickly realised that much useful information could be accumulated in the day-long laboratory inspection by having both a consultant pathologist and a senior medical laboratory scientific officer as a combined inspection team in each speciality, and this will probably become the pattern for the future.

Before the visit a manual, Guidelines for accreditation—what to achieve, is sent to the institution to be visited, together with a request to complete an application form giving details of the department. Each inspector has a manual with a checklist for each discipline based on the "box" format, covering all aspects of quality assessment, organisation and administration, personnel, facilities and equipment, policies and procedures and education.

Meetings are held not only with the consultant pathologists but also with members of the junior medical and technical staff, and with the hospital manager, and elected clinical and general practitioner representatives.

The pilot studies so far carried out have shown that 55-65% of laboratories would be accredited; 10% would fail, and the remainder have remedial deficiencies.

Recently a project officer (Mrs C Blair) has been appointed and an office set up in Sheffield while regional coordinators have been appointed to each region to assist the visitation process. In the near future a permanent Independent Accreditation Board will be created with a variable shareholding distributed between the Royal College of Pathologists and the Associations of Clinical Pathologists and Clinical Biochemists, the Institute of Medical Laboratory Sciences and NHS management. It is hoped to recruit other "users" to the Board, while "observers" from health departments in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland are likely to be invited to attend meetings.

An independent chairman with voting rights but without a shareholding will be appointed. The Board will be advised with respect to the granting of accreditation or otherwise by advisory panels in each discipline, in which it is hoped the specialist societies and the NEQUAS panels will be well represented.

In the absence of any untoward happenings...
Survey of GPs' attitudes to microbiology services.
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