Correspondence

The investigation of hypercalcaemia

The recent ACP Broadsheet by P L Selby and P H Adams is very helpful and we agree with its recommendations.1 However, we feel that there is an important omission, namely that serum intact parathyroid hormone (PTH) concentrations are not invariably frankly raised in primary hyperparathyroidism but may be at the upper limits of the normal range. PTH concentrations in this range are also found in hypocalciuric hypercalcaemia (familial benign hypercalcaemia) which may lead to a misdiagnosis of hyperparathyroidism. Most kindreds have a history of (unnecessary) parathyroidectomy, often repeated. We strongly recommend that an index of calcium excretion be measured in any patient with hypercalcaemia who is being considered for parathyroidectomy and, where calcium excretion is relatively low, family studies be undertaken to exclude this condition.
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Dr Selby comments:
We thank Dr Gordon and colleagues for their comments on our Broadsheet on the investigation of hypercalcaemia. We entirely agree with the points that they raise regarding hypocalciuric hypercalcaemia in which, as we stated, parathyroidectomy is generally contraindicated. In our experience a substantial number of patients referred for assessment after failed parathyroidectomy have this condition. We would go even further and Dr Gordon in suggesting that the need for parathyroidectomy be questioned in anyone with inappropriately low urine calcium excretion. However, consideration of treatment lay outside the scope of our Broadsheet.

Quantitative audit of histopathology reports

I read the paper by Campbell and Griffith1 and the subsequent comments by Coghill2 with interest. Campbell and Griffith described a system of local reporting guidelines prepared in collaboration with clinical colleagues and used by pathologists in their department when preparing histology reports. Coghill on the other hand, describes a series of template reports to which measurements are added and from which words and phrases are deleted in order to generate a report. Although Coghill comments that use of this system was followed by a 1-3 day reduction in mean reporting time, neither author comments on the proportion of cases in which their respective reporting systems were found to be suitable and the proportion in which the pathologist “exercised his option of adding to or deleting from the template”.

In this department a less rigid reporting protocol has been adopted. Standard templates like those described by Coghill for commonly encountered conditions such as endometrium, uterus and cervix,conceptual products including voluntary terminations of pregnancy, cervical biopsy specimens, cone biopsy specimens, and diathermy excisions were prepared. Draft reports are compiled by the pathologist on a pro forma sheet attached to the request form and the final report is prepared by secretarial staff. A policy decision not to include “unnecessary” diagnoses in these templates, such as carcinomas occurring in specimens from an organ like uterus or cervix where malignant tumours are a comparative rarity, was made. In this situation an “individually hand crafted report” was encouraged using guidelines included in a departmental handbook.

From 1 August to 31 December 1993, 1825 specimens were processed in this department, of which 1403 were from those organs for which a standard protocol had been prepared. Of the 1043 specimens, 939 (87%) were reported using standard templates to which no additional information incorporated in free text was necessary. Conceptional products were least likely to require additional free text whilst specimens of uterus and cervix were most likely to necessitate such additional information (table).

This audit has enabled us to identify those pathologies not included in the original templates which were encountered with sufficient frequency to merit subsequent inclusion. Adapted templates or hand crafted reports using the information required in the departmental handbook were prepared in the remaining cases.

The use of templates has increased the standard of reports by providing the pathologists with a checklist of points which require comment in every case. We have found that they speed the reporting process and because of their synoptic nature save time when, before the report is signed, the original is compared with the final typed version prepared by our secretarial staff.
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Dr Coghill comments:
I am delighted but not surprised to hear that a centre of excellence such as a University Department in Sheffield uses standard template reports for their routine histopathological reporting. This is relatively common practice in the United States where laboratory computing is rather more advanced than elsewhere. Dr Heatley expresses interest in the proportion of our cases in which template reports are used. At the time of my audit and at present 60% of our reports are entered by the pathologist. The Sheffield policy is to exclude the use of template reports for unusual conditions in favour of what I described as “hand crafted” reports. It is not in the use of templates, carefully engineered, for the reporting of these cases that I am particularly enthusiastic.

When a case under consideration is not already included in our directory of reports, a new template is generated which is then used to report the current case and is added to the directory for future use. However, I have also prospectively reviewed a number of reports from the Sheffield archives. The contents of the templates are carefully engineered so that the correct one is selected by the retrieval software following the entry of key words describing the important features of any case. If the search terms used are imprecise, the system will offer a differential diagnosis that may then be refined manually by viewing on the screen or automatically by the addition of further terms. By including typical immunohistochemical profiles in the templates, quite complex diagnostic decisions can be assisted. The way in which the template is “engineered” ensures that it can be easily edited to resemble a “hand crafted” product. The templates also contain appropriate prognostic and other data as well as key references extracted from the recent literature. This adds value to the final report with no effort from the pathologist. The response from clinicians has been favourable.

Therefore, it is in the reporting of “unnusual” cases that my “textpert” system comes into its own. With the assistance of other pathologists, more expert than myself, it is my hope that this directory of templates can be expanded to become a major resource for practising histopathologists and trainees. With the addition of explanatory hypertext, references and possibly digitised colour images, the final product could potentially replace the pathologist’s textbooks, journals and reference slides. Through the economic and ecologically sound medium of electronic publishing, it is my hope that these efforts can be made available to a wide audience. If regular updates are mailed or distributed by a Wide


Reporting format for 1403 specimens received between 1 August and 31 December 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of specimen</th>
<th>Number received</th>
<th>Number without additional information</th>
<th>Percentage without additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Products of conception</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervical biopsy</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cone biopsy/DLE</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endometrial curettage</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uterus and cervix</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DLE = diathermy loop excision.
The Royal Society of Health presents the following courses

**Care at Home and Quality of Life (CH411)**
- **Date:** Tuesday, 29 November 1994
- **Venue:** Hotel Ibis, Ladywell Walk, Birmingham B5 4ST
- **Fee:** To be announced

**Care at Home and Quality of Life (CH412)**
- **Date:** Tuesday, 13 December 1994
- **Venue:** Regent’s College, Regents Park, London NW1 4NS
- **Fee:** To be announced

For further information, please contact:
Anne Farchney, Conference Department, The Royal Society of Health, RSH House, 38A St George’s Drive, London SW1V 4BH (Tel: 071 630 0121; fax: 071 976 6847).

---

**Notice:**

The October issue of the journal a printing error occurred in the paper by Ohasha M, Kanno H, Machii T, Aozasa K (J Clin Pathol 1994;47:928–932). Figure 1 was labelled incorrectly as (A), (B), (A) but should read (A), (B), (C). The correct version of fig 1C is reproduced here.

---

**Postgraduate course in gynecologic and obstetric pathology with clinical correlation**

**March 27–31 1995**

The Departments of Pathology, Massachusetts General Hospital and Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Harvard Medical School will present a postgraduate course in Gynecologic and Obstetric Pathology under the direction of Drs Robert E Scully, Robert H Young, and Christopher R Crum, to be held at the Four Seasons Hotel, Boston.

This course is designed for pathologists and obstetricians/gynecologists at resident and practitioner levels. It will provide an in-depth review of gynecologic and obstetric pathology with emphasis on morphologic diagnostic features and clinicopathologic correlation including management. Special attention will be paid to recent advances and newly recognized entities. Instruction will be primarily by lecture, but will also include case presentations and discussion periods. Each participant will receive a comprehensive course syllabus.

The course has Category 1 accreditation for approximately 35 hours CME credit by the American Medical Association and 35 cognates, formal learning, by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

The fee for the course is $775.00 (residents and fellows $600.00). For further information, please contact: Department of Continuing Education, Harvard Medical School, 25 Shattuck Street, Boston, MA 02115 Tel: 617 432 1525; fax 617 432 1562.

---

**Melanoma**

**10–12 May 1995**

**Conference Centre, Brighton, UK**

The Melanoma Study Group are holding a three day multidisciplinary conference on all aspects of melanoma diagnosis and treatment. The programme includes slide seminars given by a number of experts in the field. A wide range of biopsy material will be available for examination. Abstracts for oral or poster presentation and biopsy cases for discussion are invited. The conference will be suitable for 15 cognate points for CME and takes place during the Brighton International Festival.

Apply to: Dr N Kirkham, P.O. Box 334, Histopathology Department, Royal Sussex County Hospital, Brighton BN2 5BG Tel: 0273 664501. Fax: 0273 600182.

---

**Correction**

In the October issue of the journal a printing error occurred in the paper by Ohasha M, Kanno H, Machii T, Aozasa K (J Clin Pathol 1994;47:928–932). Figure 1 was labelled incorrectly as (A), (B), (A) but should read (A), (B), (C). The correct version of fig 1C is reproduced here.

---

**Figure 1: Monocytoid cells near the sheath artery of the spleen (A) haematoxylin and eosin. Monocytoid cells showing a positive reaction for CD20 (B), but not for DBA.44 (C) (ABC method).**

---

**Briançon Congrès de Dermatopathology**

**6–10 February 1995**

**Parc Hotel, Briançon, France**

The programme includes slide seminars in dermatopathology as well as case presentations and discussions. Seminars will be given by Dr Jeanine Wächsler of Paris and Dr Lorenzo Cerroni of Graz. Other seminars will be given by British pathologists. Delegates may also submit cases for presentation and discussion. In addition to interesting and difficult cases there will be a special prize for “The Best Mistake” presented in the special session devoted to this interesting phenomenon in diagnostic histopathology. The week will be suitable for 20 CME points for CME. This meeting offers an opportunity to meet in the pleasant atmosphere of “the highest fortified town in Europe”, in the sunny southern Alps. Delegates will attend from many countries in Europe.

Apply to: Dr N Kirkham, P.O. Box 334, Histopathology Department, Royal Sussex County Hospital, Brighton BN2 5BG Tel: 0273 664501. Fax: 0273 600182 or Dr J-H Oddou, B.P. 8, 05000 Gap, France. Fax: (33) 92 51 92 55.

---

**Area Network such as the Internet or CompuServe, users will be able to harness the power of the pathology information explosion effortlessly and focus it precisely on the generation of their reports.**

The project is still recruiting and so any pathologist in the UK or elsewhere who is interested in contributing, is welcome to contact the author by post or E-mail (CompuServe 100255,2131).

---

I read with interest the paper by . . .

In his letter dealing with letters that begin "I read with interest the paper by . . ." (IWIFTPB) Dr O'Brian should have addressed the authors' reply that so frequently starts, "We thank Boggs for his/her interest in our paper" (WTBFHIIOP).

What the authors of such letters probably mean is, "Trust Boggs to point out that he/she published a larger series than ours 10 years ago" or "Damn Boggs for noticing that our p values are out by a factor of 10".

Over the years, I have noticed that it is uncommon for writers of WTBFHIIOP letters ever to admit honestly their mistakes even when these are pointed out to them in unambiguous terms, preferring to deny, obfuscate, or side-step their errors. Perhaps the problem lies with the fact that letters and authors' replies are not subject to peer review, merely to the perfunctory scrutiny of an over-worked editor. Perhaps that is how this one got through or am I to expect an ITWFHIIML reply?
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