Candidial infection is uncommon in acute oesphagitis: evidence from a non-selected DGH population

Mucosal candidia infection of the lower oesophagus is unusual except in certain groups of patients who are either immunosuppressed or who have other recognised causes of candidal infection.1 Invasive oesophageal candidiasis occurs most often in the immunosuppressed, occurring in 10–20% of patients with myeloproliferative disorders or leukaemia and in up to 74% of patients with AIDS, with an increased frequency of infection in patients with endocrine disorders such as hypoparathyroidism.1 Previous studies have shown that the incidence of candidal infection in 22 000 consecutive hospital admissions was 0.1% (27 cases), whereas it was found in less than 5% of a general population presenting with gastrointestinal complaints.1 It is important to exclude invasive candidiasis as this is a major risk factor in the development of candidal septicaemia, which can result as a direct effect of visceral wall complication.2 Closures of oesophageal candidiasis also include oesophageal stenosis and perforation, which may occur in the acute phase of infection, and which can be life threatening. Less commonly, pseudodiverticulosis may also result.1

Candidal oesophagitis is caused most commonly by C. albicans, C. tropicalis, and C. krusei.3 The diagnosis of invasive candidiasis requires a combination of clinical suspicion and laboratory investigation. Difficulties in diagnosis arise where the clinical presentation is non-specific or serology produces false positive results because of vulvovaginal candidiasis. Oesophageal brushings are useful for identifying mucosal surface candidal colonisation but are poor at detecting fungal invasiveness.4

Here we present the results of a retrospective review of 60 cases of acute oesophagitis, with reassessment for candida by D-PAS staining.

Sixty consecutive oesophageal biopsies coded on the laboratory computer SNOMED database as acute inflammation with or without ulceration were examined from the period 1997–1998. In our hospital few specimens are sent for mycological culture, and brush cytology is not performed if no spare unstained sections were available. If no spare unstained sections were available, the sections were pretreated with fresh deionised water (followed by treatment with periodic acid Schiff reagent and Carnoy’s haematoxylin, with tapwater washes in between each stage. The original H&E sections were re-examined to identify the presence of squamous mucosa with fibroinflamed and necrotic exudate representing the surface of an ulcer crater. The PAS-D stained sections were examined by both of us for evidence of candidal hyphae and spores, looking for mycelial forms of the fungus and for pseudo-hyphae, which were considered the minimum criteria for diagnosis of invasive candidiasis.1

Results—Nine of the 60 patients (15%) showed acute ulceration of the oesophagus; the remainder showed acute inflammation with Barrett’s change in many cases but no evidence of acute ulceration. Of the 60 oesophageal biopsies examined, no candidal hyphae or spores were identified, either on initial haematoxylin and eosin examination or during this study, after re-evaluation of all the cases with D-PAS. Two of the biopsies did contain some D-PAS positive material, but this material did not have the appearances of fungal spores and we both considered it to be artefact. No mycelial forms or hyphae were present in the sections of any of the cases examined.

Comment—Assessment of endoscopic biopsies for fungi using only haematoxylin and eosin staining may be difficult. The differentiation of eosinophilic bodies or hyphae-like tissue in areas of acute oesophageal ulceration may include food debris, degenerate and necrotic tissue of an ulcer, herpetothelial ulcer, reflux oesophagitis, glycoegenic acahnthesis, other artefacts, and carcinoma. It is widely recognised that the use of D-PAS or Grocott stains may assist in the recognition of fungal hyphae and spores. More elaborate methods have also been used for detection of candida, such as immunostaining for C. albicans and polymerase chain reaction.5

The aim of our study was to examine the method of routine reporting currently used in our laboratory when dealing with inflamed oesophageal biopsies—that is, without routine additional fungal stain—and to examine the efficacy of detecting candida on routine haematoxylin and eosin stained slides with an additional PAS or D-PAS stain. We showed that the addition of a routine fungal stain for endoscopic biopsy is likely to be of benefit in the detection of candida if the patient is not in an at risk group. If the patient is at risk of candida then combined endoscopic biopsy and brush cytology is likely to be much more effective than a biopsy alone for the detection of the organism.6

Causes of candidial infection of the lower oesophagus include use of antibiotics, which may allow overgrowth or colonisation by Candida species, infected corticosteroids, reduced gastric acid output from H2 receptor blockers, proton pump inhibitors, or prior vagotomy. Alcoholism, diabetes, malnutrition, advanced age, and abnormal oesophageal motility associated with conditions such as scleroderma and achalasia have also been associated with candida oesophagitis. Strictures, obstructing tumours, or diverticula which cause stasis are also associated with fungal oesophageal candidiasis.7,8

Nine patients (15%) in our study had D-PAS stains performed at the time of biopsy by the reporting pathologist and the majority of these additional stains were requested when there was evidence of acute ulceration, not just inflammation.

The use of routine stains for candida is not justified unless the patient is immunosuppressed or falls into an at risk group. Routine investigation for oesophageal candidal infection should also include brush cytology.
Although the purpose of Weddell's trip was not discovery, his name has been retained by three eponyms: the Weddell seal, the Weddell sea, and Weddellite (calcium oxideate).

CARLOS ORTIZ-HIDALGO
Department of Pathology, The American British Coudray Hospital, Star 136 Qq. Observatorio, Mexico City 01120, Mexico


The risk of infection transmission by blood transfusion in England

The review by Soldan and Barbara1 on the risks of infection transmission by blood transfusion is an interesting and comprehensive article. However, there is little reference of prion disease and in particular new variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease (nvCJD) and the recently recommended control measures for blood donated in the United Kingdom. The only mention is in the last paragraph where they state “whether prion disease can be transmitted by transfusion is currently uncertain.”

From 1995 to the end of March 1999, 40 cases of nvCJD had been reported in the United Kingdom, and it is currently not known how many people may be incubating it. A recent working party2 considers that the distribution of infectivity of nvCJD may be different from that of other forms of CJD, as in the former there may be more involvement of lymphoreticular tissues, possibly involving circulating lymphocytes. Evidence of nvCJD has previously been found in human tonsillar tissue.

In Britain donated blood supplies are to be treated to reduce the risk of patients being infected with nvCJD because of the theoretical risk that it could be transmitted by white blood cells. Plasma which is used to manufacture plasma products—for example, as used in haemophilia—is currently obtained outside Britain.3 Also from November 1999 all cellular blood products will undergo leucodepletion,4 which removes up to 95% of white blood cells.

Unfortunately, further research will resolve these uncertainties about the infectivity of blood products and allow an accurate determination of risk.

S DAWSON
Public Health Laboratory, Gloucestershire Royal Hospital, Gloucester GL1 3NN, UK

An assessment of the artefacts introduced by mounting two parallel sections from each histological level of cervical punch biopsies.

A previous study5 that compared different methods of orienting cervical biopsies has been extended to determine the optimal method of mounting the sections, cut from these biopsies, on the slide to ensure that they are clearly visible for histological examination under the coverslip. In this department six levels have traditionally been cut from each cervical biopsy, with two adjacent sections from each level being mounted on either side of the midline along the long axis of the slide. This practice places the sections in close proximity to the edge of the coverslip where they may not be protected if the coverslip moves medially or where they may become obscured if mountant is smeared from between the slide and the coverslip, and becomes smeared over the edge of coverslip. Two hundred routine cervical punch biopsies in which duplicate sections from each level were mounted on either side of the midline were assessed prospectively up to July 1999. They were compared with 47 biopsies, in which duplicate sections from each level incompletely covered by the coverslip where they may not be protected if the coverslip moves medially or where they may become obscured if mountant is smeared from between the slide and the coverslip, and becomes smeared over the edge of coverslip.

Table 1 The number of sections not covered by the coverslip that were covered by balsam, and the number of levels where material was obscured by balsam; if two levels were mounted the level was only considered to be obscured if both sections were obscured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of sections</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of sections not protected by the coverslip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two sections/level</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One section/level</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sections covered by mountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two sections/level</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One section/level</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sections obscured by mountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two sections/level</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One section/level</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of levels with both sections obscured by mountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two sections/level</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One section/level</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Book reviews


This book updates two related WHO publications, Basic Tests for Pharmaceutical Substances (1986) and Basic Tests for Pharmaceutical Dosage Forms (1991), and gives information on tests for a further 23 substances, 81 dosage forms, and four medicinal plant materials. The drugs/preparations listed are mainly from the WHO Model List of Essential Drugs (1997). Reagents, test solutions, and volumetric solutions not listed before are detailed in the present volume, although there is nothing on suppliers, and little on reagent stability, storage conditions, and so on. There is a cumulative index to the three books.

The tests are confined to a physical description of the material and simple colour and other reactions, and aim to facilitate identity testing of bulk supplies, for example when labelling is unclear, and to indicate whether gross degradation has occurred in certain substances. A lot of work has gone into this relatively short publication, as evidenced by the list (more than a page) of acknowledgements of individuals and collaborating centres. Is the book of interest to clinical/forensic laboratories? Probably not, except that some laboratories might find a few of the tests useful if asked to identify powders, and so on (see Flanagan RJ, et al. Basic analytical toxicology. Geneva: WHO, 1995). There are simpler ways of identifying tablets (for example, Ramsey JD, Woolley JM. TLC/UV—a CD-ROM for the identification of tablets and capsules. The International Association of Forensic Toxicologists: Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting, Padova, 1997:174–82).

The tests are supplemented by a review of recent published non-WHO work on simple methods for identifying pharmaceuticals, including volumetric, spectrophotometric, and thin layer chromatographic (TLC) methods. It seems that more than 150 TLC procedures were developed by WHO collaborators in the early 1980s using some 40 different mobile phases, but this work was not published as it was thought necessary to try to reduce the number of mobile phases used. Publishing and updating books, data sheets, and so on is becoming easier as desk top and even electronic publishing become the norm. It remains to be seen how WHO will respond to this challenge—there is not even an email address for comments in the present volume.

R J FLANAGAN


The first edition of this book was published in 1990 with the subtitle A guide to the FAB classification. (The FAB group had by then published proposals for the classification of the acute leukaemias, the myelodysplastic syndromes and the chronic lymphoid leukemias.) “This book is much more than an atlas,” quoted from a review of that edition, advertises this new volume from its back cover. How true. Much more than just a guide to the FAB classification too. It has been comprehensively revised and updated to include current immunophenotypic, cyto- genetic, and molecular developments, and also consideration of scatterplot data from the new generation of automated counters. The book is both a comprehensive atlas of clearly reproduced photomicrographs of a whole range of common and rare leukaemic material, and an elegant and enthusiastically written treatise on leukaemia classification.

No classification of leukaemia can be perfect. The often competing criteria of easy and reproducible applicability, clinical relevance, and biological plausibility necessitate compromises. This work does not seek to champion or defend the FAB classifications, but explains them critically, and sets them in a contemporary context in the light of the newer technological developments. Cyto- genetic and molecular discoveries have clarified many biological entities. Meanwhile, generations of careful morphologists, for whom Dr Bain is a contemporary standard bearer, have gone back to the microscopic appearances to find that much of the information was there for the want of looking. Thus we can predict from the preliminary appearances when we are going to find an 8;21 translocation or a 16 inversion, whether or not a Philadelphia negative case is going to appear with a bcr rearrangement, and many more examples. For the clinical haematologist this is not only rapidly available free information, it is also fun, and there’s little enough of that around these days. Even the developing “Bugger the cytochemistry, what do the markers show?” school of haematology should be enticed back to their microscopes by this enthusiastic writing, and I commend this book unreiversedly to all haematologists and trainees.

PETER CAREY

Notices

Practical Adult Cardiovascular Pathology Course

Royal Brompton Hospital, Imperial School of Medicine

6–7 March 2000

A “hands on” course approaching in detail the problems facing the diagnostic pathologist when dealing with cardiovascular pathology. Approaches to cardiac necropsy and sudden death will be emphasised. The course is aimed at trainees studying for the MRCPath.

Further details: Short Course Office, National Heart and Lung Institute, Dovehouse Street, London SW3 6LY, UK; tel +44 (0)2073518172; fax +44 (0)2073518246; email: shortcourse.NHII@IC.ac.uk

British Society for Clinical Cytology

BSCC Spring Tutorial: Cervical Cytology

Guy’s Hospital, London

7 April 2000

Lectures and workshops including “Invasive squamous cell carcinoma” (W Gray), “Borderline changes” (P Smith), and “Atrophic smears” (L Turnbull). Further details: BSCC Office, EMI, Central Research Laboratories, Dawley Road, Hayes, Middx UB3 1HH, UK; tel +44 (0)181 6062511; fax +44 (0)181 6062565; email: lesley.couch@psilink.co.uk
The risk of infection transmission by blood transfusion in England
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