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Angiomyofibroblastoma of the vagina

Angiomyofibroblastoma is a rare, recently described, soft tissue tumour that occurs mainly, but not exclusively, in the vulval region of premenopausal women. We report a case arising in the vagina to draw the attention of pathologists to the fact that this rare neoplasm can occur outside the vulva.

A 54 year old woman, para 4 + 0, presented with a two year history of vaginal wall prolapse. Vaginal examination revealed a polyoid lesion on the anterior wall. Surgical removal and vaginal wall repair was performed.

The surgical specimen consisted of surface mucosa with an underlying well circumscribed, firm, homogenous, white coloured lesion measuring 2.5 cm in maximum diameter. Histology showed unremarkable surface squamous epithelium. Deep to this, a well circumscribed but unencapsulated lesion was present. This contained numerous randomly distributed blood vessels, most of which were thin walled and capillary-like (fig 1A), whereas others had thick muscular walls. The surrounding stroma contained spindle shaped cells, some with wavy nuclei (fig 1B), and others with a plasmacytoid or epithelioid appearance. Occasional multinucleate cells were present (fig 1B).

There was little or no nuclear pleomorphism and mitotic figures were not identified. In some areas there was a tendency for concentration of the stromal cells around blood vessels, although this was not a prominent feature. The stroma contained collagen fibres and was focally oedematous with some extravasation of red blood cells. Immunohistochemical staining showed diffuse positivity of stromal cells for vimentin (Dako, Copenhagen, Denmark). There was focal strong staining for desmin (Dako) and occasional cells were weakly positive for α smooth muscle actin (Sigma, Poole, Dorset, UK). There was no staining of stromal cells for S100 protein (Diagnostic Products Ltd, Abingdon, UK), AE1/AE3 (Dako), CD34 (Sertec, Oxford, UK), or factor VIII related antigen (Sigma, Ontario, Canada). Staining for α smooth muscle actin, CD34, and factor VIII highlighted the vascular channels. There was diffuse strong positivity of stromal cells for the oestrogen receptor (ER) (Dako) and progesterone receptor (PR) (Dako).

Within the vulva the chief differential diagnosis of angiomyofibroblastoma is likely to be a leiomysarcoma with prominent vascularity or an angiomyoma. However, diffuse immunoreactivity for antidesmin antibodies would be expected in both these lesions, rather than the focal positivity seen in our present case.

The immunophenotype of angiomyofibroblastoma is not distinct but most cases are desmin positive and α smooth muscle actin negative. However, some are negative for desmin or positive for α smooth muscle actin. In this case, there was focal strong immunoreactivity for desmin, with only occasional cells staining with anti-α smooth muscle actin. Diffuse positivity for ER and PR was present and this has been described previously in vulval angiomyofibroblastoma. Although this raises the possibility that angiomyofibroblastoma is a hormonally responsive neoplasm, positivity for ER and PR might simply be a reflection of the presence of these receptors normally in the subepithelial stromal cells of the vulva and vagina. It is probable that angiomyofibroblastoma in this region is derived from mesenchymal cells in the subepithelial myoid stromal zone, which extends from the endocervix to the vulva. However, in a recent report this lesion has also been described in the fallopian tube.
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Thrombophilia testing

In his recent leader, Dr Baglin gives an interesting overview of thrombophilia testing. However, his clinical practice of screening all unselected patients with an episode of venous thromboembolism is at odds with the British committee for standards in haematology guidelines on the investigation of thrombophilia. According to these guidelines, the main indications for thrombophilia testing are patients with a venous thromboembolism before the age of 45 years, recurrent venous thrombosis or thrombophlebitis, thrombosis in an unusual site, or a first venous thromboembolism with a clear family history of venous thrombosis. Such restrictions on expensive and time consuming thrombophilia tests to patient groups more likely to have underlying thrombophilic defects are almost mandatory in haematology departments working under the financial constraints of the present day national health service.
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A comparison of international normalised ratio (INR) measurement in hospital and general practice settings: evidence for lack of standardisation

Previous reports of discrepancies in international normalised ratio (INR) measurement between centres have focused on hospital based methodology. Previously, we have demonstrated differences in derived INR values for the same sample tested in primary care and in one of three different haematology laboratories. However, his clinical practice of screening all unselected patients with an episode of venous thromboembolism is at odds with the British committee for standards in haematology guidelines on the investigation of thrombophilia. According to these guidelines, the main indications for thrombophilia testing are patients with a venous thromboembolism before the age of 45 years, recurrent venous thrombosis or thrombophlebitis, thrombosis in an unusual site, or a first venous thromboembolism with a clear family history of venous thrombosis. Such restrictions on expensive and time consuming thrombophilia tests to patient groups more likely to have underlying thrombophilic defects are almost mandatory in haematology departments working under the financial constraints of the present day national health service.
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method of INR testing, the result obtained was taken as the gold standard. Samples were sent to the laboratory using routine transport with no samples tested more than 12 hours after venesection.

Fifty four separate venous samples from 26 patients were sent from the practice to the laboratories. The INR values obtained ranged from 1.0 to 6.1. Table 1 shows the mean difference in results from the various machines. There was a significant mean difference in the practice Thromboteq results relative to the ACL and the KC-10 in both laboratories, but none between practice measurements and those obtained in laboratory 1 using the same technology. There were also significant differences between all hospital systems. Furthermore, there was a significant difference between ACL and KC-10 results from the same laboratory and between KC10 results from different laboratories.

Our results suggest that regular differences occur in INR measurements obtained on the same samples using different methodologies and drawn attention to inherent problems associated with INR measurement in different settings. The clinical implication of these findings is that patients could receive different doses of warfarin depending upon which centre monitors their INR. Nevertheless, the best agreement to be found was between the practice derived INR and the laboratory derived INR using the same technology. This shows that primary care INR estimations are as reliable as laboratory estimations using the same combination of reagents and technology. Therefore, it follows that as long as continuity of INR estimation by location and method is maintained for individual patients, the rate of unnecessary warfarin dose adjustments will be reduced.

### Table 1 Mean difference (SEM) in INR between methods (n = 54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACL Lab 1</th>
<th>ACL Lab 2</th>
<th>KC-10 Lab 1</th>
<th>KC10 Lab 2</th>
<th>Thromboteq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>0.25 (0.04)**</td>
<td>0.50 (0.05)**</td>
<td>0.35 (0.06)**</td>
<td>-0.06 (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC-10</td>
<td>0.24 (0.03)**</td>
<td>0.11 (0.05)*</td>
<td>-0.13 (0.06)*</td>
<td>-0.55 (0.07)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thromboteq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.42 (0.07)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.001.

INR, international normalised ratio.

More fundamental questions are: What is the purpose of giant multi-author texts like this, who needs them, when will they be used and how, and if they are required, what is the “pecking order” for choice of these? Very often better written, more detailed, and more up to date descriptions exist in specific texts. The constraints of producing a multi author work like this mean that the individual chapters are unlikely to rival the detail of the specialised book. However, I suspect most of us consult books like this on the areas in which we do not have specialised texts. Apart from this text, this market segment appears to include Ackerman’s Surgical Pathology edited by Rosai, Anderson’s Pathology edited by Damjanov and Linder, and Silverberg’s Principles and Practice of Surgical Pathology. Perhaps the Oxford Textbook of Pathology is not a direct competitor because its remit is so different. The choice of which of these books to consult is a personal matter, depending on preferred style and balance of writing. In my view, Ackerman is particularly commendable for Rosai’s masterful treatment of the diagnosis in surgical pathology, Silverberg is brief and to the point, yet quite detailed, and Anderson’s Pathology is good for clinicopathological correlations and the general context of disease. This text lies somewhere in the middle, meeting several of the purposes, but to my mind it is beaten for quality of histological description by the first two works, although still very worthwhile if funds allow its purchase.

T J STEPHENSON

Atlas of Immunology. Cruse JM, Lewis RE. (Lippincott, 1999. ISBN 5 740 64807 0.) The Atlas of Immunology aims to be “the most up to date and thoroughly illustrated treatise available”. Sadly the book does not achieve what it sets out to do. Many of the images by their nature attempt to illustrate clinical or laboratory situations and, particularly for these, the highest quality of image is required to enable the differentiation from other often subtly different conditions. Many clinical images are given simply as line drawings—for example, a malar rash in systemic lupus erythematosus, the hands in systemic sclerosis, or a baby with an intravenous line (the image for severe combined immunodeficiency). A dermatology text would not accept line drawings of a malar rash and why should immunologists? It is as if a team of journalists have collected as many images as possible regardless of quality, content, or currency. All are printed in black and white, and the reproduction is often poor. No explanation is given to any figure, either in the text, or in the legends, which are all simple statements such as “release of sequestered antigen”. For images such as indirect immunofluorescence of salivary gland duct showing the staining pattern of anti-salivary gland antibodies labelled simply as “Sjögren’s syndrome” this is especially uninformative. Even the accompanying text is now largely outdated.

This ambitious project was an opportunity for two distinguished authors to provide the reader with access to a lifetime’s experience of the first class images, using each one as an explanation of a key immunological concept. Each would have a detailed explanation, describing the distinguishing features, and contrasting it with similar images. As a minimum it would
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With the dramatic fall in professors of medical microbiology, together with the recommended reduction in didactic teaching of medical students, the requirement for a readable and affordable textbook assumes even more importance. Although the would be doctors of tomorrow do not necessarily see it like that—plenty of money for the pleasures of life, but none for books. David Shanson’s Microbiology in Clinical Practice has been a recommended text for medical students throughout the UK since its launch in 1982. So what has changed since the first edition? New diseases and new pathogens have emerged such as Helicobacter pylori; hepatitis C, E, and G; Escherichia coli 0157; Bartonella; Chlamydia pneumoniae; and variant CJD—to name but a few. In addition to the new, we welcome back the old: diphtheria and tuberculosis. The ever ingenious bacteria appear to have the upper hand against the pharmacuetical chemist, and the global epidemic of AIDS marches ever onwards, ever confident into this new millennium. In an attempt to aid the would be Alexander Flemings of the future to climb out of their Petri dishes and discard the loop, an additional chapter entitled “Applications of molecular biology to clinical microbiology and infectious diseases” has been added. This highly readable textbook is recommended to medical students, MLSOs, infection control nurses, and general practitioners alike. Value for money at £29.99—all for the price of a few beers!


This is the fourth edition of this excellent book which has found on the shelves of most microbiology laboratories in the UK. In the 16 years since the first edition it has grown from 13 to 19 chapters to take account of recent developments in infections and agents such as new variant CJD, risk assessment, and European regulations and recommendations. The book is full of practical advice on avoiding laboratory hazards, such as aerosol generation and sharps injury, as relevant now as before disposable equipment and test formats. It also provides a fascinating list of published reports of laboratory acquired infections and is the standard UK reference source for these.

The strength of this book lies in its detailed coverage of all aspects of laboratory practice and management, which is backed up by reference to appropriate health and safety regulations or guidelines. For example, there is an excellent comprehensive chapter on safety cabinets and a helpful section on transport of isolates and samples, although the latter does not discuss the recent UK post office changes. Some of the references are a little out of date, such as 1982 for the text on bacterial pathogenesis, and there are occasional errors, but the overall quality of the book is as high as ever.

Everyone working in a laboratory setting should have to read this book, especially those with little experience of working with viable organisms or clinical samples, such as those taking up genetic manipulation work. It remains thoroughly recommended.
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