Letters

Workload measurement in histopathology

I am surprised that both Suvarna and Kay’s paper on workload measurement in histopathology and Furness’ subsequent commentary do not refer to North American reports on this subject. A formal method of assessing physician workload and value has been developed in the USA from 1988 onwards and is now in widespread use for billing.

The basis of the system has been published in detail. The system uses a relative value unit (RVU) for comparing the “physician value” of different activities. The value includes: time taken; mental effort and judgement; technical skill and physical effort; and psychological stress. Relative values are assigned to a service by asking a sample of practitioners to rate the value of the service in relation to a reference service. It has been shown to be reproducible and valid. Relative value scales have been developed for pathology and are published in the Federal Register. The services and procedures are defined in the American Medical Association’s Current procedural terminology.

As an illustration, using the limited published data on individual workload and making reasonable assumptions, an efficient whole time equivalent pathologist working 44 weeks a year, seven laboratory sessions a week (three sessions for meetings, audit, management and research) might earn about 4500 RVUs per annum.

This equates to: Either: 4286 FNAs or: 10 714 pathologist interpretations of cervical cytology or: 1974 large resections, for example bowel, prostate, or lung for neoplasm or: 6000 biopsy specimens of colon, stomach, or prostate or: 20 455 appendices or gallbladders or: 34 615 vas or fallopian tubes from hysterectomies.

[Note: the unit of service is the specimen and extra credit is given for special stains.]

Accurate measurement of workload is important to determine departmental resources, for internal departmental allocation of work, and to assess the likely impact of service developments. It may become even more important in the near future when the manpower planning failures of the last few years lead to short staffed departments and gross discrepancies between individual workloads. This situation will doubtless lead to demands for redistribution of work and/or remuneration; these potential disputes can only be solved fairly if there is an accepted way of measuring workload.

The RVU system seems fair and should be easy to apply and to audit. It is consistent, has been validated, and is under regular review. There is every good reason to introduce it to the United Kingdom as a way of measuring workload in histology and cytopathology.

Authors’ response

We are grateful for the response from Dr Griffiths and his illustration of an alternate methodology of calculating histopathologists’ workload. The resource based relative value is derived from an assessment of time and intensity of work with practice cost and opportunity cost factors (training, and so on). In broad terms it parallels the Kornor unit (KU) in attributing work to case diagnosis and has been tried in some centres.

We chose to limit ourselves to common UK units of measurement in our paper since these are used to justify funding and service provision plans. We consider we have illustrated the limitations of the Welcan, KU, and case load number assessment (as suggested by the Royal College of Pathologists). We feel there is merit in a simple system providing a more interactive assessment of histopathologists’ activity and consider that the KU figures can be altered progressively as reporting standards change, to reflect the alteration in workload. Nevertheless, the RBRV methodology deserves comparison.

The limitations of the RBRV model include the arbitrary grouping of named codes together, lack of necropsy work assessment, and work specific time allocation to whole session activities (for example, research). However, if we use Dr Griffiths’ examples of an “average” histopathologist we can see the ratios of work assessment are similar for KUs and RVUs (table).

We do not believe that anyone could seriously imagine a workload of pure appendices/colon/cytology/vasa as above. Do just over 2 FNA samples equate to 1 colectomy, or do 3 vasectomy samples equate to 1 hemicolecotomy, using the RVU or KU respectively? We imagine not, but if nothing else it serves to illustrate the need for workloads to be seriously addressed if funded service provision is to go forwards. There is an increasing trend for standardised dissection and reporting across the UK. The Royal College of Pathologists’ workload numbers of 4000 and 2500 specimens, for district general and teaching hospitals, are clearly arbitrary and of little relevance. These figures may reflect the RCPath committee members’ lack of experience of work outside teaching environments. That Welcans and Korners have limitations is also evident. To expect that KUs would be accepted across the country “as the best thing since sliced bread” would be naive, but we believe we can win them back, or another system. The argument is going to have to be addressed soon. Ideally this will involve all histopathologists across the UK.

K SUVARNA
M S KAY
Department of Histopathology, Northern General Hospital, Herrick Road, Sheffield S5 7AU

Chlamydia pneumoniae and atherosclerosis

In their leader article, Taylor-Robinson and Thomas cogently discussed the association of C pneumoniae and atherosclerosis and examined whether C pneumoniae infection is specific for arteries and atheroma. We agree that current evidence suggests that it is not. In C pneumoniae has been associated with several diseases, among which the only common factor seems to be the presence of diseased tissue (table). The authors also discussed how future studies should be designed to investigate its role in atherosclerosis. We agree that although pathological studies have demonstrated the presence of C pneumoniae in atherosclerotic vessels, they can never show whether infection is a cause or follows its development. Animal studies and antibiotic intervention trials are therefore required to prove that C pneumoniae is clinically important. However, the concern is that in some populations the prevalence of chronic active C pneumoniae infection may be too low to enable unselective trials to show an effect where in fact one may exist. Furthermore, for reasons of appropriate prescribing alone, antibiotics should only be given to subjects in whom there is good reason to believe there is current C pneumoniae infection, especially if, as has been suggested, treatment may need to be for prolonged periods of up to a year. Future research should therefore include efforts to determine how infected individuals can be rapidly identified. We believe serology is inadequate. Specific tests of current infection, such as probing for C pneumoniae DNA in blood or monocysts need urgently to be validated.

Y WONG
M EWARD
Wexes Cardiothoracic Unit, Southampton General Hospital, Southampton S016 5DY, UK

Some of the diseases associated with C pneumoniae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Coronary artery disease</th>
<th>Asthma</th>
<th>Rheumatoid arthritis</th>
<th>Sarcoidosis</th>
<th>Alzheimer dementia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main age(s) of onset</td>
<td>Rises steeply from 35 years onwards 3-4% (40-49 years) 6-7% (60-64 years)</td>
<td>Early (childhood) and late onset types recognized 5%; 15% in second decade</td>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>20-30 years</td>
<td>Above 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK prevalence</td>
<td>Male:female prevalence 5.5:1 (34-44 years). Ratio reduces with increasing age</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Childhood asthma can improve in teens but frequently returns. Adult asthmatics can improve with age</td>
<td>Variable. Mortality not increased</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Variable but increased risk of mortality</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Uncommon in Far East and developing countries</td>
<td>Uncommon in black Africans</td>
<td>Global although it can be uncommon in black Africans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/race</td>
<td>Common in countries where fat consumption is high</td>
<td>Common in countries where fat consumption is high</td>
<td>Common in countries where fat consumption is high</td>
<td>Common in countries where fat consumption is high</td>
<td>Common in countries where fat consumption is high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in prevalence in recent times</td>
<td>Reducing in most developed countries</td>
<td>Reducing in most developed countries</td>
<td>Reducing in most developed countries</td>
<td>Reducing in most developed countries</td>
<td>Reducing in most developed countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authors’ response

Wong and Ward concur with the major points we made in highlighting the efforts that are required to unravel the role of *Chlamydia pneumoniae* in atherosclerosis. Their comments, however, go beyond this and focus on a possible association of *C pneumoniae* with some other diseases. Despite the occasional voice of dissent, there is now overwhelming evidence of an association between *C pneumoniae* and atherosclerosis. What this means is quite unclear and is, of course, the overriding question that needs to be resolved. Many would think an association of *C pneumoniae* with asthma and to a lesser extent with sarcoidosis is a reasonable proposition. However, as the microorganism is to be found in peripheral blood mononuclear cells of a substantial proportion of individuals with and without cardiovascular disease, it is possible for it to lodge just about anywhere in the body and all sorts of relations with disease might be imagined, many perhaps turning out to be spurious. Indeed, it is reasonable to list rheumatoid arthritis and Alzheimer dementia in the same context as atherosclerosis. We think not. There is some evidence, which certainly needs to be substantiated, for an association between *C pneumoniae* and the HLA-B27 positive spondyloarthopathy subgroup of juvenile chronic arthritis, but we are aware of only a single report of *C pneumoniae* in one adult with rheumatoid arthritis. Furthermore, while there is a report of this microorganism being found in brain tissue of patients with Alzheimer disease, is a single, unconfirmed report sufficient to talk in terms of an association that means anything? While it is feasible, it would, nevertheless, be startling if future research showed that this single microorganism was responsible for so many diverse diseases.

DAVID TAYLOR-ROBINSON
BRENDA J THOMAS
Gentlemans Medicine Unit, Division of Medicine (A), Imperial College School of Medicine, St Mary’s Hospital, London W2 1NY, UK


PCR to detect *M tuberculosis*

Although aspirates from solitary pulmonary nodules were not included among specimens used to assess the rapid polymerase chain reaction (PCR) technique, 3 this technique shows promise in improving the diagnostic rate for *M tuberculosis* in solitary pulmonary nodules of < 4 cm diameter. 4 Seven of eight aspirates from patients with other evidence of tuberculosis (including five with bacteriological proof, and three with significant response to a therapeutic trial of chemotherapy) tested positive by PCR, and one of three not validated by either technique also tested positive by PCR. 5 The sensitivity of PCR for aspirates from solitary pulmonary nodules is therefore impressively high, with virtually no false positives. The clinical decision process for malignant solitary pulmonary nodules which at present generates a positive predictive value of the order of a mere 50%, thereby yielding an unacceptably high resection rate for benign (including tuberculosis) lesions, 6 would be greatly enhanced by a more enthusiastic use of the PCR technique.

OMF JOLobe
Department of Medicine for the Elderly, Tameside General Hospital, Fountain St, Ashton under Lyne OL6 9RW, UK


Notice

**International Society of Dermatopathology: 20th Colloquium**

24–26 September 1999

Prague

“Dermatopathology and General Pathology are One Pathology”

Co-sponsored by the European Society of Dermatopathology and the Dermatopathology Group of the Czech Dermatological Society. The Colloquium includes a long course, a short course, a self-assessment course, free communications, poster sessions, and breakfasts with leading dermatopathologists from different parts of the world.

Further details from: Dr Jana Hercogova, Charles University 2nd Medical School, Department of Dermatology, V úvalu 84, 150 18 Prague 5, Czech Republic; tel +4202 2443 8700; fax +4202 2443 8720; email: jana.hercogova@lfmotol.cuni.cz

Corrections

In the leader by Dobbins, Kate and Wilcox in the March issue (vol 52, page 169) there is an uncorrected error in the section headed “Acridine orange staining of catheter blood.” Line 4 of this section should read: “The technique requires as little as 50 μl of blood...”

In the leader by McMullin in the April issue (vol 52, page 247), a single sentence has been separated unintentionally into two. In the left hand column, three lines from the bottom of the page, the sentence as corrected should read: “As the gene is on the X chromosome and the other X chromosome is “lyonised” in females, leading to inactivation of the lyonised gene, damage to a single gene results in abnormal GPI anchor expression.”
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