

sive. Specifically, Dr. McGowan implies that groups like the American Thoracic Society are insular and perhaps uninterested in reaching out and working with other groups of health professionals to contain tuberculosis. In fact, nothing can be further from the truth.

The American Thoracic Society, and particularly its Assembly on Microbiology, Tuberculosis, and Pulmonary Infection, is a heterogeneous organization with expertise in an array of specialties including microbiology, nursing, preventive medicine, infectious diseases, and pulmonary medicine. The American Thoracic Society has a long history of working effectively with other organizations interested in various aspects of tuberculosis and is, like SHEA, a member of the National Coalition for the Elimination of Tuberculosis. That the American Thoracic Society has been working hard to deal with tuberculosis is reflected in the fact that most of Dr. McGowan's references are either published by the American Thoracic Society or authored by members of the organization.

These points notwithstanding, Dr. McGowan's call for collaborative effort is appropriate and welcome. Speaking for our assembly and the American Thoracic Society, we would welcome an opportunity to work together with groups like SHEA to address problems in tuberculosis control in general and nosocomial tuberculosis in particular.

**Jeffrey Glassroth, MD**  
Northwestern University  
Medical School  
Chicago, Illinois

*The author replies.*

It is a delight to see this rapid and positive response to my editorial<sup>1</sup> by such a prominent and respected expert in the field of tuberculosis as Dr. Glassroth. I

hasten to assure him that he has suspected potential insult where none was intended. In fact, close cooperation between pulmonary clinicians and hospital epidemiologists is crucial to tuberculosis control efforts in our hospital; I am sure that this is the case in most other medical centers.

My suggestion in the editorial was for hospital epidemiologists to work to change the perception of the public and of groups like the national, state, and local Lung Associations for whom pulmonary physicians and the American Thoracic Society (ATS) are their only resource. In Georgia, through a state TB Task Force, we have found that the hospital epidemiology community and the Lung Association have mutual interests and common concerns. Establishing a working relationship has benefited both.

I welcome the offer of Dr. Glassroth and the ATS Assembly on Microbiology, Tuberculosis, and Pulmonary Infection to work closely with SHEA. I agree that both groups being active in the National Coalition for the Elimination of Tuberculosis is probably not sufficient contact. Perhaps appointment of liaison representatives by each organization to the other would be a useful way to build a continuing and productive relationship.

The invitation by Dr. Glassroth to work together should pave the way for further networking among SHEA and other pertinent groups, as dealing with revitalization of this old adversary will require strong, persistent efforts by all those affected.

**John E. McGowan, Jr., MD**  
Emory University School  
of Medicine  
Atlanta, Georgia

**REFERENCE**

1. McGowan JE Jr. Resurgent nosocomial

tuberculosis: consequences and actions for hospital epidemiologists. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 1992;13:575-578.

## **TB Test Results May Be Skewed**

### **To the Editor:**

In the Brief Report entitled "Increased Rate of Tuberculin Skin Test Conversion Among Workers at a University Hospital," published this past October,<sup>1</sup> the authors described that intermediate strength tuberculin (0.5 ml) was inoculated subcutaneously. Standards recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)<sup>2</sup> emphasize the intradermal injection of 0.1 ml of 5 TU PPD. Any modification to this procedure may cause an important mistake in calculating the rate of tuberculosis infection. There are two problems with the method described by Ramirez et al. One is the dose of 0.5 ml, and the other is the subcutaneous injections. They are giving a larger dose by an unusual method that makes it very difficult to interpret their results. If this is the case, their conclusions may be wrong.

**Samuel Ponce de Leon, MD, MSc**  
**Julio Molina, MD**  
Division of Hospital Epidemiology  
Instituto Nacional de Nutricion  
Mexico City, Mexico

### **REFERENCES**

1. Ramirez JA, Anderson P, Herp S, Raff MJ. Increased rate of tuberculin skin test conversion among workers at a university hospital. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 1992;13:579-581.
2. CDC. Screening for tuberculosis and tuberculous infection in high-risk populations. *MMWR.* 1990;39:1-7.

*The author replies.*

The policy for tuberculin skin testing at the Humana Hospital University of Louisville included

continued on page 193