behavior by health care providers that could be harmful to patients.

The authors state in their abstract, "Emergency endotracheal intubation appears to contribute to the overall incidence of nosocomial pneumonia." In the text they elaborate, "The extent to which emergency intubations, an increasingly common procedure, contribute to the overall incidence of nosocomial pneumonia is unknown. At our 800-bed institution, approximately 15 to 20 patients require emergency or urgent intubation each month. If 45% of these patients develop pneumonia, they constitute a large population of individuals not previously recognized as being at increased risk of pneumonia."

From these statements one might conclude that whenever emergency endotracheal intubation is contemplated, it should be considered relative to an increased risk of pneumonia. What is the evidence? The authors showed that 45% of all patients who required emergency endotracheal intubation during a given time in their hospital developed either definite or probable pneumonia within three days of intubation. *There was no control* group comprised of patients with similar characteristics but whose tracheas were not intubated. Yet the authors attributed the 45% incidence of post-intubation pneumonia to the intubation procedure. Their own data showed that their patients were highly susceptible to pneumonia, 31% of whom had antecedent respiratory infections. The critical question is whether the patients would have (survived and) contracted pneumonia if their tracheas had not been intubated.

Our principal concern is that poorly informed persons, fearing the 45% incidence of pneumonia attributed by the authors to the intubation procedure, might inappropriately withhold emergency endotracheal intubation from patients for whom the procedure might be helpful or even life saving. The high incidence of pneumonia in patients undergoing emergency endotracheal intubation is probably related to the fact that these patients are at high risk for nosocomial pneumonia by virtue of pre-existing acute or chronic respiratory disease. Additionally, endotracheal intubation may contribute to the development of pneumonia simply by prolonging patients' lives long enough for them to develop pneumonia. Regardless of why the pneumonia developed, mortality in this study was the same after emergency endotracheal intubation whether the patient developed pneumonia or not.

Ronald A. Gabel, MD
Professor and Chairman
Department of Anesthesiology
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

Sandra J. Pfaff, RN, BSN, CIC
Infection Control Practitioner
Strong Memorial Hospital
Rochester, New York

Dr. Lowy and co-authors respond to Dr. Gabel and Ms. Pfaff:

Dr. Gabel and Ms. Pfaff raise the issue that some individuals might withhold emergency intubation from patients because of the high risk of pneumonia as a result of our paper. This was not our intent. As stated in the text, the patients included were those who "required" emergency intubation. There was no option in these cases. For the same reason, there was no control group.

We attempted to address the issue of whether the pneumonia *was* procedure-related by determining the overall incidence of pneumonia among patients followed for 14 days. When pneumonia developed, 87.5% of patients developed it within three days of intubation, suggesting that the pneumonia was procedure related. In the discussion section we also note that it is unclear whether aspiration occurs as a result of the intubation process or the respiratory or cardiac arrest. It was certainly not our intent to discourage intubation in patients who require it. Rather we hoped to identify a previously unrecognized group who appear to be at risk for developing nosocomial pneumonia.

Franklin D. Lowy, MD
Audrey Adams, RN, CIC
Penelope Carlisle, RN, CIC
Cheryl Feiner, MPH
Montefiore Medical Center
Bronx, New York

Laboratory Directors Endorse CDC Recommendations

To the Editor:

A revision of the Recommendations for Prevention of HIV Transmission in Health-Care Settings was issued by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) on August 21, 1987. According to the recommendations, the CDC advises precautions for all clinical specimens to prevent the risk of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) fluid infection. Recommendations are specifically stated for laboratories, autopsy or mortician services, dentistry, invasive procedures, dialysis, and related health care services.

The CDC recommends that laboratories continue to employ those standard safety and barrier procedures already well known (ie, gloves, protective eyewear, laboratory coat, face mask, etc). None of these protective items should be worn outside the laboratory. Biological safety cabinets must be used for procedures that are likely to create aerosols. In addition, the use of syringes and needles should be limited to situations where no alternative exists; avoid mouth pipetting by using mechanical devices; use well-constructed containers with secure lids to prevent leakage of fluids during transport; and decontaminate work bench and laboratory equipment after liquid spills or after completion of a laboratory procedure.

The Association of State and Territorial Public Health Laboratory Directors endorses the CDC recommendations for the protection of health care workers, particularly laboratory workers, from infection by blood-borne agents. Although CDC guidelines are voluntary and relate primarily to human immunodeficiency virus, the employer or director of a laboratory has an obligation to provide orientation and continuing education for all employees, to provide equipment and supplies to minimize the risk of infection, and to monitor employee compliance with the safety recommendations. An excellent additional laboratory guideline is the Human T-Lymphotropic Virus Type III/Lymphadenopathy-Associated Virus Agent Summary Statement

published in the *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (29 August* 1986, 35:540-542, **547-549) as an addendum** to the 1984 CDC/NIH Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories.

An important reason for endorsement of the CDC Recommendations by the Association of State and Territorial Public Health Laboratory Directors is our belief that uniform and consistent guidelines are necessary for protecting health care workers. As a professional organization, the association has a responsibility to promote acceptable, uniform, national recommendations concerned with the potential of HIV infection, as well as other infections, in the work place. The association encourages other professional organizations to join in the endorsement of the CDC recommendations for Prevention of HIV Transmission in Health-Care Settings. Additional information regarding the content of these important biosafety guidelines may be obtained by contacting the state public health laboratory director in a particular state.

J. Mehsen Joseph, PhD
President
Association of State & Territorial
Public Health Laboratory Directors
Baltimore, Maryland

Reusable Latex Gloves

To **the Editor:**

The Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the American Hospital Association (AHA), and the Association for Practitioners in Infection Control (APIC) have recommended that blood and body fluid precautions be practiced with all recipients of health care at all times.[1-3] In a study conducted at a state institution last year, it was determined that RNs have 13 patient encounters per shift whereas LPNs have up to 15 encounters, and nursing assistants 14 such encounters. The implementation of universal precautions will have a significant fiscal impact on health care facilities, estimated to be as much as $65,000 annually in one 1,100-bed institution for the mentally retarded.

RECOMMENDED GLOVE USE IN INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS

Sterile Procedures	Sterile Gloves
High-risk patient care activities	Disposable Gloves
Drawing blood	
Cleaning blood spills	
Oral hygiene, etc	
Low-nsk nursing activities	Reusable latex gloves
Changing bed pans	
Handling soiled linen	
Changing diapers	
Giving enemas, etc	

We are looking into the possibility of reusing heavy latex gloves for carrying out low-risk nursing activities. The CDC and OSHA (Occupational Health and Safety Administration) have been contacted regarding this proposal and have indicated that there are no regulations against the reuse of appropriate gloves (Personal communication, Walter Bond, MS, Hospital Infections Program, Centers for Disease Control, 1987). The Association for Practitioners in Infection Control has stated criteria for determining if a product may or may not be safely reused.[4] These criteria are met by several available brands of heavier gauge latex gloves.

We recommend reusing latex gloves for low-risk activities due to the economic advantage and to combat any shortage of disposable gloves that may develop. The Maryland state contract price for one pair of disposable gloves is 15 cents while a suitable pair of reusable gloves costs 42 cents, thus ensuring that reusing the latter even three times makes it financially viable. Also, a longer cuff and heavier construction provide increased protection to hands of health care workers. We emphasize that reuse of gloves is suggested only for low-risk areas, where asepsis is not required and where digital dexterity is not a prerequisite (Table). Strict guidelines for washing gloves after each use and for discarding damaged gloves should be implemented.

We would like to offer reusable gloves as an option and would appreciate more information regarding evaluations performed in other jurisdictions. It is our view that institutions would benefit by using reusable gloves wherever possible and hiring additional infection control practitioners with the resultant cost savings. We believe that reusable gloves effectively serve the dual purposes of protecting the patient and protecting the health care provider.

REFERENCES

1. US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control. *Recommendations for Prevention of HIV Transmission in Health Care Settings.*
2. American Hospital Association: *Statement of the Advisory Committee on Infection Within Hospitals on Protection of Health Care Workers.* June 18, 1987.
3. Board of Directors, Association for Practitioners of Infection Control: *APIC Statement on AIDS Precautions in the Health Care Setting.* 1987.
4. The Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation: *Reuse of Disposables.* Technology Assessment Report No. 6-83, 1983.

Ebenezer Israel, MD, MPH
Pat Powers, RN, MSN
Rebecca M. Thambidurai, MD
Division of Infection Control
Department of Health and
Mental Hygiene
Baltimore, Maryland

AIDS in a Blood Bank Technician in Mexico City

To the Editor:

Since the AIDS epidemic began, health care workers have become increasingly concerned with the possibility of acquiring the infection during patient care. To date there have been at **least** nine accidental cases of infection in nurses and technicians from England, France, and the US.[1-7] Only one case of AIDS is reported among them. Here we report the case of a technician who acquired AIDS and died as a consequence of an accidental infection.

The patient was a 39-year-old male,