and prompt intrathecal administration of antiserum would make such adjuvant therapy problematic.

Morton N. Swartz, M.D.
Massachusetts General Hospital
Boston, MA 02114

New York–Presbyterian and GE

TO THE EDITOR: In his Perspective article, Dr. Garber (Oct. 14 issue)1 appropriately alerts us to the potential for conflicts of interest when an academic medical center forms a relationship with a business company. New York–Presbyterian Hospital is very sensitive to this possibility. At the same time, academic medical centers, facing formidable challenges to bring down the costs of care without affecting quality or access, would do well to embrace best business practices and new technology, regardless of where those ideas originate.

Our collaboration with GE Medical Systems is based on having access to business skills and cutting-edge equipment that, in our judgment, will benefit our patients and increase our ability to provide cost-effective, high-quality care. We purchase from GE only technology that the hospital deems to be in the best interest of its patients. We will never delegate to a third party any decisions regarding our patients and the manner or method of our delivery of health care.

Herbert Pardes, M.D.
New York–Presbyterian Hospital
New York, NY 10032
mmanners@nyp.org


Normal Serum Vitamin D Levels

TO THE EDITOR: Kratz et al. report in the October 7 issue1 the revised laboratory reference values for tests commonly ordered at the Massachusetts General Hospital. We noticed that the normative range for 25-hydroxyvitamin D is below what is now the recommended range.2,3 Historical, “normative” data for circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels were based on samples from sun-deprived human subjects, who appeared to be free of disease, with normal circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels assessed by plotting a Gaussian distribution.4 There are many reasons why this method is inaccurate, including such factors as race, lifestyle, use or nonuse of sunscreen, age, and geographic latitude, as well as inappropriately low recommended dietary intake of vitamin D. As a result, investigators have begun to define nutritional vitamin D deficiency by using various biomarkers for circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels, including calcium homeostatic indicators, such as parathyroid hormone, calcium absorption, and bone-mineral density.2,4 Noncalcium homeostatic factors, such as insulin resistance and beta-cell function, have been added to the list of 25-hydroxyvitamin D biomarkers.5 With the use of data from these biomarkers, vitamin D deficiency should be defined as circulating levels of 25-hydroxyvitamin D that are less than 32 ng per milliliter (80 nmol per liter).2

Bruce W. Hollis, Ph.D.
Carol L. Wagner, M.D.
Medical University of South Carolina
Charleston, SC 29425
hollisb@musc.edu


THE AUTHORS REPLY: Drs. Hollis and Wagner raise an important issue: What is the appropriate nor-
mative range for serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D? Clearly, historical “normative” data may underesimate circulating levels of 25-hydroxyvitamin D expected in patients with sufficient vitamin D. Currently, however, methodologic and technical issues prevent a direct comparison of values across laboratories. In fact, there is no consensus on a specific level of 25-hydroxyvitamin D that is indicative of vitamin D deficiency. Reported lower limits of the normal range are between 2 and 32 ng per milliliter (5 to 80 nmol per liter) — levels associated with minimized serum parathyroid hormone values. Given the absence of assay standardization and the lack of consensus regarding clinical cutoff values, reference ranges must remain laboratory-specific. As we point out in the introduction to our tables, the reference ranges listed are for tests performed at the Massachusetts General Hospital. Clinical measurements from most immunoassays, and certainly from immunoassays for 25-hydroxyvitamin D, must be interpreted within the clinical context of each patient; one should not rely solely on cutoff values based on so-called normal levels, even those defined with the use of additional biomarkers.

Alexander Kratz, M.D., Ph.D.
Patrick M. Sluss, Ph.D.
Kent B. Lewandrowski, M.D.
Massachusetts General Hospital
Boston, MA 02114


Footprints

TO THE EDITOR: In their Clinical Problem-Solving article “Footprints” (Sept. 30 issue), Kassutto and Daily present the case of a patient with erythema nodosum, bilateral hilar lymphadenopathy, and a positive purified-protein-derivative (PPD) test. The diagnosis, primary tuberculosis, was based on an assumed recent PPD conversion. There had been no previous PPD testing. Löfgren’s syndrome with latent tuberculosis is an equally probable diagnosis. The evaluation, although thorough and thoughtful, missed the opportunity to obtain a diagnosis by omitting bronchoscopy. Bronchoscopy with transbronchial lung biopsy, transbronchial needle aspiration, or both has a high diagnostic yield in sarcoidosis (83 percent in stage 1). The finding of noncaseating granulomas with negative cultures for acid-fast bacilli and fungi would strongly support the diagnosis of Lofgren’s syndrome, and a latent infection with Mycobacterium tuberculosis would explain the positive PPD test. The identification of Mycobacterium tuberculosis (by means of cultures or the polymerase chain reaction) would be diagnostic of a primary infection with M. tuberculosis. Positive cultures would allow for sensitivity testing and document the degree of sensitivity to isoniazid. This would justify the authors’ approach of observation and chemoprophylaxis against primary tuberculosis. If the bronchoscopy were nondiagnostic (i.e., if there were no granulomas and negative cultures), a reaction to treatment with a sulfa drug would be probable, and the patient should be advised accordingly.

Khaled Al-Khasawneh, M.D.
Peter White, Jr., M.D.
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences
Little Rock, AR 72205
alhhasawnehkhaledr@uams.edu

We agree with Al-Khasawneh and White that bronchoscopy and biopsy would have been an equally reasonable approach to the management of this case. The clinicians and the patient chose to forgo a more invasive procedure, given her clinical improvement, her presumed recent exposure, and the probable diagnosis of primary tuberculosis. The diagnostic yield of bronchoscopy and biopsy is indeed high for sarcoidosis (especially if done before corticosteroid treatment
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