arthritis involving I belli and Cryptosporidium infestation in patients with AIDS are not yet well known. Further studies should help clarify these questions. We are not aware of any previous report of reactive arthritis after enteric infection due to I belli and we believe this to be the first such report.

J GONZALEZ-DOMINGUEZ
R ROLAND
Rheumatology Unit
Hospital Universitario Reina Sofia
Córdoba, Spain
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AUTHORS’ REPLY We are pleased that the first article in Lesion of the month has attracted interest and correspondence.

In reply to Dr Edgar et al, we feel that the use of Bence-Jones protein (BJP) as a descriptive term for urinary monoclonal free light chains is in such standard usage as to be fully acceptable; few clinicians or laboratory scientists would be in any doubt as to the meaning of this term.

The agarose gel electrophoretic assay used for the detection of urinary BJP in our laboratory has a sensitivity of 0.08 g/l, which after concentration of urine ×2000 gives a lower limit of detection of approximately 0.001 g/l of monoclonal light chains (Sheldon J, personal communication). In this case BJP was not quantified but was expressed as two faint bands of kappa protein at initial testing. The laboratory routinely expresses BJP calculated as a ‘percentage of total urinary protein’.

It is our experience, and that of our colleagues in the laboratory, that the term ‘benign’ can be applied to the presence of a monoclonal protein in persons with no evidence of myeloma, Waldenstroms macroglobulinaemia, amyloidosis or other related B cell malignancy. We suggest that the term can only be applied once the condition is shown to be stable with time – five years for IgG and IgA and 10 years for IgM paraprotein. An alternative term monoclonal gammopathy of unknown significance (MGU) is better used when any doubt exists.

We agree with Dr Edgar et al, and hope that Lesion of the month highlights the need to follow up the findings of even a faint band of BJP with serial BJP measurements. It was this omission which led to the difficulties encountered in this case. However, we appreciate the concern expressed by Dr Edgar that early bone marrow examination be undertaken if any BJP is detected and there is general agreement that this decision should be based on clinical judgement. Most clinicians would find it impossible, for reasons of resource limitation and clinical acceptability, to perform bone marrow examination on every patient with any detectable BJP, although this is a moot point. Certainly levels of >0.01 mg/l are more suggestive of malignancy and should be investigated with bone marrow examination. As far as other investigations are concerned plain radiographs are generally regarded as a more sensitive indicator of the presence of myeloma. Isotope bone scans can often be normal in myeloma even with significant bony deposits. Interpretation of the finding of BJP may be aided also by assay of β2 microglobulin. β2 microglobulin may be elevated either with deterioration in renal function or with myeloma tumour mass; interpretation of elevated levels may be difficult.

If Lesion of the month continues to draw attention to important clinical issues and to open areas of controversy then it will surely achieve its intended purpose.

J D M EDGAR
N P RICHARDS
R J POWELL
Department of Immunology
University Hospital Queen’s Medical Centre
Nottingham NG7 2UH


Antiphospholipid antibodies (aPL) in systemic lupus erythematosus. Are they specific tools for the diagnosis of aPL syndrome?

We read with interest the paper by Ghirardello et al on antiphospholipid antibodies (aPL) in systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) but would suggest that their conclusion, “lupus anticoagulant (LA) but not anticardiolipin antibody (aCL) positivity is a specific tool for the diagnosis of thrombotic complications...in SLE”, is interpreted with caution.

There are a number of methodological problems in setting up a study of this kind which should be highlighted:

1) This study was retrospective and it cannot be assumed that the presence of aPL at the time of study is aPL +ve at the time of diagnosis of SLE. In fact, the authors do not specifically state in reference to the 47 patients who had experienced pregnancy, whether they were diagnosed as having SLE at that time. It is therefore likely that the recording of aPL complications using...