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. ROLDAN
Rheumatology Unit
Hospital Universitario Reina Sofia
Cordoba, Spain
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**MATTERS ARISING**

**Bence-Jones protein and vertebral osteoporosis**

We welcome the introduction of *Lesson of the Month* and read with interest the case report submitted by Hugh R A et al regarding the investigation of patients presenting with back pain. As the authors rightly point out, the exclusion of occult lymphoproliferative disorders in this group of patients is of the utmost importance. There are, however, several points of concern arising from the case particularly in relation to the clinical interpretation of monoclonal urinary free light chains.

The use of the term Bence-Jones protein (BJP) can cause confusion as it refers to the original heating test for the detection of urinary monoclonal free light chains. These are now best detected using the more sensitive techniques of immunoelectrophoresis or immunofixation. As this interesting case demonstrates, serum immunoglobulin levels can remain normal in a few cases, even in the terminal stages of disease. It is therefore imperative that paired serum and urine samples are sent for immunochromatographic analysis.

We feel it is potentially misleading to say “...Traces of urinary BJP in isolation can prove to be benign ...”. It is generally agreed that their detection is highly suggestive of underlying lymphoproliferative disease in the majority of cases and it is wise to dismiss such findings as benign. In addition the definition of “a trace” will depend heavily on the detection system employed in individual laboratories. An accurate quantitation of the free light chains should routinely be undertaken; measurement of total urine protein is less informative. These are the important lessons we must ensure patients or occult myeloma do not get to be detected and successfully treated.

We would emphasise that in patients presenting in this manner, a more aggressive investigational approach is indicated including early bone marrow examination and radioisotope scanning of bone. Only when negative results from these investigations are available would it be advisable to monitor the patient over time remembering that a repeat bone marrow examination is always an option at a later date.

J D M EDGAR
N P RICHARDS
R 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 aPL positivity at the time of study, were they also 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
this approach will be inaccurate. Ideally, a prospective study is needed with the enrolment of SLE patients at the time of aPL detection and close observation over a long follow-up time.

2) The lack of standardisation of both lupus anticoagulant and anti-cardiolipin tests continues to be a major problem in interpreting clinical data published on antiphospholipid antibodies. However, better interlaboratory agreement was achieved when IgG and IgM aCLs were recorded in a semi-quantitative fashion (that is, negative, or low, medium, high positive). Ghirardello et al do not specifically comment on such standardisation for their own laboratory.

3) The ELISA assay for aCL is clearly a more sensitive assay for detecting aPLs than the Russell viper venom time. Interestingly, in this study LA positivity was only found in those patients who were aCL positive. Furthermore, a significant association between high titres of IgG aCL and arterial thrombosis suggests that the aCL titre may be more important than the presence of aCL in SLE patients. Previous reports have suggested that aCL, rather than LA, is a better predictor of fetal death in SLE pregnancy, and that high titre aCL carries a worse prognosis. In this regard, Ghirardello et al have not studied aPL complications at different titres of aCL. Furthermore, patients in 'risk pregnancies' were treated with aspirin which might affect the frequency of complications observed.

In summary, larger prospective studies of SLE patients with aPL, better standardisation of aPL assays, and analysis of differing titres of aPL in respect of aPL complications are needed.

N P HOPKINSON Rheumatology Unit, City Hospital Hucknall Road Nottingham, United Kingdom

K LIM J GARDNER-MEDWIN Department of Immunology Queen's Medical Centre University Hospital Nottingham NG7 2UH, United Kingdom


Authors' reply Dr Hopkinson et al suggest caution in interpreting the conclusion of our study regarding the specificity of antiphospholipid antibodies (aPL) for aPL complications in systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). However, it seems they did not take into account the second part of our conclusion; that is, "the measurement of IgG antcardiolipin antibody (aCL) level seems to be a valuable requirement before attributing clinical value to aCL positivity". We believe therefore that our conclusion summarised our results regarding LA and both aCL positivity and level.

Dr Hopkinson also comments adversely about some of the methodological approaches we used.

1) Our study was a cross-sectional rather than a retrospective study. In fact, individuals were considered "ideal" classified as SLE with aPL complications' or 'SLE without aPL complications' and as 'aCL positive' or 'aCL negative' at a single point in time. Nevertheless, we did consider some anamnestic manifestations which occurred after SLE diagnosis to define individuals as 'SLE with aPL complications' and to be able to evaluate possible relationships between aPL and some low prevalence aPL complications. Such a study design, that has been widely used to investigate the clinical significance of aPL, has both well known advantages and disadvantages. As Dr Hopkinson and colleagues pointed out, our study failed to distinguish between the occurrence of anamnestic manifestations and the aPL determination may be a bias in our study. However, the relevance of this bias depends on some variables, particularly on the total amount of anamnestic data recorded and the length of time elapsed from their occurrence and the aPL determination.

Although the prospective study may be considered as suitable for this purpose, some ethical considerations should be taken into account by authors who are interested in research as well as in patient care. In performing such studies, standard antithrombotic anti-cardiolipin treatment should also be avoided in patients considered at risk of thromboembolic complications on the basis of previous studies, including cross-sectional ones (for example, patients with LA and/or high IgG aCL level). This methodological requirement seems to be particularly unethical in setting up studies on SLE pregnancy outcome, since aspirin is now largely and effectively administered to pregnant women who are at risk for preeclampsia, a complication frequently observed in pregnant patients with SLE.

2) We currently record aCL positivity in a semi-quantitative manner, according to the KAPS group international guide-lines on aCL test standardisation. Otherwise, in our study we expressed aCL results by calculating a cut-off point and testing its specificity for aPL complications in SLE by ROC curve analysis. We considered as optimum cut-off aCL mean levels +4 standard deviations (SD) of 100 healthy subjects and found that, by increasing the number of SD (for example, to 6 SD), the specificity improved although to a lesser extent than the sensitivity loss.

3) We agree with Dr Hopkinson regarding higher sensitivity of ELISA assay in respect to the Russell viper venom time for aPL detection, as well as a better value of high IgG aCL titre rather than the only aCL presence in SLE, as it stated in our paper. Conversely, we agree with other reports that LA rather than aCL positivity is a predictor of aPL complications in SLE, since we assessed specificity using an original approach, that is, the evaluation of aPL profile only in aPL positive patients with and without aPL related manifestations; patients with complications of aPL syndrome definitely due to factors different from aPL were thus excluded.

Finally, Dr Hopkinson's reference 5 seems inappropriate in this context since Lockshin's patients "do not represent a random cross-section of pregnant patients with SLE" as they were specifically referred to him because of preeclampsia.

In conclusion, a cross-sectional study seems to be a suitable design to reach a goal like ours. A large prospective study, but with some ethical reservations, could provide more striking results.

A GHIRARDELLO A DORIA P F GAMBARI Division of Rheumatology Department of Internal Medicine University of Padova via Giustiniani 2-15128-Padova, Italy


