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Occupational exposure of midwives to nitrous oxide on delivery suites

In our opinion, the article “Occupational exposure of midwives to nitrous oxide on delivery suites” is in need of some remarks. In the paper a serious problem seems to be the presence of nitrous oxide in samples collected at the beginning of the shift. Many years ago, when N₂O in urine was first evaluated, we frequently observed “upsurge” concentrations of N₂O in urine of exposed and unexposed subjects. The phenomenon was kept under control and disappeared when urine samples were treated with a small quantity of H₂SO₄ (0.2 ml). For this reason, we suggested the following:... Approximatly 10 ml of urine were collected from all the subjects at the end of the exposure period in 120 ml gastight glass vials with airtight plugs. Caps were rapidly replaced in the vials to prevent any significant loss of N₂O. The vials contained 0.2 ml sulfuric acid in order to avoid the production of N₂O (probably due to microflora activity). Another point we consider very important is that the subjects must void the bladder rapidly in areas known to be free of nitrous oxide, otherwise a significant contamination of samples can occur.

In conclusion, we think that among the simple precautions that should be taken to avoid significant errors (avoiding collection of urine samples in places contaminated with N₂O, carrying out collection rapidly, and using airtight collection vials in order to avoid any major loss of dissolved anaesthetic), one point should be emphasised in view of its importance: storage of urine before analysis can produce an endogenous formation of N₂O originating from the oxidation processes of the nitrogen compounds present in biological fluids. Experiments performed to study this phenomenon have shown that the process is inhibited if the urine is kept acid. If, as a precaution, a few drops of strong acid are added to each collection vial before urine samples are collected, new formation of nitrous oxide will be avoided and the urine samples may then be stored as long as required prior to the analysis.

Author’s reply

Professor Imbriani and colleagues report experiments which showed that endogenous formation of N₂O was inhibited if urine is kept acid. The convenience of adding 0.2 ml of sulphuric acid to vials recommends its use. The period between sample collection and deposit in a freezer was approximately the same for each sample. Despite this 24 midwives had zero N₂O in their pre-shift samples and 22 had non-zero values, of whom 12 had very high values. The period between deposit in a freezer and analysis varied between samples but biological activity should not occur in the freezer.

The evidence for workplace counselling is in Medline

Henderson et al point out the increasing approval of counselling as an effective intervention to treat or prevent the effects of stress at work by British judges, although they could use expert advice on this matter. In reaction to this development, they pose the rhetorical question: where to find evidence on the effectiveness of counselling. In stead of answering this question they grasp the opportunity to criticise the report of the British Association for Counselling. I totally agree with their criticism of the report. It is of low quality and does not provide reliable evidence on the effectiveness of counselling. However, I was surprised by the fact that the authors did not present reliable evidence that does exist on the topic. The question cannot be left unanswered. We gave an answer to an almost similar question in our article on evidence based medicine. We showed the feasibility of searching for evidence in Medline for practitioners of occupational health. We elaborated an example of a teacher with symptoms of burnout who wanted to know the best treatment for his condition. Our search resulted in at least one good review and one meta-analysis. The meta-analysis by van der Klink et al firmly concludes: “stress management interventions are effective and cognitive-behavioural interventions are more effective than the other intervention types”. This is in line with the earlier findings of the review by Murphy that we found as well.

From the authors’ editorial it can be inferred that they favour interventions such as a reduction of working hours or increasing staff numbers, more than counselling. This does sound sympathetic to me as well and it is in line with the principle of hierarchy of controls, which states that primary prevention is to be preferred to, for example, personal protective equipment. However, in our case, there is not much evidence that supports such an approach. This is partly due to a lack of studies in the area of occupational interventions. The organisational intervention studies that have been done, however, do not yield a significant effect size. On the other hand, there seems to be enough evidence to conclude that cognitive behavioural interventions are effective in counterbalancing the effects of stress at work. So, even when only reliable evidence is used, there is still much to support counselling in the sense of cognitive behavioural treatment. In addition, there is a systematic review in the Cochrane Library on counselling in primary care, which concludes that it is associated with a modest improvement in short term outcome compared to “usual care” and not associated with more costs. Based on this evidence I would not simply reject counselling as ineffective.

This case illustrates that, in occupational health in general, there is a lack of awareness of the existence of evidence on effective interventions. That is the main reason why we are in the process of developing an Occupational Health Field within the Cochrane Collaboration. The Cochrane Collaboration is an international organisation, dedicated to making up-to-date, accurate information about the effects of healthcare readily available worldwide. Have a look at www.cochrane.org for more details.

We hope that, in the near future, the Occupational Health Field will fulfil its promises and will simplify the finding of evidence on occupational health interventions like counselling.

M Imbriani
Università degli Studi di Pavia Dipartimento di Medicina Preventiva, Occupazionale e di Comunità, Pavia, Italy
S Ghittori, L Maestri
Labs-Meia, Fondazione Salvatore Maugeri IRCCS, via Ferrata, B, Pavia, Italy
Correspondence to: Dr S Ghittori, sghittori@fsm.it
doi: 10.1136/oem.2003.012534

References

Author's reply

Professor Imbriani and colleagues report experiments which showed that endogenous formation of N₂O was inhibited if urine is kept acid. The convenience of adding 0.2 ml of sulphuric acid to vials recommends its use. The period between sample collection and deposit in a freezer was approximately the same for each sample. Despite this 24 midwives had zero N₂O in their pre-shift samples and 22 had non-zero values, of whom 12 had very high values.

The period between deposit in a freezer and analysis varied between samples but biological activity should not occur in the freezer.

I Matthews
Department of Epidemiology, Statistics and Public Health, University of Wales College of Medicine, Heath Park, Cardiff CF14 4XN, UK; matthewis@cf.ac.uk

The evidence for workplace counselling is in Medline

Henderson et al point out the increasing approval of counselling as an effective intervention to treat or prevent the effects of stress at work by British judges, although they could use expert advice on this matter. In reaction to this development, they pose the rhetorical question: where to find evidence on the effectiveness of counselling. In stead of answering this question they grasp the opportunity to criticise the report of the British Association for Counselling. I totally agree with their criticism of the report. It is of low quality and does not provide reliable evidence on the effectiveness of counselling. However, I was surprised by the fact that the authors did not present reliable evidence that does exist on the topic. The question cannot be left unanswered. We gave an answer to an almost similar question in our article on evidence based medicine. We showed the feasibility of searching for evidence in Medline for practitioners of occupational health. We elaborated an example of a teacher with symptoms of burnout who wanted to know the best treatment for his condition. Our search resulted in at least one good review and one meta-analysis. The meta-analysis by van der Klink et al firmly concludes: “stress management interventions are effective and cognitive-behavioural interventions are more effective than the other intervention types”. This is in line with the earlier findings of the review by Murphy that we found as well.

From the authors’ editorial it can be inferred that they favour interventions such as a reduction of working hours or increasing staff numbers, more than counselling. This does sound sympathetic to me as well and it is in line with the principle of hierarchy of controls, which states that primary prevention is to be preferred to, for example, personal protective equipment. However, in our case, there is not much evidence that supports such an approach. This is partly due to a lack of studies in the area of occupational interventions. The organisational intervention studies that have been done, however, do not yield a significant effect size. On the other hand, there seems to be enough evidence to conclude that cognitive behavioural interventions are effective in counterbalancing the effects of stress at work. So, even when only reliable evidence is used, there is still much to support counselling in the sense of cognitive behavioural treatment. In addition, there is a systematic review in the Cochrane Library on counselling in primary care, which concludes that it is associated with a modest improvement in short term outcome compared to “usual care” and not associated with more costs. Based on this evidence I would not simply reject counselling as ineffective.

This case illustrates that, in occupational health in general, there is a lack of awareness of the existence of evidence on effective interventions. That is the main reason why we are in the process of developing an Occupational Health Field within the Cochrane Collaboration. The Cochrane Collaboration is an international organisation, dedicated to making up-to-date, accurate information about the effects of healthcare readily available worldwide. Have a look at www.cochrane.org for more details.

We hope that, in the near future, the Occupational Health Field will fulfil its promises and will simplify the finding of evidence on occupational health interventions like counselling.

J Verbeek
Coronel Institute for Occupational and Environmental Health, University of Amsterdam, Occupational Health Field, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Kuopio, Finland; j.verbeek@omic.uva.nl
doi: 10.1136/oem.2003.012138

References
BOOK REVIEW

Tolley’s managing stress in the workplace


“Not another book about workplace stress”—emanating in this case, from the “stress industry” would be an understandable reaction. Carole Spiers, the author, unequivocally describes herself as an “occupational stress consultant” and head of the Carole Spiers Group: “International Corporate Well-being Consultants”.

She faces up to the implications immediately by asking “Why indeed another book about stress? What makes it different from the others?” Well, this one is intended to be practical and user friendly—a handbook that can sit on your shelf and act as a reference manual to be dipped into whenever required. It is aimed primarily at employers, employees, and their representatives rather than occupational health practitioners or academics; this is not a criticism—many occupational health practitioners will appreciate the way in which the subject of work related stress is assiduously presented in all its complexity.

Far from being all about the practicalities of managing stress in the workplace, there are chapters which go into some detail about the nature of stress, current legislation, and the health and safety framework in the UK and, to some extent, Europe. Naturally there has to be constant reference to health and safety and employment law but also to civil litigation, and here comes one of the problems: very few cases of work induced stress have in fact been litigated and those that have, have not, in many people’s view, been very typical. Moreover, this is a fast changing field and the useful synopsis of appeal cases heard in 2002 and already out of date on account of impending House of Lords judgements. In another domain, namely identifying current workplace stressors, the template used: Culture, Demands, Control, Relationships, Change, Role, and Support has already been refined by the Health and Safety Executive as more is learned about measurability of stress—after all most employers have, have not, in many people’s view, been very typical. Moreover, this is a fast changing field and the useful synopsis of appeal cases heard in 2002 and already out of date on account of impending House of Lords judgements. In another domain, namely identifying current workplace stressors, the template used: Culture, Demands, Control, Relationships, Change, Role, and Support has already been refined by the Health and Safety Executive as more is learned about measurability of stress—after all most employers

In 400 pages the author covers most of what there is to know about the wider world of stress and has usefully interwoven a number of relevant themes. I was surprised how little mention was made of the medicalisation of stress—after all most employers receive their first intimation of an employee’s stressed state by means of a sickness absence certificate signed by a general practitioner. This issue is only cursorily examined in chapter 10. I also failed to recognise many of the examples of stressed individuals which populate the book. They are all real cases, but where are the people with relatively undemanding jobs, beset by social problems, domestic difficulties, and unhealthy habits referred by harassed middle managers? It is often a toss up to know who will “go off with stress” first. I am not sure that this book is very enlightening about how to manage those people and how to prevent the seemingly inevitable slide of such individuals into resentment, long term sickness absence, and, eventually, Incapacity Benefit. There does, also, seem to be an emphasis on larger organisations and not much about the dynamics within small and medium sized enterprises (where most people work these days), which are different.

The book does, however, deserve to be “dipped into” because there is a wealth of descriptive material on which to build.

D Snashall

NOTICE

28th ICOH International Congress on Occupational Health

The 28th ICOH International Congress on Occupational Health will be held in Milan, Italy, 11–16 June 2006. Further information: www.icoh2006.it
Tel: +39 0250320110; fax: +39 025032011
Email: sabrina.braia@unimi.it

CORRECTION

doi: 10.1136/oem.2002.006239corr1

With reference to the paper “Risk of selected birth defects by maternal residence close to power lines during pregnancy” (Blaasaa KS, Tynes T, Lie RT. Occup Environ Med 2004;61:174–6), the authors state: “The total number of births inside the specified corridor given as 128 680 in the Results was wrong. We verified, however, that only 42 223 pregnancies were completed on specific addresses inside the corridor. These 42 223 births represented the cohort from which we identified the 465 cases and selected 930 controls. This should have been specified in the paper. The error gave a wrong impression of the prevalence of defects but had no implications for the results of the paper.”

www.occenvmed.com
The evidence for workplace counselling is in Medline

J Verbeek

*Occup Environ Med* 2004 61: 558-559
doi: 10.1136/oem.2003.012138

Updated information and services can be found at:
http://oem.bmj.com/content/61/6/558.2

These include:

**References**
This article cites 5 articles, 1 of which you can access for free at:
http://oem.bmj.com/content/61/6/558.2#BIBL

**Email alerting service**
Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

Notes

To request permissions go to:
http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions

To order reprints go to:
http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform

To subscribe to BMJ go to:
http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/