

hepatitis B surface antigen, though the plasma source will have been checked for the presence of hepatitis B virus by polymerase chain reaction.

The allocation of IVIG varies from country to country. Australia, Spain and the USA on the whole use IVIG derived from plasma from donors from their own country. With the proviso that the products are otherwise similar, this decision makes good sense given the differences in endemic diseases and vaccination protocols between countries. Another significant difference is the method of collecting plasma; in the UK this has been performed on an altruistic voluntary basis while in the US donors are paid. This may result in an increase in the proportion of donors from lower socioeconomic groups in the USA. There is debate as to which method of plasma collection is safer with regard to the risk of potential transmission of infection; however, plasma from all sources is subjected to a rigorous series of checks. During the production of IVIG there are serial steps to inactivate and/or clear any viruses/transmissible agents which may be present in the plasma. The emergence of new viruses such as severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus and the spread of established viruses such as WNV to new geographical areas may have an impact on the selection of plasma/product to ensure that appropriate cover is provided.

In the UK, plasma is currently sourced from the USA because of directives resulting from concern regarding possible variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (vCJD) transmission. At present, blood donations from those resident in the UK for three months or more between 1980 and 1996, or who received a blood transfusion or surgery in the UK, are prohibited from being used for the production of IVIG. However, current production processes have been shown to remove prions down to undetectable levels in the final IVIG product.⁵ Given the current worldwide shortage of IVIG, with major problems in obtaining adequate supplies in the UK, even for indications which are both licensed and life threatening, it is vital that the ban on UK plasma is urgently revisited and that any decisions regarding risk assessment are made based on the scientific evidence base available. The current ban

on the use of UK plasma is also inconsistent with the ongoing use of UK packed cells, albumin and colloid plasma substitutes produced with gelatine obtained from bovine bone products.

T EL-SHANAWANY

*Specialist Registrar in Immunology
University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff*

WAC SEWELL

*Visiting Professor of Immunology
University of Lincoln, Lincoln*

SA MISBAH

*Consultant Immunologist
Churchill Hospital, Oxford*

STEPHEN JOLLES

*Consultant Immunologist and Allergist
University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff*

References

- 1 Hayes EB, Gubler DJ. West Nile virus: epidemiology and clinical features of an emerging epidemic in the United States. *Ann Rev Med* 2006;57:181–94.
- 2 Shimoni Z, Niven MJ, Pitlick S, Bulvick S. Treatment of West Nile virus encephalitis with intravenous immunoglobulin. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2001;7:759.
- 3 Galama JM, Vogels MT, Jansen GH, Gielen M, Heessen FW. Antibodies against enteroviruses in intravenous Ig preparations: great variation in titres and poor correlation with the incidence of circulating serotypes. *J Med Virol* 1997;53:273–6.
- 4 Thorpe SJ, Fox B, Heath A *et al*. International collaborative study to assess candidate reference preparations to control the level of anti-D in IVIG for use in Europe and the United States. *Biologicals*. 2006;34: 209–12.
- 5 Reichl HE, Foster PR, Welch AG *et al*. Studies on the removal of a bovine spongiform encephalopathy-derived agent by processes used in the manufacture of human immunoglobulin. *Vox Sang* 2002; 83:137–45.

Skin cancer: prevalence, prevention and treatment

Editor – Dr Sharpe's editorial on skin cancer (*Clin Med* July/August 2006 pp 333–4) is a good overview of the subject for non-dermatologists. Despite the editorial requirement for brevity, his failure to specifically mention Mohs micrographic surgery (MMS) misses an opportunity to bring this little known treatment to the attention of our general medical colleagues. This highly specialised form of

cutaneous surgery has an important role in the management of selected cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma¹ and published national guidelines recognise MMS as the treatment of choice for high risk, invasive facial basal cell carcinoma.² Mohs surgery, in which tumours are excised under total microscopic control, was pioneered in the USA and is increasingly available in specialised dermatology units in the UK. For the most difficult lesions, it offers tumour removal with maximal preservation of normal tissue together with cure rates which surpass those offered by radiotherapy or formal excision with wide margins. Of particular interest to readers of this journal, MMS is a surgical technique exclusively practised by physicians.

NICHOLAS R TELFER

*Consultant Dermatological Surgeon
Dermatology Centre, Manchester*

References

- 1 Motley R, Kersey P, Lawrence C *et al*. Multiprofessional guidelines for the management of patients with primary cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma. *Br J Plast Surg* 2003;56:85–91.
- 2 Telfer NR, Colver GB, Bowers PW. Guidelines for the management of basal cell carcinoma. *Br J Dermatol* 1999;141:415–23.

Skin cancer and surgical margins for basal cell carcinoma

Editor – I enjoyed reading Sharpe's informative editorial (*Clin Med* July/August 2006 pp 333–4) which rightly highlights the burden that skin cancer care creates in the UK with over 50,000 recorded basal cell carcinomas (BCCs). However, I feel clarification is needed regarding BCC excision as an error in marking surgical margins of just 1 mm can adversely affect cure rates. Sharpe states that the recommended minimum clearance margin is 3 mm for most BCCs.¹ However, in clinical practice, for predetermined surgical margins around BCC most surgeons would take at least 4 mm. The reason for this is that 3 mm margins will clear approximately 85% of well-defined previously untreated BCC less than 20 mm in diameter on the face, whereas 4 mm margins achieves >95% clearance.² If the goal of BCC excision is complete extirpation of the tumour then margins of 3 mm are