tion. These assays are readily applicable for small-scale analysis, inductive screening, and if necessary, for regional population studies. Caution must be exercised to limit false negatives by minimizing the gap between assay primers. Although specific base changes may be associated with melting signatures, confirmation requires sequencing of PCR products. We reduced the likelihood of false positives arising in this manner by ruling out the presence of sequence variants in the region being interrogated within the population under study. Nevertheless, in unknown populations, we recommend conducting sequencing in a limited number of individuals to verify the basis for melting curve profiles of the variants being screened.
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To the Editor:
Seventy percent of patients with superficial urothelial cell carcinoma develop recurrences after transurethral resection of the primary tumor. Because recurrence prediction on the basis of tumor size, grade, and multiplicity is unreliable, all patients need regular bladder examination with cystoscopy. An accurate method to differentiate between patients with short or long recurrence-free periods might reduce the number of invasive cystoscopies in a subgroup of patients.

The gene MKI67 (proliferation marker antigen identified by the monoclonal antibody Ki-67) and the antiapoptosis gene survivin are promising prognostic markers, because increased MKI67 and survivin mRNA concentrations indicate short recurrence-free periods (1–4). In addition to the presence of survivin mRNA in tumor tissue, we observed a relationship between early tumor recurrence and increased concentrations of survivin mRNA in bladder washings (5). Bladder washings are easily obtained during cystoscopy and generally reflect the molecular biological status of the urothelium (6, 7).

To confirm our previous findings regarding survivin and to investigate the recurrence-predictive value of MKI67 mRNA, we collected 95 blad-
we previously had found a correlation between survivin mRNA expression in bladder washings and the recurrence-free interval (5). In that study, bladder washings were enriched for urothelial cells to prevent interference of gene expression normalization by nonurothelial cells, especially leukocytes. In the present study, we omitted the elaborate enrichment step to simplify the procedure. This omission may have led to the loss of a correlation between survivin mRNA expression and the time to tumor recurrence. The lack of this correlation may also be related to the loss of a substantial number of bladder washings, which may have influenced the recurrence pattern of the patient cohort.

Despite the lack of a correlation with recurrence, we observed a correlation of survivin and MKI67 mRNA expression with the pathologic variables tumor stage and grade. Therefore, even in the absence of enrichment for urothelial cells, bladder washings provided an accurate profile of the molecular biological status of the urothelium. The independent prognostic value of tumor markers assessed in bladder washings needs further investigation.
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Preanalytic Error Tracking in a Laboratory Medicine Department:
Results of a 1-Year Experience

To the Editor:

Remarkable advances in technology, automation, and testing procedures have produced radical changes in laboratory organization, granting major precision and accuracy of test results. Nevertheless, errors occurring within the whole testing process still influence the quality of laboratory performance. There is heterogeneous information on the error rate within the whole laboratory testing process (from 0.1% to 9.3%) (1). Moreover, the frequencies and types of mistakes differ between one facility and another and between one time period and another (2). Process analysis has demonstrated that laboratory errors occur primarily in the preanalytic phase, influencing patient outcomes and costs (1–3). Compliance with systems of quality management, such as certification and accreditation, requires accurate procedures for identifying the processes that are more susceptible to errors (4).

The Laboratory Medicine Department of the University Hospital of Verona is a laboratory service providing stat and routine tests for clinical chemistry, hematology, coagulation, and immunology, serving an area with a population of 270 000 inhabitants. The laboratory serves a hospital with 750 beds and specialized care units. Inpatient phlebotomies are performed by clinical department staff, whereas blood specimens from outpatients are collected on site by laboratory personnel. After implementation of the new ISO accreditation guidelines, since October 2004 the laboratory staff has been trained to identify and systematically record each error encountered within the global testing process, particularly preanalytic mistakes. Venous blood samples for routine clinical chemistry (lithium hepa-
risin gel tubes), hematologic (EDTA tubes), coagulation (buffered sodium citrate tubes), electrophoresis, specific protein, and immunology testing (serum gel tubes) were considered unsuitable according to the following accepted criteria (5, 6): inappropriate volume (excess or deficit in the volume required to perform the analysis), wrong or missing patient identification, inappropriate container, visible hemolysis after centrifugation, clotting, and contamination from infusion route. The laboratory staff was provided with a notebook in which numbers of tubes and errors were recorded daily, and the quality referent of our laboratory systematically discussed and reviewed data on a weekly basis.

From October 2004 to September 2005, a total of 423 075 routine venous blood specimens (71 922 from outpatients; 17%) were received in the 5 more representative sections of our laboratory (130 806 for clinical chemistry testing, 113 699 for hemato-
logic testing, 61 301 for coagulation testing, 59 403 for electrophoresis and specific protein testing, and 57 866 for immunology testing). According to the above specified criteria, 3154 (0.74%) preanalytic errors were identified and recorded in the 1-year observational period (Table 1). Errors were related to samples in which they were relevant. In agreement with earlier data (1, 7), we observed a significant difference in the error rate between inpatients and outpatients (0.82% vs 0.37%; χ² test, P <0.001). The most common mistakes could be traced to incorrect procedures for sample collection, including hemolysis and clotting. The prevalences of other types of errors were rather different between specimens collected from inpatients and outpatients. In particular, insufficient volume was a prevailing cause of unsuitable specimens for inpatient samples, whereas the prevalence of inappropriate containers was particularly high for outpatient specimens. Current data on laboratory error rates are mixed (1). In a survey on outpatient phlebotomy success, most unsuitable samples resulted from hemolysis (18.1%), insufficient quantity (16.0%), and clotting (13.4%) (5). These data are comparable to those provided by additional investigations, which confirm that problems directly related to specimen collection are the first causes of preanalytic errors, especially hemolyzed, clotted, insufficient, and incorrect samples (1, 7–9). This investigation represents a logical extension of previous analyses focused on laboratory errors identified after collection of clinically questionable results in stat departments for a shorter period of time (2, 8) or involving limited areas of laboratory testing, such as clinical chemistry (7) and hematology (9).