

MORBIDITY AND MORTALITY WEEKLY REPORT

Printed and distributed by the Massachusetts Medical Society,
publishers of *The New England Journal of Medicine*

Vol. 36 / No. SS-2

CDC **Surveillance** **Summaries**

November 1987

Contents

Trichinosis Surveillance, 1985

State Activities for Surveillance of
Occupational Disease and Injury, 1985

Ectopic Pregnancy Mortality in the
United States, 1979-1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30333

CDC Surveillance Summaries are published by the Epidemiology Program Office, Centers for Disease Control, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Atlanta, Georgia 30333.

SUGGESTED CITATIONS

General: Centers for Disease Control. *CDC Surveillance Summaries*, November 1987. *MMWR* 1987;36(No. SS-2).
Specific: Centers for Disease Control. [Title of particular article/chapter.] In: *CDC Surveillance Summaries*, November 1987. *MMWR* 1987;36(No. SS-2):[inclusive page numbers].

Centers for Disease ControlJames O. Mason, M.D., Dr.P.H.
Director

This report was prepared in:
Epidemiology Program OfficeCarl W. Tyler, Jr., M.D.
Director

Michael B. Gregg, M.D.
Deputy Director

Editorial Services.....R. Elliott Churchill, M.A.
Chief

Norma W. Strawn
Writer-Editor

Patsy H. Hurst
Illustrator

Ruth C. Greenberg
Editorial Assistant

Division of Surveillance and Epidemiologic
StudiesRuth L. Berkelman, M.D.
Director

Contents

Forewordii

History of CDC Surveillance Activitiesiii

Data Sources.....iv

Surveillance Subjects and Responsible Organizational Units.....v

Trichinosis Surveillance, 1985
 Theodore M. Bailey, M.D., M.P.H., Peter M. Schantz, V.M.D., Ph.D......1

State Activities for Surveillance of Occupational Disease and Injury, 1985
 Joann T. Muldoon, M.S., M.A., Laverne A. Wintermeyer, M.D.,
 John A. Eure, M.S., Laurence Fuortes, M.D., James A. Merchant, M.D., Ph.D.,
 Stephanie F. Van Lier, Thomas B. Richards, M.D.7

Ectopic Pregnancy Mortality in the United States, 1979-1982
 Tedd Ellerbrock, M.D., Hani K. Atrash, M.D., M.P.H.,
 Carol J.R. Hogue, Ph.D., M.P.H., Joyce M. Hughes13

State and Territorial Epidemiologists and
 State Laboratory Directors.....Inside back cover

Foreword

The purpose of the *CDC Surveillance Summaries* is to make available the most current information on conditions of public health interest for which CDC has major responsibility. These reports complement other data published by CDC in the *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)*, the *MMWR* auxiliary publications, and other reports on specific subjects prepared by the responsible surveillance programs. This volume contains epidemiologic information derived from surveillance forms, special investigations, and other sources of information collected at the state and national levels.

History of CDC Surveillance Activities

CDC has been actively involved in disease-surveillance activities since the formation of the Communicable Disease Center in 1946. The original scope of the National Surveillance Program included the study of malaria, murine typhus, smallpox, psittacosis, diphtheria, leprosy, and sylvatic plague. In 1954, a surveillance section was established within the Epidemiology Branch of CDC, primarily concerned with planning and conducting continuing surveillance and making periodic reports. National emergencies such as the Asian influenza pandemic and the discovery of Legionnaires' disease have prompted the involvement of CDC in new surveillance activities. Over the years the surveillance activities of CDC have expanded to include not only new areas in infectious disease but also programs in human reproduction, environmental health, chronic disease, risk reduction, and occupational safety and health. Ongoing evaluation of these programs has led to new methods of data collection and analysis and has prompted examination of how data are disseminated to the public health community.

In 1980 and 1981, a survey of CDC staff and state epidemiologists suggested that improved coordination of surveillance reports with the *MMWR* and the *MMWR Annual Summary* (later titled *Summary of Notifiable Diseases, United States*) would facilitate timely publication; provide greater uniformity in the acquisition, evaluation, and reporting of surveillance data; and encourage use of these data. Several approaches to the development of a systematic process of disseminating disease-specific surveillance reports were considered. On the basis of considerations of timeliness, cost advantages, and editorial uniformity, a report published on a quarterly basis was recommended. Subsequent financial and personnel constraints have made it necessary to publish these reports less frequently.

Although this publication is published more often than once a year, it will typically contain annual data rather than interim data. The *Summary of Notifiable Diseases* will complement rather than serve as the cumulative summary of the *CDC Surveillance Summaries*.

Data Sources

Data on the reported occurrence of notifiable diseases are derived from reports supplied by the state and territorial departments of health and CDC program activities. These data are routinely published in the *MMWR*, and complementary data are published in *MMWR* auxiliary publications.

CDC also maintains national surveillance programs for selected diseases—with the cooperation of state and local health departments and other Federal agencies—and publishes detailed epidemiologic analyses periodically. Data appearing in the *CDC Surveillance Summaries* or in a separate surveillance report may not agree exactly with reports published in the *MMWR* because of differences in timing of reports or because of refinements in case definition. It should be noted that data collected for the *MMWR* and the more detailed data published by individual CDC programs are collected independently.

These data should be interpreted with caution. Some diseases that cause severe clinical illness and are associated with serious consequences are probably reported quite accurately. However, diseases that are clinically mild and infrequently associated with serious consequences are less likely to be reported. Additionally, subclinical cases are seldom detected except in the course of epidemic investigations or special studies. The degree of completeness of reporting is also influenced by the diagnostic facilities available, the control measures in effect, and the interests and priorities of state and local officials responsible for disease control and surveillance. Finally, factors such as the introduction of new diagnostic tests and the discovery of new disease entities may cause changes in disease reporting independent of the true incidence of disease. Despite these limitations, the data in these reports have proven to be very useful in the analysis of trends.

Surveillance Subjects and Responsible Organizational Units

The most recent surveillance data on specific subjects may be obtained from the following responsible organizational units at CDC:

| Subject | Responsible Organizational Unit |
|--|--|
| Abortion | Division of Reproductive Health Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) | AIDS Program Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Alcohol-related morbidity and mortality | Division of Surveillance and Epidemiologic Studies Epidemiology Program Office |
| Anthrax | Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Aseptic meningitis | Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Behavioral risk factors | Division of Nutrition Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Botulism | Enteric Diseases Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Brucellosis | Bacterial Zoonoses Activity Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Cancers, endometrial and ovarian | Epidemiologic Studies Branch Division of Reproductive Health Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Chancroid | Division of Sexually Transmitted Diseases Center for Prevention Services |
| Cholera | Enteric Diseases Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Congenital malformations | Division of Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities Center for Environmental Health and Injury Control |
| Dengue | Dengue Branch Division of Vector-Borne Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Diabetes | Division of Diabetes Control Center for Prevention Services |
| Diphtheria | Surveillance, Investigations, and Research Branch Division of Immunization Center for Prevention Services |

| Subject | Responsible Organizational Unit |
|------------------------|---|
| Drinking and Driving | Division of Nutrition Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Encephalitis | Arbovirus Reference Branch Division of Vector-Borne Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Enterovirus | Respiratory and Enterovirus Branch Division of Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Foodborne disease | Enteric Diseases Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Gonorrhea | Division of Sexually Transmitted Diseases Center for Prevention Services |
| Hazards, occupational | Surveillance Branch Division of Surveillance, Hazard Evaluations, and Field Studies National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health |
| Hepatitis | Hepatitis Branch Division of Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Homicide | Division of Injury Epidemiology and Control Center for Environmental Health and Injury Control |
| Hysterectomy | Epidemiologic Studies Branch Division of Reproductive Health Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Immunization survey | Surveillance, Investigation, and Research Branch Division of Immunization Center for Prevention Services |
| Infections, nosocomial | National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance System Hospital Infections Program Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Influenza | Influenza Branch Division of Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Injury | Division of Injury Epidemiology and Control Center for Environmental Health and Injury Control |
| Injury, occupational | Division of Safety Research National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health |

| Subject | Responsible Organizational Unit |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Lead poisoning in workers | Surveillance Branch Division of Surveillance, Hazard Evaluations, and Field Studies National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health |
| Legionellosis | Respiratory Diseases Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Leprosy | Respiratory and Special Pathogens Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Leptospirosis | Bacterial Zoonoses Activity Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Lymphogranuloma venereum | Division of Sexually Transmitted Diseases Center for Prevention Services |
| Malaria | Malaria Branch Division of Parasitic Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Measles | Surveillance, Investigations, and Research Branch Division of Immunization Center for Prevention Services |
| Meningitis, bacterial | Meningitis and Special Pathogens Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Meningitis, viral | Division of Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Mortality, infant | Division of Reproductive Health Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Mortality, maternal | Division of Reproductive Health Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Mumps | Surveillance, Investigations, and Research Branch Division of Immunization Center for Prevention Services |
| Nutrition | Division of Nutrition Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Pelvic inflammatory disease | Division of Sexually Transmitted Diseases Center for Prevention Services |
| Pertussis | Division of Immunization Center for Prevention Services |
| Plague | Plague Branch Division of Vector-Borne Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |

| Subject | Responsible Organizational Unit |
|--|---|
| Pneumoconiosis, coal workers | Epidemiological Investigations Branch Division of Respiratory Disease Studies National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health |
| Poliomyelitis | Surveillance, Investigations, and Research Branch Division of Immunization Center for Prevention Services |
| Pregnancy and fertility, teenage | Division of Reproductive Health Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Pregnancy, ectopic | Division of Reproductive Health Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Psittacosis | Bacterial Zoonoses Activity Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Rabies | Viral and Rickettsial Zoonoses Branch Division of Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Reye syndrome | Epidemiology Office Division of Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Rickettsial disease (Rocky Mountain spotted fever, typhus, Q fever, endemic typhus) | Viral and Rickettsial Zoonoses Branch Division of Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Rocky mountain spotted fever | Viral and Rickettsial Zoonoses Branch Division of Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Rubella | Surveillance, Investigations, and Research Branch Division of Immunization Center for Prevention Services |
| <i>Salmonella</i> | Enteric Diseases Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Sexually transmitted diseases | Division of Sexually Transmitted Diseases Center for Prevention Services |
| <i>Shigella</i> | Enteric Diseases Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Smoking | Office on Smoking and Health Center for Health Promotion and Education |
| Sterilization, surgical | Epidemiologic Studies Branch Division of Reproductive Health Center for Health Promotion and Education |

| Subject | Responsible Organizational Unit |
|---|--|
| Sudden unexplained death syndrome, Southeast Asian refugees | Division of Environmental Hazards and Health Effects Center for Environmental Health and Injury Control |
| Suicide | Division of Injury Epidemiology and Control Center for Environmental Health and Injury Control |
| Summer mortality | Division of Environmental Hazards and Health Effects Center for Environmental Health and Injury Control |
| Syphilis | Division of Sexually Transmitted Diseases Center for Prevention Services |
| Toxic shock syndrome | Respiratory and Special Pathogens Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Trichinosis | Helminthic Diseases Branch Division of Parasitic Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Trichomoniasis | Division of Sexually Transmitted Diseases Center for Prevention Services |
| Tuberculosis | Division of Tuberculosis Control Center for Prevention Services |
| Tularemia | Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Typhoid | Enteric Diseases Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Typhus | Viral and Rickettsial Zoonoses Branch Division of Viral Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |
| Venereal disease | Division of Sexually Transmitted Diseases Center for Prevention Services |
| Water-related disease | Enteric Diseases Branch Division of Bacterial Diseases Center for Infectious Diseases |

Trichinosis Surveillance, 1985

Theodore M. Bailey, M.D., M.P.H.
Peter M. Schantz, V.M.D., Ph.D.
*Helminthic Diseases Branch
Division of Parasitic Diseases
Center for Infectious Diseases*

Introduction

Trichinosis, infection with *Trichinella spiralis*, persists as a public health problem in the United States. Although fewer than 100 cases per year are now being reported, many mild or asymptomatic infections are undetected or misdiagnosed unless they are related epidemiologically to more severe cases (1). Public health officials believe that the reported cases represent only a fraction of the total number of cases that occur each year. Nevertheless, the current surveillance system is useful in monitoring trends in disease incidence, in initiating outbreak investigations, and in identifying groups at high risk for the infection.

Materials and Methods

State health departments report new cases of trichinosis by week to the National Morbidity Reporting Service. Supplemental epidemiologic information is submitted by the reporting state on Surveillance Case Report forms (CDC 54.7-Rev 7-81) to the Division of Parasitic Diseases (DPD), Center for Infectious Diseases, CDC. Additional cases are identified through reported results of trichinosis serologic tests performed by the Helminthic Diseases Branch, DPD, and through investigations conducted by the DPD staff.

This year the case definition for trichinosis has been expanded to reflect the importance of serologic testing in identifying a case of trichinosis. Criteria for the inclusion of cases in outbreaks have been simplified and expanded to reflect the importance of serologic testing in identifying mild or asymptomatic associated cases that are linked epidemiologically to an implicated meal or meat product.

The CDC case definition for trichinosis is as follows:

1. *Trichinella*-positive muscle biopsy or positive serologic test for trichinosis in a patient with clinical symptoms compatible with trichinosis (including eosinophilia, fever, myalgia, and periorbital edema),
or
2. In an outbreak, at least one individual must meet criterion #1. Associated cases are defined by either a positive serologic test for trichinosis or clinical symptoms compatible with trichinosis (including eosinophilia, fever, myalgia, and periorbital edema) in persons who have shared the epidemiologically implicated meal or have consumed the implicated meat product.

As in the past, cases reported by the states but not characterized by written surveillance reports or not fitting the case definition are not included in this report. The expanded criteria were used for the evaluation of suspected cases of trichinosis reported to CDC in 1985.

Results

In 1985, 46 cases of trichinosis from 11 states were reported to CDC. Thirty-two (70%) of these cases occurred in Alaska, Maine, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.


Alaska reported the largest number of cases, 19, or 41% of the total (Table 1). The Middle Atlantic and New England states accounted for 39% of the reported cases. States with the highest 5-year mean trichinosis incidence for 1981-1985 were Alaska (15.4 cases/1,000,000 population), Rhode Island (7.3), Connecticut (3.8), New Jersey (2.1), and Vermont (1.9). Moderately high mean incidence was reported in Hawaii (1.4) and in Maine (1.1). No cases were reported for this period in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Wyoming. The other states reported between 0.1 and 1.0 case/1,000,000 population.

Of the 46 cases reported in 1985, 46% occurred in males and 54% in females. The mean age of patients was 36.1 years, ranging from 2 to 67 years (Figure 1).

Table 1. Trichinosis cases, by state, United States, 1985

| State | Cases | Percent | Rate per million population |
|--------------|-------|---------|-----------------------------|
| Alaska | 19 | 41.3 | 39.7 |
| Colorado | 1 | 2.2 | 0.3 |
| Connecticut | 2 | 4.3 | 0.6 |
| Florida | 1 | 2.2 | 0.1 |
| Maine | 5 | 10.9 | 4.4 |
| Michigan | 3 | 6.5 | 0.3 |
| New Jersey | 4 | 8.7 | 0.5 |
| New York | 3 | 6.5 | 0.2 |
| Pennsylvania | 4 | 8.7 | 0.3 |
| Texas | 3 | 6.5 | 0.2 |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 2.2 | 0.2 |
| TOTAL | 46 | 100 | 0.2 |

FIGURE 1. Trichinosis cases, by age group and sex, United States, 1985



In previous years, a consistent seasonal pattern for trichinosis in the United States showed a peak in December and January that was related to the consumption of homemade pork sausage during the Christmas holidays. No such peak was evident in 1984 or 1985. In 1984, a large proportion of cases were reported in May and were associated with smoked sausage prepared by an ethnic club for Easter. In 1985, a large proportion of cases were reported in March and were associated with grizzly bear meat used in Alaska (Figure 2).


All of the patients reported at least one of the common signs and symptoms of trichinosis: 28 (62%) of 45 had fever, 23 (52%) of 44 had periorbital edema, 30 (65%) of 46 had myalgia, and 43 (98%) of 44 had eosinophilia. Most of the patients recovered, one patient died, and the outcomes for four were unknown.

The mean incubation period for the 27 cases for which the dates of consumption of incriminated meat and onset of symptoms were available was 19.6 days (range = 1-62 days). Diagnosis of trichinosis was confirmed by serologic tests for 17 persons (55% of those who had serologic testing done). Muscle biopsy was performed on 11 patients (24%), and all results were positive.

The infective meat item was identified in 43 of 46 cases; however, in only 12 cases (of which four were from the Alaska outbreak and five were from an outbreak in Maine) was the suspected food item examined for *Trichinella* larvae. Eleven of the 12 items were positive. Where the food item was known or suspected, pork was incriminated in 21 (49%) cases, bear meat in 15 (35%), and other meat in seven (16%). Sausage was the form of pork most frequently implicated—in 13 (30%) of the cases (Table 2).

The method of meat preparation was identified in 35 cases: in nine (26%) of these the meat was eaten raw, in 15 (43%) it was boiled, in five (14%) it was fried, and in the other six cases various methods of preparation were used. In 16 cases (39% of those for which a source was reported) the implicated meat was obtained from a super-market, butcher shop, or other commercial outlet. In five (12%) cases it was obtained

FIGURE 2. Trichinosis cases, by month of onset, United States, 1985



directly from the farm, and in 20 (49%) the meat was obtained through hunting. Of these 20, the most common game animal was bear (15 cases), whereas walrus accounted for four cases, and in one case the animal was not identified.

Five common-source outbreaks accounted for 27 (59%) of the 46 cases reported to CDC in 1985. Two of these outbreaks have been previously reported (2). The largest outbreak occurred in Alaska in March. Signs and symptoms suggestive of trichinosis developed in 14 of 19 persons who ate grizzly bear meat. The implicated meat had been frozen for approximately 3 weeks, and the frozen meat was cut into bite-sized pieces and cooked in a stew with vegetables for 1-2 hours before being served at a birthday party. Sixteen persons ate the stew. At the time of the investigation, no samples of meat were available for examination. Test results of sera drawn from 17 persons 3 months after consumption of the bear meat were negative, with one exception; the index patient had a titer of 1:20 in the bentonite flocculation test.

In the second largest outbreak, which occurred in Maine, 19 persons ate pork from a sow purchased at a local farm. Data are not available for three of these persons, but of the 16 others, five showed signs and symptoms of trichinosis. Meat samples from the implicated pig were found to have 300 *Trichinella* larvae/g. Convalescent-phase sera were obtained from 11 persons, two of whom had titers of $\geq 1:10$, with signs and symptoms of trichinosis.

Other outbreaks involved the consumption of raw walrus meat that had been frozen for an unknown period of time (four cases in Alaska) and undercooked sausage (two cases each in New Jersey and Michigan).

Discussion

Since the late 1940s and early 1950s, the annual incidence of trichinosis in the United States has declined progressively (3). The lowest annual incidence was in 1983, when only 30 cases of trichinosis were reported (4). In 1984, 65 cases were reported, with one death (5). In 1985, 46 cases were reported, with one death. In the 5-year period 1981-1985, the mean number of cases reported was 85; however, in the period 1983-1985, the mean number of cases reported per year was 47. No apparent change in the surveillance system can account for this downward trend in the number of reported cases.

Over half of the cases reported in 1985 were associated with common-source outbreaks. Outbreak investigations often lead to the detection and diagnosis of associated cases that would otherwise go undiagnosed and, therefore, unreported if

Table 2. Trichinosis cases, by source of infection, United States, 1985

| Food | Cases* | Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Pork | 21 | 48.8 |
| Sausage 13 | | |
| Chops 2 | | |
| Roast 2 | | |
| Other 4 | | |
| Bear | 15 | 34.9 |
| Walrus | 4 | 9.3 |
| Other wild animal | 1 | 2.3 |
| Ground beef | 2 | 4.7 |
| TOTAL | 43 | 100 |

*In three cases the source of infection was unknown.

they occurred as sporadic individual cases. Investigations also help to identify risk factors associated with trichinosis (6). Through the surveillance system, investigators have found that a large number of cases have occurred in the Middle Atlantic and New England states because of the high concentration of ethnic groups whose culinary preferences include raw or lightly cooked pork. The ethnic groups identified primarily consist of traditionally Eastern European populations such as those of Italian, German, or Polish descent. Immigrants from Southeast Asia have also been found to be a high-risk group because of similar culinary preferences (7).

Recent surveys have demonstrated that trichinosis prevalence varies in different regions of the country; 0.58% of the pigs examined from selected slaughterhouses in the Middle Atlantic states and 0.73% of those from slaughterhouses in the New England states have been infected with *Trichinella* (8,9), surpassing the estimated nationwide rate of 0.1% (10). However, in a slaughterhouse-based survey of 1,223 pigs in Louisiana, only one infected animal was detected (11), and of 3,245 pigs examined from five midwestern states, not one infected carcass was detected (B. Stromberg, personal communication). These findings suggest that both the prevalence of trichinosis in the local swine population and local food preferences are contributing factors to the risk of human infection. The impact of these risk factors needs further investigation.

References

1. Pawlowski ZS. Clinical aspects in man. In: Campbell WC, ed. *Trichinella* and trichinosis. New York: Plenum Press, 1983:367-401.
2. CDC. Trichinosis—Maine, Alaska. MMWR 1986;35:33-5.
3. Schantz PM. Trichinosis in the United States—1947-1981. Food Tech March 1983:83-6.
4. CDC. Trichinosis Surveillance, 1983. In: CDC Surveillance Summaries. MMWR 1984;33 (No. 4SS):17SS-23SS.
5. CDC. Trichinosis Surveillance, 1984. In: CDC Surveillance Summaries. MMWR 1986;35 (No. 2SS):11SS-15SS.
6. Schantz PM, Juranek DD, Schultz MG. Trichinosis in the United States, 1975; increase in cases attributed to numerous common-source outbreaks. J Infect Dis 1977;136:712-5.
7. Stehr-Green JK, Schantz PM. Trichinosis in Southeast Asian refugees in the United States. Am J Public Health 1986;76:1238-9.
8. Schad GA, Leiby DA, Duffy CH, Murrell KD. Swine trichinosis in New England slaughterhouses. Am J Vet Res 1985;46:2008-10.
9. Schad GA, Kelly M, Leiby DA, Blumrick K, Duffy CH, Murrell KD. Swine trichinosis in mid-Atlantic slaughterhouses: possible relationship to hog marketing systems. Prev Vet Med 1985;3:391-9.
10. Zimmerman WJ, Zinter DE. The prevalence of trichiniasis in swine in the United States, 1966-1970. HSMHA Health Rep 1971;86:937-45.
11. Hugh-Jones ME, Stewart TB, Raby C, Morrison JE, Isenstein RS, Klei TR. Prevalence of trichinosis in southern Louisiana swine. Am J Vet Res 1985;46:463-5.

State Activities for Surveillance of Occupational Disease and Injury, 1985

Joann T. Muldoon, M.S., M.A.
Laverne A. Wintermeyer, M.D.
John A. Eure, M.S.
Iowa Department of Public Health

Laurence Fuortes, M.D.
James A. Merchant, M.D., Ph.D.
Stephanie F. Van Lier
University of Iowa

Thomas B. Richards, M.D.
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

Introduction

Accurate surveillance of occupational disease and injury is essential to effective prevention programs. In the past, no systematic approach has been available to public health officials for identifying, reporting, or following up on adverse health conditions related to specific occupations, and surveillance efforts have been inadequate to meet the health information needs of prevention programs. Recognizing that state health departments play an important role in the surveillance of occupational disease (1), the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), in 1981, began a series of cooperative agreements with state health departments to help them develop occupational surveillance programs and build surveillance capacity within their departments. To date, NIOSH has awarded approximately \$2.7 million to support 22 state projects. Under one of these agreements, in 1985 the Iowa Department of Public Health conducted a mail-based survey of state epidemiologists to determine the activities of state health departments in the surveillance of occupational disease and injury (2). This report summarizes conditions existing at the time of the survey but does not reflect changes in activity since that time.

Methods

The survey focused on the use of eight sources of information about occupational health or hazards: 1) health care providers, 2) death certificates and autopsy reports, 3) birth certificates, 4) cancer registries, 5) registries for occupational diseases other than cancer, 6) hospital or insurance billing information, 7) workers' compensation claims, and 8) environmental sampling data (measured levels of the hazards to which workers are exposed).

Health departments in all 50 states, New York City, and the District of Columbia responded. Except for telephone calls to correct inconsistencies, no attempt was made to verify the responses independently or to complete questions left blank.

Results

The following is a brief description of the eight potential data sources and a discussion of the responses and their implications.

Health Care Providers

Thirty-two (62%) of the health departments had voluntary or mandatory programs that require health care providers to report occupational diseases or injuries to a state

agency (Table 1, Figure 1). At the time of the survey (1985), legislation was pending in California, Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, and New Jersey to require the reporting of occupational illnesses or to add additional diseases to those already required; laws were subsequently passed in California, Maine, and New Jersey. Groups required or asked to report were private physicians (25 states), hospitals (19), laboratories (17), and others (13) (e.g., nursing home administrators, labor unions, and employers). Case reports were directed to more than one agency in six states. Overall, reports

Table 1. Activities for the surveillance of occupational disease reported by health departments in 50 states, New York City, and the District of Columbia, by source of data, 1985

| Source | Activity | Number of departments reporting |
|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Health care providers | providers report | 32 |
| | mandatory for some diseases | 29 |
| | voluntary | 3 |
| | penalties for not reporting | 16 |
| | all six sentinel health events | 16 |
| | reporting criteria developed | 5 |
| | follow-up of some cases | 18 |
| | intervention efforts | 10 |
| | data analyzed/published | 7 |
| Death certificates and autopsy reports | occupation/industry data coded | 31 |
| | machine readable | 28 |
| | analyzed | 23 |
| | published | 10 |
| | Part II cause-of-death machine readable | 29 |
| | central file of autopsy reports | 15 |
| Birth certificates | parents' occupation recorded | 14 |
| | parents' place of employment recorded | 5 |
| | data coded/machine readable | 9 |
| | data analyzed/published | 4 |
| Cancer registries | registries maintained | 32 |
| | occupational histories included | 18 |
| | worksite medical data included | 9 |
| | data analyzed/published | 5 |
| Registries for occup. diseases other than cancer | registries maintained | 7 |
| | data analyzed/published | 5 |
| | occupational histories included | 4 |
| Hospital or insurance billing information | data received and analyzed | 4 |
| Workers' compensation claims | machine readable | 33 |
| | state labor department analyzes | 24 |
| | state health department analyzes | 8 |
| Environmental sampling data | data collected | 23 |
| | company name/address | 21 |
| | employee identifiers | 17 |
| | dust levels | 17 |
| | other contaminant levels | 20 |
| | noise levels | 14 |

were sent to state health departments (25 respondents), labor departments (7), and other agencies (4) (e.g., county health departments or worker compensation boards).

Reporting of occupational diseases was ascertained by collecting information on six sentinel health events (3). Of the six conditions, lead poisoning was most frequently listed as reportable (28 respondents), and Arkansas, Colorado, New Jersey, New York State, and Utah had criteria for evaluating case reports. Criteria varied among these states (e.g., in Colorado, blood lead levels required to be reported were $>25\mu\text{g}/100\text{ ml}$; in New Jersey, $\geq 25\mu\text{g}/100\text{ ml}$; and in New York, $\geq 40\mu\text{g}/100\text{ ml}$).

In 10 states, the health department used case reports in its intervention activities, such as in worker education, employer consultation, or engineering controls. Eighteen state health departments indicated that they try to obtain additional details beyond the initial report—some routinely, some periodically (e.g., reviewing medical records, obtaining a complete occupational history, and/or evaluating the worksite environment). Seven departments publish a summary of information from case reports, but no department had evaluated its surveillance program to see if all cases were being reported.


Death Certificates and Autopsy Reports

Both death certificates and autopsy reports include information on the relationship between work-related factors and the death. Fifty-six percent of the health departments reported that they maintain in machine-readable form the cause-of-death data contained in Part II of death certificates. Fifteen states maintain a central file of autopsy reports. Nine states maintain both Part II death-certificate data in machine-readable form and a central file of autopsy reports.

Birth Certificates

In some states, birth certificates list both the father's and the mother's occupations and may also list the parents' places of employment. Despite the potential usefulness

FIGURE 1. Reporting of occupational illness, by location and type of mandate covering health care providers, United States, 1985



of this information, only 14 (27%) departments collect it, and only four (8%) of these analyze it.

Cancer Registries

Cancer registries are becoming an important source of health information for use in prevention. Information now being recorded in cancer registries may include occupational histories and medical data collected at the worksite. Central cancer registries were reported by 32 departments; 11 of these collect an occupational history on every case, and seven collect an occupational history on selected cases.

Registries for Occupational Diseases Other Than Cancer

Seven states—Colorado, Hawaii, Maryland, New Jersey, Nevada, New York, and North Carolina—reported maintaining registries for occupational diseases other than cancer. Conditions covered by the registries include silicosis; asbestosis; exposures to heavy metals, toxic substances, carbon monoxide, pesticides, and radiation; and congenital malformations. Five of the registries include occupational histories and medical data; three also include smoking histories and data on worksite environmental sampling.

Hospital or Insurance Billing Information

Only four states use hospital or private insurance billing information, but this source may prove valuable for occupational surveillance if certain problems—such as maintaining patient confidentiality, frequent readmissions that result in duplication, and lack of direct access to hospital records—can be overcome. To help make hospital records more useful, Wisconsin passed state legislation to standardize required occupational information.

Workers' Compensation Claims

Thirty-three departments reported having workers' compensation claims in machine-readable form. State labor departments analyze these data in 24 states, independent of any analysis by the Supplementary Data System of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. State health departments also analyze the data in eight states.

Environmental Sampling Data (Hazard Surveillance)

When diseases in exposed workers are detected, information on the levels and conditions to which these workers were exposed may help public health investigators identify others at the same worksite who are at risk. Less than half of the health departments report that they collect worksite environmental data. Some departments obtain such data from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration or the Mine Safety and Health Administration; others collect it independently. California legislation allows the state health department to monitor exposure and medical data collected by employers in compliance with regulations.

Discussion

Regarding the eight potential data sources queried for surveillance of occupational disease, machine-readable data on workers' compensation was listed most frequently as being available for surveillance purposes (63% of states), followed by provider reports (62%), death certificates coded for occupation or industry (60%), environmental data (44%), cancer registries with occupational histories (35%), birth certificates with parents' occupations (27%), registries for diseases other than cancer (13%), and hospital or private insurance (8%).

There is scant information with which to compare these results. A 1981 survey of state and local offices that maintain vital statistics found 18 states coding industry

and/or occupation on some death certificates (4); in the current survey, 31 respondents reported this activity. Although this is an encouraging increase, results of the current survey indicate that surveillance activities for occupational disease are not uniform from state to state and that considerable room for improvement still exists. For example, only seven state health departments publish a summary of information reported by health care providers, and five departments report no activity related to the eight potential data sources.

Surveillance of occupational illness and injury serves two basic purposes. The first is to detect cases of illness and injury so that intervention strategies can be targeted to affected groups and individuals and their worksites. Although the established surveillance systems for communicable diseases are helpful models, the circumstances of many work-related disorders require unique approaches to develop a comprehensive system for detecting specific occupational disorders. The second purpose is to monitor trends in the occurrence of work-related diseases and injuries to help evaluate the effectiveness of specific interventions.

Because of the complex and multifactorial nature of many work-related health conditions, surveillance often focuses on workplace hazards as well as health events. Hazard surveillance consists of the periodic characterization of chemical or physical hazards in the workplace and may provide very useful information in the absence of a simultaneous assessment of health status. In many industries, hazard surveillance by direct measurement of levels of airborne contaminants or noise levels is used to direct strategies for primary prevention. Although health surveillance and hazard surveillance can be performed as separate, isolated endeavors, linkage of the two in the same population is often preferable.

State health departments must play a part in any comprehensive surveillance activity that is to be effective. Surveillance activities should also involve local health departments that can intervene at the worksite, especially in small businesses. Cooperative arrangements between state departments of health and labor can direct intervention activities to needs identified by local surveillance reports. Thus, "grass-roots" support for prevention activities at the workplace can be developed. For this type of support to be developed, however, persons reporting cases must receive feedback in the form of analyses and interpretation of the data they have reported.

In the process of increasing the quantity of data collected, several states have developed innovative approaches to improving the quality of surveillance data. For example, the annual report by California on workers' compensation claims now links workers' compensation reports with a summary of death certificates on which pneumoconiosis was listed as the primary cause. The Virginia State Department of Health consolidates statistics on occupational diseases from workers' compensation files, physicians, and hospitals and provides feedback on the results via an epidemiologic bulletin sent to all physicians. To be effective, any surveillance system ultimately depends on analysis, interpretation, and feedback to persons reporting. In turn, any national surveillance program depends on the consolidation of information provided by the states to the appropriate health agencies.

NIOSH has recently proposed national strategies to prevent 10 leading work-related diseases and injuries (5). In each strategy, state-based surveillance is recommended to help target new or improved prevention programs and to monitor the effectiveness of these programs. NIOSH remains committed to the aggressive pursuit of a comprehensive national surveillance plan with six basic elements:

1. To develop a model system for state reporting of occupational disorders
2. To incorporate occupational concerns into national health surveys (e.g., National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey)
3. To improve systems for hazard surveillance
4. To develop uniform approaches for using existing sources of health data
5. To disseminate information on surveillance methods
6. To place the 10 leading work-related diseases and injuries under nationwide surveillance

The efforts of state health departments are critical to the success of this plan. As the objectives of the plan are achieved, a more comprehensive and uniform approach to the surveillance of occupational disorders will be established throughout the country.

References

1. Key MM. State and local health departments: forgotten resources in occupational safety and health. *J Occup Med* 1985;27:379-85.
2. Muldoon JT, Wintermeyer LA, Eure JA, Fuortes L, Merchant JA, Van Lier SF, Richards TB. Occupational disease surveillance data sources, 1985. *Am J Public Health* 1987;77:1006-8.
3. Rutstein DD, Mullan RJ, Frazier TM, Halperin WE, Melius JM, Sestito JP. Sentinel health events (occupational): a basis for physician recognition and public health surveillance. *Am J Public Health* 1983;73:1054-62.
4. Kaminski R, Brockert J, Sestito J, Frazier T. Occupational information on death certificates: a survey of state practices. *Am J Public Health* 1981;71:525-6.
5. Association of Schools of Public Health. Proposed national strategies for the prevention of leading work-related diseases and injuries, part 1. Washington, DC: Association of Schools of Public Health under a cooperative agreement with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 1986.

Ectopic Pregnancy Mortality in the United States, 1979-1982

Tedd Ellerbrock, M.D.

Hani K. Atrash, M.D., M.P.H.

Carol J.R. Hogue, Ph.D., M.P.H.

Joyce M. Hughes

Pregnancy Epidemiology Branch

Research and Statistics Branch

Division of Reproductive Health

Center for Health Promotion and Education

Introduction

From 1970 through 1983, the number of ectopic pregnancies in the United States increased from 17,800 to 69,600 (1). During this same period, the rate of ectopic pregnancies for women 15-44 years of age increased from 4.5 to 14.0 per 1,000 reported pregnancies (live births, legally induced abortions, and ectopic pregnancies).

Despite increases in both the number and the rate of ectopic pregnancies, the number and rate of deaths due to ectopic pregnancy in the United States decreased (1). In 1970, 63 deaths due to ectopic pregnancy were reported, a rate of 35.5 deaths per 10,000 ectopic pregnancies; in 1983, 37 deaths due to ectopic pregnancy were reported, a rate of 5.3 deaths per 10,000 ectopic pregnancies. However, this decrease in ectopic pregnancy mortality was less than the decrease in the number of maternal deaths due to three other major causes (hemorrhage, infection, and embolism) during the same period. Consequently, by 1982, ectopic pregnancy had become the second leading cause of maternal mortality in the United States (2).

In 1979, CDC began a nationwide surveillance program to document the number and characteristics of women dying from ectopic pregnancies and to help prevent mortality associated with ectopic pregnancies. Mortality data for 1979-1980 have been reported (3,4). This report updates that information and presents data on all known deaths from ectopic pregnancy that occurred in the United States from 1979 through 1982.

Methods

For this study, an ectopic pregnancy was defined as a pregnancy located outside the uterine cavity, including tubal, cervical, cornual, ovarian, and abdominal pregnancies, as well as pregnancies in a rudimentary horn of an anomalous uterus. An ectopic pregnancy death was defined as any death resulting from a complication of an ectopic pregnancy or the chain of events initiated by that pregnancy, regardless of the amount of time between termination of pregnancy and death.

CDC contacted the health departments of all 50 states, New York City, and the District of Columbia for information about ectopic pregnancy deaths. Additional information was obtained from the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) and from CDC's statistics on abortion mortality. Death certificates, medical records, and autopsy reports were reviewed. Since clinical information was frequently unavailable on decedents who had not received professional medical care, the results reported in this surveillance summary were based on characteristics of known cases.

The estimated number of ectopic pregnancies was based on data from the National Hospital Discharge Survey (NHDS). This survey is a systematic sample of

medical records from a representative sample of hospitals in the United States. Each year, it includes approximately 200,000 records from about 400 nonfederal, short-stay hospitals in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The NHDS abstracts the first seven diagnoses listed for each patient. For this report, investigators identified ectopic pregnancies by reviewing all seven diagnoses for discharges coded 633, according to the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9).

The geographic regions used in this report are those defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The risk of death is the number of women dying of ectopic pregnancy per 10,000 women hospitalized for ectopic pregnancy. The relative risk is the ratio of the risk of death of one group divided by the risk of death of the group in the same category with the lowest risk of death. Variances for the NHDS estimates of hospitalized patients with ectopic pregnancies are available from published tables (5). A zero variance was assumed for the counts of deaths, and the variance for a ratio of random variables was calculated by a standard method (6). Estimates of the number of ectopic pregnancies have been rounded to the nearest 100. For both the number of ectopic pregnancies and the deaths due to ectopic pregnancy, the racial category "white" includes Hispanics.

Results

From 1979 through 1982, a total of 180 ectopic pregnancy deaths were reported to CDC. Following investigation, 166 of these were classified as deaths due to ectopic pregnancy (Table 1). In the 14 other deaths, only two of the decedents had had an ectopic pregnancy. One of these two deaths was due to pulmonary embolism, and the other was due to a pheochromocytoma. During this same 4-year period, an estimated 232,600 cases of ectopic pregnancy occurred in the United States, for a risk of death of 7.1 per 10,000 cases (Table 1).

In the study period, more than half (55%) of the decedents were women of black and other races, despite the fact that white women had almost three times as many ectopic pregnancies. Consequently, the risk of death due to an ectopic pregnancy for women of black and other races was 3.6 times the risk for white women. Of the 166 women who died, 80 were black, 64 were white, 10 were of Asian or Pacific Islander descent, 10 were Hispanic, and two were native American.

The risk of death showed no consistent relationship to age (range = 16-43 years). Eighty percent of the decedents were 20-34; 14%, ≥ 35 ; and 6%, ≤ 19 years of age.

More than half (51%) of the women were married at the time of death. However, the risk of death for women who either had never married or had been previously married was about 1.7 times the risk for married women.

The risk of death due to ectopic pregnancy was similar in the four geographic regions. All 166 deaths occurred in 32 states and New York City. Approximately 45% of these deaths occurred in the four reporting areas with the largest number of ectopic pregnancy deaths.

In 90 instances, the gestational age was known at the time symptoms began (Table 2). In approximately one-third of these, the gestational age was < 7 weeks; in one-third, 7-9 weeks; and one-third, ≥ 10 weeks. Because pain is the most commonly reported symptom of ectopic pregnancy (7), each case was reviewed to determine if pain had preceded the death. In the 122 instances in which this information was available, almost all of the patients (96%) experienced pain during the pregnancy.

In 101 instances, the gestational age was known at the time of death. In approximately half of these, the gestational age was ≤ 9 weeks; in the other half, it

was ≥ 10 weeks. The site of the ectopic pregnancy was known in almost all (97%) cases. Eighty-one percent of the pregnancies were tubal; 12%, cornual; and 7%, abdominal.

Routine diagnostic studies for ectopic pregnancy were not performed in many of the 166 cases. For example, although the records did not indicate whether a pregnancy test was performed in 63 of these cases, they showed that a pregnancy test was not performed in 52 (50%) of the other 103 cases. Furthermore, in the 118 instances in which information was available concerning ultrasonograms, 107 (91%) of the women did not have an ultrasonogram. Similarly, in the 138 instances in which information was available concerning culdocentesis, 75% of the women did not have this procedure. In 109 cases, the type of final primary physician was known. Half of these physicians were board certified, board eligible, or residents in obstetrics and gynecology.

Information about the patient's treatment was available for most (92%) of the cases. In these cases, more than half (59%) of the women received no treatment. Of the 165 women whose cause of death was known, 146 (88%) died from hemorrhage. Two-thirds of those who died from hemorrhage had no surgery, whereas one-third died from hemorrhage either during or after surgery. The place of death was known in all but four of the 166 cases. Almost two-thirds of these deaths occurred in the

Table 1. Risk of death per 10,000 ectopic pregnancies and relative risk, by year, race, age, marital status, and region, United States, 1979-1982

| Characteristics | Distribution of deaths (N = 166) | Distribution of ectopic pregnancies (N = 232,600)* | Risk | Relative risk (95% CL) [†] |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|------|-------------------------------------|
| Year | | | | |
| 1979 | 39 | 50,000 | 7.8 | NA |
| 1980 | 46 | 52,200 | 8.8 | NA |
| 1981 | 36 | 68,000 | 5.3 | NA |
| 1982 | 45 | 62,400 | 7.2 | NA |
| Race | | | | |
| White | 74 | 172,400 | 4.3 | Referent |
| Black and others | 92 | 60,200 | 15.3 | 3.6 (2.7-4.7) [‡] |
| Age (years) | | | | |
| ≤ 19 | 10 | 13,700 | 7.3 | 1.3 (0.9-1.9) |
| 20-24 | 46 | 61,900 | 7.4 | 1.3 (0.9-1.8) |
| 25-29 | 47 | 81,800 | 5.7 | Referent |
| 30-34 | 40 | 53,400 | 7.5 | 1.3 (0.9-1.8) |
| > 35 | 23 | 21,800 | 10.6 | 1.8 (1.3-2.6) [‡] |
| Marital status | | | | |
| Current | 85 | 144,000 | 5.9 | Referent |
| Never married | 54 | 55,800 | 9.7 | 1.6 (1.2-2.2) [‡] |
| Previously married | 23 | 22,900 | 10.0 | 1.7 (1.1-2.4) [‡] |
| Region | | | | |
| Northeast | 40 | 49,100 | 8.1 | 1.3 (0.9-1.8) |
| North Central | 37 | 57,900 | 6.4 | Referent |
| South | 51 | 70,300 | 7.3 | 1.1 (0.8-1.6) |
| West | 38 | 55,300 | 6.9 | 1.1 (0.8-1.5) |

*Rounded to the nearest hundred. Sums of values may not equal totals because of rounding.

[†]Confidence limits

[‡]Significant at $p < 0.05$.

NA — Not applicable

hospital, and the others occurred either at home or in transit to the hospital. Finally, nine of the ectopic pregnancy deaths reportedly occurred after an attempted abortion.

Discussion

This is the only surveillance system in which nationwide data on ectopic pregnancy mortality are systematically collected and analyzed. Independently, a comparable number of ectopic pregnancy deaths (168) were reported through national vital statistics for the same period.

Table 2. Selected characteristics of 166 women dying from ectopic pregnancy, United States, 1979-1982

| Characteristics* | Number of deaths | Percent† |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|----------|
| Gestational age (weeks) | | |
| at onset of symptoms (N = 90) | | |
| <7 | 31 | 34 |
| 7-9 | 29 | 32 |
| 10-12 | 14 | 16 |
| >12 | 16 | 18 |
| Pain (N = 122) | | |
| Yes | 117 | 96 |
| No | 5 | 4 |
| Gestational age (weeks) | | |
| at death (N = 101) | | |
| <7 | 22 | 22 |
| 7-9 | 30 | 30 |
| 10-12 | 24 | 24 |
| >12 | 25 | 25 |
| Site of pregnancy (N = 161) | | |
| tubal | 130 | 81 |
| cornual | 19 | 12 |
| abdominal | 12 | 7 |
| Diagnostic studies | | |
| pregnancy test (N = 103) | 51 | 50 |
| ultrasonogram (N = 118) | 11 | 9 |
| culdocentesis (N = 138) | 34 | 25 |
| Final primary physician (N = 109) | | |
| obstetrician-gynecologist | 55 | 50 |
| not obstetrician-gynecologist | 26 | 24 |
| none | 28 | 26 |
| Procedure for treatment (N = 152) | | |
| laparotomy | 62 | 41 |
| none | 90 | 59 |
| Cause of death (N = 165) | | |
| hemorrhage without surgery | 98 | 59 |
| hemorrhage with surgery | 48 | 29 |
| infection with surgery | 5 | 3 |
| anesthesia complication | 3 | 2 |
| other causes | 11 | 7 |
| Place of death (N = 162) | | |
| hospital | 98 | 60 |
| home | 45 | 28 |
| in transit | 13 | 8 |
| other | 6 | 4 |

*Number known

†Percentage of known cases. The sum of percentages for each characteristic may not be 100% because of rounding.

The data in this report support the findings of previous studies based on this surveillance system for 1979-1980 (3,4). The risk of death from ectopic pregnancy is much greater than that associated with uterine pregnancy (3,8,9). For example, in 1982, 237 maternal deaths were due to direct or indirect obstetric causes (this excludes deaths due to ectopic pregnancy and abortion) (2), and there were 3,680,537 live births (10). In the same year, of the 1,303,980 legally induced abortions reported, 11 resulted in death (11). Consequently, 248 deaths occurred among 4,984,517 uterine pregnancies, a risk of five deaths per 100,000 uterine pregnancies. In comparison, 45 deaths occurred among an estimated 62,400 ectopic pregnancies, a risk of 72 deaths per 100,000 ectopic pregnancies. These findings indicate that, in 1982, the relative risk of death associated with ectopic pregnancy was about 14 times greater than that associated with uterine pregnancy.

The relative risk of death from ectopic pregnancy for women of black and other races is about 3.5 times that for white women (1,3). This risk is comparable with the threefold risk of death for black and other races for abortions (12) and for all maternal deaths (13). In 1979-1982, of the 92 women in the "black and other races" category who died from ectopic pregnancy, 80 (87%) were black.

Hemorrhage was the cause of death in 88% of all ectopic pregnancy deaths. A diagnosis of ectopic pregnancy before rupture might have prevented some of these deaths. For this reason, prenatal care in the first trimester may facilitate the diagnosis and management of ectopic pregnancy before rupture. The increased risk of ectopic pregnancy death in blacks may be related to the timing and quality of prenatal care among black women. Although data on comparative quality of prenatal care are not available, date of initiation of prenatal care is routinely collected for live births. Among the women who have live-born infants, fewer blacks than whites begin prenatal care in the first trimester. For example, among women delivering in 1983, about 60% of black women and 80% of white women began prenatal care in the first trimester (14).

This report contains some caveats for the clinician that may help prevent ectopic pregnancy deaths. First, pain—in addition to being the most commonly reported symptom of ectopic pregnancy—precedes almost all (96%) ectopic pregnancy deaths. This finding reemphasizes the traditional maxim of "think ectopic," especially when the clinician is evaluating a woman of reproductive age who has abdominal pain. Second, the three most important tests for the early diagnosis of ectopic pregnancy are culdocentesis, ultrasonogram, and human chorionic gonadotropin assay (15). However, a pregnancy test was performed in only half of the 103 ectopic pregnancy deaths for which information is available. In addition, only a fourth of 138 decedents had culdocentesis, and less than a tenth of 118 decedents had an ultrasonogram. If all three of these tests had been performed on these patients, some of the women might not have died. Finally, in 58 (36%) of the 162 ectopic pregnancy deaths for which the place of death is known, the women died either at home or in transit to the hospital. Therefore, when a clinician suspects that a patient may have an ectopic pregnancy, a diagnosis should be made and the treatment started as soon as possible. Any delay may result in death.

Some factors may have affected the accuracy of the number of ectopic pregnancies and ectopic pregnancy deaths reported here. Estimates of ectopic pregnancies were derived from a sample of medical records of patients discharged from hospitals and are therefore subject to sampling error. In addition, some ectopic pregnancies

resolve spontaneously, and the women are not hospitalized (16). Furthermore, the number of ectopic pregnancies in 1981 was much higher than expected on the basis of rates of increase for the period 1970-1980 (1). On the other hand, the determination of an ectopic pregnancy death frequently depends on surgical or autopsy findings, or both, and some deaths that occurred without surgery or an autopsy may not have been reported. However, since ectopic pregnancy deaths occur in women of reproductive age, an autopsy is probably more likely for this condition than for other fatal conditions that affect an older population.

References

1. CDC. Ectopic pregnancy in the United States, 1970-1983. In: CDC Surveillance Summaries, August 1986. MMWR 1986;35(No 2SS):29SS-37SS.
2. National Center for Health Statistics. Advance report of final mortality statistics, 1982. Hyattsville, Maryland: National Center for Health Statistics. Monthly Vital Statistics Report 1984;33(No 9, supplement):38. (DHHS Pub No [PHS] 85-1120).
3. Dorfman SF. Deaths from ectopic pregnancy, United States, 1979 to 1980. Obstet Gynecol 1983;62:334-8.
4. Dorfman SF, Grimes DA, Cates W Jr, Binkin NJ, Kafrissen ME, O'Reilly KR. Ectopic pregnancy mortality, United States, 1979 to 1980: clinical aspects. Obstet Gynecol 1984;64:386-90.
5. National Center for Health Statistics. 1985 summary: National Hospital Discharge Survey. Hyattsville, Maryland: National Center for Health Statistics. Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics 1986;127,12. (DHHS Pub No [PHS] 86-1250).
6. Kendall MG, Stuart A. The advanced theory of statistics. New York: Hafner Publishing Co, 1968:232.
7. Langer A. Clinical presentation of tubal pregnancy. In: Langer A, Iffy L, ed. Extrauterine pregnancy. Littleton, Massachusetts: PSG Publishing Co, Inc, 1986:235-44.
8. LeBolt SA, Grimes DA, Cates W Jr. Mortality from abortion and childbirth: are the populations comparable? JAMA 1982;248:188-91.
9. Cates W Jr, Smith JC, Roach RW, Grimes DA. Mortality from abortion and childbirth: are the statistics biased? JAMA 1982;248:192-6.
10. National Center for Health Statistics. Advance report of final natality statistics, 1982. Hyattsville, Maryland: National Center for Health Statistics. Monthly Vital Statistics Report 1984;33(No 6, supplement):1. (DHHS Pub No [PHS] 84-1120).
11. CDC. Abortion surveillance, 1982-1983. In: CDC Surveillance Summaries, February 1987. MMWR 1987;36(No 1SS):11SS-42SS.
12. Atrash HK, MacKay HT, Binkin NJ, Hogue CJR. Legal abortion mortality in the United States: 1972 to 1982. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1987;156:605-12.
13. Kaunitz AM, Hughes JM, Grimes DA, Smith JC, Roach RW, Kafrissen ME. Causes of maternal mortality in the United States. Obstet Gynecol 1985;65:605-12.
14. National Center for Health Statistics. Health, United States, 1985. Hyattsville, Maryland: National Center for Health Statistics, 1985. (DHHS Pub No [PHS] 86-1232).
15. Weinstein L. Epidemiology of ectopic pregnancy. In: DeCherney AH, ed. Ectopic pregnancy. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Publishers, Inc, 1986:1-13.
16. Burrows S, Moors W, Pekala B. Missed tubal abortions. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1980;136:691-2.

State and Territorial Epidemiologists and State Laboratory Directors

The contributions of the State and Territorial Epidemiologists and the State Laboratory Directors to this report are gratefully acknowledged. The persons listed were in the positions shown as of July 15, 1987.

| State | Epidemiologists | Laboratory Directors |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Alabama | Charles H. Woernle, MD | James L. Holston, Jr., DrPH |
| Alaska | John P. Middaugh, MD | Vacant |
| Arizona | Steven J. Englander, MD, MPH | Jon M. Counts, DrPH |
| Arkansas | Thomas C. McChesney, DVM | Robert L. Horn |
| California | Kathleen H. Acree, MDCM, MPH | G. W. Fuhs, DrSciNat |
| Colorado | Richard E. Hoffman, MD, MPH | Ronald L. Cada, DrPH |
| Connecticut | James L. Hadler, MD, MPH | Jesse Tucker, PhD |
| Delaware | Paul R. Silverman, DrPH | Mahadeo P. Verma, PhD |
| District of Columbia | Martin E. Levy, MD, MPH | James B. Thomas, ScD |
| Florida | Michael H. Wilder, MD, Acting | Eldert C. Hartwig, ScD |
| Georgia | R. Keith Sikes, DVM, MPH | Frank M. Rumph, MD |
| Hawaii | Christine Nevin-Woods, DO, MPH | Vernon K. Miyamoto, PhD |
| Idaho | Charles D. Brokopp, DrPH | Darrell W. Brock, DrPH |
| Illinois | Byron J. Francis, MD | Robert Coe, Acting |
| Indiana | Charles L. Barrett, MD | Greg Hayes, PhD |
| Iowa | Laverne A. Wintermeyer, MD | W. J. Hausler, Jr., PhD |
| Kansas | Cindy Wood, MD, MPH | Roger H. Carlson, PhD |
| Kentucky | Michael Moser, MD, MPH | Cecil Webb, MS |
| Louisiana | Joyce B. Mathison, MD | Henry Bradford, PhD |
| Maine | Kathleen F. Gensheimer, MD | Philip W. Haines, DrPH |
| Maryland | Ebenezer Israel, MD, MPH | J. Mehsen Joseph, PhD |
| Massachusetts | George F. Grady, MD | Ralph Timperi, MPH |
| Michigan | Kenneth R. Wilcox, Jr., MD | George R. Anderson, DVM |
| Minnesota | Michael T. Osterholm, PhD, MPH | Robert Linder, MD, PhD |
| Mississippi | Fred E. Thompson, MD | R. H. Andrews, MPH |
| Missouri | H. Denny Donnell, Jr., MD, MPH | Eric Blank, DrPH |
| Montana | Judith K. Gedrose, MN | Douglas Abbott, PhD |
| Nebraska | Paul A. Stoesz, MD | John Blosser |
| Nevada | George E. Reynolds, MD, Acting | George E. Reynolds, MD |
| New Hampshire | Eugene Schwartz, MD | Veronica C. Malmberg |
| New Jersey | William E. Parkin, DVM | Shaheidy I. Shaheid, PhD |
| New Mexico | Harry F. Hull, MD | Loris W. Hughes, PhD |
| New York City | Stephen Schultz, MD | Paul S. Maye, DSc |
| New York State | Dale L. Morse, MD, MS | Herbert W. Dickerman, MD, PhD |
| North Carolina | J. N. MacCormack, MD, MPH | Mildred A. Kerbaugh |
| North Dakota | James L. Pearson, DrPH | Jane S. Robb |
| Ohio | Thomas J. Halpin, MD, MPH | Gary D. Davidson, DrPH |
| Oklahoma | Gregory R. Istre, MD | Garry L. McKee, PhD |
| Oregon | Laurence R. Foster, MD, MPH | Michael R. Skeels, PhD |
| Pennsylvania | Ernest J. Witte, VMD, MPH | Vern Pidcoe, DrPH |
| Rhode Island | Barbara A. DeBuono, MD, MPH | Raymond G. Lundgren, Jr., PhD |
| South Carolina | Clark W. Heath, Jr., MD, Acting | Arthur F. DiSalvo, MD |
| South Dakota | Kenneth A. Senger | A. Richard Melton, DrPH |
| Tennessee | Robert H. Hutcheson, MD | Michael W. Kimberly, DrPH |
| Texas | Charles E. Alexander, MD | Charles E. Sweet, DrPH |
| Utah | Craig R. Nichols, MPA | Francis M. Urry, PhD |
| Vermont | Richard L. Vogt, MD | Katherine A. Kelley, DrPH |
| Virginia | Grayson B. Miller, Jr., MD | Frank W. Lambert, Jr., PhD |
| Washington | John M. Kobayashi, MD | Jack Allard, PhD |
| West Virginia | Roy C. Baron, MD, MPH, Acting | John W. Brough, DrPH |
| Wisconsin | Jeffrey P. Davis, MD | Ronald H. Laessig, PhD |
| Wyoming | Harry C. Crawford, MD | Donald T. Lee, PhD |
| Guam | Robert L. Haddock, DVM | Angelina Roman, Acting |
| Federated States of | | |
| Micronesia | Eliuel K. Pretrick, MO | Vacant |
| Marshall Islands | Tony de Brum | Vacant |
| Northern Mariana Is.* | Vacant | Vacant |
| American Samoa | Julia L. Lyons, MD, MPH | Vacant |
| Palau* | Anthony H. Polloi, MO | Vacant |
| Puerto Rico | John V. Rullan, MD | Raul Baco, MD |
| Virgin Islands | John N. Lewis, MD | Norbert Mantor |

*Formerly Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report is prepared by the Centers for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia. This edition is printed and distributed by the Massachusetts Medical Society, publishers of *The New England Journal of Medicine*. The data in this report are provisional, based on weekly reports to CDC by state health departments. The reporting week concludes at close of business on Friday; compiled data on a national basis are officially released to the public on the succeeding Friday.

The editor welcomes accounts of interesting cases, outbreaks, environmental hazards, or other public health problems of current interest to health officials. Such reports and any other matters pertaining to editorial or other textual considerations should be addressed to the attention of the Editor, *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, Centers for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia 30333.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services / Public Health Service

Director, Centers for Disease Control: James O. Mason, M.D., Dr.P.H.

Director, Epidemiology Program Office: Carl W. Tyler, Jr., M.D.

Editor: Michael B. Gregg, M.D.

Managing Editor: Gwendolyn A. Ingraham

HHS Publication No. (CDC) 85-8017

Subscriptions to this edition of *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* are available through the Massachusetts Medical Society, C.S.P.O. Box 9120, Waltham, MA 02254-9120, U.S.A. *MMWR* also expects to publish four Quarterly Surveillance Reports and two to four Supplements during the course of a yearly subscription.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Third Class Mail: 52 issues and annual and supplements, \$26.00

First Class Mail: 52 issues and annual and supplements, \$46.00

Please inquire about our foreign and Canadian rates.

Reprints of articles in *MMWR* may be ordered in minimum quantities of 100. Also available are single copies and back issues of *MMWR*, the Quarterly Surveillance Reports, the Supplements, and the Annual Reports at the following domestic rates:

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| Weekly issue | \$ 2.00 |
| Quarterly Surveillance Reports | 3.00 |
| Supplements | 3.00 |
| Annual Report | 4.00 |

Please inquire for more information and for foreign rates.

Massachusetts Medical Society

C.S.P.O. Box 9120

Waltham, MA 02254-9120

Address correction requested

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Boston, MA
Permit #59673