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## Current Trends

## Oral Contraceptives and Cancer Risk

An initial analysis of an ongoing, multicenter case-control study indicates that women who have used oral contraceptives are approximately half as likely to develop ovarian and endometrial cancer as women who have never used them and that, despite previous concerns, contraceptive use does not appear to increase a woman's risk of breast cancer.

The study used population-based cancer registries in eight geographic regions across the United States to identify women 20-54 years of age with newly diagnosed breast, ovarian, or endometrial cancer. Controls were women of the same ages without known cancer, chosen from the same geographic areas by dialing randomly selected telephone numbers.

The relative risk of ovarian cancer for women who had used oral contraceptives for at least 1 month, as compared with women who had never used them, was 0.6 ( $95 \%$ confidence limits 0.4-0.9). The longer a woman had used oral contraceptives, the lower her risk of developing ovarian cancer. The protective effect of oral contraceptive use persisted more than 10 years after pill use was discontinued.

The relative risk of endometrial cancer for women who had used combined oral contraceptives containing both an estrogen and a progestin was 0.5 ( $95 \%$ confidence limits 0.4-0.8). By contrast, women who had used sequential oral contraceptives (estrogen and progestin components taken at different times of the month) appeared to have an increased risk of endometrial cancer. The protective effects of combined oral contraceptives against endometrial cancer appeared to be restricted to women who had used them for 1 year or longer and was concentrated in nulliparous women.

For breast cancer, women who had used oral contraceptives had a relative risk of 0.9 (95\% confidence limits 0.8-1.2) compared with women who had never used them. There was no evidence that long-term oral contraceptive use of more than 10 years or oral contraceptive use that began 16 or more years ago, shortly after oral contraceptives were introduced in this country, increased the risk of breast cancer. Furthermore, there was no indication of any increased risk of breast cancer due to oral contraceptive use for high-risk women such as those with family histories of breast cancer or with previous biopsies for benign breast disease. Similarly, there was no evidence of an increased risk of breast cancer for women who used oral contraceptives before their first pregnancy.
Reported by M Child, MD, F Vellios, MD, Emory University, Atlanta; JW Meigs, MD, WD Thompson, PhD, C White, MBBS, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven; M Swanson, PhD, Michigan Cancer Foundation, Detroit; M Corder, MD, E Smith, PhD, University of lowa College of Medicine, lowa City; C Key,

## Oral Contraceptives-Continued

MD, D Pathak, PhD, New Mexico Tumor Registry, Albuquerque; D Austin, MD, California Dept for Health Svc, Emeryville; D Thomas, MD, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle; J Lyon, MD, D West, PhD, Utah Cancer Registry, Salt Lake City; L Burnett, MD, Vanderbilt University Hospital, F Gorstein, MD, Vanderbilt Medical Center, Nashville; A Paris, MD, West Plains Memorial Hospital, West Plains, R McDivitt, MD, Jewish Hospital of St. Louis, W Bauer, MD, D Gersell, MD, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri; S Robboy, MD, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston; R Hoover, MD, National Cancer Institute, JJ Schlesselman, PhD, Uniform Svcs University of the Health Sciences, B Stadel, MD, National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development, Bethesda; D Schottenfeld, MD, Memorial SloaneKettering Cancer Center, New York; W Christopherson, MD, University of Louisville Health Sciences Center, Kentucky; R Kurman, MD, Georgetown University School of Medicine, Washington, D.C.; Center for Population Research, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Carcinogenesis Extramural Program, National Cancer Institute; Family Planning Evaluation Div, Center for Health Promotion and Education, CDC.
Editorial Note: The Cancer and Steroid Hormone Study is a collaborative effort of the National Cancer Institute and eight Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Centers of the Institute, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and the Centers for Disease Control. It is specifically designed to clarify the association between oral contraceptive use and breast, endometrial, and ovarian cancer.

Methodologic biases are unlikely to account for the study's findings. Selection bias was minimized by attempting to enroll all women from the eight geographic areas who have newly diagnosed breast, endometrial, or ovarian cancer and by selecting controls at random from the same areas. Accurate histories of oral contraceptive use were facilitated by a book containing photographs of all oral contraceptives ever marketed in the United States and by a calendar with which the women could relate periods of contraceptive use to reproductive histories and other life events ( 1 ). Because of the widespread use of oral contraceptives and the common occurrence of endometrial and ovarian cancer, the protective effects of oral contraceptives against these tumors could have a large public health impact. The reduced risk of cancer among women who have used oral contraceptives would result in the prevention of over 1,700 cases of ovarian cancer and over 2,000 cases of endometrial cancer in the United States each year. References

1. Rosenberg MJ, Layde PM, Ory HW, Strauss LT, Rooks JB, Rubin GL. Agreement between women's histories of oral contraceptive use and physician records. Int J Epidemiol (In Press).

## Epidemiologic Notes and Reports

## Rubella in Universities - Washington, California

Seattle, Washington: Between April 4 and May 3, 1981, 12 cases of rubella were reported among students at the University of Washington in Seattle. Eight cases were serologically confirmed as rubella by a four-fold or greater rise in hemagglutination-inhibition (HI) antibody titer. The students' ages ranged from 21 to 30 years with a mean of 23 years, and six students attended the same drama class. Nine of the 12 students were female; one, who contracted rubella in her first trimester of pregnancy, chose to have an abortion. No specific control measures were instituted in this outbreak, nor was the index case ever identified. The University of Washington does not require students to prove immunity to rubella before enrollment.

## Rubella-Continued

Los Angeles, California: In late November 1981, 10 cases of rubella-like illness were reported among students seen at the University of Southern California student health center. The illnesses were characterized by maculopapular rashes lasting 3-5 days, low grade fever, malaise, arthralgia, and conjunctivitis. Between November 1981 and January 20, 1982, 49 students developed a similar illness, with the peak occurring between November 15 and December 15; two cases were serologically confirmed as rubella. The students' ages ranged from 18 to 34 years with a mean of 21.5 years. Sixty-seven percent of affected students were male; 30\% lived in university dormitories or apartments; and $38 \%$ were enrolled as business majors. The University of Southern California, which does not require proof of immunity to rubella, did not implement a control program.

Berkeley, California: Between December 21, 1981, and March 23, 1982, 17 cases of rash illness were reported among students at the University of California-Berkeley. Eleven of the cases were serologically confirmed as rubella. The students, who ranged in age from 20 to 34 years, had a mean age of 28.7 years. Twelve of the affected students were male. Although one student was initially hospitalized for diagnostic purposes, no nosocomial spread of rubella occurred. No pregnant students or contacts were identified. The majority of ill students resided in a cooperative residential hall ( 190 residents). Although rubella cases are reported routinely among students at the University of California-Berkeley, no proof of rubella immunity is required for admission.
Reported by J Altman, MD, Student Health Svc, University of Washington, D Hoyt, A Cronin, J Frederickson, C Nolan, Seattle-King County Health Dept, J Allard, PhD, State Epidemiologist, Washington State Dept of Social \& Health Svcs; J Chapman, MD, Student Health Svc, University of California-Berkeley, L Dales MD, AJ Ebbin, MD, Student Health Svc, University of Southern California, L Habel MPH, B Weiss, MPH, M Strassburg MD, S Fannin, MD, Los Angeles Dept of Health Svcs, J Chin MD, State Epidemiologist, California State Dept of Health; Immunization Div, Center for Prevention Svcs, CDC.
Editorial Note: These reports demonstrate the potential for rubella outbreaks among university students. An estimated $10 \%-20 \%$ of persons $\geqslant 18$ years of age remain susceptible (1). Since many students and university personnel are of child-bearing age and some may be pregnant at the time of an outbreak, rubella can pose a serious public health problem.

Although rubella immunization is required for school entrance or attendance in all states, female students $\geqslant 12$ years old are exempted in many states because of the theoretical risk to a fetus associated with vaccinating pregnant women. Existing data, however, show this potential risk, to be minimal (2). Because of continued rubella outbreaks on campuses and exposure of pregnant students, university employees, and contacts, universities should address the issue of rubella immunity among students and staff (3-6). The Immunization Practices Advisory Committee (ACIP) strongly urges educational institutions to consider requiring proof of immunity (documented history of rubella vaccination on or after the first birthday or presence of antibody to rubella) for admission or employment (2). Both male and female students should be included in any such requirement.

## References

1. Dales LG, Chin J. Public health implications of rubella antibody levels in California. Am J Public Health 1982;72:167-72.
2. ACIP. Rubella prevention. MMWR 1981;30:37-42,47.
3. CDC. Rubella in Wisconsin - an outbreak on a college campus. In: Rubella surveillance report, January 1976-December 1978. Atlanta: CDC 1980:20-2.
4. Guyer B, Giandelia JW, Bisno AL, et al. The Memphis State University rubella outbreak. An example of changing rubella epidemiology. JAMA 1974;227:1298-300
5. Strassburg MA, Marquard JL, Fannin SL, Greenland S. Rubella on a university campus: an evaluation of case immunity histories. Nurs Res 1980;29:390-1.
6. Chretien JH, Esswein JG, McGarvey MA, deStwolinski A. Rubella: pattern of outbreak in a university. South Med J 1976;69:1042-4

## Current Trends

## Serologic Diagnosis of Measles

As the countdown for measles elimination has progressed, increasing efforts have been made to confirm measles cases by laboratory methods. As an additional measles serodiagnostic test, a staphylococcal protein A (SPA) adsorption test has recently been adapted to measure measles-specific $\lg M(1,2)$. This test is based on the principle that SPA will bind $\lg G$ antibody and will permit its removal from a serum specimen, allowing any residual measles $\operatorname{lgM}$ antibody to be measured by routine hemagglutination-inhibition (HI) testing (3).

The sensitivity and specificity of the SPA test were assessed relative to sucrose gradient ultracentrifugation (SGU), the standard method for measuring measles-specific $\lg \mathrm{M}$, using 79 serum specimens from patients clinically suspected of having measles (Table 1) (4). The sensitivity of the SPA was $71 \%(45 / 63)$, and the specificity was $81 \%(13 / 16)$. In this study, a positive $\lg M$ detected by SPA was almost always confirmed as $\lg M$ by the SGU; of the 48 serum specimens positive by SPA, 45 ( $94 \%$ ) were also positive by SGU. However, a negative SPA test did not mean IgM was absent; of the 31 specimens that tested negative by the SPA test, 18 (58\%) were positive by SGU.

Continued on page 401

TABLE I. Summary - cases of specified notifiable diseases, United States

| DISEASE | 29th WEEK ENDING |  |  | CUMULATIVE, FIRST 29 WEEKS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | July 24, 1982 | $\begin{gathered} \text { July } 25, \\ 1981 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEDIAN } \\ & \text { 1977.1981 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { July 24, } \\ \hline 1982 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { July } 25, \\ 1981 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MEDIAN } \\ 1977.1981 \end{gathered}$ |
| Aseptic meningitis | 222 | 338 | 184 | 2.734 | 2.853 | 2.028 |
| Bruceliosis | 5 | 1 | 4 | 85 | 83 | 100 |
| Encephalitis: Primary (arthropod-borne \& unspec.) | 27 | 41 | 28 | 473 | 504 | 385 |
| Post-infectious | - | - | 4 | 41 | 60 | 119 |
| Gonorrhea: Civilian | 18.635 | 20. 036 | 20.759 | 497.975 | 545.709 | 530.099 |
| Military | 293 | 755 | 547 | 14.070 | 16.324 | $15,109$ |
| Hepatitis: Type A | 393 | 518 | 566 | 12.083 | 14.187 | 15.834 |
| Type B | 383 | 412 | 358 | 11,364 | 11.184 | 9.171 |
| Non A, Non B | 35 | N | N | 1.182 | N | N |
| Unspecified | 184 | 197 | 197 | 5,002 | 6,084 | 5,564 |
| Legionellosis | 17 | N | N | 225 | N | N |
| Leprosy | 10 | 6 | 3 | 111 | 145 | 96 |
| Malaria | 15 | 28 | 26 | 513 | 778 | 376 |
| Measles (rubeola) | 61 | 48 | 150 | 1.071 | 2.399 | 12.256 |
| Meningococcal infections: Total | 36 | 52 | 38 | 1.860 | 2.290 | 1.708 |
| Civilian | 35 | 52 | 38 | 1.848 | 2.282 | 1.691 |
| Military | 1 | - | - | 12 | 8 | 12 |
| Mumps | 52 | 40 | 148 | 3.938 | 2.923 | 10.554 |
| Pertussis | 36 | 27 | 44 | 606 | 586 | 692 |
| Rubella(German measles) | 21 | 30 | 98 | 1.811 | 1.567 | 10.222 |
| Syphilis (Primary \& Secondary): Civilian | 632 | 667 | 452 | 17.856 | 16.596 | 13.213 |
| Military | 12 | 21 | 5 | 223 | 217 | 167 |
| Tuberculosis | 540 | 531 | 585 | 14.199 | 14.650 | 15.390 |
| Tularemia | 10 | 12 | 8 | 115 | 118 | 94 |
| Typhoid fever | 4 | 9 | 9 | 207 | 277 | 250 |
| Typhus fever, tick-borne (RMSF) | 64 | 60 | 60 | 543 | 709 | 57.3 |
| Rabies, animal | 119 | 176 | 120 | 3.486 | 4.295 | 2.694 |

TABLE II. Notifiable diseases of low frequency, United States

|  | CUM. 1982 |  | CUM. 1982 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anthrax | - | Poliomyelitis: Total | 3 |
| Botulism (Wash. 1, Calif. 1) | 48 | Paralytic | 3 |
| Cholera | - | Psittacosis (Wash. 2) | 69 |
| Congenital rubella syndrome | 5 | Rabies, human | 6 |
| Diphtheria | - | Tetanus (Ala. 1) | 40 |
| Leptospirosis | 31 | Trichinosis | 59 |
| Plague | 5 | Typhus fever, flea-borne (endemic, murine) (Tex. 2) | 19 |

N : Not notifiable

TABLE III. Cases of specified notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending July 24, 1982 and July 25, 1981 (29th week)

| REPORTING AREA | ASEPTIC <br> MENIN. <br> GITIS <br> 1982 | BRUCEL- <br> LOSIS <br> CUM. <br> 1982 | ENCEPHALITIS |  | GONORRHEA <br> (Civilian) |  | HEPATITIS (Viral), by type |  |  |  | LEGIONEL | LEPROSY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Primary | Post-infectious |  |  | A | B | NA,NB | Unspecified |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1981 \end{aligned}$ | 1982 | 1982 | 1982 | 1982 | 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ |
| UNITED STATES | 222 | 85 | 473 | 41 | 497.975 | 545.709 | 393 | 383 | 35 | 184 | 17 | 111 |
| NEW ENGLAND | 10 | 3 | 16 | 5 | 12.448 | 13.609 | 8 | 29 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 1 |
| Maine | - | - | - | - | 583 | 672 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| N.H. | 1 | - | - | - | 355 | 480 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| Vt . | - | - | - | - | 247 | 234 | - | - | - | - | 4 | - |
| Mass. | 4 | - | 6 | - | 5.805 | 5.607 | 6 | 11 | - | 7 | - | - |
| R.I. | 5 | - | - | - | 834 | 725 | 1 | 5 | - | - | - | - |
| Conn. | - | 3 | 10 | 5 | 4,624 | 5.891 | - | 13 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| MID. ATLANTIC | 23 | 3 | 55 | 11 | 63.454 | 64.192 | 43 | 64 | 3 | 14 | 4 | 4 |
| Upstate N.Y. | 8 | 3 | 19 | 3 | 10.381 | 10.512 | 9 | 18 | - | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| N.Y. City | - | - | 11 | - | 26.556 | 26.910 | 1 | 4 | - | - | - | 1 |
| N.J. | 12 | - | 12 | - | 11.366 | 12.066 | 14 | 25 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Pa . | 3 | - | 13 | 8 | 15.151 | 14.704 | 19 | 17 | - | 5 | - | 1 |
| E.N. CENTRAL | 19 | - | 106 | 7 | 67.610 | 83,559 | 35 | 48 | 3 | 15 | 2 | 3 |
| Ohio | 7 | - | 36 | 4 | 20,520 | 28,369 | 10 | 19 | - | 5 | 2 | - |
| Ind. | 3 | - | 27 | 2 | 8,068 | 7.327 | 9 | 9 | 2 | 8 | - | - |
| III. | - | - | 7 | 1 | 14,978 | 22,946 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Mich. | 6 | - | 34 | - | 17,358 | 17,447 | 11 | 17 | - | 2 | - | - |
| Wis. | 3 | - | 2 | - | 6,686 | 7.470 | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| W.N. CENTRAL | 14 | 11 | 32 | 3 | 24.453 | 26,093 | 13 | 17 | 2 | 3 | - | 3 |
| Minn. | - | - | 11 | 1 | 3.676 | 4.224 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | - | 1 |
| lowa | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 2,575 | 2.846 | 2 | 1 | - | $-$ | - | - |
| Mo. | - | 3 | 4 |  | 11,482 | 11.896 | 5 | 3 | - | - | - | 1 |
| N. Dak. | 4 | - | - | - | 330 | 365 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| S. Dak. | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 668 | 717 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Nebr. | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | 1.490 | 1.997 | - | 3 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Kans. | 2 | 3 | 3 | - | 4.232 | 4.048 | 1 | 6 | - | - | - | - |
| S. ATLANTIC | 67 | 17 | 74 | 6 | 119.176 | 134,365 | 49 | 89 | 7 | 14 | 1 | 6 |
| Del. | - | - | - | - | 2,055 | 2.126 | 1 | 4 | - | - | - | - |
| Md. | 1 | - | 14 | - | 17.165 | 15.100 | 4 | 16 | - | 1 | - | 2 |
| D.C. | 2 | - | - | - | 7.496 | 8,217 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 2 |
| Va. | 8 | 7 | 19 | 1 | 10,897 | 12.199 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| W. Va. | - | - | 2 | - | 1.491 | 2.039 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| N.C. | 9 | - | 9 | 1 | 21.492 | 20.826 | 3 | 4 | - | 1 | - | - |
| S.C. | - | 2 | - | - | 13.133 | 13,111 | 3 | 10 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Ga. | 2 | 1 | - | - | 9.483 | 27.563 | 4 | 22 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Fla. | 45 | 7 | 30 | 4 | 35,964 | 33.184 | 30 | 24 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 3 |
| E.S. CENTRAL | 8 | 10 | 25 | 2 | 44,468 | 44.702 | 14 | 22 | - | 2 | - | - |
| Ky. | 3 | - | - | - | 6,002 | 5.716 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Tenn. | 3 | 6 | 14 | 2 | 17.161 | 17,042 | 7 | 14 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Ala. | 4 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 13.521 | 13,495 | 1 | 5 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Miss. | 1 | 1 | 3 | - | 7.784 | 8.449 | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| W.S. CENTRAL | 28 | 23 | 58 | 1 | 71.938 | 71.069 | 70 | 25 | - | 62 | - | 15 |
| Ark. | - | 4 | 2 | - | 5.857 | 5.270 | - | 1 | - | 5 | - |  |
| La. | 1 | 6 | 8 | - | 13,289 | 10.950 | 6 | 2 | - | 3 | - | - |
| Okla. | 8 | 3 | 16 | - | 7.964 | 7.702 | 17 | 8 | - | 3 | - | - |
| Tex. | 19 | 10 | 32 | 1 | 44.828 | 47.147 | 47 | 14 | - | 51 | - | 15 |
| MOUNTAIN | 5 | - | 18 | 3 | 17.984 | 21.311 | 53 | 19 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| Mont. | 1 | - | - | - | 750 | 770 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Idaho |  | - | - | - | 826 | 895 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Wyo. | - | - | - | - | 524 | 5497 | - | 5 | $-$ | - | - | - |
| Colo. | 3 | - | 8 | 1 | 4.812 | 5.757 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| N. Mex. | - | - | - | - | 2.263 | 2.347 | 16 | 2 | - | 3 | - | - |
| Ariz. | - | - | 6 | - | 4.870 | 6.481 | 19 | 10 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Utah | 1 | - | - | 2 | 843 | 995 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Nev. | - | - | 4 | - | 3,096 | 3.569 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| PACIFIC | 48 | 18 | 89 | 3 | 76,444 | 86,809 | 108 | 70 | 17 | 57 | 1 | 77 |
| Wash. | 6 | - | 9 | - | 6.208 | 7.108 | 5 | 8 | - | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| Oreg. | - | $\square$ | 2 | - | 4.318 | 5,285 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| Calif. | 37 | 17 | 74 | 3 | 62.661 | 70,620 | 92 | 57 | 15 | 49 | - | 49 |
| Alaska | 2 | 1 | 3 | - | 1,896 | 2.142 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| Hawaii | 3 | - | 1 | - | 1.361 | 1.654 | - | - | - | - | - | 21 |
| Guam | U | - | - | - | 53 | 72 | U | U | U | U | U | - |
| P.R. | U | - | 1 | - | 1.579 | 1.821 | 4 | U | U | U | $u$ | - |
| V.I. | - | - | 1 | - | 126 | 107 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pac. Trust Terr. | $u$ | - | - | - | 187 | 257 | $u$ | $u$ | U | U | U | 10 |

TABLE III (Cont.'d). Cases of specified notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending July 24, 1982 and July 25, 1981 (29th week)

| REPORTING AREA | MALARIA |  | MEASLES (RUBEOLA) |  |  | MENINGOCOCCAL INFECTIONS (Total) |  | MUMPS |  | PERTUSSIS | RUBELLA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1981 \end{aligned}$ | 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \end{aligned}$ | 1982 | 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & \hline 1981 \end{aligned}$ |
| UNITED STATES | 15 | 513 | 61 | 1.071 | 2.399 | 36 | 1.860 | 52 | 3,938 | 36 | 21 | 1.811 | 1,567 |
| NEW ENGLAND | - | 26 | - | 9 | 72 | 2 | 101 | 2 | 158 | 3 | 1 | 16 | 110 |
| Maine | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | 6 | - | 34 | - | - | - | 33 |
| N.H. | - | - | - | 2 | 6 | - | 14 | - | 12 | - | - | 8 | 43 |
| Vt . | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | 6 | - | 5 | - | - | - | - |
| Mass. | - | 20 | - | 2 | 51 | 1 | 26 | 1 | 77 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 22 |
| R.I. | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 11 | - | 14 | - | - | 1 | - |
| Conn. | - | 4 | - | 3 | 8 | 1 | 38 | 1 | 16 | - | - | 3 | 12 |
| MID. ATLANTIC | 4 | 70 | 2 | 155 | 773 | 5 | 333 | 2 | 248 | 8 | - | 86 | 187 |
| Upstate N.Y. | 1 | 16 | 2 | 105 | 201 | 1 | 109 | 2 | 53 | 4 | - | 41 | 84 |
| N.Y. City | - | 21 | - | 42 | 66 | - | 58 | - | 41 | 1 | - | 31 | 47 |
| N.J. | 1 | 21 | - | 4 | 51 | 2 | 71 | - | 36 | 1 | - | 14 | 46 |
| Pa. | 2 | 12 | - | 4 | 455 | 2 | 95 | - | 118 | 2 | - | - | 10 |
| E.N. CENTRAL | 2 | 35 | - | 66 | 75 | 2 | 222 | 11 | 2.118 | 1 | 2 | 152 | 334 |
| Ohio | - | 9 | - | 1 | 15 | - | 83 | 4 | 1.547 | - | - | 5 | 3 |
| Ind. | - | 1 | - | 2 | 8 | - | 22 | 4 | 137 | - | - | 26 | 124 |
| III. | $\overline{-}$ | 3 | - | 23 | 23 | 2 | 62 |  | 165 | - | - | 55 | 81 |
| Mich. | 2 | 20 | - | 40 | 28 | - | 43 | 2 | 287 | 1 | - | 45 | 33 |
| Wis. | - | 2 | - |  | 1 | - | 12 | 1 | 82 | 1 | 2 | 26 | 103 |
| W.N. CENTRAL | - | 14 | 10 | 49 | 10 | 1 | 78 | 11 | 536 | 1 | - | 59 | 76 |
| Minn. | - | 2 | - | - | 3 | 1 | 20 | 10 | 412 | - | - | 9 | 7 |
| lowa | - | 5 | - | $\bar{\square}$ | 1 | - | 5 | - | 29 | - | - | - | 4 |
| Mo. ${ }^{\text {N. }}$ | - | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - | 23 | - | 15 | - | - | 38 | 2 |
| S. Dak. | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | 1 | $\bar{\square}$ | - | - | - |
| Nebr. | - | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | - | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 |
| Kans. | - | 1 | 7 | 44 | 1 | - | 12 | $\overline{1}$ | 79 | - | - | 11 | 62 |
| S. ATLANTIC | 6 | 80 | 1 | 35 | 333 | 8 | 372 | 3 | 221 | 11 | 2 | 68 | 125 |
| Del. | - | - | - | - | - | - | 372 | - | 10 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Md. | - | 12 | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 23 | - | 21 | 3 | - | 33 | 1 |
| D.C. | - | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | - | 21 | 3 | - | - | $-$ |
| Va. | 3 | 26 | - | 14 | 6 | 2 | 42 | - | 30 | 2 | - | 13 | 4 |
| W. Va. | 1 | 6 | - | 2 | 9 | - | 7 | 1 | 82 | 2 | - | 1 | 22 |
| N.C. | - | 2 | - | - | 3 | 1 | 77 | 1 | 11 | - | - | 1 | 5 |
| S.C. | - | 3 | - | - | - | 1 | 41 | , | 13 | 1 | - | 1 | 8 |
| Ga. Fla . | 2 | 10 | - | 15 | 108 | 2 | 81 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 35 |
| Fla. | 2 | 18 | 1 | 15 | 204 | 1 | 99 | - | 43 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 49 |
| E.S. CENTRAL | - | 6 | - | 8 | 2 | 1 | 123 | 3 | 35 | 1 | - | 39 | 25 |
| Ky. Tenn. | - | 4 | - | 1 | - | - | 20 | 1 | 10 | - | - | 22 | 16 |
| Ala. | - | - | - | 6 | $\bar{\square}$ | 1 | 52 | 1 | 14 | 1 | - | 1 | 8 |
| Miss. | - | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 44 | - | 5 | - | - | - | 1 |
|  | , |  | - | 1 | - | - | 7 | 1 | 6 | - | - | 16 | - |
| W.S. CENTRAL | 1 | 35 | 1 | 15 | 787 | 5 | 219 | 5 | 149 | 4 | 1 | 98 | 128 |
| Ark. | - | 3 | - | - | 1 | - | 12 | - | 6 | - | - | 1 | 2 |
| La. | - | 3 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 38 | - | 3 | - | - | 1 | 9 |
| Okla. | - | 5 | - | - | 5 | 2 | 23 | - | - | - | - | 3 | - |
| Tex. | 1 | 24 | 1 | 13 | 179 | 2 | 146 | 5 | 140 | 4 | 1 | 93 | 117 |
| MOUNTAIN | - | 15 | - | 5 | 32 | 5 | 91 | 5 | 66 | 5 | 1 | 59 | 76 |
| Mont. | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | 3 | 1 | - | 5 | 3 |
| Idaho | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 6 | - | 3 | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| Wyo. | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | 2 | 1 | - | 7 | 3 |
| Colo. | - | 8 | - | 5 | 9 | 3 | 37 | - | 8 | 3 | - | 4 | 30 |
| N. Mex. | - | 2 | - | - | 8 | 1 | 14 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 5 |
| Ariz. | - | 3 | - | - | 4 | 1 | 15 | 3 | 32 | - | - | 8 | 19 |
| Utah | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 7 | 1 | 13 | - | 1 | 20 | 4 |
| Nev. | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | 3 | 1 | 5 | - | - | 9 | 9 |
| PACIFIC | 2 | 232 | 47 | 729 | 315 | 7 | 321 | 10 | 407 | 2 | 14 | 1,234 | 506 |
| Wash. | - | 11 | - | 31 | 3 | 1 | 32 | - | 61 | 1 | 2 | 34 | 55 |
| Oreg. | - | 9 | 1 | 8 | 3 | - | 63 | - | - | - | 1 | 6 | 49 |
| Calif. | 2 | 210 | 46 | 686 | 307 | 6 | 213 | 9 | 332 | 1 | 11 | 1,185 | 389 |
| Alaska | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 10 | - | 6 | - | - | 1 | - |
| Hawaii | - | 2 | - | 3 | 2 | - | 3 | 1 | 8 | - | - | 8 | 13 |
| Guam | U | 1 | U | 5 | 6 | U | 2 | U | 3 | $u$ | $u$ | 2 | 1 |
| P.R. | U | 4 | U | 76 | 245 | $u$ | 7 | $u$ | 43 | v | $u$ | 6 | 3 |
| V.I. | - | - | - | - | 17 | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Pac. Trust Terr. | $u$ | - | U | - | 1 | $u$ | - | $u$ | 1 | $u$ | U | - | 1 |

TABLE III (Cont.'d). Cases of specified notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending July 24, 1982 and July 25, 1981 (29th week)

| REPORTING AREA | SYPHILIS (Civilian) <br> (Primary \& Secondary) |  | TUBERCULOSIS |  | TULA. REMIA | TYPHOID FEVER |  | TYPHUS FEVER (Tick-borne) (RMSF) |  | RABIES, Animal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1981 \end{aligned}$ | 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUM. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ |
| UNITED STATES | 17.856 | 16,596 | 540 | 14.199 | 115 | 4 | 207 | 64 | 543 | 3.486 |
| NEW ENGLAND | 307 | 345 | 20 | 385 | 2 | - | 14 | 1 | 6 | 26 |
| Maine | 1 | 2 | 1 | 31 | - | - | - | - | - | 19 |
| N.H. | 1 | 12 | - | 11 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| V . | 1 | 13 | - | 7 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| Mass. | 203 | 231 | 16 | 256 | 2 | - | 10 | I | 3 | 4 |
| R.I. | 17 | 19 | 1 | 17 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| Conn. | 84 | 68 | 2 | 63 | - | - | 2 | - | 1 | 3 |
| MID. ATLANTIC | 2.457 | 2.491 | 111 | 2,388 | 7 | - | 33 | 4 | 20 | 103 |
| Upstate N.Y. | 243 | 232 | 14 | 401 | 7 | - | 4 | 1 | 2 | 51 |
| N.Y. City | 1.476 | 1.496 | 39 | 875 | - | - | 20 | - | 1 | - |
| N.J. | 333 | 340 | 18 | 486 | - | - | 5 | - | 10 | 6 |
| Pa. | 405 | 423 | 40 | 626 | - | - | 4 | 3 | 7 | 46 |
| E.N. CENTRAL | 940 | 1,134 | 75 | 2.169 | - | 1 | 16 | 10 | 51 | 396 |
| Ohio | 173 | 149 | 11 | 370 | - | 1 | 8 | 10 | 50 | 58 |
| Ind. | 105 | 111 | 11 | 288 | - | - | - | - | - | 59 |
| III. | 448 | 640 | 43 | 880 | - | - | 3 | - | 1 | 200 |
| Mich. | 156 | 182 | 10 | 518 | - | - | 5 | - | - | 4 |
| Wis. | 58 | 52 | - | 113 | - | - |  | - | - | 75 |
| W.N. CENTRAL | 334 | 335 | 16 | 423 | 14 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 17 | 775 |
| Minn. | 64 | 118 | - | 71 | - | 1 | 5 | - | - | 134 |
| lowa | 20 | 13 | 1 | 48 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 3 | 246 |
| Mo. | 201 | 177 | 8 | 200 | 9 | - | 1 | - | 5 | 69 |
| N. Dak. | 4 | 6 | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | 68 |
| S. Dak. | - | 2 | 2 | 19 | - | - | - | 3 | 3 | 61 |
| Nebr. | 10 | 4 | 4 | 19 | 2 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 92 |
| Kans. | 35 | 15 | 1 | 59 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 5 | 105 |
| S. ATLANTIC | 4.871 | 4,336 | 92 | 2.890 | 9 | - | 29 | 34 | 303 | 600 |
| Del. | 9 | 7 | 1 | 25 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| Md. | 268 | 323 | 13 | 333 | 1 | - | 7 | 6 | 34 | 33 |
| D.C. | 272 | 361 | 4 | 114 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| Va . | 344 | 395 | 10 | 315 | 2 | - | 2 | 7 | 37 | 307 |
| W. Va. | 20 | 13 | 2 | 86 | - | - | 3 | 1 | 5 | 32 |
| N.C. | 342 | 335 | 20 | 467 | $\overline{5}$ | - | - | 17 | 136 | 37 |
| S.C. | 262 | 288 | 2 | 277 | 5 | - | 3 | 2 | 65 | 32 |
| Ga. | 1,008 | 1.124 | 15 | 427 | - | - | - | 1 | 24 | 118 |
| Fla. | 2.346 | 1.490 | 25 | 846 | 1 | - | 14 | - | 2 | 39 |
| E.S. CENTRAL | 1.259 | 1. 074 | 55 | 1.320 | 6 | - | 14 | 9 | 40 | 411 |
| Ky. | 70 | 55 | 12 | 335 | - | - | - | - | - | 85 |
| Tenn. | 330 | 421 | 20 | 438 | 4 | - | 2 | 6 | 26 | 257 |
| Ala. | 464 | 303 | 20 | 375 | - | - | 9 | 1 | 6 | 69 |
| Miss. | 395 | 295 | 3 | 172 | 2 | - | 3 | 2 | 8 | - |
| W.S. CENTRAL | 4.660 | 4.045 | 69 | 1,699 | 58 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 96 | 685 |
| Ark. | 118 | 16 | 10 | 181 | 38 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 95 |
| La. | 979 | 938 | 13 | 281 | 3 | - | 2 | - | - | 17 |
| Okla. | 104 | 90 | 5 | 227 | 17 | - | 2 | - | 52 | 127 |
| Tex. | 3,459 | 2. 941 | 41 | 1.010 | - | - | 15 | - | 28 | 446 |
| MOUNTAIN | 445 | 411 | 17 | 405 | 14 | 1 | 8 | - | 7 | 130 |
| Mont. | 3 | 9 | - | 25 | 2 | - | - | - | 2 | 51 |
| Idaho | 19 | 15 | 1 | 17 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| Wyo. | 11 | 7 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 11 |
| Colo. | 124 | 137 | - | 50 | 3 | - | 2 | - | - | 17 |
| N. Mex. | 95 | 78 | 2 | 78 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 11 |
| Ariz. | 106 | 80 | 12 | 170 | - | - | 4 | - | - | 27 |
| Utah | 13 | 16 | - | 23 | 7 | - | 1 | - | - | 7 |
| Nev. | 74 | 69 | 2 | 40 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 3 |
| PACIFIC | 2,583 | 2.425 | 85 | 2.520 | 5 | - | 64 | 1 | 3 | 360 |
| Wash. | 83 | 94 | 9 | 155 | 1 | - | 3 | - | - | - |
| Oreg. | 66 | 53 | 1 | 99 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Calif. | 2,355 | 2,226 | 73 | 2,045 | 3 | - | 57 | 1 | 3 | 286 |
| Alaska | 8 | 10 | - | 46 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 73 |
| Hawaii | 71 | 42 | 2 | 175 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| Guam | 1 | - | U | 4 | - | U | - | U | - | - |
| P.R. | 332 | 378 | U | 195 | - | U | 2 | U | - | 30 |
| V.I. | 15 | 13 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pac. Trust Terr. | - | - | U | 68 | - | U | - | $u$ | - | - |

TABLE IV. Deaths in 121 U.S. cities,* week ending
July 24, 1982 (29th week)

| REPORTING AREA | ALL CAUSES, BY AGE (YEARS) |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P\& } 1^{* *} \\ & \text { TOTAL } \end{aligned}$ | REPORTING AREA | ALL CAUSES, bY AGE (YEARS) |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P\& I** } \\ & \text { TOTAL } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underset{\text { AGES }}{\text { ALL }}$ | $\geqslant 65$ | 45.64 | 25-44 | 1.24 | <1 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALL } \\ \text { AGES } \end{gathered}$ | $\geq 65$ | 45.64 | 25.44 | 1.24 | <1 |  |
| NEW ENGLAND | 734 | 513 | 147 | 33 | 18 | 23 | 50 | S. ATLANTIC | 1,147 | 701 | 278 | 92 | 28 | 48 | 32 |
| Boston, Mass. | 198 | 122 | 49 | 12 | 7 | 8 | 22 | Atlanta, Ga. | 141 | 81 | 29 | 20 | 1 | 10 | 4 |
| Bridgeport, Conn. | 57 | 40 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | Baltimore, Md. | 160 | 93 | 42 | 18 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Cambridge, Mass. | 36 | 27 | 9 | - | - | - | 1 | Charlotte, N.C. | 52 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 5 | - |
| Fall River, Mass. | 26 | 22 | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | Jacksonville, Fla. | 93 | 58 | 24 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Hartford, Conn. | 75 | 51 | 16 | 7 | 1 | - | - | Miami, Fla. | 116 | 62 | 36 | 11 | 2 | 5 | - |
| Lowell, Mass. | 21 | 17 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 3 | Norfolk, Va. | 58 | 31 | 16 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Lynn, Mass. | 15 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | - | - | Richmond, Va. | 63 | 43 | 17 | - | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| New Bedford, Mass. | 22 | 18 | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | Savannah, Ga. | 46 | 33 | 12 | - | 1 | - | 5 |
| New Haven, Conn. | 60 | 34 | 13 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 1 | St. Petersburg, Fla. | 87 | 69 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Providence, R.I. | 67 | 50 | 13 | - | - | 4 | 4 | Tampa, Fla. | 64 | 43 | 13 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Somerville, Mass. | 10 | 9 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | Washington, D.C. | 211 | 120 | 53 | 20 | 5 | 13 | 4 |
| Springfield, Mass. | 49 | 35 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | Wilmington, Del. | 56 | 37 | 13 | 3 | 3 | - | 1 |
| Waterbury, Conn. | 39 | 29 | 8 | 2 | - | - | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worcester, Mass. | 59 | 50 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | E.S. CENTRAL | 654 | 404 | 181 | 31 | 18 | 20 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Birmingham, Ala. | 114 | 73 | 26 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| MID. ATLANTIC Albany, N.Y. | 2.587 55 | 1.723 39 | 570 | 168 | 62 | 63 | 112 | Chattanooga, Tenn. | 41 | 26 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Allentown, Pa . | 16 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Knoxville, Tenn. Louisville Ky. | 45 | 30 | 12 | 2 | 1 | - | 9 |
| Buffalo, N.Y. | 120 | 81 | 32 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 15 | Louisvilie, Ky. | 89 110 | 69 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Camden, N.J. | 38 | 21 | 11 | 3 | - | 3 | - | Mobile, Ala. | 100 | 49 | 39 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Elizabeth, N.J. | 19 | 12 | 7 | - | - | - | 3 | Montgomery, Ala. | 52 | 24 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 6 | - |
| Erie, Pa. $\dagger$ | 48 | 36 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | Nashville, Tenn. | 103 | 65 | 30 | 4 | - | 4 | 7 |
| Jersey City, N.J. | 69 | 45 | 15 | 5 | 1 | 3 | - | Nashvile, Yem. |  | 65 | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| N.Y. City, N.Y. | 1.513 | 1.011 | 314 | 119 | 41 | 28 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newark, N.J. | 73 | 34 | 25 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3 | W.S. CENTRAL | 1.265 | 740 | 313 | 112 | 52 | 48 | 37 |
| Paterson, N.J. | 38 | 27 | 9 | 1 | - | 1 | 4 | Austin, Tex. | 170 | 38 | 25 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Philadelphia, Pa. $\dagger$ | 113 | 65 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 14 | 5 | Baton Rouge, La. | 52 | 26 | 15 | 9 | 2 | - | 3 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. $\dagger$ | 87 | 50 | 25 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 4 | Corpus Christi, Tex. | 55 | 38 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Reading, Pa . <br> Rochester N. Y | 32 124 | 24 | 25 | 7 | - | 1 | 2 | Dallas, Tex. | 185 | 110 | 46 | 21 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| Schenectady, N.Y. | 124 30 | 88 21 | 25 | 7 | 4 | - | 8 | El Paso, Tex. | 41 | 19 | 11 | 9 | - | 2 | 2 |
| Scranton, Pa. $\dagger$. | 31 | 23 | 8 | $\underline{-}$ | - | - | 1 | Fort Worth, Tex. | 81 | 53 | 19 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 4 |
| Syracuse, N.Y. | 94 | 69 | 17 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Houston, Tex. | 262 | 142 | 65 | 23 | 20 | 12 | 6 |
| Trenton, N.J. | 44 | 29 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | Little Rock, Ark. | 96 123 | 58 65 | 29 34 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| Utica, N.Y. | 14 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | New Orleans, La. | 123 170 | 65 107 | 34 33 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| Yonkers, N.Y. | 29 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | 5 | Shreveport, La. | 51 | 34 | 9 | 3 | $-$ | 5 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tulsa, Okla. | 19 | 50 | 17 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| E.N. CENTRAL | 2,309 | 1,423 | 551 | 163 | 83 | 89 | 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Akron, Ohio | 62 | 39 | 15 | 1 | 4 | 3 | - | MOUNTAIN | 576 | 343 | 132 | 50 | 28 | 23 | 15 |
| Canton, Ohio | 22 | 17 | 5 | - | - | - | 1 | Albuquerque, N. Mex. | 72 | 37 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 4 | - |
| Chicago, III. | 524 | 312 | 118 | 47 | 26 | 21 | 9 | Colo. Springs, Colo. | 29 | 24 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | 173 | 115 | 37 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 11 | Denver, Colo. | 130 | 84 | 16 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 4 |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 195 | 108 | 56 | 17 | 6 | 8 | 4 | Las Vegas, Nev. | 69 | 33 | 19 | 12 | 4 | I | - |
| Columbus, Ohio | 138 | 79 | 39 | 9 | 6 | 5 | - | Ogden, Utah | 15 | 12 | 1 | - | 2 | - | 2 |
| Dayton, Ohio | 127 | 13 | 34 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 2 | Phoenix, Ariz. | 125 | 71 | 36 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 2 |
| Detroit, Mich. | 241 | 149 | 61 | 19 | 6 | 6 | 3 | Pueblo, Colo. | 30 | 17 | 7 | 5 | 1 | - | 2 |
| Evansville, Ind. | 44 | 36 | 6 | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | Salt Lake City, Utah | 33 | 19 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | 53 | 31 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | Tucson, Ariz. | 73 | 46 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Gary, Ind. | 16 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 1 | - | - | Tucson, Ariz. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 55 | 36 | 16 | 2 | - | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indianapolis, Ind. | 185 | 97 | 47 | 14 | 11 | 16 | - | PACIFIC | 1.800 | 1,168 | 383 | 131 | 67 | 49 | 85 |
| Madison, Wis. | 38 | 20 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | Berkeley, Calif. | 18 | 13 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | 131 | 93 | 26 | 3 | 3 | 6 | - | Fresno, Calif. | 65 | 35 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Peoria, III. | 48 | 33 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 6 | Glendale, Calif. | 26 | 23 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| Rockford, III. | 44 | 25 | 13 | - | 2 | 4 | 2 | Honolulu, Hawaii | 62 | 37 | 12 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| South Bend, Ind. | 54 | 41 | 10 | 2 | 1 | - | 6 | Long Beach, Calif. | 88 | 59 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Toledo, Ohio | 88 | 56 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | Los Angeles, Calif. | 588 | 392 | 119 | 42 | 19 | 14 | 19 |
| Youngstown, Ohio | 71 | 55 | 14 | 1 | 1 | - | - | Oakland, Calif. | 61 | 33 | 18 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pasadena, Calif. | 24 | 20 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Portland, Oreg. | 122 | 82 | 26 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| W.N. CENTRAL | 759 | 503 | 149 | 52 | 23 | 31 | 23 | Sacramento, Calif. | 67 | 37 | 18 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Des Moines, Iowa § | 53 | 51 | - | - | 1 | - | - | San Diego, Calif. | 163 | 111 | 32 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 14 |
| Duluth, Minn. | 28 | 22 | 3 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | San Francisco, Calif. | 159 | 107 | 39 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Kansas City, Kans. | 51 | 23 | 16 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | San Jose, Calif. | 153 | 92 | 36 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 9 |
| Kansas City, Mo. | 120 | 76 | 30 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Seattle, Wash. | 124 | 78 | 27 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Lincoln, Nebr. | 37 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | Spokane, Wash. | 47 | 35 | 7 | 2 | 3 | - | 7 |
| Minneapolis, Minn. | 90 | 56 | 16 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 1 | Tacoma, Wash. | 33 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 2 | - | 2 |
| Omaha, Nebr. | 81 | 45 | 25 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| St. Louis, Mo. | 123 | 79 | 27 | 10 | 2 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| St. Paul, Minn. | 83 | 61 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 6 | $\overline{-}$ | TOTAL | 11.831 | 7,518 | 2,704 | 832 | 379 | 394 | 442 |
| Wichita, Kans. | 93 | 67 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]$\dagger \dagger$ Total includes unknown ages.
§Data not available. Figures are estimates based on average of past 4 weeks.

TABLE 1. Comparison of staphylococcal protein A adsorption (SPA) with sucrose gradients ultracentrifugation (SGU) for measles specific IgM antibody detection

|  |  | SGU |  | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Positive |  | Negative | 48 |
| SPA | Positive | 45 | 3 | 31 |
|  | Negative | 18 | 13 | 79 |
|  | Total | 63 |  |  |
|  | Sensitivity |  | 45 of $63=71 \%$ |  |
| Specificity |  | 13 of $16=81 \%$ |  |  |
|  | Predictive value positive |  | 45 of $48=94 \%$ |  |

Serum specimens from 36 measles cases confirmed by a four-fold or greater rise in complement-fixation or HI -antibody titer were used to determine when measles $\operatorname{lgM}$ becomes positive by SPA. Only six of 19 (32\%) specimens collected 0-4 days after rash onset were positive by SPA compared with 12 of 17 ( $71 \%$ ) specimens collected $5-21$ days following rash onset ( $\mathrm{X}^{2}=4.01, \mathrm{p}=0.045$ ).
Reported by Viral Exanthems and Herpes Virus Br, Div of Viral Diseases, Center for Infectious Diseases, Surveillance, Investigations, and Research Br, Immunization Div, Center for Prevention Svcs, CDC.
Editorial Note: The techniques most commonly used to confirm measles infections serologically are the HI and the complement-fixation (CF) tests (3). A four-fold rise in measles-specific HI or CF antibody titers between acute- and convalescent-phase serum specimens confirms measles infection. HI antibodies generally become detectable within the first several days following rash onset and peak approximately 2 weeks later (Figure 1) (5-7). Complement-fixation titers frequently follow the rise in HI titers, often by 1-3 days. However, there is considerable individual variation; some persons reach peak HI and CF titers within the first few days after rash onset (5,8,9). Measles-specific IgM antibodies may be detected shortly after rash onset and peak within 10 days after rash onset; they are usually undetectable by 30 days (10).

The SGU method (used most often to measure measles $\operatorname{lgM}$ ) is cumbersome and timeconsuming and requires expensive and sophisticated equipment. The SPA adsorption test, although less sensitive than SGU for detecting $\operatorname{lgM}$, is simple to perform and requires the addition of only one adsorption step to the serum-treatment procedure for the measles HI assay. Laboratories that perform the HI assay should consider adding the SPA technique for $\operatorname{lgM}$ measurement and should establish internal quality control with known $\operatorname{lgM}$ positive and $\lg M$ negative specimens. A positive test is presumptive evidence of acute measles infection. The three instances in which the SPA adsorption test was positive and the SGU was negative may have been false positives. However, it is possible that the SPA adsorption test may have detected IgM not detectable by SGU. A negative SPA adsorption test, however, should not be interpreted as the absence of IgM.

The laboratory is more helpful for confirming measles cases than for ruling out measles as the cause of a rash illness. The presence of measles-specific $\operatorname{lgM}$ or the detection of a four-fold rise in measles HI or CF antibody titers between acute- and convalescent-phase serum specimens confirms an acute measles infection. However, lgM may not be detected, even in specimens collected when antibody should peak, and four-fold rises may go undetected, particularly if peak titers were reached before an acute-phase specimen was drawn (11).

Laboratory confirmation should be sought for all suspected cases of measles occurring in the United States. However, decisions to take outbreak-control measures should be made on clinical and epidemiological grounds, since laboratory confirmation may take several weeks from rash onset, and the absence of laboratory evidence for measles infection may not rule out measles.
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FIGURE 1. Schematic of immune response in acute measles infection


## Epidemiologic Notes and Reports

## Acute Bacterial Conjunctivitis - Southeastern Georgia, 1981

In September and October 1981, an outbreak of conjunctivitis involving primarily grade-school-aged children occurred in southeastern Georgia. Between September 5 and October 16, the Office of Epidemiology, Georgia Department of Human Resources, received both passive and active surveillance reports of over 2,000 conjunctivitis cases in 20 counties. Reports

## Conjunctivitis-Continued

suggested that the outbreak peaked in the week ending September 19. The patients' ages ranged from 6 months to 84 years (median age $=7$ years).

Between September 24 and October 4, a telephone survey of households with children in three randomly selected first grade classes (the age group most affected) was conducted in one community. Of the 72 selected households, 44 ( $61 \%$ ) were contacted. Twenty-two of 44 $(50 \%)$ reported one or more persons with conjunctivitis since September 1 . Eighteen of 44 first graders $\mathbf{( 4 1 \% )}$ had conjunctivitis. There was no difference in attack rates between males and females, blacks and whites, and residents within and beyond city limits. Symptoms reported from the index case in affected households were: conjunctival injection ( $86 \%$ ), lid swelling $(73 \%)$, watering ( $73 \%$ ), purulent drainage ( $73 \%$ ), eye pain ( $60 \%$ ), itching ( $55 \%$ ), headache ( $36 \%$ ), and discomfort on exposure to bright light (32\%). Fever, as well as respiratory and gastrointestinal symptoms were present in $<10 \%$ of cases. Thirty-eight percent of cases involved one eye; $62 \%$ were bilateral. The median duration of illness was 6.5 days (range 2 days-2-1/2 weeks). In nine of the 22 case households ( $41 \%$ ), more than one person was affected. In three households, multiple cases appeared simultaneously. In households with multiple cases, age-specific attack rates were: $\leqslant 4$ years, four of five ( $80 \%$ ); 5-9 years, 29 of 35 ( $83 \%$ ); 10-14, six of 14 ( $43 \%$ ); $15-19$, zero of nine; $20-29$, one of $11(9 \%) ; \geqslant 30$, zero of 31 .

Microscopic examination of purulent material obtained from the eyes of eight acutely ill children in one community revealed small, pleomorphic intracellular gram-negative rods morphologically compatible with the presence of Haemophilus organisms. A possible Haemophilus species was isolated from seven of the eight specimens but could not be further identified. A similar organism was isolated from 17 persons with conjunctivitis in another community. Viral cultures from nine patients were negative.

Health authorities considered the possibility that gnats (Hippelates pusio) were responsible for mechanical transmission of this disease. These insects derive nourishment from eye secretions and were unusually prevalent during the outbreak period. Attempts to isolate Haemophilis from gnats trapped in a first-grade classroom were unsuccessful.
Reported by R Poblete, MD, Baxley, DC Schwekendiek, Tift General Hospital, Tifton, I Eunice, RN, C Matthews, JT Holloway, MD, Health District 9, Unit 2, Waycross, J Franklin, Bacteriology Laboratory, RK Sikes, DVM, State Epidemiologist, Georgia Dept of Human Resources; Field Svcs Div, Epidemiology Program Office, CDC.
Editorial Note: Outbreaks of seasonal conjunctivitis in the southern states and southern California were described as early as 1929 (1-5); they occurred during the summer or early fall and primarily affected young children. The etiologic agent was Haemophilus aegyptius (known as the Kochs-Weeks bacillus and now as H. influenza biotype III), and mechanical vector transmission by gnats has long been suggested. In many areas of the southern United States, these insects are prevalent during the warm months. Gnat-borne transmission has been documented in animal studies (6).

[^1]
## Conjunctivitis-Continued

In this outbreak, transmission by gnats was suggested. It was hypothesized that such transmission may have been facilitated when children congregated in school yards. It was not possible, however, to discern the relative importance of vector or direct person-to-person spread.

## References

1. Bengston IA. Seasonal acute conjunctivitis occurring in the Southern states. Public Health Rep 1933:48:917-26.
2. Davis DJ, Pittman M. Acute conjunctivitis caused by hemophilus. Am JDis Child 1950;79:211-22.
3. The California eye gnat. Science 1929;69:14.
4. Dawson CR. Epidemic Koch-Weeks conjunctivitis and trachoma in the Coachella Valley of California. Am J Ophthalmol 1960;49:801-8.
5. Dow RP, Hines VD. Conjunctivitis in Southwest Georgia. Public Health Rep 1957;72:441-8.
6. Payne WJ Jr, Cole JR Jr, Snoddy EL, Seibold HR. The eye gnat Hippelates pusio as a vector of bacterial conjunctivitis using rabbits as an animal model. J Med Entomol 1977;13:599-603.

## Notice to Readers
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[^0]:    *Mortality data in this table are voluntarily reported from 121 cities in the United States, most of which have populations of 100,000 or more. A death is
    reported by the place of its occurrence and by the week that the death certificate was filed. Fetal deaths are not included.
    **Pneumonia and influenza
    $\dagger$ Because of changes in reporting methods in these 4 Pennsylvania cities, these numbers are partial counts for the current week. Complete counts will be available in 4 to 6 weeks.

[^1]:    The Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, circulation 111,113, is published by the Centers for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia. The data in this report are provisional, based on weekly telegraphs 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.
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