

Correspondence

Reply

To the Editor:

We would like to thank Drs Feng and Wang¹ for indicating 2 errors in Table I of our article recently published in the *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*.² Actually, the prevalence rates for all health care workers should be 7.83 (95% CI, 6.84-7.90) in the case of a positive response to natural rubber latex and 7.40 (95% CI, 6.71-8.09) in the case of IgE to natural rubber latex, respectively. Although providing wrong figures cannot be excusable, we would like to indicate that our figures were conservative compared with the true estimations. The prevalence of latex allergy continues to be a relevant problem among health care workers.

Isabella Annesi-Maesano, DSc, PhD^a
Jean Bousquet, MD^b

From ^aINSERM, Villejuif, France, and ^bUniversity Hospital, Chest and Allergy Clinic, Montpellier, France. E-mail: annesi@vjf.inserm.fr.

Disclosure of potential conflict of interest: The authors have declared that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Feng C, Wang H. Two errors in the article by Bousquet et al in JACI. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2007;■■■■■■■■.
2. Bousquet J, Flahault A, Vandenplas O, Ameille J, Duron JJ, Pecquet C, et al. Natural rubber latex allergy among health care workers: a systematic review of the evidence. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2006;118:447-54.

doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2006.12.673