

REVIEW

Health and safety at necropsy

J L Burton

J Clin Pathol 2003;**56**:254–260

The postmortem room is a source of potential hazards and risks, not only to the pathologist and anatomical pathology technician, but also to visitors to the mortuary and those handling the body after necropsy. Postmortem staff have a legal responsibility to make themselves aware of, and to minimise, these dangers. This review focuses specifically on those hazards and risks associated with the necropsy of infected patients, with foreign objects present in the body, and with bodies that have been contaminated by chemicals or radioactive sources.

"Quidquid agis, prudenter agas, et respice finem." (Whatever you do, do cautiously, and look to the end.) Anon.

"The chapter of knowledge is very short, but the chapter of accidents is a very long one." Lord Chesterfield, 1694–1773.

The mortuary can be a dangerous place. Most dangerous in this environment is the individual who is ignorant of, or who ignores, the potential hazards at necropsy. Such people are a liability to themselves, colleagues working in the mortuary (pathologists and anatomical pathology technicians (who have the highest rate of necropsy related morbidity¹)), visitors to the mortuary (clinical staff and students), and those involved in handling the body (relatives, funeral directors,^{2,3} embalmers,^{4,5} and crematoria staff), or material derived from it (laboratory workers³) after necropsy. The decline in mortuary acquired infections such as tuberculosis and blood borne hepatitis in the past 25 years can be largely attributed to the increased awareness and adoption of safe working practices.^{6–9}

There is a considerable body of literature and legislation pertaining to the design and provision of a safe working environment^{10,11} and safe working practices within the mortuary.^{12–20} It is not my intention to focus on this, because such general principles have been discussed in detail elsewhere.^{21–23} Neither will I discuss general aspects of laboratory health and safety, such as handwashing, how to handle sharps, or the prohibitions on eating, drinking, smoking, and the application of cosmetics that apply in the mortuary. Instead, this review will focus on specific dangers faced at necropsy. Such dangers include: the acquisition of "category 3" risk pathogens^{24,25}; injuries (with the concomitant dangers of haemorrhage and sepsis) and electro-

cution; and finally (but rarely) poisoning, as a result of chemicals and/or radiation. Consequently, this review discusses the "high risk" (of infection) necropsy, dangerous foreign objects, and the contaminated body. First, however, it is useful to consider the nature of risks and hazards.

RISKS AND HAZARDS

Although these terms are often used interchangeably, they are not synonymous in the context of health and safety. The danger of injury posed by a slippery floor, the sharp corner of a table, the blade of a knife or saw, or the point of a needle represents a hazard. In contrast, the chance of acquiring a blood borne infection such as hepatitis B virus (HBV) or human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) from a sharps injury represents a risk.^{13,21}

Pathogens may be acquired by inhalation (of aerosols), ingestion, direct inoculation, entry through pre-existing breaks in the skin, and through the mucous membranes of the eyes, nose, and mouth. Any procedure that may result in infection through one of these routes constitutes a hazard.²¹

THE HIGH RISK (OF INFECTION) NECROPSY

Occupationally acquired infections, particularly "hazard group 3" risk infections, can have a devastating impact on the health care worker.^{26,27} Knowledge of the risks of infection is therefore essential. Accidental exposures to high risk pathogens are uncommon but not infrequent, and many could be prevented.^{28,29}

"The decline in mortuary acquired infections such as tuberculosis and blood borne hepatitis in the past 25 years can be largely attributed to the increased awareness and adoption of safe working practices"

The high risk necropsy can be defined as the "postmortem examination of a deceased person who has had, or is likely to have had, a serious infectious disease that can be transmitted to those present at the necropsy, thereby causing them serious illness and/or premature death".³⁰ The principal biological risks faced by mortuary

Correspondence to:
Dr J L Burton, Academic
Unit of Pathology, E-Floor
Medical School, Beech Hill
Road, Sheffield S10 2RX,
UK; j.l.burton@shef.ac.uk

Accepted for publication
16 October 2002

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; HBV, hepatitis B virus; HCV, hepatitis C virus; HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; OR, adjusted odds ratio; TSE, transmissible spongiform encephalopathy; v-CJD, variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease

workers are the infections caused by *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, the blood borne hepatitis, HIV, and agents responsible for transmissible spongiform encephalopathies (TSE), such as variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (v-CJD).³ All of these pathogens retain their infectivity after death.^{31–35}

Such diseases are frequently asymptomatic and may be present without morphological evidence at necropsy.³⁴ The social stigma attached to those in groups at high risk of acquiring such infections means that both the clinical team and the mortuary staff (including the pathologist) may be unaware of the risk associated with the necropsy.^{36–38} For example, it is estimated that there are more than 11 000 cases of undiagnosed HIV infection in the UK.³⁹ The presence of such pathogens may not become known until after the gross examination.^{34 40} This becomes less worrisome if all staff in the mortuary regard every necropsy as a potential source of these pathogens, regardless of whether or not an infection has been documented in the medical notes, and irrespective of whether the patient is known to belong to a high risk group. This is especially prudent in medicolegal cases, where the pathologist often has to rely on the brief non-medical notes provided by the coroner's officer.⁴¹

Let us consider first the risks of acquiring such pathogens at necropsy, before discussing strategies for reducing such risks.

Mycobacterium tuberculosis

It has long been known that staff working in the mortuary are at risk of occupational infection with *M tuberculosis*. The literature abounds with reported cases of acquired pulmonary^{40 42–46} and cutaneous infection.⁴⁷ Indeed, René Laennec (1781–1826; inventor of the stethoscope) died of the disease, having acquired it from the dissection of tuberculous cadavers.⁴⁸ Xavier Bichat (1771–1802), regarded as the “Father of Histology” and performer of some 600 necropsies in the year of his death, also succumbed to the disease.⁴⁹

Pulmonary tuberculosis accounts for approximately 90% of cases and is acquired by inhalation of aerosols or dried material.⁴³ Cutaneous infection (“prosector's paronychia”, “prosector's wart”, or “verruca necrogenica”) accounts for 5–10% of cases, the bacillus being introduced into previously traumatised skin or via a skin puncture.⁴⁷ Mucocutaneous transmission of tuberculosis at necropsy has not been reported.⁴³ The resurgence of tuberculosis, especially in HIV positive patients, and the emergence of multidrug resistant strains^{3 50 51} reinforce the importance of this disease in any consideration of necropsy health and safety.⁴³ It is estimated that some 12 500 laboratory workers face occupational risk of exposure in the UK alone.⁴³ Kantor *et al* have suggested that staff coming into contact with patients with open tuberculosis have a 17.8 fold increased risk of acquiring the disease, but do not distinguish between clinical and postmortem staff.³⁴ Well documented cases of tuberculosis developing after exposure at necropsy exist—for example, 25% of Mantoux negative students who attended a necropsy on an immunocompromised patient in Australia developed tuberculosis.⁴⁵

Teppo *et al* noted that the incidence of tuberculosis among pathologists engaged in postmortem practice (10%) was greater ($p = 0.00157$) than in general physicians (1%) and specialists in tuberculosis and respiratory medicine (4%).⁵² That tuberculosis poses a serious threat to postmortem room workers is further highlighted by Collins and Grange⁴³ in their recent definitive review which found that, in contrast to patients with open tuberculosis, even very brief exposure during a necropsy carries a very high risk of infection. Tubercle bacilli have been isolated from glass plates held 10 cm above lungs sliced at necropsy, and from various sites around the postmortem suite up to 24 hours after the examination of a tuberculous cadaver.⁴³

It has been suggested that the patient with tuberculosis may be more infectious at necropsy than during life. Templeton *et al* reported that none of 40 Mantoux negative clinical

staff caring for a patient who died of unsuspected tuberculosis showed a skin test conversion, whereas all five non-reactors present at the necropsy converted from negative to positive and two of these developed positive sputum cultures.⁴⁰ Kantor *et al* observed a similar preponderance of nosocomial infection among postmortem workers.³⁴

Human immunodeficiency virus

The necropsy is a valuable investigation in patients who have died from AIDS because it permits clinicopathological follow up, elucidation of the descriptive clinical pathology and epidemiology of HIV disease, validation of endpoints in clinical trials, assessment of drug efficacy and toxicity, accumulation of tissue for further research, and medical education.⁵³ HIV serophobia has been documented among staff working in mortuaries handling high risk cases since the 1980s,^{53–57} although there is no evidence that HIV is readily acquired in the mortuary. Consequently, it is difficult to justify refusal to undertake necropsies on patients with such infections.^{53 58} Indeed, Gottfried⁵⁷ has suggested that “those individuals who remain unwilling to expose themselves to high risk patients or specimens, even after expert counselling, should be advised to seek a change of career”. However, pathologists (and other mortuary workers) should not undertake such cases if they are themselves immunosuppressed (and hence at risk of acquiring opportunistic pathogens from such cases),⁵³ have uncovered wounds, weeping skin lesions, or other dermatitides.⁵⁸

Most health care workers found to be HIV seropositive have a history of behavioural (male homosexual contact or intravenous drug use) or transfusional exposure.⁵⁹ Occupational exposure to HIV is uncommon,^{60 61} and the overall risk of seroconversion after contact with HIV positive blood is low (seroconversion rate, 0–0.42%).^{28 29 62 63} Most documented cases of HIV seroconversion after occupational exposure occurred after needlestick injuries (the most common source of exposure^{20 28 64}). The estimated HIV transmission rate after a single percutaneous inoculation (needles contain approximately 1 µl of blood) is 0.10–0.36%.^{28 53 65} (This may underestimate the risk associated with accidental deep scalpel injuries.⁶⁶ More blood is inoculated by deeper injuries than superficial injuries, and by hollow bore needles than by solid suture needles.^{59 67}) The seroconversion rate after mucocutaneous exposure is 0.04–0.63%.^{28 65} A meta-analysis²⁸ of 6170 exposures in prospective studies demonstrated a seroconversion rate of 0.25% (95% confidence interval (CI), 0.12% to 0.47%) after percutaneous exposure and 0.09% (95% CI, 0.006% to 0.50%) after mucocutaneous exposure. The aerosol transmission rate has not been documented.^{53 68} There is only one well documented case of HIV transmission at necropsy, in which a scalpel blade injury to the hand⁶⁸ led to seroconversion in a consultant pathologist. A similar injury, occurring in a surgeon, has also led to occupational exposure to HIV and seroconversion.⁶⁹

“HIV serophobia has been documented among staff working in mortuaries handling high risk cases since the 1980s, although there is no evidence that HIV is readily acquired in the mortuary”

The risk of seroconversion after occupational exposure will depend upon the viral load within the patient, the volume of fluid inoculated/ingested (discussed below), and the susceptibility of the health care worker (including whether or not they receive postexposure prophylaxis with zidovudine).^{59 70} Factors known to increase the risk of seroconversion include: deep injury (adjusted odds ratio (OR), 16.1; 95% CI, 6.1 to 44.6); terminal illness in the source patient (OR, 6.4; 95% CI, 2.2 to 18.9); visible blood on device (OR, 5.2; 95% CI, 1.8 to 17.7); and procedures involving the direct placement of needles into

blood vessels (OR, 5.1; 95% CI, 1.9 to 14.8).⁷⁰ Those working in the postmortem room should be aware that the viral load in peripheral blood CD4+ T cells is greatest during the acute phase of the infection⁷¹ and during the final stages of the disease,⁷² when an increasing viral load is associated with a decline in CD4+ T cells and a rapidly deteriorating clinical course.⁷³ Consequently, HIV titres at necropsy may be greater than in many living patients with HIV.

Several investigators have questioned whether postponement of the necropsy of patients known to be HIV positive reduces the risk of infection. In fact, feasible necropsy delays do not reduce the risk—viable HIV-2 has been isolated from blood obtained 16.5 days after death.³³ Other studies have shown that viable HIV can be isolated from cranial bone, brain, cerebrospinal fluid,⁷⁴ lymph node, spleen,^{74 75} and blood^{75 76} up to five days after death, when stored at 6°C. (Interestingly, HIV could not be isolated from bone dust obtained with a hand saw from the calvarium of seropositive patients.⁷⁵) Furthermore, HIV remains viable in spleen at room temperature for at least 14 days.⁷⁵ Outside the body, the virus is not hardy, and is inactivated by drying and by several disinfectants, including a 0.5% solution of sodium hypochlorite, 4% buffered formaldehyde solution, 50% ethyl alcohol, 1% glutaraldehyde, 3% hydrogen peroxide, phenolic compounds, and iodophor compounds.^{58 77} (Phenolic disinfectants are preferable to hypochlorite, which is corrosive, may liberate harmful amounts of chlorine, and reacts with formaldehyde to produce bischloromethyl ether, a potent carcinogen.³)

Hepatitis B and C

The epidemiology and routes of transmission of the category 3 risk viral hepatitis (HBV and hepatitis C (HCV)) closely mirror those of HIV.³ HBV is highly infectious, and transmission can occur following exposure to extremely small volumes of infected blood.³ However, the risk of occupational acquisition of HBV is extremely low (and indeed fell steadily between 1985 and 1993), largely as a consequence of routine pre-exposure vaccination among health workers.⁷⁸ Staff who have not been vaccinated against HBV should not engage in postmortem work.⁷⁹

In contrast, HCV is probably less infectious than HBV, but no vaccine exists. Occupational acquisition of HCV has been reported in health care workers and the rate of transmission after percutaneous exposure is 2.7–10%.^{79 80}

Transmissible spongiform encephalopathies

The risk of acquiring other category 3 risk pathogens, notably the prions responsible for TSE (including v-CJD) is considerably less. However, it should be remembered that the agents responsible for TSE are extremely resilient. They are not “killed” by formalin or phenolised formalin fixation, and are resistant to routine methods of physical and chemical decontamination.^{3 21 81} Furthermore, v-CJD can be transmitted from archived, formalin fixed, paraffin wax embedded tissues,⁸² and can survive reduction to ash at 360°C.³ Decontamination requires disinfection with sodium hypochlorite (20 000 parts per million chlorine for at least one hour), 1–2M sodium hydroxide, or steam autoclaving at 134°C for at least 18 minutes.³ Given the prolonged latency of these disorders, evidence of an occupational risk to postmortem room workers remains circumstantial. However, a single case of v-CJD has been reported in a laboratory technician whose work included handling formalin fixed brains.⁸³

Miscellaneous infections

In addition to the infections discussed above, it should be remembered that at necropsy the cadaver is a potential source of infection with other organisms, notably *Streptococcus pyogenes*,⁸⁴ gastrointestinal organisms (including hepatitis A), and potentially *Neisseria meningitidis*.³ Such pathogens give rise

to potentially curable disease but nonetheless may result in considerable morbidity.⁸⁴

Hazard group 4 risk pathogens

Necropsies on patients with hazard group 4 pathogens²⁴ (for example, the viral haemorrhagic fevers) should only be performed where absolutely necessary. In the UK, necropsies on such cases are prohibited unless performed in a designated mortuary.¹⁹ Such cases will not be discussed further in this review.

MINIMISING THE RISKS POSED BY THE INFECTED CADAVER

Although much has been written on how to perform necropsies on infected cadavers safely, there are remarkably few studies from which one can draw evidence upon which to base a “safe” postmortem practice. The most recent guidelines on postmortem practice published by the Royal College of Pathologists (London, UK)⁸⁵ recommend that mortuaries adopt health and safety protocols for the performance of postmortem examinations for all necropsies performed on cadavers known or suspected to be infected with a hazard group 3 pathogen. Detailed examples of such protocols are presented in these guidelines.⁸⁵ Such detail falls beyond the scope of this review but the basic principles are presented here.

(1) Immunisation: all staff involved in the necropsy or coming into contact with materials derived from it should be vaccinated against tetanus,²¹ poliomyelitis,²¹ tuberculosis,⁴³ and hepatitis B.⁷⁹

(2) Pre-necropsy testing: this should be considered in cases where there is reason to suspect that the body may be infected with a previously undetected category 3 pathogen. Given the diagnostic purpose of the investigation, working parties of the Royal College of Pathologists (London, UK)^{20 85} have noted that pre-necropsy HIV testing is appropriate in hospital (consented) cases. In such cases, prior consent for testing is not required. Similarly, the coroner may give consent for HIV serology. In the UK there seems little epidemiological justification to test all bodies for HIV before necropsy, except where the deceased is known to have been exposed to particular high risk activities (such as intravenous drug use).^{20 39} In cases where such testing proves positive, the pathologist has a duty of care to the patient and his/her relatives and sexual partners to disclose the information; this is usually achieved via the patient's physician.^{20 86}

(3) Clothing: in surgery, protective clothing is worn to reduce the risk of transmitting pathogens from the health care workers to the patient. At necropsy, the protective clothing serves the opposite function. The currently recommended clothing for performing (all) necropsies includes: a cap/hood that completely covers the hair; eye protection (ideally a visor that provides full face protection); a face mask (a tight fitting micro-filter mask is necessary for cases of suspected tuberculosis); surgical shirt and trousers; waterproof boots (ideally with steel toecaps (to prevent penetration by dropped sharps)); a full length gown; a waterproof apron that is long enough to reach below the tops of the boots, and at least one pair of gloves (discussed below).^{11 20 22 53 79 87 88} Some pathologists choose to wear a disposable water repellent body suit over their surgical shirt and trousers and to tape their gloves to this forming a waterproof seal.⁵⁸ Overly cumbersome clothing is itself hazardous—for example, the advantages of down draught ventilation headgear in reducing aerosol transmission may be outweighed by a reduction in field of vision and communication.⁵⁵ As noted above, penetrating injuries are a common route of transmission for pathogens at necropsy. Injuries to the hands are most common, particularly on the palmer surfaces of the thumb, index finger, and middle finger of the non-dominant hand.⁸⁹ Among pathologists, O'Brian⁸⁹

found that cuts are twice as common as needlestick injuries. The frequency of injury is inversely related to one's clinical experience. Mast *et al* have shown that wearing surgical gloves significantly reduces the volume of blood transferred during a needlestick injury by 63% and 86% for suture and hollow needles, respectively.⁶⁷ Weston and Locker⁸⁸ have shown that gloves, especially those of anatomical pathology technicians, are frequently punctured at necropsy and that 31.8% of such punctures go unnoticed. Double gloving and frequent changing of gloves during the necropsy (whether or not they appear damaged) is recommended by some,^{58, 90} but felt to be an unnecessary expense by others.⁹¹ However, it should be noted that with double gloving the outer glove protects and reduces the frequency of perforations of the inner glove.⁹² The outer glove should fit closely to the hand.⁵⁸ The frequency of glove perforations can also be reduced by advising staff to remove rings before donning gloves—multiple perforations are often found at the base of the ring finger.⁹³ Additional protection can be obtained by wearing a gauntlet on the non-dominant hand. Such gauntlets, made of metal mesh^{58, 94, 95} or Kevlar,⁹⁶ provide protection against cuts but will not prevent needlestick injuries. However, these gloves can feel cumbersome, reduce sensation, and can reduce manual dexterity.^{58, 94}

(4) Reduce aerosol formation: this is essential for reducing the risk of acquiring airborne infections such as tuberculosis⁹⁷ and enteric pathogens,⁹⁸ and for necropsies on patients suspected of having HIV or TSE. It should be realised that most airborne bacteria in mortuaries are derived from the skin of the staff present.^{98, 99} Down draught ventilation tables reduce the particle transmission of microorganisms^{54, 98, 99} (and have the added advantage of reducing odours). The hazards for the formation of aerosols relate principally to the use of saws (especially power saws)⁹⁸ and opening of the intestines (which should be performed under water²¹). Care should be taken when removing, handling and/or washing organs to avoid splashing and aerosol formation.⁹⁸ High pressure water sprays should not be used.²¹ Some authors have recommended eviscerating the infected body organ by organ, rather than with the more traditional Letulle technique, in which the organs are removed en bloc.⁵⁵ A reduction in aerosol dissemination during cranial necropsy can be achieved by placing clear plastic bags over the head while eviscerating the brain,¹⁰⁰ although specific tents have been developed to cover the head and neck of the patient.¹⁰⁰

(5) Equipment: the equipment used to perform the necropsy should be kept to a minimum, and be kept in clear view at all times. Scalpels and scissors with pointed ends should not be used.^{53, 55} Instruments (and especially sharps) should never be passed from hand to hand.⁵⁸ For necropsies on patients where a TSE is suspected, disposable instruments should be used. Non-disposable instruments require prolonged disinfection as described above.⁵⁸

(6) Circulators: it is not necessary to carry out necropsies on patients suspected or known to be infected with a category 3 risk pathogen in a specialist mortuary, but the number of staff present during the procedure should be kept to a minimum.^{55, 101} Therefore, in practice, the pathologist should be accompanied by an anatomical pathology technician, who assists in the evisceration and dissection, and a circulator. The pathologist and technician are "dirty", whereas the circulator avoids direct contact with potentially infected or contaminated tissues, fluids, and surfaces and so remains "clean".^{55, 102} The roles of the circulator include: labelling specimen containers and holding them so that the prosector may deposit specimens without coming into contact with the outside of the container; completion of paperwork associated with such specimens; recording organ weights and any other contemporaneous notes desired by the prosector; adjustment of overhead lighting where necessary; monitoring the practice of the prosector and technician to ensure they follow health and

safety guidelines; and liaison between the prosector and clinicians, so that the contaminated prosector does not have to handle clean surfaces such as telephone receivers.¹⁰²

(7) Safe sharps practice: it is essential that a safe sharps practice is meticulously followed at all times. Hazards are posed both by equipment used to perform the necropsy (scalpels, scissors, needles, and saws) and by the body itself (bone fragments and unsuspected objects within the body (discussed below)). "Blind" dissection should be avoided. Only one study has evaluated the safety of evisceration techniques. Walker *et al* found that the use of rib shears to open the thorax is most likely to produce potentially dangerous sharp rib ends, whereas an electric saw produces the smoothest ends.¹⁰³ Therefore, the use of an electric saw to open the chest may reduce the potential for sharps injuries. However, such saws may produce aerosols,¹⁰³ and it has also been suggested that prolonged and repeated use may be a cause of vibration induced white fingers among mortuary assistants.¹⁰⁴ For reconstruction of the infected body some authorities recommend that sutures are not used (given that protective gauntlets will not protect from penetrating injuries caused by suture needles) and that the body instead be closed with staples, tissue adhesives, or even left unreconstructed and sealed in a leakproof body bag.^{20, 55} However, there are no studies or guidelines as to which method represents best practice.

DANGEROUS FOREIGN BODIES

The body may contain objects whose presence may or may not be known at the start of the examination, and which may be hazardous to the pathologist and the anatomical pathology technician. The literature focuses on three specific areas, namely hidden sharp objects, implanted cardioverter defibrillators, and exploding bullets.

Hidden sharp objects

In addition to the care taken when handling the sharp objects used to perform the necropsy, consideration should be given to the possibility that the body contains "occult" sharps. Such objects may be a legacy of previous medical intervention, as in the case of vena-caval (Greenfield) filters,¹⁰⁵ the presence of which may not be documented in the medical notes. The fine anchoring points of the filter are sharp and may cause deep puncture wounds.¹⁰⁵

"The body may contain objects whose presence may or may not be known at the start of the examination, and which may be hazardous to the pathologist and the anatomical pathology technician"

Sharp objects within the body may alternatively be a consequence of the patient's lifestyle. Hutchins and colleagues have recently reported a series of four patients with seropositive HIV infection who came to necropsy and were found to have retained fragments of needles in the subcutaneous tissues of the neck. Such needle fragments (which were between 10 and 45 mm long) were the legacy of long term intravenous drug use in patients who resorted to deep cervicoclavicular injection when peripheral access became difficult. These cases were (fortunately) not associated with needlestick injury, but staff performing necropsies on those with a history of intravenous drug use must be aware of this potential (albeit rare) hazard. Radiographic screening has been suggested for cases where retained needle fragments are suspected.^{106, 107} Needle fragments have also been discovered in the myocardium of intravenous drug users.¹⁰⁸

Implanted cardioverter defibrillators

These devices are similar to cardiac pacemakers, and are used in the treatment of malignant tachyarrhythmias such as ventricular tachycardia and ventricular fibrillation.¹⁰⁹ The electric

pulse delivered by the defibrillator to the myocardium is approximately 20–40 J (one million times greater than that of a cardiac pacemaker).¹⁰⁹ It is clear that such devices can discharge after the patient's death and at necropsy.¹⁰⁹ Although there are no documented cases of electrocution occurring at necropsy, Prahlow *et al* report numerous anecdotal cases.¹¹⁰ It is recommended that care is taken to deactivate these devices (ideally, done by the manufacturer or, if unavailable, with a doughnut shaped magnet placed over the pulse generator) before handling them.^{109 110} As with cardiac pacemakers, the batteries within such devices can detonate when heated, and therefore implantable defibrillators must be removed from bodies that are to be cremated and must not be disposed of by incineration.^{109 110}

Exploding bullets

Those working in mortuaries where deaths as a result of shootings are investigated face the potential hazard that the deceased was shot with explosive ammunition. Such bullets are designed to fragment upon contact with the victim, thus slowing the bullet and imparting more of its kinetic energy to the body.^{111 112} In addition to causing severe injury to the victim, such bullets pose a hazard to the surgeon and the pathologist if they fail to explode.¹¹¹ In cases where explosive ammunition is suspected, goggles should be worn and long handled instruments used to minimise the risk of injury to eyes and fingers. Once removed, the bullet must be handled with rubber coated forceps, kept in a padded container to shield it from excess vibration and heat, and must be kept away from sources of microwave radiation.^{111 112} The Winchester "Black Talon" bullet is designed so that its jacket expands by peeling back to form "petals" that slow its path through tissue. These petals are sharp and may cause glove puncture.¹¹³

THE CONTAMINATED BODY

Staff involved in postmortem practice should be aware that, on rare occasions, they may be faced with a request to undertake a necropsy on a body that been contaminated either chemically or by radioactive sources.

Chemical contaminants

The literature that relates to the hazards posed by chemical contaminants at necropsy focuses primarily on the necropsy of patients who have died from cyanide poisoning. It has been suggested that cyanide liberated from such bodies may poison postmortem personnel.¹¹⁴ However, in two subsequent reported cases of necropsies on cyanide related deaths, no increase in blood cyanide values was detected in the postmortem workers.^{115 116} However, one pathologist experienced headache and a burning throat sensation and one technician reported lightheadedness and throat discomfort.¹¹⁵ The occupational exposure to cyanide can be minimised by performing the necropsy in a well ventilated environment, using down draught ventilation. The risk is proportional to the amount of cyanide present in the stomach. Cyanide salts liberate hydrogen cyanide when they come into contact with gastric acid. The upper gastrointestinal tract should be dissected out unopened and intact and examined in a fume cupboard.^{115 116} One should not rely on the smell of "burnt almonds" to detect cyanide—many people are anosmic to this.¹¹⁷

To my knowledge, there have been no reported cases of secondary toxicity caused by organophosphates among postmortem staff, but there is a theoretical risk (for example, deaths following industrial accidents or terrorist attacks). Occupationally acquired organophosphate toxicity has been reported among health care workers who failed to take appropriate precautions when treating organophosphate poisoning.¹¹⁸ Health care workers handling the bodies of those contaminated by organophosphates should use chemical barrier protection (latex gloves afford little protection).¹¹⁸

Take home messages

- Staff involved in postmortem practice face risks of life threatening infections and serious injury. The nature of these risks may not be apparent before (or during) the necropsy
- Hazards associated with the body pertain to infection, foreign objects within the body, and the contaminated body
- Many accidents in the mortuary can be avoided by careful practice

Radioactive contaminants

Bodies may be contaminated by radioactive materials deliberately, as a consequence of medical treatment,¹¹⁹ or as a consequence of the explosion of atomic devices or working in the nuclear industry.¹²⁰ Necropsies on radioactive bodies that had been recently dosed with strontium-89-chloride before death have been reported.¹¹⁹ In the reported case, whole body and hand exposures were recorded as 0.000 for all personnel involved (although this is not surprising because strontium is concentrated in the bones). Staff engaging in the necropsy of patients who have been treated with radioisotopes should liaise with their local department of nuclear medicine before starting the necropsy to seek advice and appropriate monitoring.

CONCLUSION

Those involved in postmortem practice have a statutory duty not only to ensure that they are aware of the hazards and risks associated with such work, but also to take steps to minimise these risks. The hazards present within a body are often unknown at the start of the necropsy. Meticulous practice in all cases, and not just those where a risk has been identified, is essential. The principal risks relate to the acquisition of occupationally acquired infections, either by sharps injury or by inhalation. Many such cases are avoidable. Local health and safety policies should be made available to all staff, and should be followed. Specialist advice may be needed in rare cases.

REFERENCES

- 1 Hall AJ, Aw TC, Harrington JM. Morbidity survey of post mortem room staff. *J Clin Pathol* 1991;**44**:433–5.
- 2 Young SEJ, Healing TD. Infection in the deceased: a survey of management. *Communicable Disease Report Review* 1995;**5**:R69–73.
- 3 Healing T, Hoffman P, Young S. The infection hazards of human cadavers. *Communicable Disease Report Review* 1995;**5**:R61–8.
- 4 Start RD, Dube A, Cross SS, *et al*. Funeral directors, mortuaries and necropsies: implications for necropsy consent rates and the prevention of infection. *J Clin Pathol* 1996;**49**:217–22.
- 5 Heckerling PS, Johnson Williams M. Attitudes of funeral directors and embalmers toward autopsy. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1992;**116**:1147–51.
- 6 Harrington JM, Shannon HS. Incidence of tuberculosis, hepatitis, brucellosis and shigellosis in British medical laboratory workers. *BMJ* 1976;**1**:759.
- 7 Grist NR. Infections in British clinical laboratories, 1980–1981. *J Clin Pathol* 1983;**36**:121–6.
- 8 Grist NR, Emslie JAN. Infections in British clinical laboratories, 1986–87. *J Clin Pathol* 1989;**42**:677–81.
- 9 Grist NR, Emslie JAN. Infections in British clinical laboratories, 1988–1989. *J Clin Pathol* 1991;**44**:667–9.
- 10 Department of Health and Social Security. *Health Service management—electrical safety and post-mortem rooms*. Health note (82) 39. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1982.
- 11 Department of Health. *Mortuary and post-mortem room*. Health building note 20. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1991.
- 12 Her Majesty's Stationary Office. *Health and Safety at Work Act*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1974.
- 13 Berenzweig G. Pathology laboratories and post mortem rooms: management and control—health and safety aspects. *Health Estate Journal* 1991;**45**:10–14.
- 14 Health Services Advisory Committee. *Safety policies in the Health Service*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1983.
- 15 Health Services Advisory Committee. *Safe working and the prevention of infection in clinical laboratories*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1991.
- 16 Royal Institute of Public Health and Hygiene. *A handbook of mortuary practice and safety for anatomical pathology technicians*. London: Royal Institute of Public Health and Hygiene, 1991.

- 17 **Department of Health.** *The control of substances hazardous to health: guidance for the initial assessment in hospitals.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1989.
- 18 **UK Health Departments.** *Guidance for clinical health care workers: protection against infection with blood-borne viruses.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1998.
- 19 **UK Health Departments.** *Management and control of viral haemorrhagic fevers: summary of guidelines from the Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1998.
- 20 **Banatvala JE, Chrystie IL, Breuer J, et al.** *HIV and the practice of pathology.* Report of the Working Party of the Royal College of Pathologists. 1995. London: Marks and Spencer Publications Unit, Royal College of Pathologists.
- 21 **Al-Wali A.** Biological safety. In: Burton JL, Ruddy GN, eds. *The hospital autopsy.* London: Arnold, 2001:25–36.
- 22 **Burton JL, Ruddy GN.** Autopsy suite design and construction. In: Burton JL, Ruddy GN, eds. *The hospital autopsy.* London: Arnold, 2001:37–41.
- 23 **Hall A.** Post-mortem hazards. *Occupational Health* 2002;161–3.
- 24 **Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens.** *Categorisation of pathogens according to hazard and categories of containment.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1990.
- 25 **Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens.** *Microbiological risk assessment: an interim report.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1996.
- 26 **Aoun H.** When a house officer gets AIDS. *N Engl J Med* 1989;321:693–6.
- 27 **Aoun H.** From the eye of the storm, with the eyes of a physician. *Ann Int Med* 1991;116:335–8.
- 28 **Ippolito G, Puro V, De Carli G, and the Italian Study Group on Occupational Risk of HIV Infection.** The risk of occupational human immunodeficiency virus infection in health care workers. Italian multicenter study. *Arch Intern Med* 1993;153:1451–8.
- 29 **Marcus R and the CDC Cooperative Needlestick Surveillance Group.** Surveillance of health care workers exposed to blood from patients infected with the human immunodeficiency virus. *N Engl J Med* 1988;319:1118–23.
- 30 **Claydon SM.** The high risk autopsy. Recognition and protection. *Am J Forensic Med Pathol* 1993;14:253–6.
- 31 **Henry K, Dexter D, Sannerud K, et al.** Recovery of HIV at autopsy. *N Engl J Med* 1989;321:1833–4.
- 32 **Bail J, Desselberger U, Whitwell H.** Long-lasting viability of HIV after patient's death. *Lancet* 1991;338:63.
- 33 **Douceron H, Deforges L, Gherardi R, et al.** Long-lasting postmortem viability of human immunodeficiency virus: a potential risk in forensic medicine practice. *Forensic Sci Int* 1993;60:61–6.
- 34 **Kantor HS, Poblete R, Pusateri SL.** Nosocomial transmission of tuberculosis from unsuspected disease. *JAMA* 1988;260:833–7.
- 35 **de Craemer D.** Postmortem viability of human immunodeficiency—implications for the teaching of anatomy. *N Engl J Med* 1994;331:1315.
- 36 **Sadler DW, Pounder DJ, Urquhart GED, et al.** Prevalence of HIV antibody in forensic cases. *BMJ* 1992;304:1027–8.
- 37 **Edlin GP.** Active tuberculosis unrecognized until necropsy. *Lancet* 1978;1:650–2.
- 38 **Landefeld CS, Chren M-M, Myers A, et al.** Diagnostic yield of the autopsy in a university hospital and a community hospital. *N Engl J Med* 1988;318:1249–54.
- 39 **Evans B, McHenry A, Mortimer J.** *HIV and AIDS in the UK. An epidemiological review: 2000.* London: Public Health Laboratory Service, 2001.
- 40 **Templeton GL, Illing LA, Young L, et al.** The risk for transmission of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* at the bedside and during autopsy. *Ann Int Med* 1995;122:922–5.
- 41 **Patel F.** Over my dead body: coroner's case. *Br J Hosp Med* 1991;46:11.
- 42 **Lundgren R, Norrman E, Asberg I.** Tuberculosis infection transmitted at autopsy. *Tubercle* 1987;68:147–50.
- 43 **Collins CH, Grange JM.** Tuberculosis acquired in laboratories and necropsy rooms. *Commun Dis Public Health* 1999;2:161–7.
- 44 **Stenton SC, Hendrick DJ.** Occupational tuberculosis and a failed postgraduate medical examination. *Occup Med* 1996;46:87–8.
- 45 **Wilkins D, Woolcock AJ, Cossart YE.** Tuberculosis: medical students at risk. *Med J Aust* 1994;160:395–7.
- 46 **Smith JH.** The hazard to pathologists from tuberculous specimens. *Hum Pathol* 1996;27:1251–2.
- 47 **Goette DK, Jacobson KW, Doty RD.** Primary inoculation tuberculosis of the skin: prosector's paronychia. *Arch Dermatol* 1978;114:567–9.
- 48 **Porter R.** Scientific medicine in the nineteenth century. In: *The greatest benefit to mankind. A medical history of humanity from antiquity to the present.* London: Fontana Press, 1999:308–12.
- 49 **Hill RB, Anderson RE.** The recent history of the autopsy. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1996;120:702–12.
- 50 **CDSC.** Drug resistant tuberculosis outbreak in North London—update. *Commun Dis Rep CDR Wkly* 2002;12. (www.phls.co.uk/publications/cdr/archive02/News/news3102.html#TB)
- 51 **Uttamchandani R, Reyes R, Dittes S, et al.** Epidemiologic notes and reports: nosocomial transmission of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis to health-care workers and HIV-infected patients in an urban hospital—Florida. *MMWR* 1990;39:718–22.
- 52 **Teppo L, Ojajarvi J, Brander E.** The tuberculosis morbidity among pathologists in Finland. *Scand J Respir Dis* 1974;55:257–61.
- 53 **Lucas SB.** HIV and the necropsy. *J Clin Pathol* 1993;46:1071–5.
- 54 **Pasia OG.** Views clash on AIDS autopsy. *CAP Today* 1987;1:1–9.
- 55 **Patel F.** HIV serophobia in the mortuary: an algorithm system for handling high-risk forensic cases. *Med Sci Law* 1997;37:296–301.
- 56 **de Camargo JLV.** AIDS autopsies: has the risk been established? *Hum Pathol* 1988;19:1115–16.
- 57 **Gottfried EL.** Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome and the clinical laboratory worker. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1987;111:1024–6.
- 58 **Geller SA.** The autopsy in acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. How and why. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1990;114:324–9.
- 59 **Chamberland ME, Ciesielski CA, Howard RJ, et al.** Occupational risk of infection with human immunodeficiency virus. *Surg Clin North Am* 1995;75:1057–70.
- 60 **Klatt EC.** Surgery and human immunodeficiency virus infection: indications, pathologic findings, risks, and risk prevention. *Int Surg* 1994;79:1–5.
- 61 **Hospital Infections Program and AIDS Program, CDC.** Epidemiologic notes and reports update: human immunodeficiency virus infections in health-care workers exposed to blood of infected patients. *MMWR* 1987;37:285–9.
- 62 **Henderson DK, Fahey FJ, Willy M, et al.** Risk for occupational transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 (HIV-1) associated with clinical exposures. A prospective evaluation. *Ann Int Med* 1990;113:740–6.
- 63 **Gerberding JL, Bryant-LeBlanc CE, Nelson K, et al.** Risk of transmitting the human immunodeficiency virus, cytomegalovirus, and hepatitis B to health care workers exposed to patients with AIDS and AIDS-related conditions. *J Infect Dis* 1987;156:1–8.
- 64 **Heptonstall J, Gill ON, Porter K, et al.** Health care workers and HIV: surveillance of occupationally acquired infection in the United Kingdom. *Communicable Disease Report Review* 1993;3:R147–53.
- 65 **Tokars JI, Marcus R, Culver DH, et al.** Surveillance of HIV infection and zidovudine use among health care workers after occupational exposure to HIV-infected blood. *Ann Int Med* 1993;118:913–19.
- 66 **Reichert CM.** New safety considerations for the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome autopsy. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1992;116:1109–10.
- 67 **Mast ST, Woolwine JD, Gerberding JL.** Efficacy of gloves in reducing blood volumes transferred during simulated needlestick injury. *J Infect Dis* 1993;168:1589–92.
- 68 **Johnson MD, Schaffner W, Atkinson J, et al.** Autopsy risk and acquisition of human immunodeficiency virus infection. A case report and reappraisal. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1997;121:64–6.
- 69 **Ippolito G, and the Studio Italiano Rischio Occupazionale de HIV (SIRHO).** Scalpel injury and HIV infection in a surgeon. *Lancet* 1996;347:1042.
- 70 **CDC Cooperative Needlestick Surveillance Group, Abiteboul D, Lot F, Heptonstall J.** Case-control study of HIV seroconversion in health care workers after percutaneous exposure to HIV-infected blood—France, United Kingdom, and United States, January 1988–August 1994. *MMWR* 1995;44:929–32.
- 71 **Daar ES, Moudgh T, Meyer MS, et al.** Transient high levels of viremia in patients with primary human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. *N Engl J Med* 1991;324:961–4.
- 72 **Ho DD, Moudgil T, Alam M.** Quantitation of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 in the blood of infected persons. *N Engl J Med* 1989;321:1621–5.
- 73 **Schnittman SM, Greenhouse JJ, Psallidopoulos MC, et al.** Increasing viral burden in CD4+ T-cells from patients with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection reflects rapidly progressive immunosuppression and clinical disease. *Ann Int Med* 1990;113:438–43.
- 74 **Ho DD, Rota TR, Schooley RT, et al.** Isolation of HTLV-III from cerebrospinal fluid and neural tissues of patients with neurologic syndromes related to the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 1985;313:1493–7.
- 75 **Nyberg M, Suni J, Haltia M.** Isolation of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) at autopsy one to six days postmortem. *Am J Clin Pathol* 1990;94:422–5.
- 76 **Bankowski MJ, Landay AL, Staes B, et al.** Postmortem recovery of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 from plasma and mononuclear cells. Implications for occupational exposure. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1992;116:1124–7.
- 77 **Spire B, Barré-Sinoussi F, Montagnier L, et al.** Inactivation of lymphadenopathy associated virus by chemical disinfectants. *Lancet* 1984;1:899–901.
- 78 **Collins M, Heptonstall J.** Occupational acquisition of acute hepatitis B infection by health care workers: England and Wales, 1985–93. *Communicable Disease Report Review* 1994;4:R153–5.
- 79 **Shapiro CN.** Occupational risk of infection with hepatitis B and hepatitis C virus. *Surg Clin North Am* 1992;75:1047–56.
- 80 **PHLS Hepatitis Subcommittee.** Hepatitis C virus: guidance on the risks and current management of occupational exposure. *Communicable Disease Report Review* 1993;3:R135–9.
- 81 **Brumback RA.** Routine use of phenolized formalin in fixation of autopsy brain tissue to reduce risk of inadvertent transmission of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease. *N Engl J Med* 1988;319:654.
- 82 **Brown P, Gibbs Jr, CJ, Gajdusek DC, et al.** Transmission of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease from formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded human tissue. *N Engl J Med* 1986;315:1614–15.
- 83 **Miller DC.** Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease in histopathology technicians. *N Engl J Med* 1988;318:853–4.
- 84 **Hawkey PM, Pedler SJ, Southall PJ.** *Streptococcus pyogenes*: a forgotten occupational hazard in the mortuary. *BMJ* 1980;281:1058.

- 85 **The Royal College of Pathologists.** *Guidelines on autopsy practice.* Report of a working group of The Royal College of Pathologists. London: The Royal College of Pathologists, 2002.
- 86 **Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs,** American Medical Association. Confidentiality of human immunodeficiency virus status on autopsy reports. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1992;**116**:1120–3.
- 87 **Bull AD,** Channer J, Cross SS, *et al.* Should eye protection be worn when performing necropsies? *J Clin Pathol* 1991;**44**:782.
- 88 **Weston J,** Locker G. Frequency of glove puncture in the post mortem room. *J Clin Pathol* 1992;**45**:177–8.
- 89 **O'Briain DS.** Patterns of occupational hand injury in pathology. The interaction of blades, needles, and the dissector's digits. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1991;**115**:610–13.
- 90 **Lucas S.** Glove puncture in the post mortem room [letter]. *J Clin Pathol* 1992;**45**:548.
- 91 **Dunn PJ.** Glove puncture in the post mortem room [letter]. *J Clin Pathol* 1992;**45**:548.
- 92 **Gerberding JL,** Quebbeman EJ, Rhodes RS. Hand protection. *Surg Clin North Am* 1992;**75**:1133–9.
- 93 **Nicolai P,** Aldam CH, Allen PW. Increased awareness of glove perforation in major joint replacement. A prospective, randomised study of Regent Biogel Reveal gloves. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1997;**79**:371–3.
- 94 **Bickel JT,** Diaz-Arias AA. Metal mesh gloves for autopsy use. *J Forensic Sci* 1990;**35**:12–13.
- 95 **Zugibe FT,** Costello J. Protective gloves for high-risk autopsies. *Am J Forensic Med Pathol* 1995;**16**:182.
- 96 **Sale GE.** Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome and the pathologist [letter]. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1991;**115**:741.
- 97 **Dooley SW,** Castro KG, Hutton MD, *et al.* Guidelines for preventing the transmission of tuberculosis in health-care settings, with special focus on HIV-related issues. *MMWR Recomm Rep* 1990;**39**:1–29.
- 98 **Newsom SWB,** Rowlands C, Matthews J, *et al.* Aerosols in the mortuary. *J Clin Pathol* 1983;**36**:127–32.
- 99 **Al-Wali A,** Kibbler CC, McLaughlin JE. Bacteriological evaluation of a down-draught necropsy table ventilation system. *J Clin Pathol* 1993;**46**:746–9.
- 100 **Towfighi J,** Roberts AF, Foster NE, *et al.* A protective device for performing cranial autopsies. *Hum Pathol* 1989;**20**:288–9.
- 101 **Health Services Advisory Committee.** *Safe working and the prevention of infection in the mortuary and post-mortem room.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1991.
- 102 **Maas AE.** AIDS autopsy precautions. *Pathologist* 1985;**39**:768–9.
- 103 **Walker JEC,** Ruddy GN, Rodgers B, *et al.* How should the chest wall be opened at necropsy? *J Clin Pathol* 2002;**55**:72–5.
- 104 **Toren K,** Jonsson P. Is skull sawing by autopsy assistants overlooked as a cause of vibration-induced white fingers? *Scand J Work Environ Health* 1996;**22**:227–9.
- 105 **Abraham JL,** Greenfield LJ. Hazard to pathologists and anatomists from vena-caval (Greenfield) filters. *Lancet* 1995;**346**:1100.
- 106 **Hutchins KD,** Williams AW, Natarajan GA. Neck needle foreign bodies. An added risk for autopsy pathologists. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2001;**125**:790–2.
- 107 **Nosher JL,** Siegel R. Percutaneous retrieval of nonvascular foreign bodies. *Radiology* 1993;**187**:649–51.
- 108 **Thorne LB,** Collins KA. Speedballing with needle embolisation: case study and review of the literature. *J Forensic Sci* 1998;**43**:1074–6.
- 109 **Walley VM,** Bourke ME, Green M, *et al.* Implantable cardioverter-defibrillators and the pathologist: comment and cautionary notes. *J Forensic Sci* 1998;**43**:969–73.
- 110 **Prahlow JA,** Guileyardo JM, Barnard JJ. The implantable cardioverter-defibrillator. A potential hazard for autopsy pathologists. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1997;**121**:1076–9.
- 111 **Knight B.** Explosive bullets: a new hazard for doctors. *BMJ* 1982;**284**:768–9.
- 112 **Eckert WG.** Exploding bullets. A hazard to the victim, physician, and investigator. *Am J Forensic Med Pathol* 1981;**2**:103–4.
- 113 **McCormick GM,** II, Young DB, Stewart JC. Wounding effects of the Winchester Black Talon bullet. *Am J Forensic Med Pathol* 1996;**17**:124–9.
- 114 **Andrews JM,** Sweeney ES, Grey TC, *et al.* The biohazard potential of cyanide poisoning during postmortem examination. *J Forensic Sci* 1989;**34**:1280–4.
- 115 **Nolte KB,** Dasgupta A. Prevention of occupational cyanide exposure in autopsy prosectors. *J Forensic Sci* 1996;**41**:146–7.
- 116 **Forrest ARW,** Galloway JH, Slater DN. The cyanide poisoning necropsy: an appraisal of risk factors. *J Clin Pathol* 1992;**45**:544–5.
- 117 **Fernando GCA.** Risk of inhalation of cyanide during necropsy. *J Clin Pathol* 1992;**45**:942.
- 118 **Geller RJ,** Singleton KL, Tarantino ML, *et al.* Nosocomial poisoning associated with emergency department treatment of organophosphate toxicity—Georgia, 2000. *MMWR* 2002;**49**:1156–76.
- 119 **Schraml FV,** Parr LF, Ghurani S, *et al.* Autopsy of a cadaver containing Strontium-89-chloride. *J Nucl Med* 1997;**38**:380–2.
- 120 **Nelson IC,** Thomas Jr, VW, Kathren RL. Plutonium in South-Central Washington State autopsy tissue samples—1970–1975. *Health Phys* 1993;**65**:422–8.



Want to know more?

Data supplements

Limited space in printed journals means that interesting data and other material are often edited out of articles; however, limitless cyberspace means that we can include this information online.

Look out for additional tables, references, illustrations.

www.jclinpath.com



Health and safety at necropsy

J L Burton

J Clin Pathol 2003 56: 254-260

doi: 10.1136/jcp.56.4.254

Updated information and services can be found at:

<http://jcp.bmj.com/content/56/4/254.full.html>

These include:

References

This article cites 87 articles, 20 of which can be accessed free at:

<http://jcp.bmj.com/content/56/4/254.full.html#ref-list-1>

Article cited in:

<http://jcp.bmj.com/content/56/4/254.full.html#related-urls>

Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

Notes

To request permissions go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions>

To order reprints go to:

<http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform>

To subscribe to BMJ go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/>