sound trials that would obtain conclusive evidence, the following steps need to be carried out:

1. Double-blind trials should be conducted against a treated arm with a standard pyrimethamine-sulfonamids scheme for 1 year.
2. In the setting of our new knowledge about the geographical restriction of genotypes of toxoplasma, these trials should be carried out in sites with a homogenous distribution of these genotypes.
3. A concerted work plan should be established between the groups of researchers in toxoplasmosis to decide which is the best new drug to be tested in this trial based on the *in vitro* and *in vivo* data.

Researchers in South America would like to carry out clinical trials, but we are sure that our institutional review boards would never accept an untreated arm. The results would be useful to Europe if we were able to identify new combinations of drugs that are more efficacious and with relevant effect even in mild clinical forms of the disease.

J E Gomez-Marín, A delaTorre

Centro de Investigaciones Biomedicas, Universidad del Quindío, Quindío, Colombia

Correspondence to: J E Gomez-Marín, Centro de Investigaciones Biomedicas, Universidad del Quindío, Quindío, Colombia; gepamol2@uniquindio.edu.co

Competing interests: None declared.

References

1. Gilbert R, Dezateux C. Newborn screening for congenital toxoplasmosis: feasible, but benefits are not established. *Arch Dis Child* 2006;**91**:629–31.
2. Gallego-Marín C, Henao AC, Gómez-Marín JE. Clinical validation of a western blot assay for congenital toxoplasmosis and newborn screening in a hospital in Armenia (Quindío), Colombia. *J Trop Pediatr* 2006;**52**:107–12.
3. Schmidt DR, Hogh B, Andersen O, *et al*. The national neonatal screening programme for congenital toxoplasmosis in Denmark: results from the initial four years, 1999–2002. *Arch Dis Child* 2006;**91**:661–5.
4. Gomez-Marín JE. Evaluación del tratamiento de la toxoplasmosis gestacional en una cohorte colombiana. *Infectio* 2005;**9**:16–23.
5. Wallon M, Kodjikian L, Binquet C, *et al*. Long term ocular prognosis in 327 children with congenital toxoplasmosis. *Pediatrics* 2004;**113**:1567–72.
6. McLeod R, Boyer K, Karrison T, *et al*. Toxoplasmosis Study Group. Outcome of treatment for congenital toxoplasmosis, 1981–2004: the National Collaborative Chicago-Based, Congenital Toxoplasmosis Study. *Clin Infect Dis* 2006;**42**:1383–94.

Was “variations of reproductive development” considered?

The new intersex terminology scheme, based on disorders of sex development (DSD) and discussed in the consensus statement by Hughes *et al*,¹ seems to offer the following benefits:

1. It covers a wide range of intersex conditions without using the archaic and stigmatising hermaphrodite and male/female pseudo-hermaphrodite terms.
2. It should end the problem of usage of the term “intersex” by some clinicians to mean ambiguous genitalia (and being extrapolated by the media to mean sex identity problems in

all cases) when it in fact includes conditions such as complete androgen insensitivity syndrome and Swyer syndrome, with a totally female phenotype.

3. It should abolish the assumption, on the part of the uninformed, that all affected people are “between the two sexes”.

4. It should reduce the problem of people using nouns to label patients. (“She’s a male pseudo-hermaphrodite” or “She’s a genetic male”, as if her whole being/identity is governed by this).

5. It allows the inclusion of non-intersex XX–female conditions like Mayer-Rokitansky-Kuster-Hauser syndrome, which share some common features (such as absence of uterus/vagina) with XY–female intersex conditions

6. It provides a terminology which might be acceptable to clinicians and funding bodies, and which has fewer political/activism associations in the eyes of parents.

7. It possibly differentiates intersex from trans-sexuality more clearly (but there is no doubt that the trans community will try to annex the DSD term).

The downside could be:

1. The choice of the term “disorder” is bad news. One might say, in its defence, that DSD is merely an umbrella term, and that the name of an individual diagnosis would be used wherever possible, but DSD’s position at the top of the naming hierarchy makes it hard to ignore this term.

2. Some adults like the more sociopolitical, whole-person terms, and may ask why people who have been advocating a non-medicalising “proud to be intersex” philosophy over the past 10–15 years now seem to be advocating terms based on pathology.

3. Reduction to a three-letter acronym is possibly unfortunate as it allows the use of DSD as a cover-up term (to avoid having to say the word “disorder” or “sex”?)

4. There was a lack of wide consultation on the new scheme among international peer support groups.

On 8 August 2006, one of our UK members had her story published in the *Independent* newspaper, an account in which she uses the term intersex. When asked whether she knew that the term was likely to change to DSD (in clinical circles at least), she replied, “Disorders of... is horrible. Just adds to the sense that we are wrong. I like intersex.”

So the overall structure of the scheme seems to be a considerable advance on what has hitherto been available, although certain terms used in it seem to be retrograde in nature. Like Milton Diamond and Hazel Beh,² my first reaction was why not use “variations of sex development”, but then I learnt that “variations of sex development” is already in use for ventriculoseptal defect. Was “variations of reproductive development” considered, especially as many people might take issue with the notion that their sex is disordered, whereas they might accept that they have a variation in some aspects of their reproductive tract?

Another important issue discussed in Chicago is improved patient care. We have worked since the mid-1990s with selected clinicians from UK to promote a patient-centred, multi-disciplinary approach to intersex patient care of the sort recommended in the consensus statement. The first meeting to which we were invited to discuss this with clinicians in the University College London Hospital National Health Service Trust was

held on 6 August 1997, and the multi-disciplinary clinic there has been running successfully for several years now, with a high proportion of our members attending. So the recommended paradigm is already up and running in the UK.

M Simmonds

Correspondence to: M Simmonds, Androgen Insensitivity Syndrome Support Group, UK; www.medhelp.org/www/aia

doi: 10.1136/adc.2006.107797

Competing interests: None declared.

References

1. Hughes IA, Houk C, Ahmed SF, *et al*. Consensus statement on management of intersex disorders. *Arch Dis Child* 2006;**91**:554–63.
2. Diamond M, Beh H G. Variations of sex development instead of disorders of sex development. *Arch Dis Child*, 2006 Electronic Letter, 27 July, 2006.

Exposure to latex in schools

Latex allergy poses considerable life-long risks to those affected. Latex allergy typically occurs in, but is not restricted to, those with frequent exposure to latex and with allergy cross-reactive foods (bananas, chestnuts, kiwis and avocados).¹ Recurrent exposure is often occupational—seen in healthcare workers and rubber industry workers—and is also seen in certain patient groups such as patients with spina bifida and patients who have undergone multiple surgical procedures.² Atopic individuals exposed to latex are at an increased risk of developing latex allergy compared with the general population.³ Exposure to powdered latex gloves seems to be a particularly important factor in sensitising susceptible individuals,³ and the powder in the gloves is detectable in the environment for several months after glove use ceases.

A 12-year-old atopic boy with a history of latex allergy developed more frequent reactions after beginning secondary school. This prompted us to survey all secondary schools in the Fingal area of North Dublin in relation to latex exposure, and in particular, glove use.

Of the 28 schools, 12 (43%) responded. Of these, 9 (75%) were using latex gloves, including 6 (50%) using powdered latex gloves. No other source of latex exposure was identified by the schools. None of the schools had undertaken a risk assessment in relation to glove usage. Reasons cited for the choice of gloves were: (1) they were the only gloves made available by the employer; (2) they were the only gloves available in the suppliers’ catalogue; and (3) comfort. The activities requiring glove use were science (biology and chemistry, home-economics, agricultural science, green school duties), waste recycling and first aid.

The main benefit of latex gloves over non-latex alternatives is improved protection against blood-borne infections.² Although this is clearly desirable to protect those undertaking first aid duties, it is not required for routine school practicals.

The unnecessary, routine use of latex gloves should be identified and discouraged through appropriate risk assessment.² Despite the relatively low response rate in our survey, even if all non-responding schools were not using latex gloves, a minimum of 21% of schools