Retraction

Editor’s note: In the March 2008 issue of MLO, a Special Report from R.J. Ozmon, MT(ASCP) SBB, contained what was purported to be a quotation attributed to Mr. Rick Betts, director of marketing for Abaxis. This quotation was incorrect. MLO apologizes to Mr. Betts and Abaxis for this error in Mr. Ozmon’s report. In an e-mail to Mr. Ozmon, Mr. Betts’ comments in their entirety read as follows:

Dear Mr. Ozmon,

My CEO, Clint Severson asked me to respond to your letter dated October 31, 2007.

Abaxis is disappointed to hear that a professional medical technical consultant such as yourself is so ill-informed on the reasons behind the FDA’s decision to grant CLIA waived status to our electrolyte analytes and as a result our Comprehensive Metabolic Panel. Many of the points you attempt to make in your letter are simply not true. The Piccolo technology does exactly what you have stated in your own words — “a procedure that employs methodologies that are as simple and accurate as to render the likelihood of erroneous results negligible; or pose no reasonable risk or harm to the patients if the test is performed incorrectly.” If a Piccolo test is performed incorrectly, no result will be given to the operator and therefore no harm can come to any patient as a result of an erroneous report. Also, you mention that the CLIA waiver “takes away all the oversight and control.” This too is not true. Each waived laboratory must follow “the manufacturer’s recommendations” and must run controls once a month and at every lot change. The waiver does remove the burdens that are keeping many doctors from performing a particular reagent disc, the results are automatically suppressed and not provided to the clinician. Our instrument provides consistent lab-accurate results at the point-of-care with a high degree of reliability and clinical certainty.

The bottom line is. Our technology is not what you say it is. While we applaud your conviction, we believe that you could use some additional training to understand all the facts of CLIA waived point-of-care chemistry technology prior to engaging in a crusade based on conjecture and personal opinion, rather than clinical and medical facts.

We wish you luck in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,
Rick Betts
Director of Marketing
Abaxis-Medical

Incorrect alphabits

I just got to read your December 2007 issue, and noticed in the Toxikon article by Jeffrey Hays [“Toxikon: an ancient word fits modern-day poisons,” page 10] that EMIT is listed as “electro-magnetic impedance translation.” Um, sorry, but it was “enzyme multiplied immunoassay technique” last time I looked!

Eileen Nickoloff, PhD
Alaska State Public Health Laboratory
Anchorage, AK

Editor’s note: After some research, we discovered that, indeed, Dr. Nickoloff is absolutely correct. Despite our best efforts to make completely certain that we have the appropriate definition of the “alphabits” we use, occasionally all of the many eyes that review and proofread copy miss the mark. Thanks so much for notifying us of this error, which has been changed on the existing materials on file for our archives and for reprints.