

TESTIMONY RE: HB5347
AN ACT PROHIBITING THE USE OF LATEX GLOVES IN FOOD BUSINESSES
General Law Committee.

Chairmen: Senator Carlo Leone and Representative David Baram.
The Ranking Members: Senator Kevin Witkos and Representative Dan Carter.

Connecticut House of Representatives
January 27, 2105

Good afternoon. My name is Mary Catherine Gennaro and I am a board certified Family physician from Plymouth, NH. I am here to speak on behalf of the proposed legislation HB-5347 to ban the use of latex gloves and utensils from food service.

Traditionally latex has been thought of as a glove, a ball, or a thing, not an organic substance. This is incorrect. Natural Rubber Latex is a plant based protein(s) that runs as sap from the Hevea Brasiliensis tree. It is similar to sap that runs through maple trees. It is as much a product of a plant like a tomato or a peanut is, and can be as dangerous. However, unlike peanut or other plants, natural rubber latex is found in over 40,000 common products.

The allergy manifests in many ways from rash to full blown anaphylactic shock which can lead to death. My own allergy started as a rash on my hands and progressed to internal and external swelling with severe abdominal pain, severe diarrhea, racing heart, flushing and shortness of breath. Every time I accidentally ingest latex through latex contaminated food I develop anaphylactic symptoms, although I have not yet experienced shock. This has been a progressive disease for me as it is for many. This allergy is insidious. It comes on slowly and we often have no idea we have the problem. There is no cure only avoidance.

Latex allergy is a worldwide health issue. Approximately 4% of all allergy sufferers have a latex allergy as their primary allergen. According to a study done in Spain latex allergy sufferers are the fourth largest group of allergy patients-international. Seventeen percent of healthcare workers and over sixty percent of children with spina bifida are affected. Recent data indicates approximately 11% of our elderly population are allergic.(Grieco et al.Journal of Immunity and aging 2014,11:7 Latex sensitization in elderly: Allergological study and diagnostic protocol) Also at risk are anyone with multiple surgeries and "food service workers, hairdressers, routine housekeeping, maintenance" (NIOSH-web site). There is evidence food service employees have the same risk as health care workers (Journal of Food Protection, Vol 71, No. 11, 2008 Page 2336, Latex Glove Use by Food Handlers: The Case for Non-latex Gloves.)

Donald H. Beezhold, et.al. did an experiment that showed the protein from the latex glove transferred (contaminated)to the food 100% of the time regardless of manufacturer. There was no transfer of protein from the vinyl. (Journal of Allergy

and Asthma: Latex Protein: A Hidden "Food" Allergen? P. 304)

The latex protein leaches onto food every time someone wearing latex gloves or latex utensils touches the food. As we ingest the latex-contaminated food, the human host is inoculated with the latex protein through mucosal membranes: mouth, esophagus, and stomach. This puts all people at risk to have an allergic reaction. This could explain why some adults and children – like my son- are developing the allergy in spite of no known risk factors.

This is 100% cross contamination with a known potential deadly allergen. It is like spreading a thin film of peanut butter on the food of peanut allergy sufferers and not telling them. With one big difference, we cannot smell it, see it, or taste it. But it is there, unknown to us, and it is deadly and it will affect us every time.

Gloves are supposed to protect consumer from any bacteria should the employee not wash their hands appropriately. Latex has been shown to fail in protection anywhere from 1-58% of the time. (See article in Skin and Allergy News , December 2001 volume 32, number 12 page 1). According to several studies (see Washington Post Article) employees are less likely to wash their hands if wearing gloves. One study done in the UK in 2010 found an increase in coliform bacteria in food, 2 fold, compared to food prepared without gloves.

The reality: latex gloves do not protect from cross contamination of anything. You must change your gloves after each thing you do. This is simply not done. And in fact, as cited earlier latex gloves cross-contaminate 100% of the time with their own toxic protein.

The CDC states the only way to prevent and treat this allergy is avoidance and only people handling infectious diseases should be using latex gloves. They recommend that food service workers should not be using latex gloves. (See #1 in NIOSH suggestions for preventing Latex allergy in the work place handout Also, on the CDC web site under Saving Lives protecting the people latex allergy)

This is 100% preventable. Rhode Island, Arizona and Oregon have banned it. Several years ago I sent a letter to Alex Ray, owner of the largest chain of Restaurants in New Hampshire (The Common Man chain), discussing the ramifications of latex glove use on the consumer as well as the employer. It is a Worker's Compensation issue. After he researched it thoroughly, he removed it from all of his restaurants. He now advertises that he takes his patrons "safety seriously" and only uses non- latex gloves. (See menu from Common Man- Italian Farmhouse). He transitioned his restaurants slowly, which caused no disruption to his business.

Please help us keep our people safe by protecting them from the use of latex in food service. No one knows when the allergy will develop nor do they know the severity of their first reaction or subsequent reactions. As we know this is 100%

preventable, the CDC, in particular NIOSH (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health) recommends not using the latex product in food service. Even the glove industry knows this is a problem as they all make non-latex gloves. Nobody will suffer banning latex use in the food industry; however, latex-allergic people will benefit and at risk patrons and restaurant workers may be prevented from developing this allergy and becoming like me. Any risk of transmitting this known, potentially toxic protein, and causing harm is too high.

Thank you for your time.

Food Sanitation Rules Effective Date: September 4, 2012

Table of Contents

OAR 333-150 OAR 333-157 OAR 333-158 OAR 333-160 OAR 333-162

Annex

Form 1 Form 2

Food Sanitation Rule 1 Inspection and Licensing Procedures 89 Combination Food Service Facilities 94
Destruction of Food Unfit for Human Consumption 95 Mobile Units, Commissaries and Warehouses 96

Applicant and Food Employee Interview 101 Food Employee Reporting Agreement 102

Inspectional Guides

Food Code Inspectional Guide 103 Index 108

The official copy of an Oregon Administrative Rule is contained in the Administrative Order filed at the Archives Division, 800 Summer St. NE, Salem, Oregon 97310. Any discrepancies with the published version are satisfied in favor of the Administrative Order. The Oregon Administrative Rules and the Oregon Bulletin are copyrighted by the Oregon Secretary of State, Terms and Conditions of Use.

3-304.15 Gloves, Use Limitation.

(A) If used, single-use gloves shall be used for only one task such as working with ready-to-eat food or with raw animal food, used for no other purpose, and discarded when damaged or soiled, or when rips occur in the operation. (B) Except as specified in ¶ (C) of this section, slash-resistant gloves that are used to protect the hands during operations requiring cutting shall be used in direct contact only with food that is subsequently cooked as specified under Part 3-4 such as frozen food or a primal cut of meat.

(C) Slash-resistant gloves may be used with ready-to-eat food that will not be subsequently cooked if the slash-resistant gloves have a smooth, durable, and nonabsorbent outer surface; or if the slash-resistant gloves are covered with a smooth, durable, nonabsorbent glove, or a single-use glove.

(D) Cloth gloves may not be used in direct contact with food unless the food is subsequently cooked as required under Part 3-4 such as frozen food or a primal cut of meat.

(E) The use of latex gloves in food service establishments is prohibited.

(Chapter 3 page 30 of the Sanitation Rules)

General Interest

Latex Glove Use by Food Handlers: The Case for Nonlatex Gloves

ROHAN AMERATUNGA,^{1*} SHANTHI AMERATUNGA,² CHRISTINE CROOKS,¹ AND GREG SIMMONS³

¹LabPlus, P.O. Box 110031, Auckland City Hospital, Park Road, Grafton, Auckland 1148, New Zealand; ²School of Population Health, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand; and ³Auckland Regional Public Health Service, Cornwall Complex, Floor 2, Building 15, Greenlane Clinical Centre, Private Bag 92605, Symonds Street Auckland 1150, New Zealand

MS 08-184; Received 15 April 2008/Accepted 24 June 2008

ABSTRACT

There is increasing concern that continued exposure to latex products can predispose individuals, particularly those who are atopic (allergy prone), to latex allergy. Latex allergy as a serious hazard has been well documented in the health care industry. There are also well-documented cases of food handlers who have had allergic reactions after the use of latex gloves. The contamination of food with latex proteins by food handlers using latex gloves can also result in potentially severe allergic reactions in latex-allergic consumers. We review latex allergy and present the case for avoiding latex glove use by food handlers in the food and hospitality industries. Adopting the use of nonlatex gloves has benefits for workers, consumers, and the food industry.

Latex allergy is recognized as a serious problem among health care workers and patients. Some studies have reported that up to 25% of atopic (allergy prone) health care workers became sensitized to latex during the course of their work (32, 35). Similarly, children with spina bifida are reported to become allergic to latex because of early exposure to latex and multiple surgical procedures (2). In one such study, 32 (40%) of 80 children with spina bifida had levels of immunoglobulin E to latex of more than 0.7 kU/liter (2).

Other occupational groups experiencing an increased risk of sensitization with exposure to latex include janitors, construction workers, those in the sex industry, and food workers (11, 48). However, in contrast to the health care industry, latex allergy in other occupational groups has not been systematically studied. Here we review latex allergy and present the rationale for advocating synthetic gloves in the food industry.

LATEX PRODUCTION: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The rubber tree, *Hevea brasiliensis*, may have been discovered by early Mayan Indians. It was found again in Brazil in the 19th century. From there it was exported to the Kew Gardens in London in the 1880s, and then to Sri Lanka, Singapore, and Malaysia. Although the tree was not native to Asia, it thrived, and large tracts of rain forest were cleared for rubber plantations in the first half of the twentieth century.

Charles Goodyear, Nathaniel Hayward, and Thomas

Hancock are credited with the discovery of vulcanization (34); when the sap from the tree is heated, it becomes less sticky and develops the elastic properties that we associate with rubber.

Rubber manufacture is a complex process. The sap from the tree is first collected by cutting the bark, a task undertaken by workers known as rubber tappers. Ammonia is placed at the bottom of the collecting vessels to prevent coagulation. The resulting liquid latex is subsequently processed with the addition of multiple chemicals and heating. This allows cross-linking of the *cis*-1,4-polyisoprene rubber polymer, which is what gives the latex the characteristic elastic and tensile properties. Because of this complex process, latex products contain a large number of added chemicals as well as proteins from the rubber tree sap. Several of these proteins are the triggers for allergic reactions to latex (43).

THE ADVANTAGES OF LATEX

The use of gloves in surgery is a long-established practice to prevent infection of both the surgeon and patient with each other's pathogens. For surgeons, latex gloves have several advantages. The tensile properties allow freedom of movement. Latex gloves also have excellent tactile properties and are less prone to developing microtears compared with vinyl gloves with prolonged usage (26). Therefore, surgeons are less likely to be exposed to pathogens, particularly during longer operations.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SYNTHETIC ALTERNATIVES

The major impetus for the development of synthetic rubber was the Japanese invasion of Southeast Asia in

* Author for correspondence. Tel: +649-307-4949; Ext 6113; Fax: +649-307-2826; E-mail: rohana@adhb.govt.nz.

World War II. Rubber from these areas was no longer available to the rest of the world. As a result, many latex alternatives were developed to assist the war effort.

Synthetic alternatives to rubber gloves include neoprene and polymers such as polyvinylchloride. Nitrile gloves, which are increasingly used in some industries, appear to have tensile properties superior to those of vinyl gloves (42). One recent study assessing examination gloves found that nitrile gloves had fewer preexisting pinhole defects compared with latex gloves (36). In another comparison of puncture resistance and flexibility, nitrile gloves were found to be comparable to latex, although the latex gloves resealed more effectively after puncturing. These gloves were available at a reasonable cost and were considered a suitable alternative for those health workers who have sensitivities to latex proteins (37).

However, some alternatives to latex gloves have disadvantages. They are mostly petroleum based, and some brands are more expensive than latex gloves. Secondly, they may be less biodegradable, and incineration can produce toxic fumes (7). It is also important to note that some synthetic gloves may have latex, which is added to enhance the tensile properties of these products (17); the risk for latex sensitization by hybrid gloves needs further investigation.

THE RECENT HISTORY OF LATEX ALLERGY

After the HIV/AIDS epidemic in the early 1980s, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention issued guidelines for universal precautions to reduce the risk of transmission of the virus. As a result, there was a dramatic increase in latex glove usage (44).

By the mid 1980s, latex allergy was recognized as a major occupational hazard for health care workers and patients (20). As indicated above, up to 25% of atopic health care workers developed latex sensitization (35). Earlier studies identified increasing risk of latex allergy among susceptible children with spina bifida because of multiple operations and exposure to other latex products such as catheters (2). Recent data suggest that up to 10% of children with eczema are at risk of latex sensitization (23).

The explanation for the rapid increase in latex allergy is uncertain (34), but several possible explanations have been offered (6). Due to increased demand for latex gloves in the 1980s and 1990s, manufacture occurred in many poorly regulated latex factories (6). There is a suspicion that some of these manufacturers released large quantities of poor-quality latex gloves into the market because of the sudden commercial opportunity.

Second, there was a change in manufacturing location from areas where latex was used, to countries where latex was produced. Prior to relocation of these factories, liquid latex was transported in vats containing ammonia. This process took several months, and it may have enhanced hydrolysis of latex proteins (34). When there was a shift of manufacture to countries where latex was produced, the exposure time to ammonia was reduced.

Last, changes in latex processing and use of trees with high-latex yields may have contributed to the allergenicity

of latex products. These possibilities are not mutually exclusive, as there are no systematic studies of the allergens in different latex glove brands before 1987. Increased usage (34), in addition to increased awareness and diagnosis, is likely to have contributed to the apparent increased burden of latex allergy.

Adverse reactions to latex can take several forms (15, 46). Type I hypersensitivity reactions occur when patients generate immunoglobulin E antibodies to latex proteins. Some of those patients sensitized can develop life-threatening anaphylaxis on re-exposure to latex. These individuals can be identified by skin or radioallergosorbent testing and in some cases, by latex challenge in specialized settings.

People with latex allergy are also at increased risk of reacting to certain foods such as avocados and bananas (31). This is thought to be due to cross-reactivity between chitinase, a defense-related protein in fruits, and the Hev b6 protein in latex (44). The allergenic proteins are structurally very similar, even though they are not botanically related (8). Other common foods that have been implicated in cross-reactions with latex proteins resulting in allergic reactions are kiwifruit, chestnut, potato, tomato, and papaya (49). There are reports of many other foods, which also have the potential to cross-react with latex.

Other people can develop type IV contact sensitivity reactions to latex (19). It is thought that these individuals react to some of the chemicals such as thiurams and carbamates, which are added during the latex production process. These patients can be identified by patch testing.

People who wear latex gloves are also at risk of irritant dermatitis caused by poor or excessive hand washing or not drying their hands before and after glove usage. It is very important to distinguish these different reactions, as both the prognosis and implications for prevention vary (22).

POWDERED LATEX GLOVES

The addition of cornstarch is a major risk factor for latex sensitization and allergic reactions (30). Cornstarch is added to make the donning of gloves easier in some contexts, e.g., the health care industry. It is thought that cornstarch particles become airborne and carry latex proteins, which allows sensitization via the respiratory tract (3, 47).

Studies have shown that the use of powdered latex gloves is associated with much higher levels of airborne latex protein (4). The most convincing evidence for the allergenicity of powdered latex gloves comes from a large study in Germany, in which reduction in use of powdered latex gloves was associated with a concomitant reduction in the reported systemic reactions to latex (1).

LATEX IMMUNOTHERAPY

Continued sensitization to latex can be prevented through the avoidance of latex exposure. There has been interest in latex-specific immunotherapy (generally involving periodic exposure to latex allergen by subcutaneous injection), although results for efficacy and safety from clinical trials have been inconsistent (41). There is a risk of significant allergic reactions during these procedures. Re-

TABLE 1. *Advantages and disadvantages of latex gloves and alternative synthetic gloves*

NRL ^a gloves		Synthetic gloves	
Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages
Reduced risk of transmission of viruses (HIV)	Irritant dermatitis caused by poor hand washing practices	Reduced risk of transmission of viruses (HIV)	Irritant dermatitis caused by poor hand washing practices
High degree of puncture resistance	Susceptible individuals risk sensitization to latex proteins: after wearing latex gloves, after treatment by a health professional wearing latex gloves, by consuming food handled by a wearer of latex gloves	Susceptible individuals are not exposed to latex proteins	Less biodegradable than NRL gloves
Seal after puncturing		Similar cost to NRL gloves (nitrile gloves)	
Reasonable cost		Tensile properties similar to NRL	
Good tensile properties			

^a NRL, natural rubber latex.

cently an alternative to conventional immunotherapy has been investigated in Europe (13). The administration of latex allergen sublingually may offer reduced risk of adverse reactions; however, extensive clinical trials are still required to prove efficacy and safety (33). This form of immunotherapy is not approved in the United States (13).

HYPOALLERGENIC LATEX GLOVES

Latex proteins that trigger type I hypersensitivity reactions are not required for the tensile properties of latex gloves. Attempts are being made to degrade these proteins during the manufacture of latex products (38). The addition of alcalase may reduce latex proteins in gloves (16).

A 2-year study of the use of powder-free, low-natural rubber latex (NRL) allergen gloves identified improved satisfaction in healthcare workers, a large reduction (approximately 50%) in reportage of symptoms to NRL, and significant cost savings (25). This observation is supported by a systematic review suggesting the use of nonlatex gloves prevents sensitization in health care workers (28).

There is still considerable variation in latex glove quality (21, 24). In a survey of gloves used by health care workers for either examination or surgery in Singapore (24), examination gloves had higher NRL allergen content than surgical gloves had (24). These data highlight the problem with variable glove quality. A summary of the advantages of nonlatex gloves over latex gloves is presented in Table 1.

Assessment of allergenic material in gloves may be possible, and cutoff levels have been investigated (39). Large-scale, long-term studies may be needed to quantify risk of sensitization, based on NRL allergen levels in gloves. Levels of NRL allergenic proteins are currently not routinely stated for gloves. As all latex gloves are potentially allergenic, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Center for Devices and Radiological Services does not allow the use of the label "hypoallergenic gloves" on any latex products sold in the United States (14).

Because of the significant increase in the occurrence of latex allergy, several U.S. hospitals are actively pursuing a latex-free policy (9), even though latex may have some advantages over some varieties of synthetic gloves for surgeons.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS FOR THE FOOD INDUSTRY?

Glove use is common among food handlers to prevent pathogen contamination of food. With increased exposure, there are greater risks for both handlers and consumers of developing latex allergy. Several case reports of severe reactions to latex in chefs and other food handlers have been documented (27, 45). These workers, particularly those who are atopic, may be at increased risk of latex sensitization and allergy. One Spanish study suggested that latex allergy might be as common among food workers as health care workers (48).

In addition to the occupational safety and health risks for food workers using latex gloves, there is mounting concern that food consumers with latex allergy are at increased risk of allergic reactions. Food contamination with latex proteins from gloves can occur during processing or food service practices. One study demonstrated that cheese handled by a worker wearing latex gloves had significant levels of latex proteins (5). In a case study of a child who had an anaphylactic reaction after consuming a doughnut, latex proteins were identified as the trigger (8).

While establishing cause and effect in such instances is challenging, the role of latex as an avoidable food allergen justifies precautions similar to those being taken in the health care industry.

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration convened in a meeting in 2003 (12) to examine the evidence that latex allergens from food handlers' gloves could trigger allergic reactions in susceptible consumers. It was accepted that there was a risk, albeit slight, of such reactions. The panel called for further studies including double-blind threshold studies to determine the level of risk to consumers. We have not been able to identify any studies that have examined the threshold of transferred latex allergens that might cause allergic reactions in susceptible consumers.

POLICY RELATING TO GLOVE USE

The marginal advantages of latex gloves in the health care industry are not applicable to the food industry. In contrast to surgeons, the barrier and tensile properties of latex are less critical for food workers. Policies on the use

24. Koh, D., V. Ng, Y. H. Leow, and C. L. Goh. 2005. A study of natural rubber latex allergens in gloves used by healthcare workers in Singapore. *Br. J. Dermatol.* 153:954-959.
25. Korniewicz, D. M., N. Chookaew, M. El-Masri, K. Mudd, and M. E. Bollinger. 2005. Conversion to low-protein, powder-free surgical gloves: is it worth the cost? *AAOHN J.* 53:388-393.
26. Korniewicz, D. M., L. Garzon, J. Seltzer, and M. Feinleib. 2004. Failure rates in nonlatex surgical gloves. *Am. J. Infect. Control* 32: 268-273.
27. Laing, M. E., J. Barry, A. M. Buckley, and G. M. Murphy. 2006. Immediate and delayed hypersensitivity reactions to food and latex in a chef. *Contact Derm.* 55:193-194.
28. LaMontagne, A. D., S. Radi, D. S. Elder, M. J. Abramson, and M. Sim. 2006. Primary prevention of latex related sensitisation and occupational asthma: a systematic review. *Occup. Environ. Med.* 63: 359-364.
29. Lee, A., R. Nixon, and K. Frowen. 2001. Reduction of use of latex gloves in food handlers: an intervention study. *Contact Derm.* 44: 75-79.
30. Lundberg, M., K. Wrangsjö, and S. G. Johansson. 1997. Latex allergy from glove powder—an unintended risk with the switch from talc to cornstarch? *Allergy* 52:1222-1228.
31. Mikkola, J. H., H. Alenius, N. Kalkkinen, K. Turjanmaa, T. Palosuo, and T. Reunala. 1998. Hevein-like protein domains as a possible cause for allergen cross-reactivity between latex and banana. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 102:1005-1012.
32. Moreno, H. L., E. Avila, Y. Angulo, J. Portillo, L. Moreno, G. Reza, V. Hernandez, and M. Levario. 2005. Frequency in allergy to proteins of latex in health care workers. *Allergol. Immunopathol. (Madr.)* 33:210-213.
33. Nettis, E., M. C. Colanardi, A. L. Soccio, M. Marcandrea, L. Pinto, A. Ferrannini, A. Tursi, and A. Vacca. 2007. Double-blind, placebo-controlled study of sublingual immunotherapy in patients with latex-induced urticaria: a 12-month study. *Br. J. Dermatol.* 156:674-681.
34. Ownby, D. R. 2002. A history of latex allergy. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 110:27-32.
35. Ozkan, O., and F. Gokdogan. 2003. The prevalence of latex allergy among health care workers in Bolu (Turkey). *Dermatol. Nurs.* 15: 543-547, 554.
36. Patel, H. B., G. J. Fleming, and F. J. Burke. 2003. A preliminary report on the incidence of pre-existing pinhole defects in nitrile dental gloves. *Br. Dent. J.* 195:509-512; discussion, 505.
37. Patel, H. B., G. J. Fleming, and F. J. Burke. 2004. Puncture resistance and stiffness of nitrile and latex dental examination gloves. *Br. Dent. J.* 196:695-700; discussion, 685; quiz, 707.
38. Perrella, F. W., and A. A. Gaspari. 2002. Natural rubber latex protein reduction with an emphasis on enzyme treatment. *Methods* 27:77-86.
39. Reinikka-Railo, H., H. Kautiainen, H. Alenius, N. Kalkkinen, M. Kulomaa, T. Reunala, and K. Turjanmaa. 2007. Latex allergy: the sum quantity of four major allergens shows the allergenic potential of medical gloves. *Allergy* 62:781-786.
40. Rosenstock, L. 1997. Preventing allergic reactions to natural rubber latex in the workplace. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/latexalt.html>. Accessed 25 May 2008.
41. Sastre, J., M. Fernandez-Nieto, P. Rico, S. Martin, D. Barber, J. Cuesta, M. de las Heras, and S. Quirce. 2003. Specific immunotherapy with a standardized latex extract in allergic workers: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 111: 985-994.
42. Sawyer, J., and A. Bennett. 2006. Comparing the level of dexterity offered by latex and nitrile SafeSkin gloves. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* 50: 289-296.
43. Sussman, G. L., D. H. Beezhold, and V. P. Kurup. 2002. Allergens and natural rubber proteins. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 110:S33-39.
44. Sussman, G. L., D. H. Beezhold, and G. Liss. 2002. Latex allergy: historical perspective. *Methods* 27:3-9.
45. Tavidia, S., C. A. Morton, and A. Forsyth. 2002. Latex, potato and tomato allergy in restaurateur. *Contact Derm.* 47:109.
46. Taylor, J. S., and E. Erkek. 2004. Latex allergy: diagnosis and management. *Dermatol. Ther.* 17:289-301.
47. Tomazic, V. J., E. L. Shampaine, A. Lamanna, T. J. Withrow, N. F. Adkinson, Jr., and R. G. Hamilton. 1994. Cornstarch powder on latex products is an allergen carrier. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 93:751-758.
48. Valks, R., L. Conde-Salazar, and M. Cuevas. 2004. Allergic contact urticaria from natural rubber latex in healthcare and non-healthcare workers. *Contact Derm.* 50:222-224.
49. Yunginger, J. 2003. Natural rubber latex allergy. p. 1487-1495. In N. Adkinson, J. W. Yunginger, W. W. Busse, B. S. Bochner, F. E. R. Simons, and S. T. Hoigate (ed.), *Middleton's allergy: principles and practice*, vol. 2. Mosby, St. Louis.