

Weekly

November 12, 2004 / Vol. 53 / No. 44

Great American Smokeout — November 18, 2004

In 2002, a total of 45.8 million U.S. adults (22.5%) were current smokers, a decrease from 24.1% in 1998, and an estimated 46 million adults were former smokers (1). For the first time, more adults had quit smoking than were still smoking (1). To assist in continuing this trend, the American Cancer Society (ACS) is sponsoring the 28th Great American Smokeout on November 18, 2004. Cigarette smokers are encouraged to quit smoking for at least 24 hours in the hope they might stop smoking.

The likelihood of permanently quitting smoking is increased when effective therapies are used, such as physician assistance, pharmacologic treatment, and behavioral counseling (2). In addition to individual methods, an environmental approach to reducing tobacco use involves increasing the excise tax for tobacco products, developing multicomponent mass media campaigns, fostering provider reminder systems, using telephone quitlines, reducing patient out-of-pocket costs for effective cessation therapies, and reducing exposure to secondhand smoke through smoking bans and restrictions (3). Additional information about the Great American Smokeout is available at http://www.cancer.org or by telephone, 800-227-2345.

References

- 1. CDC. Cigarette smoking among adults—United States, 2002. MMWR 2004;53:427–31.
- Fiore MC, Bailey WC, Cohen SJ, et al. Treating tobacco use and dependence: clinical practice guidelines. Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service; 2000. AHQR publication 00-0032.
- 3. CDC. Strategies for reducing exposure to environmental tobacco smoke, increasing tobacco-use cessation, and reducing initiation in communities and health-care systems: a report on recommendations of the Task Force on Community Preventive Services. MMWR 2000;49(No. RR-12):2–9.

State-Specific Prevalence of Current Cigarette Smoking Among Adults — United States, 2003

Cigarette smoking causes approximately 440,000 deaths annually in the United States (1). To assess the prevalence of current cigarette smoking among adults, CDC analyzed data from the 2003 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) survey. This report summarizes the results of that analysis, which indicated substantial variation in cigarette smoking prevalence in the 50 states, the District of Columbia (DC), Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands (USVI) (range: 10.0%–34.0%). To further reduce the prevalence of smoking, states/areas should implement comprehensive tobacco-control programs.

BRFSS is a state-based, random-digit–dialed, telephone survey of the U.S. civilian, noninstitutionalized population aged ≥18 years. In 2003, the median state/area response rate was 53.2% (range: 34.4%–80.5%). Estimates were weighted by age and sex distributions for each state's population, and 95% confidence intervals were calculated. BRFSS respondents were asked, "Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?" and "Do you now smoke cigarettes every day, some

INSIDE

- 1038 Indoor Air Quality in Hospitality Venues Before and After Implementation of a Clean Indoor Air Law — Western New York, 2003
- 1041 Vaccination Coverage Among Children Entering School United States, 2003–04 School Year
- 1044 Awareness of Family Health History as a Risk Factor for Disease — United States, 2004
- 1047 Preventive-Care Practices Among Adults with Diabetes Puerto Rico, 2000–2002
- 1050 West Nile Virus Activity United States, November 3–8, 2004
- 1051 Notices to Readers

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

The *MMWR* series of publications is published by the Coordinating Center for Health Information and Service (Proposed), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Atlanta, GA 30333.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. [Article Title]. MMWR 2004;53:[inclusive page numbers].

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Julie L. Gerberding, M.D., M.P.H. Director

Dixie E. Snider, M.D., M.P.H. (Acting) Chief of Science

Tanja Popovic, M.D., Ph.D. (Acting) Associate Director for Science

Coordinating Center for Health Information and Service (Proposed)

James S. Marks, M.D., M.P.H. (Acting) Director

> John W. Ward, M.D. Editor, MMWR Series

Suzanne M. Hewitt, M.P.A. Managing Editor, MMWR Series

Douglas W. Weatherwax (Acting) Lead Technical Writer/Editor

> Stephanie M. Malloy Jude C. Rutledge Teresa F. Rutledge *Writers/Editors*

Lynda G. Cupell Malbea A. LaPete *Visual Information Specialists*

Kim L. Bright, M.B.A. Quang M. Doan, M.B.A. Erica R. Shaver Information Technology Specialists

Notifiable Disease Morbidity and 122 Cities Mortality Data

Robert F. Fagan Deborah A. Adams Felicia J. Connor Lateka Dammond Rosaline Dhara Donna Edwards Patsy A. Hall Pearl C. Sharp days, or not at all?" Current smokers were defined as those who reported having smoked ≥ 100 cigarettes during their lifetimes and who currently smoke every day or some days.

In 2003, the median prevalence of current cigarette smoking among adults was 22.1% in the 50 states and DC (range: 12.0% [Utah]–30.8% [Kentucky]) (Table). Smoking prevalence was higher among men (median: 24.8%; range: 14.0%– 33.8%) than women (median: 20.3%; range: 9.9%–28.1%) in the 50 states and DC. Smoking prevalence for both men and women was highest in Kentucky (men: 33.8%; women: 28.1%) and lowest in Utah (men: 14.0%; women: 9.9%). In areas other than the 50 states and DC, the median prevalence of current cigarette smoking among adults was 13.6% (range: 10.0% [USVI]–34.0% [Guam]).

Reported by: J Bombard, MSPH, A Malarcher, PhD, M Schooley, MPH, A MacNeil, MPH, Office on Smoking and Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, CDC.

Editorial Note: Although the prevalence of current cigarette smoking among U.S. adults has declined, the rate of decline has not been rapid enough for the nation to achieve the 2010 national health objective of \leq 12% of adults smoking cigarettes (objective 27-1) (2,3). The median prevalence of adult smoking decreased 1 percentage point from 2002 to 2003, and the national objective for 2010 was achieved in Utah and the USVI. The high prevalence of current cigarette smoking in most of the remaining states/areas underscores the need for increased efforts to reduce tobacco use.

The findings in this report are subject to at least three limitations. First, the BRFSS survey does not sample persons in households without telephones, a population that might be more likely to smoke (4). Second, data for cigarette smoking are based on self-reports and are not validated with biochemical tests. However, self-reported data on current smoking status have high validity (4). Third, the median response rate was 53.2% (range: 34.4%-80.5%); lower response rates indicate a potential for response bias. However, BRFSS estimates for cigarette smoking are comparable with current smoking estimates from other surveys with higher response rates (5).

Comprehensive tobacco control is effective in preventing and reducing tobacco use (6). CDC recommends the following evidence-based interventions as strategies within comprehensive tobacco-control programs: clean indoor air laws, telephone support quitlines, media campaigns, increased excise taxes on tobacco products, insurance coverage for cessation counseling and pharmaceuticals, and health-care system changes that support cessation (7). Substantial variation exists across states in their use of these strategies. For example, in 2002, two states offered Medicaid coverage for all recommended medication and counseling treatments for tobacco dependence, whereas 11 states covered no tobacco-dependence

TABLE. Prevalence of current cigarette smoking among adults*, by state/area and sex — Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 50 states, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands, 2003

_		Men	<u> </u>	Vomen		Total
State/Area	%	(95% CI†)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Alahama	28 5	(+3.1)	22.4	(+2 0)	25.3	(+1.8)
Alaska	30.3	(±3.6)	21.9	(+3.0)	26.3	(+2.4)
Arizona	23.8	(±3.0)	18.2	(± 0.0)	21.0	(+2.4)
Arkansas	27.6	(+2.5)	22.3	(± 2.7)	24.8	(±±.+) (+1.5)
California	20.5	(+2.3)	13.2	(+1.5)	16.8	(+1.4)
Colorado	19.6	(± 2.0)	17.5	(+1.7)	18.5	(+1.4)
Connecticut	19.7	(± 1.9)	17.9	(± 1.7)	18.7	(+1.2)
Delaware	26.0	(± 1.0)	18.2	(± 1.0)	21.9	(+1.8)
District of Columbia	26.2	(+4.2)	19.0	(+2.9)	22.3	(+2.5)
Florida	26.0	(± 3.1)	22.1	(± 2.3)	23.9	(±1.9)
Georgia	25.8	(±2.3)	20.0	(±1.5)	22.8	(±1.4)
Hawaii	20.1	(±2.5)	14.4	(± 1.7)	17.3	(±1.5)
Idaho	19.5	(±2.1)	18.5	(±1.7)	19.0	(±1.3)
Illinois	28.3	(±2.8)	20.5	(±1.9)	24.3	(±1.7)
Indiana	28.6	(±2.2)	23.8	(±1.6)	26.1	(±1.3)
Iowa	22.8	(±2.2)	20.7	(±1.9)	21.7	(±1.5)
Kansas	21.0	(±2.3)	19.7	(±1.7)	20.4	(±1.4)
Kentucky	33.8	(±2.7)	28.1	(±1.9)	30.8	(±1.7)
Louisiana	30.3	(±2.5)	23.2	(±1.7)	26.6	(±1.5)
Maine	23.1	(±3.1)	24.0	(±2.5)	23.6	(±2.0)
Maryland	23.0	(±2.6)	17.7	(±1.8)	20.2	(±1.6)
Massachusetts	20.0	(±1.8)	18.4	(±1.4)	19.2	(±1.2)
Michigan	30.2	(±3.0)	22.3	(±2.1)	26.2	(±1.8)
Minnesota	22.4	(±2.4)	19.9	(±1.9)	21.1	(±1.5)
Mississippi	31.1	(±2.7)	20.7	(±1.7)	25.6	(±1.6)
Missouri	31.2	(±3.1)	23.8	(±2.5)	27.3	(±2.0)
Montana	19.5	(±2.5)	20.3	(±2.2)	19.9	(±1.7)
Nebraska	23.6	(±2.2)	19.0	(±1.6)	21.3	(±1.4)
Nevada	29.0	(±3.5)	21.3	(±2.9)	25.2	(±2.3)
New Hampshire	22.4	(±2.2)	20.2	(±1.8)	21.2	(±1.4)
New Jersey	21.2	(±1.5)	17.9	(±1.1)	19.5	(±0.9)
New Mexico	23.6	(±2.2)	20.5	(±1.7)	22.0	(±1.4)
New York	24.8	(±2.2)	18.8	(±1.6)	21.6	(±1.3)
North Carolina	28.0	(±2.4)	21.9	(±1.7)	24.8	(±1.5)
North Dakota	22.0	(±2.5)	19.0	(±2.2)	20.5	(±1.7)
Ohio	26.9	(±2.8)	24.0	(±2.2)	25.4	(±1.8)
Oklahoma	27.8	(±2.0)	22.7	(±1.4)	25.2	(±1.2)
Oregon	23.1	(±2.4)	18.9	(±1.8)	21.0	(±1.5)
Pennsylvania	27.1	(±2.7)	24.1	(±2.1)	25.5	(±1.7)
Rhode Island	23.8	(±2.7)	21.1	(±2.0)	22.4	(±1.6)
South Carolina	28.5	(±2.3)	22.8	(±1.6)	25.5	(±1.4)
South Dakota	24.7	(±2.3)	20.7	(±1.8)	22.7	(±1.4)
Tennessee	27.3	(±3.3)	24.2	(±2.4)	25.7	(±2.0)
Texas	26.7	(±2.2)	17.6	(±1.4)	22.1	(±1.3)
Utah	14.0	(±2.2)	9.9	(±1.6)	12.0	(±1.4)
Vermont	19.8	(±2.3)	19.4	(±1.9)	19.6	(±1.5)
Virginia	26.4	(±2.5)	18.0	(±1.6)	22.1	(±1.5)
Washington	20.9	(±1.2)	18.2	(±0.9)	19.5	(±0.7)
vvest Virginia	27.6	(±2.8)	27.2	(±2.3)	27.4	(±1.8)
VVISCONSIN	24.0	(±2.6)	20.3	(± 2.0)	22.1	(±1.6)
vvyoming	25.2	(±2.4)	24.1	(±2.0)	24.6	(±1.6)
wedian	24.8		20.3		22.1	
Guam	42.0	(±5.9)	25.8	(±4.6)	34.0	(±3.8)
Puerto Rico	19.3	(±2.6)	8.5	(±1.3)	13.6	(±1.5)
U.S. Virgin Islands	14.2	(±3.2)	6.6	(±1.6)	10.0	(±1.7)
Median	19.3		8.5		13.6	

* Persons aged ≥18 years who reported having smoked ≥100 cigarettes during their lifetimes and who currently smoke every day or some days. Confidence interval.

treatments (8). In addition, the average cost of a single pack of cigarettes (which includes state-based excise taxes) ranged from \$3.10 in Kentucky to \$5.54 in New York in 2003 (9). The majority of states offer telephone support quitlines, and residents of all states soon will have access to a nationwide network of quitlines. Finally, only six states (California, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, and New York) have comprehensive statewide bans in effect on smoking in indoor workplaces and public places.

The more funds that states spend on comprehensive tobaccocontrol programs, the greater the reduction in smoking (6). However, the amount of money that states spend for tobacco control decreased 28% during the preceding 2 years to \$541.1 million, which is less than 3% of the estimated \$19 billion states expected to receive from tobacco excise taxes and tobacco settlement money in 2003 (10). For fiscal year 2004 (i.e., July 1, 2003–June 31, 2004), only four states (Arkansas, Delaware, Maine, and Mississippi) were investing at least the minimum per capita amount that CDC recommends for tobacco-control programs (10). Efforts and resources must be expanded if more states are to reduce smoking prevalence to $\leq 12\%$ by 2010.

References

- CDC. Annual smoking-attributable mortality, years of potential life lost, and economic costs—United States 1995–1999. MMWR 2002;51:300–3.
- CDC. Cigarette smoking among adults—United States, 2002. MMWR 2004;53:427–31.
- US Department of Health and Human Services. Healthy people 2010 (conference ed, in 2 vols). Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services; 2000. Available at http://www.health.gov/ healthypeople.
- Nelson DE, Holtzman D, Bolen J, Stanwyck CA, Mack KA. Reliability and validity of measures from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). Social Prev Med 2001;46:S3–S42.
- 5. US Department of Health and Human Services. Women and smoking: a report of the Surgeon General. Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Office of the Surgeon General; 2001:24–25.
- Farrelly MC, Pechacek TP, Chaloupka FJ. The impact of tobacco control program expenditures on aggregate cigarette sales: 1981–2000. Health Econ 2003;22:843–59.
- Task Force on Community Preventive Services. Guide to community preventive services: tobacco use prevention and control. Am J Prev Med 2001;20(2 Suppl 1):1–87.
- CDC. State Medicaid coverage for tobacco-dependence treatments— United States, 1994–2002. MMWR 2004;53:54–7.
- 9. Orzechowski W, Walker RC. The tax burden on tobacco, volume 38. Arlington, VA: Orzechowski and Walker; 2003.
- Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, American Lung Association. A broken promise to our children: the 1998 state tobacco settlement five years later. Washington, DC: Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids; 2003. Available at http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/reports/settlements/2004/fullreport.pdf.

Indoor Air Quality in Hospitality Venues Before and After Implementation of a Clean Indoor Air Law — Western New York, 2003

Secondhand smoke (SHS) contains more than 50 carcinogens (1). SHS exposure is responsible for an estimated 3,000 lung cancer deaths and more than 35,000 coronary heart disease deaths among never smokers in the United States each year (2), and for lower respiratory infections, asthma, sudden infant death syndrome, and chronic ear infections among children (3). Even short-term exposures to SHS, such as those that might be experienced by a patron in a restaurant or bar that allows smoking, can increase the risk of experiencing an acute cardiovascular event (4). Although population-based data indicate declining SHS exposure in the United States over time (5), SHS exposure remains a common but preventable public health hazard. Policies requiring smoke-free environments are the most effective method of reducing SHS exposure (6). Effective July 24, 2003, New York implemented a comprehensive state law requiring almost all indoor workplaces and public places (e.g., restaurants, bars, and other hospitality venues) to be smoke-free. This report describes an assessment of changes in indoor air quality that occurred in 20 hospitality venues in western New York where smoking or indirect SHS exposure from an adjoining room was observed at baseline. The findings indicate that, on average, levels of respirable suspended particles (RSPs), an accepted marker for SHS levels, decreased 84% in these venues after the law took effect. Comprehensive clean indoor air policies can rapidly and effectively reduce SHS exposure in hospitality venues.

The specific class of RSP monitored was $PM_{2.5}$ (i.e., particulate matter that is <2.5 microns in diameter). Particles of this size are released in substantial amounts from burning cigarettes and are easily inhaled deep into the lungs. Baseline measurements were made during July 11–23 in a purposeful sample of 22 hospitality venues in three counties in western New York. Sites were selected to provide a range of venue types, sizes, and locations. The sample consisted of seven bars, six bar/ restaurants, five restaurants, two bowling alleys, a pool hall, and a bingo hall. The venues were located in popular downtown entertainment districts and suburban areas and ranged from small neighborhood bars to large bar/restaurant chains.

At baseline, smoking was occurring in 14 bars and restaurants and four large recreation venues. Two bar/restaurant combinations allowed smoking in the bar section but not in the adjoining restaurant section. In these two venues, air quality was monitored separately in the restaurant and bar areas. In two restaurants, no smoking was occurring at baseline because restaurants were already required to be smoke-free by local clean indoor air ordinances. Follow-up measurements of air quality were made in all 22 venues during September 9–November 1. The follow-up measurements were taken on the same day of the week and at approximately the same time of day as the measurements taken before the smoke-free law was implemented.

The median time spent in each venue for all 44 baseline and follow-up observations combined was 38 minutes (range: 22–140 minutes). Measurements were taken at 1-second intervals. The number of persons and the number of burning cigarettes in each venue were recorded every 10 minutes during sampling, and the average number of persons and the average number of burning cigarettes in each venue were calculated. The volume of each venue also was measured*, and the cigarette density was calculated by dividing the average number of burning cigarettes by the room volume.

An air monitor[†] was used to sample and record RSP levels. The monitor was placed in a central location on a table or bar near the height at which a person breathes air. The monitor recorded continuous measurements, which were averaged over time. The first and last minute of logged data were removed, and the remaining data points were averaged to provide an average concentration of $PM_{2.5}$ within the venue. The percentage change in $PM_{2.5}$ levels was then determined by comparing average $PM_{2.5}$ levels in each venue before the law went into effect with levels after the law was implemented. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to assess changes between pre-law and post-law $PM_{2.5}$ levels, stratified by type of venue.

The average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration was substantially lower after the law went into effect in every venue where smoking or indirect SHS exposure had been observed at baseline, with a grand mean reduction in $PM_{2.5}$ concentration of 84% (324 $\mu g/m^3$ to 25 $\mu g/m^3$; p<0.001) (Table). When stratified by the type of venue sampled, the average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration decreased 90% (412 $\mu g/m^3$ to 27 $\mu g/m^3$; p<0.001) in the 14 bars and restaurants in which smoking was occurring at baseline (including bar/restaurant J, which was the only venue where smoking was observed during the post-law sampling). The restaurant portions of the two bar/restaurants that allowed smoking in the bar section but not in the restaurant section experienced an average 58% decrease in $PM_{2.5}$

^{*}The Zircon DM S50 Sonic Measure[®] (Zircon Corporation, Campbell, California) was used to perform this measurement.

[†] The air monitor used was a TSI SidePak AM510 Personal Aerosol Monitor[®] (TSI, Inc., St. Paul, Minnesota). The SidePak uses a built-in sampling pump to draw air through the device, which then measures the real-time concentration in milligrams per cubic meter of PM_{2.5}. The SidePak was calibrated against a SHS-calibrated nephelometer, which had been previously calibrated and used in similar studies. The SidePak was zero-calibrated before each use according to the manufacturer's specifications.

up-to-the-minute: adj

1 : extending up to the immediate present, including the very latest information; see also *MMWR*.



know what matters.



		Cigare	tte density*	Average PM	Average PM _{2.5} [†] level (µg/m ³)			
Venue	Size (m ³)	Before July 24, 2003	After July 24, 2003	Before July 24, 2003	After July 24, 2003	% reduction in PM _{2.5}		
Bars and restaurants in which								
smoking was occurring								
Bar A	349	0.86	0	353	56	84.1		
Bar B	453	1.32	0	375	20	94.7		
Bar C	225	1.34	0	1,375	52	96.2		
Bar D	319	0.94	0	386	35	90.9		
Bar E	245	0.86	0	104	28	73.1		
Bar F	339	3.25	0	569	26	95.4		
Bar G	335	1.79	0	681	13	98.1		
Bar/Restaurant H	299	1.34	0	425	10	97.6		
Bar/Restaurant I	321	1.56	0	198	21	89.3		
Bar/Restaurant J	551	1.45	0.09	597	83	86.1		
Bar/Restaurant K	479	0.42	0	62	10	83.9		
Bar/Restaurant L	318	0.52	0	352	6	98.0		
Bar/Restaurant M	786	0.25	0	54	11	79.6		
Restaurant N	95	3.15	0	233	6	97.4		
Mean [§]	365	1.36	0.01	412	27	90.3		
Restaurant portions of								
bar/restaurant combinations								
with indirect secondhand								
smoke (SHS) exposure [¶]								
Restaurant O	438	0	0	273	34	87.5		
Restaurant P	381	0	0	38	27	28.9		
Mean [§]	410	0	0	156	31	58.2		
Other venues in which								
smoking was occurring								
Bowling alley Q	5,930	0.03	0	35	13	62.9		
Bowling alley R	2.916	0.17	0	87	26	70.1		
Pool hall S	1.570	0.26	0	176	6	96.6		
Bingo hall T	3.704	0.40	0	105	26	75.2		
Mean [§]	3.530	0.22	0	101	18	76.2		
Grand mean**	1,003	1.01	0.01	324	25	84.3		
Restaurants in which no smoking and no indirect SHS exposure was occurring								
Restaurant U	446	0	0	6	6	0.0		
Restaurant V	337	0	0	41	40	2.4		
Mean [§]	392	0	0	24	23	1.2		

TABLE. Change in concentrations of respirable suspended particles after the implementation of a clean indoor air law, by venue — western New York, 2003

* Average number of burning cigarettes per 100 m³.

[†] Particulate matter <2.5 microns in diameter.

§ Results represent the average of the values for the venues listed in each category.

[¶] Restaurant O is attached to Bar A with little physical separation between the two spaces; Restaurant P is attached to Bar B but with substantial physical separation between the two spaces.

** For all venues where any smoking or indirect SHS exposure was occurring at baseline (i.e., venues A-T).

concentrations (156 μ g/m³ to 31 μ g/m³; p<0.001) after the law was implemented, even though they had only indirect SHS exposure at baseline. In the four other large recreation venues, which had larger volumes and lower smoker densities, the average PM_{2.5} concentration decreased 76% (101 μ g/m³ to 18 μ g/m³). In contrast, the PM_{2.5} concentration remained low and virtually constant in the two restaurants that were already smoke-free at baseline; these venues were not included in the grand mean calculation. **Reported by:** *MJ Travers, KM Cummings, PhD, A Hyland, PhD, Dept of Health Behavior, Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Buffalo, New York. J Repace, MSc, Repace Associates, Bowie, Maryland. S Babb, MPH, T Pechacek, PhD, R Caraballo, PhD, Office on Smoking and Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, CDC.*

Editorial Note: The findings in this report indicate that a statewide law to eliminate smoking in enclosed workplaces and public places substantially reduced RSP levels in western New York hospitality venues. RSP levels were reduced in

every venue that permitted smoking before the law was implemented, including venues in which only SHS from an adjacent room was observed at baseline.

These findings are consistent with those of previous studies. In Delaware, a similar decline in RSP levels was observed in eight hospitality venues after smoking was prohibited there by state law (7). Previous studies also have assessed the health effects of smoke-free laws. One study indicated that respiratory health improved rapidly among a sample of bartenders after a state smoke-free workplace law was implemented in California (8), and another study reported a 40% reduction in acute myocardial infarction admissions to a regional hospital during the 6 months that a local smoke-free ordinance was in effect in Helena, Montana (9). The results of these studies (both those assessing changes in indoor air quality and those assessing changes in health) suggest that improvements can occur within months of policy implementation.

The findings in this report are subject to at least two limitations. First, the venues sampled were not necessarily representative of venues in western New York. However, they did provide a range of venue types, sizes, and locations. Second, SHS is not the only source of indoor particulate matter. However, although ambient particle concentrations and cooking are additional sources of indoor particle levels, secondhand smoke is the largest contributor to indoor RSP pollution (*3*).

Eliminating nonsmoker exposure to SHS is one of the four goals of comprehensive state tobacco-control programs, as set forth in CDC's Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs (10). The results of the study described in this report indicate that a comprehensive statewide ban on smoking in indoor workplaces and public places can substantially reduce SHS exposure in these settings. Six states (California, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, and New York) currently meet the national health objective for 2010 calling for implementation of such laws. These six states account for approximately 23% of the U.S. population. Rhode Island also has adopted such a law, but the law does not take full effect until 2006. To further reduce the nearly 40,000 deaths among never smokers caused by SHS exposure each year, similar comprehensive laws are needed in the other 43 states and the District of Columbia.

References

- National Toxicology Program. 9th report on carcinogens. Research Triangle Park, NC: US Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences; 2000.
- CDC. Annual smoking-attributable mortality, years of potential life lost, and economic costs—United States, 1995–1999. MMWR 2002;51:300–3.

- National Cancer Institute. Health effects of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke: the report of the California Environmental Protection Agency. Bethesda, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute; 1999.
- 4. Pechacek TF, Babb S. Commentary: how acute and reversible are the cardiovascular risks of secondhand smoke? BMJ 2004;328:980–3.
- CDC. Second national report on human exposure to environmental chemicals. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC; 2003.
- 6. CDC. Reducing tobacco use: a report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC; 2000.
- Repace J. Respirable particles and carcinogens in the air of Delaware hospitality venues before and after a smoking ban. J Occup Environ Med 2004;46:887–905.
- Eisner MD, Smith AK, Blanc PD. Bartenders' respiratory health after establishment of smoke-free bars and taverns. JAMA 1998;280:1909–14.
- 9. Sargent RP, Shepard RM, Glantz SA. Reduced incidence of admissions for myocardial infarction associated with public smoking ban: before and after study. BMJ 2004;328:977–80.
- CDC. Best practices for comprehensive tobacco control programs— August 1999. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC; 1999. Available at http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/ bestprac.htm.

Vaccination Coverage Among Children Entering School — United States, 2003–04 School Year

One of the national health objectives for 2010 is to sustain ≥95% vaccination coverage among children in kindergarten through first grade (objective 14-23) (1). To determine the percentage of vaccination coverage among children entering kindergarten, data on vaccination coverage were analyzed from reports submitted to the National Immunization Program by states, the District of Columbia (DC)*, and eight current or former U.S. territories for the 2003-04 school year. This report summarizes the results of that analysis, which determined that coverage for all vaccines except hepatitis B (HepB) and varicella was reported at >90% in 45 areas. However, the vaccines required in each reporting area and the methods for surveying kindergarten-aged children vary substantially; in seven states, <20% of eligible children were surveyed. The wide variations in survey populations underscore the need for CDC to continue working with immunization programs in states, DC, and current or former territories to improve survey methods and automate reporting of data.

For the 2003–04 school year, all states except one submitted reports of vaccination coverage levels for children entering kindergarten. Fifty reports included coverage for poliovirus vaccine, diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and pertussis vaccine, diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and acellular pertussis vaccine,

^{*} For this report, DC is included in state totals.

or diphtheria and tetanus toxoids (DTP/DTaP/DT), measles vaccine, and rubella vaccines; 49 reports included coverage for mumps vaccine (Table 1). Coverage for HepB vaccine was included in 43 reports, and coverage for varicella vaccine was included in 33 state reports. DC reported on all of the vaccination coverages. When determining coverage, up-to-date (UTD) status was used rather than number of doses because the doses required to be UTD vary depending on timing of vaccinations, area requirements regarding number of doses, and brand of vaccines.

The number of state reports based on 100% of children entering kindergarten increased from 18 in the 2002–03 school year to 22 in 2003–04 (2). In an additional 21 states, coverage was assessed in surveys of >80% of eligible children. In the remaining seven states, coverage was assessed in surveys of <20% of eligible children (range: 0.5%–18.5%). National estimates of coverage were calculated by weighting each state's coverage estimate by the size of the state's kindergarten enrollment.

Coverage for all vaccines except HepB and varicella was reported at 90%–95% in 16 (31.3%) states and at >95% in 29 (56.9%) states (Table 1). Nationally, coverage was reported at >95% for all vaccines except varicella, for which coverage was 93.3%.

Five (63%) of the eight current or former U.S. territories reported data for the 2003–04 school year. All five reports included coverage for poliovirus vaccine, DTP/DTaP/DT vaccine, and vaccines for measles, mumps, rubella, and HepB (Table 2). Two territories reported coverage for 1 dose of varicella vaccine. The percentage of children surveyed by the current or former U.S. territories ranged from 10.0% to 100.0%. Coverage for all vaccines except DTP/DTaP/DT vaccine was reported to be >86%.

Reported by: *B Lyons, MPH, C Stanwyck, PhD, Immunization Svcs Div; M McCauley, MTSC, National Immunization Program, CDC.*

Editorial Note: CDC has increased efforts to help states and current or former U.S. territories collect and report data on vaccination coverage among children entering school by providing a new online reporting system, available since the 2002–03 school year. Anecdotal reports from states indicate that the online reporting system, which automates data management and calculation tasks, has made it easier for states to report their coverage. CDC also has encouraged greater standardization of reporting; unlike previous reports, this report is based only on coverage among children entering kindergarten, rather than on a mix of those children and first graders.

e ncore.

Week after week, MMWR Online plays an important role in helping you stay informed. From the latest CDC guidance to breaking health news, count on MMWR Online to deliver the news you need, when you need it.

Log on to cdc.gov/mmwr and enjoy MMWR performance.

know what matters.



TABLE 1. Estimated vaccination coverage a	mong children enrolled in kindergarten	, by vaccine and state*-	Annual School
Surveillance, United States, 2003–04 school y	ear	· •	

State	% surveyed [†]	Polio (%)	DTP/DTaP/DT [§] (%)	Measles (%)	Mumps (%)	Rubella (%)	HepB [¶] (%)	Varicella (%)
Alabama	100.0	96.8	96.8	96.8	96.8	96.8	**	94.7
Alaska	91.1	96.4	95.5	95.1	95.1	95.1	95.1	_
Arizona	97.0	97.9	95.6	95.6	95.6	95.6	96.5	_
Arkansas	100.0	91.4	91.3	91.3	92.7	92.7	93.2	93.4
California	100.0	96.9	96.8	96.8	96.8	96.8	98.1	98.6
Colorado	99.0	84.0	84.0	84.0	84.0	84.0	84.0	84.0
Connecticut	100.0	99.0	99.0	99.2	99.2	99.2	85.5	85.6
Delaware	82.3	98.3	98.4	94.1	94.1	94.1	97.2	86.1
District of Columbia	100.0	95.3	94.2	90.7	90.7	90.8	93.8	95.3
Florida	100.0	94.4	94.4	94.4	94.4	94.4	94.4	94.4
Georgia	97.7	92.0	92.0	92.0	92.0	92.0	92.0	92.0
Hawaii	99.3	99.4	99.1	99.4	99.4	99.4	99.6	99.8
Idaho	100.0	96.9	95.7	97.2	97.2	97.2	96.3	_
Illinois	1.1	90.4	95.1	93.8	93.8	93.8	93.6	66.2
Indiana	100.0	97.5	97.1	97.1	97.1	99.5	98.5	
lowa	98.7	88.9	88.9	88.9	88.9	88.9	88.9	_
Kansas	8.8	97.5	96.6	96.3	96.3	96.3		_
Kentucky	93.1	96.3	96.3	95.6	95.6	95.6	95.8	84.5
Louisiana	100.0	97.1	95.3	99.6	99.6	99.6	91.6	90.4
Maine	98.1	93.3	95.1	93.8	93.8	93.8		93.1
Maryland	91.8	98.7	98.5	97.8	98.4	98.4	98 5	98.8
Massachusetts	98.8	94.6	94.0	94.8	94.8	94.8	98.1	98.2
Michigan	100.0	08.8	08.1	07.4	07./	07.4	08.2	02.1
Minnesota	100.0	97.0	96.0	08.0	98.0	08.0	97.0	52.1
Miesiesinni	100.0	97.0	00.8	00.8	90.0	00.8	97.0	00.8
Missouri	08.1	99.0	99.0	99.0	99.0	07.4	99.0	33.0
Montana	90.1	97.5	90.9	97.0	97.5	97.4	97.7	—
Nebraska	100.0	96.0	90.0	00.5	95.9	95.9	07.8	
Nevada	100.0	50.4	30.0	33.3		55.5	57.0	
Nevaua New Hampshire	80.8	80.0	80.1	87.5	85.0	85.0	80.0	86.6
New lorgov	100.0	05.0	05.7	07.5	05.5	05.5	05.0	00.0
New Moxico	100.0	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	01.0
New York	100.0	91.5	91.1	91.3	91.5	91.5	92.2	91.9
New IOIK	01.2	90.5	90.3	90.0	90.4	90.4	90.1	90.9
North Dakata	91.2	99.7 07.5	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	—
Obio	100.0	97.5	97.1	94.0	94.0	94.0	97.0	—
Ohlohomo	00.0	94.0	94.1	97.2	97.2	97.2	90.3	07.4
Oragon	90.1	95.Z	94.0	93.0	93.0	93.0	97.9	97.4
Dependiconio	100.0	90.0	96.0	90.2	97.3	97.3	94.0	90.0
Pennsylvania Rhodo Jolond	94.0	00.0	00.U	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0
South Coroling	11.5	95.9	95.5	95.3	95.3	95.3	96.0	97.0
South Delete	100.0	99.1	99.2	90.2	90.2	90.2	90.9	90.0
South Dakota	100.0	96.1	96.1	94.7	94.7	94.7		94.0
Tevros	96.3	90.0	90.0	90.0 05.5	90.0	90.0	90.0	90.0
lexas	0.0	95.4	95.7	95.5	96.6	90.0	97.2	95.9
Vormont	99.4	98.5	97.9	90.4	98.5	98.6	98.0	90.0
Vermon	99.8	96.9	97.3	92.7		92.7	 05 5	
Virginia	∠.ت 100.0	97.4	90.1	97.2	91.2	97.Z	95.5	92.8
vvaShington	100.0	93.3	93.3	91.2	95.7	95.7	95.2	_
west virginia	84.8	95.6	96.8	96.1	96.1	96.1		
VVISCONSIN	1.4	92.1	93.0	89.0	89.0	89.0	89.0	91.8
vvyoming	18.5	98.1	98.4	98.5	98.5	98.5	98.4	/0.1
Iotal		95.6	95.5	95.4	96.0	95.9	95.7	93.3

* Includes District of Columbia. [†] Percentage of eligible children included in the survey. [§] Diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and pertussis vaccine, diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and acellular pertussis vaccine, or diphtheria and tetanus toxoids. [¶] Hepatitis B vaccine.

** Data not available.

Territory	% surveyed*	Polio (%)	DTP/DTaP/DT [†] (%)	Measles (%)	Mumps (%)	Rubella (%)	HepB [§] (%)	Varicella (%)
American Samoa	100.0	97.4	95.8	98.2	98.2	98.2	97.4	1
Guam	10.0	97.8	97.4	98.1	98.1	98.1	87.3	_
Marshall Islands	_	_	_	_	_		_	_
Micronesia	_	_	_	_	_		_	_
N. Mariana Islands	100.0	95.9	95.9	95.9	95.9	95.9	100.0	_
Palau	_	_	_	_	_		_	_
Puerto Rico	58.2	91.1	69.4	90.7	90.7	90.7	97.1	92.0
U.S. Virgin Islands	60.6	86.4	83.3	88.8	88.8	88.8	91.5	90.0
Total		91.4	71.4	91.2	91.2	92.2	96.6	92.0

TABLE 2. Estimated vaccination coverage among children enrolled in kindergarten, by vaccine and territory — Annual School Surveillance, current or former U.S. territories, 2003–04 school year

* Percentage of eligible children included in the survey.

¹ Diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and pertussis vaccine, diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and acellular pertussis vaccine, or diphtheria and tetanus toxoids. ⁹ Hepatitis B vaccine.

¹ Data not available.

State laws requiring proof of vaccination before entering school have been referred to as a "safety net" for the U.S. vaccination program because they ensure that no child is missed (3). This safety net relies on the efforts of school nurses, teachers, and others to identify children who are not UTD. Findings of uniformly high nationwide coverage during the 2002–03 and 2003–04 school years underscore the success of school entry requirements in boosting vaccine coverage. Childhood vaccination coverage is also measured nationally among children aged 19–35 months (4). Higher percentages of children are UTD at kindergarten entry than at younger ages, suggesting that school entry laws are a key to ensuring high coverage.

The findings in this report are subject to at least two limitations. First, methods for assessing vaccination coverage among children entering school vary because state and local laws determine which vaccines and doses are required, and sampling methods differ. The substantial variation in sampling methods among states limits the comparability of these data. Second, children attending private schools and those who are home-schooled were not surveyed by all states. The difference in vaccination rates between children schooled at home and children in traditional school environments is unknown.

Additional information about assessing and reporting vaccination coverage among children entering school is available from the National Immunization Program Immunization Information Hotline, telephone 800-232-2522 (English) or 800-232-0233 (Spanish), or by e-mail at nipinfo@cdc.gov.

References

- 1. US Department of Health and Human Services. Healthy people 2010 (conference ed, in 2 vols). Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services; 2000. Available at http://www.health.gov/healthypeople.
- CDC. Vaccination coverage among children entering school—United States, 2002–03 school year. MMWR 2003;52:791–3.

 Orenstein WA, Bernier RH. Surveillance. Information for action. Pediatr Clin North Am 1990;37:709–34.

 CDC. National, state, and urban area vaccination levels among children aged 19–35 months—United States, 2003. MMWR 2004;53: 658–61.

Awareness of Family Health History as a Risk Factor for Disease — United States, 2004

Persons who have close relatives with certain diseases (e.g., heart disease, diabetes, and osteoporosis) are more likely to develop those diseases themselves (1). Family health history is an important risk factor that reflects inherited genetic susceptibility, shared environment, and common behaviors. Although clinicians are trained to collect family histories, substantial barriers exist to obtaining this information in primary care practice (e.g., lack of time or lack of reimbursement) (2). To promote the use of family history as a screening tool for disease prevention and health promotion, several initiatives have called for new self-administered family history collection tools and educational programs to help clinicians interpret and apply family history information to patient care (3, 4). To assess attitudes, knowledge, and practices of U.S. residents regarding their family health histories, CDC analyzed data from the 2004 HealthStyles Survey. This report summarizes the results of that analysis, which indicated that although 96.3% of survey respondents believe their family history is important for their own health, few have actively collected health information from their relatives to develop a family history. Targeted public health efforts are needed to 1) help persons collect family history information to share with their health-care providers and 2) educate and assist providers to interpret and apply this information effectively.

HealthStyles is an annual mail survey of the U.S. population aged ≥ 18 years that examines health-related attitudes and behaviors (5). The survey is designed and conducted by Porter Novelli (Washington, DC), with technical assistance from health organizations, including CDC. In July and August 2004, a stratified random sample of 6,175 respondents was selected from approximately 600,000 households previously recruited to participate in a consumer marketing survey. In return for their participation, respondents were given small gifts (e.g., a 20-minute calling card) and entered into a sweepstakes drawing. Of the 6,175 households contacted by mail, 4,345 (70.4%) returned the survey. Survey data were weighted to match the 2003 Current Population Survey estimates relative to age, race/ethnicity, sex, income, and household size.

The survey included the following two general questions related to family history: 1) "How important do you think knowledge of your family's health history is to your personal health?" (possible responses were "very important," "somewhat important," "not at all important," or "not sure") and 2) "Have you ever actively collected heath information from your relatives for purposes of developing a family health history?" The likelihood of collecting a family health history was evaluated in relation to personal characteristics by using a multivariable logistic regression model. In addition, the 2004 HealthStyles Survey had a special focus on type 2 diabetes, so five questions were included to assess family history of this condition: 1) "Has your mother ever been diagnosed with type 2 diabetes?" 2) "Has your father ever been diagnosed with type 2 diabetes?" 3) "How many of your brothers and sisters were diagnosed with type 2 diabetes?" 4) "How many of your mother's relatives (her sisters, brothers, and parents) were diagnosed with type 2 diabetes?" and 5) "How many of your father's relatives (his sisters, brothers, and parents) were diagnosed with type 2 diabetes?" Knowledge of family history of type 2 diabetes was assessed by comparing "yes" or "no" responses with "don't know" responses.

Of the 4,345 respondents, 3,063 (70.5%) were non-Hispanic whites and 3,012 (69.3%) were aged 18–54 years; 2,732 (62.9%) had at least some college education, and 3,395 (78.1%) reported ever being married (Table). Slightly more than half of all respondents were female (2,246; 51.7%) and reported annual incomes \geq \$40,000 (2,355; 54.2%). Almost all of the respondents (4,183; 96.3%) considered knowledge of family history either very important (3,151; 72.5%) or somewhat important (1,032; 23.8%) to their personal health. Women were slightly more likely than men to report that family history was very important to their own health; equal proportions of men and women considered family history somewhat important. Respondents who had a high school education or less or who were aged \geq 55 years were less likely to report that family history was important for their own

TABLE. Number and percentage of survey respondents* who actively collected health information on relatives to develop a family health history, by selected characteristics — HealthStyles Survey, United States, 2004

		No. of respondents who collected	I		
Characteristic	No. of	family health	(0/)	Odds	(050/ 018)
Characteristic	respondents	mormation	(70)	Tatio	(95% CI3)
Sex					
Female	2,246	815	(36.3)	1.00	(ref [¶])
Male	2,099	481	(22.9)	0.53	(0.46–0.61)
Race/Ethnicity					
White, non-Hispanic	3,063	923	(30.2)	1.00	(ref)
Black, non-Hispanic	500	165	(32.9)	1.10	(0.88–1.37)
Hispanic	530	129	(24.4)	0.77	(0.61-0.97)
Other	252	78	(31.0)	1.11	(0.82-1.51)
Age group (yrs)					
18–54	3,012	905	(30.1)	1.00	(ref)
<u>≥</u> 55	1,333	390	(29.1)	1.13	(0.96 - 1.32)
Marital status					
Ever married	3,395	1,055	(31.1)	1.00	(ref)
Never married	875	226	(25.9)	0.77	(0.63-0.94)
Education					
Some college	2,732	911	(33.3)	1.00	(ref)
High school or less	1,222	312	(25.5)	0.69	(0.59-0.82)
Annual income					
≥\$40,000	2,355	746	(31.7)	1.00	(ref)
<\$40,000	1,990	550	(27.6)	0.95	(0.81 - 1.10)
Personal history of			. ,		. ,
type 2 diabetes					
No	3,851	1,124	(29.2)	1.00	(ref)
Yes	419	156	(37.2)	1.53	(1.22–1.93)

*N = 4,345.

Multivariate logistic regression model included the following variables: sex, race/ethnicity, age, marital status, education, income, and personal history of type 2 diabetes. All variables were weighted to match 2003 Current Population Survey estimates relative to age, race/ethnicity, sex, income, and household size.

[§]Confidence interval.

[¶]Reference value.

FIGURE. Percentage of respondents* reporting importance of family history to their personal health, knowledge of family history of type 2 diabetes, and collection of family history information — HealthStyles Survey, United States, 2004



[†]Family history of type 2 diabetes.

health. Although the majority of respondents reported that family history was important, substantially fewer persons (1,296; 29.8%) reported actively collecting information to develop a family health history (Figure). Those who had collected a family health history were more likely to be female, previously or currently married, and to have more than a high school education. Respondents with a personal history of type 2 diabetes were also more likely to have collected health information from their relatives (Table).

Respondents' knowledge of family history of type 2 diabetes varied by type of relative (Figure). Moreover, more respondents reported knowing the type 2 diabetes status of their siblings (94.5%) and mother (91.2%) than of their father (87.8%; p<0.0001). Similarly, a greater percentage of respondents reported knowing the type 2 diabetes status of maternal relatives (77.0%) than paternal relatives (70.4%; p<0.0001). Non-Hispanic white race/ethnicity and higher education and income levels were positively associated with knowledge of family history of type 2 diabetes.

Reported by: *PW Yoon, ScD, MT Scheuner, MD, M Gwinn, MD, MJ Khoury, MD, PhD, Office of Genomics and Disease Prevention; C Jorgensen, DrPH, Div of Cancer Prevention and Control, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion; S Hariri, PhD, S Lyn, MD, EIS officers, CDC.*

Editorial Note: The findings in this report indicate that 96.3% of respondents considered knowledge of family history important to their personal health and that 70.0%–94.5% could report the type 2 diabetes status of their relatives, depending on the type of relative. However, only 29.8%

reported actively collecting health information from their relatives to develop a family health history. This suggests that many persons know their family health histories but are not actively collecting the information. The analysis also suggests that certain population characteristics (e.g., sex, race, education, and socioeconomic status) might affect attitudes, knowledge, and practices regarding family health history.

The findings of this analysis are subject to at least two limitations. First, the HealthStyles Survey is subject to selection bias because the survey population is not a randomly drawn sample of the U.S. population. The results from this survey should be compared with data from population-based surveys, such as the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System survey (6). Second, the assessment of awareness of disease status among relatives was limited to type 2 diabetes. Family history of other common diseases (e.g., cardiovascular diseases and cancer) should be assessed.

Most diseases are the result of complex interactions between genetic and environmental factors (7). Family health history reflects these interactions and helps predict risk for certain disorders, including birth defects, asthma, cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, depression, Alzheimer's disease, and osteoporosis (1,8) For example, an evaluation of the risk for coronary heart disease (CHD) using a high school–based family history project determined that family history of CHD and stroke was identified in only 14% and 11% of families, respectively; however, these families accounted for 72% of all early-onset CHD and 86% of early stroke events (9).

Although family history can identify persons at increased risk for disease, its potential as a screening tool has not been realized in clinical and public health practice (2). An observational study of primary care physicians indicated that family histories were discussed about half the time at new visits and 22% of the time during follow-up visits (10). The average duration of the family history discussion was 2.5 minutes and focused more often on psychosocial concerns than on other health matters. To improve the use of family history in the clinical setting, the barriers to providers' collection and interpretation of a family history must be addressed.

The Department of Health and Human Services is highlighting the importance of family history for disease prevention with the U.S. Surgeon General's Family History Initiative. This initiative has proposed that Thanksgiving Day be designated a National Family History Day in which persons collect their family health histories. A new web-based tool, My Family Health Portrait (http://www.hhs.gov/familyhistory), enables persons to collect family history for six diseases (CHD, stroke, diabetes, and colorectal, breast, and ovarian cancer) and identify additional diseases that occur in their families. After the family history information is completed, a report is generated that includes a pedigree drawing, a listing of the family history data entered, and a statement about the importance of sharing the history with their health-care providers. My Family Health Portrait is based on a self-administered tool being developed by CDC that will enable collection of family health history and provide recommendations tailored to the level of familial risk. In 2005, the CDC tool will be evaluated in clinical settings. Information about the tool can be found at http://www.cdc.gov/genomics/activities/ogdp/2003/ chap06.htm.

Although national efforts have begun to promote the collection and use of family history information, the HealthStyles Survey data presented in this report suggest that certain subgroups of the population might benefit from targeted programs to raise awareness about the collection and recording of family health histories.

References

- 1. Bennett RL. The practical guide to the genetic family history. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 1999.
- 2. Rich EC, Burke W, Heaton CJ, et al. Reconsidering the family history in primary care. J Gen Inter Med 2004;19:273–80.
- Yoon PW, Scheuner MT, Khoury MJ. Research priorities for evaluating family history in the prevention of common chronic diseases. Am J Prev Med 2003;24:128–35.
- National Coalition for Health Professional Education in Genetics. Genetic family history resources. Lutherville, MD: National Coalition for Health Professional Education in Genetics; 2004. Available at http://www.nchpeg.org.
- Pollard WE. Use of consumer panel survey data for public health communication planning: an evaluation of survey results. American Statistical Association Proceedings of the Section on Health Policy Statistics 2002:2720–4.
- Balluz L, Ahluwalia IB, Murphy W, Mokdad A, Giles W, Harris VB. Surveillance for certain health behaviors among selected local areas— United States, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2002. MMWR 2004;53(No. SS-5).
- Khoury MJ. Genetic epidemiology. In: Rothman KJ, Greenland S, eds. Modern epidemiology. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott-Raven; 1998.
- Scheuner MT, Wang SJ, Raffel LJ, Larabell SK, Rotter JI. Family history: a comprehensive genetic risk assessment method for the chronic conditions of adulthood. Am J Med Genet 1997;71:315–24.
- 9. Hunt SC, Gwinn M, Adams TD. Family history assessment: strategies for prevention of cardiovascular disease. Am J Prev Med 2003;24: 136–42.
- Acheson LS, Wiesner GL, Zyzanski SJ, Goodwin MA, Stange KC. Family history-taking in community family practice: implications for genetic screening. Genet Med 2000;2:180–5.

Preventive-Care Practices Among Adults with Diabetes — Puerto Rico, 2000–2002

Preventive-care practices among persons with diabetes can prevent or delay complications such as eye disease, kidney disease, or nerve damage that is a precursor to disabling foot disease (1,2). However, the level of diabetes-related preventive care is inadequate in the United States (3-6), and little has been reported about preventive care in Puerto Rico, where an estimated 10% of adults have diagnosed diabetes (7). CDC analyzed data from 2000, 2001, and 2002 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) surveys to assess the percentage of adults with diabetes in Puerto Rico who engaged in five selected preventive-care practices. This report summarizes the results of that analysis, which indicated that, with the exception of hemoglobin A1c testing, the percentages of adults engaging in preventive-care practices were lower than the target percentages* set by U.S. national health objectives for 2010 (8).

BRFSS conducts state-based, random-digit-dialed telephone surveys of the U.S. civilian, noninstitutionalized population aged \geq 18 years in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and other U.S. territories. For this analysis, respondents were considered to have diabetes if they answered "yes" to the question, "Has a doctor ever told you that you have diabetes?" Women who were told they had diabetes, but only during pregnancy, were classified as not having diabetes. Persons who reported they had diabetes were asked questions from the BRFSS diabetes module on preventive-care practices, including: "About how many times in the past 12 months has a health professional checked you for hemoglobin A1c?" "When was the last time you had an eye exam in which the pupils were dilated?" "About how many times in the last year has a health professional checked your feet for any sores or irritations?" "Have you ever taken a course in how to manage your diabetes yourself?" and "About how often do you check your blood for glucose or sugar?"

The response rate to the BRFSS survey in Puerto Rico was 65.3% in 2000, 81.5% in 2001, and 75.2% in 2002. Data were aggregated for 2000–2002 to obtain reliable estimates

^{*} Hemoglobin A1c testing at least twice a year, 65% (objective 5-12[†]); annual dilated eye examination, 75% (objective 5-13); annual foot examination, 75% (objective 5-14); ever having education on diabetes self-management, 60% (objective 5-1); and self-monitoring of blood glucose at least once daily, 60% (objective 5-17).

[†]Objective 5-12 was revised since its original publication.

and weighted to reflect the age and sex distribution of the Puerto Rican population. The percentages of persons with diabetes who engaged in each of the five preventive-care practices as frequently as recommended (i.e., hemoglobin A1c testing at least twice a year, eye and foot examinations at least annually, formal diabetes education ever, and self-monitoring of blood glucose [SMBG] at least daily) were age-adjusted to the 2000 U.S. standard population for comparison with U.S. national health objectives for 2010 (8). Percentages were calculated for specific age and sex groups, and a t-test was performed to determine whether differences between groups were statistically significant. In addition, the total number of preventive-care practices per person was examined. For all analyses, statistical software was used to obtain standard errors and calculate 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

During 1998–2002, 10.0% of adults in Puerto Rico had diagnosed diabetes; prevalence was highest (25.3%) among those aged \geq 65 years (7). However, during 2000–2002, the percentages of adults with diabetes in Puerto Rico who engaged in preventive-care practices as frequently as recommended, with the exception of hemoglobin A1c testing, were lower than U.S. national health objectives for 2010 (Figure 1). The age-adjusted percentage for hemoglobin A1c testing at least twice a year was 67.3%, compared with the national target of 65%. Age-adjusted percentages for annual eye and foot examinations were 54.6% and 45.6%, respectively, versus the target of 75% for both practices; percentages for ever having received diabetes self-management education and for daily SMBG were 28.1% and 22.6%, respectively, versus a national target of 60% for both.

The percentage of adults receiving A1c testing at least twice a year was higher than the U.S. national target for 2010 for both men (69.0%) and women (65.7%) and for persons aged 18–64 years and those aged \geq 65 years; however, the percentFIGURE 1. Percentage* of adults with diabetes who engaged in each of five preventive-care practices, compared with percentage targeted by national health objectives for 2010 — Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, Puerto Rico, 2000–2002



*Age-adjusted to the 2000 U.S. standard population.

age was significantly lower in the 18–64 age group (65.5% versus 76.2%; p<0.05) (Table). The percentage who received annual foot examinations also was significantly lower among those aged 18–64 years than among those aged \geq 65 years (43.8% versus 54.6%; p<0.05). However, for the other three preventive-care practices, no significant differences by age were observed. For all of the practices, the percentages for men and women were similar.

Of the five preventive-care practices analyzed, 63.0% of adults with diabetes in Puerto Rico reported engaging in two or fewer practices, and 13.5% reported engaging in no preventive-care practices (Figure 2). A total of 37.0% of adults reported engaging in three or more practices, and 3.3% reported engaging in all five.

TABLE. Percentage of adults with diabetes who engaged in a preventive-care practice, by age group, sex, and practice — Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, Puerto Rico, 2000–2002

Hemoglobin A1c testing*		Dilated eye examination		Foot examination		Education on diabetes self-management		Self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG)		
Characteristic	%	(95% Cl [†])	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Age group (yrs	s)									
18–64	65.5	(60.7-70.3)	53.6	(49.0-58.2)	43.8	(39.2-48.4)	28.8	(24.6-33.0)	22.6	(18.6–26.6)
<u>></u> 65	76.2	(71.3-81.0)	59.5	(54.5-64.4)	54.6	(49.7-59.5)	24.7	(20.5-28.9)	22.4	(18.5-26.3)
Total	69.3	(65.8-72.9)	56.1	(52.7–59.5)	47.9	(44.5–51.3)	27.4	(24.3-30.5)	22.8	(19.9-25.7)
Total [§]	67.3	(63.3–71.3)	54.6	(50.7–58.5)	45.6	(41.7–49.5)	28.1	(24.5–31.6)	22.6	(19.2–26.0)
Sex§		. ,		,		. ,		· · ·		. ,
Men	69.0	(62.9–75.0)	53.2	(47.2-59.3)	46.8	(40.7–52.8)	28.6	(23.0-34.2)	21.3	(16.0-26.6)
Women	65.7	(60.3–71.0)	56.0	(51.0–60.9)	44.4	(39.5–49.3)	27.6	(23.2–32.0)	23.8	(19.5–28.0)

* At least twice a year for hemoglobin A1c testing, annually for dilated eye and foot examinations, ever for education on diabetes self-management, and at _ least daily for self-monitoring of blood glucose.

Confidence interval.

⁹Age-adjusted to the 2000 U.S. standard population.

FIGURE 2. Percentage of adults with diabetes who engaged in 0–5 preventive-care practices — Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, Puerto Rico, 2000–2002



Reported by: Z Kianes-Pérez, MS, M Pérez-Padua, L Pérez-Rivera, MPHE, Diabetes Prevention and Control Program, Puerto Rico Dept of Health. NR Burrows, MPH, RV Díaz-Kenney, MPH, LS Geiss, MA, Div of Diabetes Translation, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, CDC.

Editorial Note: Effective interventions are available that can prevent or delay diabetes complications (1,2). Consistent with previous reports of diabetes-related preventive care in the United States (3–6), the findings in this report indicate that the percentages of adults with diabetes in Puerto Rico who engage in preventive-care practices, with the exception of A1c testing, were lower than U.S. national health targets for 2010. Fewer than 5% of adults with diabetes engaged in all five practices. Improvement in diabetes care, particularly in self-management education and in SMBG, is needed to achieve the U.S. national health objectives for 2010 and to reduce diabetes complications. In addition, younger persons with diabetes need interventions to improve their preventive care.

The findings in this report are subject to at least three limitations. First, BRFSS collects data through telephone surveys that do not include institutionalized persons (e.g., nursing home residents) or persons without telephones. As a result, the percentages of persons with diabetes who engaged in preventive-care practices in this report might be higher than the actual percentages because persons without telephones are more likely to have lower levels of education and less likely to receive preventive care (3-6). Second, self-reported data are subject to recall bias, and the effect of this bias on the magnitude and direction of the results is unknown. Such bias might cause preventive-care practices to be either under- or overreported. Finally, BRFSS response rates in Puerto Rico ranged from 65.3% to 81.5% during the study period; however, compared with census data, BRFSS data have minimal bias (9).

"The wisest mind has something yet to learn."

George Santayana

MMWR Continuing Education makes it possible for you to stay current on relevant public health and clinical topics-online and at no charge.

Review course descriptions, take exams, track your results, and receive course certificates– all from your own computer, when and where your schedule allows.

MMWR CE A wise choice.

cdc.gov/mmwr



Since 1997, CDC has provided funding to the Diabetes Prevention and Control Program (DPCP) in Puerto Rico. DPCP adapted the Spanish version of CDC's train-the-trainer program, Diabetes Today (La Comunidad en Acción), to the Puerto Rican culture; the program is used to guide health professionals and community leaders in training lay health workers (promotores), improving diabetes self-management, and preventing diabetes complications. DPCP also develops protocols for standards of care and diabetes education materials, sponsors mass media and face-to-face educational campaigns focused on diabetes prevention and control, and collaborates with the Puerto Rico Diabetes Advisory Council and community-based organizations to improve diabetes care.

DPCP implemented the Puerto Rico Diabetes Surveillance System by using data from the BRFSS diabetes module and information from health insurance companies on diabetes, its complications, and use of health-care services. The BRFSS diabetes module is also used to evaluate program objectives and activities. Continued surveillance is essential to monitor the effectiveness of measures to improve levels of preventivecare practices among persons with diabetes in Puerto Rico.

References

- UK Prospective Diabetes Study Group. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). Lancet 1998;352:839–55.
- Narayan KM, Gregg EW, Fagot-Campagna A, Engelgau MM, Vinicor F. Diabetes—a common, growing, serious, costly, and potentially preventable public health problem. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 2000;50(Suppl 2): S77–84.
- CDC. Preventive-care practices among persons with diabetes—United States, 1995 and 2001. MMWR 2002;51:965–9.
- Saaddine JB, Engelgau MM, Beckles GL, Gregg EW, Thompson TJ, Venkat Narayan KM. A diabetes report card for the United States: quality of care in the 1990s. Ann Intern Med 2002;136:565–74.
- CDC. Levels of diabetes-related preventive-care practices—United States, 1997–1999. MMWR 2000;49:954–8.
- Beckles GL, Engelgau MM, Narayan KM, Herman WH, Aubert RE, Williamson DF. Population-based assessment of the level of care among adults with diabetes in the U.S. Diabetes Care 1998;21:1432–8.
- CDC. Prevalence of diabetes among Hispanics—selected areas, 1998– 2002. MMWR 2004;53:941–4.
- US Department of Health and Human Services. Healthy people 2010 (conference ed, in 2 vols). Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services; 2000. Available at http://www.health.gov/ healthypeople.
- Nelson DE, Holtzman D, Bolen J, Stanwyck CA, Mack KA. Reliability and validity of measures from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). Social Prev Med 2001;46:S3–S42.

West Nile Virus Activity — United States, November 3–8, 2004

During November 3–8, a total of 41 cases of human West Nile virus (WNV) illness were reported from seven states (California, Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oregon, Tennessee, and Texas).

During 2004, 40 states and the District of Columbia (DC) have reported 2,282 cases of human WNV illness to CDC through ArboNET (Figure and Table). Of these, 737 (32%) cases were reported in California, 381 (17%) in Arizona, and 276 (12%) in Colorado. A total of 1,318 (59%) of the 2,251 cases for which such data were available occurred in males; the median age of patients was 52 years (range: 1 month–99 years). Date of illness onset ranged from April 23 to October 31; a total of 77 cases were fatal.

A total of 195 presumptive West Nile viremic blood donors (PVDs) have been reported to ArboNET in 2004. Of these, 68 (35%) were reported in California; 38 (19%) in Arizona; 16 in Texas; 15 in New Mexico; seven in Colorado; six each in Louisiana and Oklahoma; five in Nevada; four in Georgia and Iowa; three each in Florida, Michigan, and South Dakota; two each in Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, and Wisconsin; and one each in Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. Of the 195 PVDs, three persons aged 35, 69, and 77 years subsequently had neuroinvasive illness, and 48 persons (median age: 52 years; range: 17–73 years) subsequently had West Nile fever.

FIGURE. Areas reporting West Nile virus (WNV) activity — United States, 2004*



* As of 3 a.m., Mountain Standard Time, November 8, 2004.

TABLE. Number of human cases of West Nile virus (WNV) illness, by area — United States, 2004*

	Neuro- invasive	West Nile	Other clinical/	Total reported	
Area	disease [†]	fever§	unspecified [¶]	to CDC**	Deaths
Alabama	13	0	0	13	0
Arizona	128	70	183	381	10
Arkansas	12	9	1	22	0
California	150	256	331	737	20
Colorado	39	237	0	276	3
Connecticut	0	1	0	1	0
District of Colum	nbia 1	0	0	1	0
Florida	29	8	0	37	2
Georgia	11	6	0	17	0
Idaho	0	0	2	2	0
Illinois	28	27	1	56	3
Indiana	5	0	2	7	1
Iowa	11	7	4	22	2
Kansas	18	25	0	43	2
Kentucky	1	6	0	7	0
Louisiana	68	17	0	85	7
Maryland	6	6	1	13	0
Michigan	10	1	0	11	0
Minnesota	13	21	0	34	2
Mississippi	23	5	2	30	3
Missouri	25	9	2	36	1
Montana	2	3	1	6	0
Nebraska	4	26	0	30	0
Nevada	25	19	0	44	0
New Jersey	1	0	0	1	0
New Mexico	30	50	4	84	4
New York	3	3	0	6	0
North Carolina	3	0	0	3	0
North Dakota	2	18	0	20	1
Ohio	11	1	0	12	2
Oklahoma	10	6	0	16	1
Oregon	0	3	0	3	0
Pennsylvania	8	3	1	12	2
South Carolina	0	1	0	1	0
South Dakota	6	45	0	51	1
Tennessee	13	1	0	14	0
Texas	84	29	0	113	8
Utah	6	5	0	11	0
Virginia	4	0	1	5	1
Wisconsin	4	6	0	10	1
Wyoming	2	5	2	9	0
Total	809	935	538	2.282	77

* As of November 8, 2004.

[†] Cases with neurologic manifestations (i.e., West Nile meningitis, West Nile encephalitis, and West Nile myelitis).

§ Cases with no evidence of neuroinvasion.

[¶] Illnesses for which sufficient clinical information was not provided.

** Total number of human cases of WNV illness reported to ArboNet by state and local health departments.

In addition, 5,562 dead corvids and 1,401 other dead birds with WNV infection have been reported from 46 states and New York City during 2004. WNV infections have been reported in horses in 37 states; one bat in Wisconsin; nine dogs in Nevada, New Mexico, and Wisconsin; six squirrels in Arizona and Wyoming; and 14 unidentified animal species in nine states (Arizona, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, Nevada, New York, and South Carolina). WNV seroconversions have been reported in 1,409 sentinel chicken flocks in 14 states (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, Louisiana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Utah) and in 25 wild hatchling birds in Missouri and Ohio. Four seropositive sentinel horses were reported in Minnesota and Puerto Rico. A total of 8,131 WNV-positive mosquito pools have been reported in 38 states, DC, and New York City.

Additional information about national WNV activity is available from CDC at http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dvbid/ westnile/index.htm and at http://westnilemaps.usgs.gov.

Notice to Readers

Maps of National, State, and County Data Now Available on CDC WONDER

Two CDC online data-access systems, WONDER (Wideranging Online Data for Epidemiologic Research) and GATHER (Geographic Analysis Tool for Health and Environmental Research), have collaborated to produce maps for WONDER data-query applications. WONDER users can now create maps for each data element measured, select quantiles or set custom break-points for data groups, choose whether to display highways and rivers, add labels, and choose a color scheme. Maps are available for the following WON-DER data requests:

- census population estimates (http://wonder.cdc.gov/ censj.html)
- bridged-race population estimates (http://wonder.cdc.gov/ bridged-racej.html)
- natality (births) (http://wonder.cdc.gov/nataj.html)

Mapping capability will eventually be available for other dataquery applications with location data elements.

WONDER (available at http://wonder.cdc.gov) is an Internet system that makes CDC information resources and public health information available to public health professionals and the general public. GATHER (available at http:// gis.cdc.gov/atsdr/default.asp) uses spatial analysis tools for public health applications, and is a product of CDC's Geographic Research, Analysis, and Services Program of the National Center for Environmental Health/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. Notice to Readers

Guidance on Initial Responses to Suspicious Letters and Packages

Law enforcement agencies and emergency responders are charged with investigation of suspicious letters and packages in the United States. Those responding are at risk from potential exposure to biologic agents, chemical substances, or radiologic materials. Guidelines for responding to five different types of situations (e.g., letter with unknown powder-like substance and threatening communication) have been developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of Health and Human Services/CDC. This guidance is now available at http://www.bt.cdc.gov/planning/pdf/suspicious-packagebiothreat.pdf.

CASES CURRENT DISEASE DECREASE INCREASE 4 WEEKS Hepatitis A, acute 216 Hepatitis B, acute 302 Hepatitis C, acute 42 79 Legionellosis 1 Measles, total Meningococcal disease 37 12 Mumps 760 Pertussis 0 Rubella 2 0.03125 0.0625 0.125 0.25 0.5 1 4

FIGURE I. Selected notifiable disease reports, United States, comparison of provisional 4-week totals November 6, 2004, with historical data

Ratio (Log scale)[†]

Beyond historical limits

* No rubella cases were reported for the current 4-week period yielding a ratio for week 44 of zero (0). † Ratio of current 4-week total to mean of 15 4-week totals (from previous, comparable, and subsequent 4-week periods for the past 5 years). The point where the hatched area

begins is based on the mean and two standard deviations of these 4-week totals.

TABLE I. Summary of provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, cumulative, week ending November 6, 2004 (44th Week)*

	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003		Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003
Anthrax	-	-	HIV infection, pediatric [™]	126	179
Botulism:	-		Influenza-associated pediatric mortality**	-	NA
foodborne	11	11	Measles, total	23 ^{††}	51 ^{§§}
infant	61	57	Mumps	169	186
other (wound & unspecified)	9	26	Plague	1	1
Brucellosis [†]	85	85	Poliomyelitis, paralytic	-	-
Chancroid	31	51	Psittacosis [†]	9	11
Cholera	4	1	Q fever [†]	60	57
Cyclosporiasis [†]	204	63	Rabies, human	3	2
Diphtheria	-	1	Rubella	10	7
Ehrlichiosis:	-	-	Rubella, congenital syndrome	-	1
human granulocytic (HGE) [†]	288	284	SARS-associated coronavirus disease [†] **	-	8
human monocytic (HME) [†]	254	235	Smallpox [†] 11	-	NA
human, other and unspecified	28	39	Staphylococcus aureus:	-	-
Encephalitis/Meningitis:	-	-	Vancomycin-intermediate (VISA)† 1	-	NA
California serogroup viral ^{†§}	75	108	Vancomycin-resistant (VRSA)† 1	1	NA
eastern equine ^{†§}	3	13	Streptococcal toxic-shock syndrome [†]	89	138
Powassan [†] §	-	-	Tetanus	15	16
St. Louis ^{† §}	8	40	Toxic-shock syndrome	108	105
western equine ^{† §}	-	-	Trichinosis	4	1
Hansen disease (leprosy) [†]	69	69	Tularemia [†]	77	77
Hantavirus pulmonary syndrome ⁺	18	18	Yellow fever	-	-
Hemolytic uremic syndrome, postdiarrheal ⁺	123	147			

-: No reported cases.

Incidence data for reporting years 2003 and 2004 are provisional and cumulative (year-to-date).

Not notifiable in all states.

§ Updated weekly from reports to the Division of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases, National Center for Infectious Diseases (ArboNet Surveillance).

¹ Updated monthly from reports to the Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention — Surveillance and Epidemiology, National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention. Last update September 26, 2004.

** Updated weekly from reports to the Division of Viral and Rickettsial Diseases, National Center for Infectious Diseases. ⁺⁺ Of 23 cases reported, 10 were indigenous, and 13 were imported from another country.

§ Of 51 cases reported, 31 were indigenous, and 20 were imported from another country.

[¶] Not previously notifiable.

	AI	os	Chlan	nvdia†	Coccidio	domvcosis	Cryptosp	oridiosis	Encephalitis/Meningitis West Nile [§]	
Penorting area	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.
UNITED STATES	31 120	38 111	731 379	728 601	4 925	3 276	2 828	2 939	809	2 840
NEW ENGLAND Maine N.H. Vt. Mass. R.I. Conn.	981 15 37 14 343 109 463	1,276 49 34 15 518 89 571	24,921 1,719 1,454 853 11,052 2,848 6,995	23,418 1,676 1,327 905 9,314 2,474 7,722	-,525 N - - - N	0,270 - - - - - N	156 18 30 23 54 4 27	169 18 19 29 73 15 15		2,040 29 - 2 - 12 5 10
MID. ATLANTIC Upstate N.Y. N.Y. City N.J. Pa.	6,925 724 3,949 1,140 1,112	8,995 825 4,987 1,362 1,821	89,390 18,736 28,111 12,799 29,744	90,583 16,866 29,375 13,375 30,967	N - N	N - N	466 162 94 30 180	373 111 105 15 142	12 1 2 1 8	222 - 56 21 145
E.N. CENTRAL Ohio Ind. III. Mich. Wis.	2,742 525 300 1,290 493 134	3,543 717 482 1,597 584 163	127,357 30,886 15,162 35,364 31,450 14,495	133,264 36,601 14,509 40,646 26,545 14,963	15 N N 15	7 N - 7	807 200 80 77 141 309	890 134 87 91 122 456	58 11 5 28 10 4	150 84 15 30 14 7
W.N. CENTRAL Minn. Iowa Mo. N. Dak. S. Dak. S. Dak. Nebr.** Kans.	641 152 50 277 14 8 41 99	687 140 75 320 3 10 49 90	44,900 8,352 5,293 17,427 1,229 2,135 4,260 6,204	42,329 9,065 4,263 15,457 1,341 2,199 3,952 6,052	5 N 3 N - 2 N	2 N 1 N - 1 N	352 117 79 61 10 37 23 25	522 137 113 42 12 37 23 158	79 13 11 25 2 6 4 18	696 48 81 39 94 151 194 89
S. ATLANTIC Del. Md. D.C. Va. W. Va. N.C. S.C.** Ga. Fla.	9,492 121 1,252 621 513 67 482 535 1,327 4,574	10,557 192 1,281 858 813 78 989 713 1,665 3,968	145,520 2,490 15,954 2,817 18,550 2,314 24,286 17,317 26,394 35,398	137,034 2,556 13,738 2,671 16,341 2,204 22,020 12,147 29,990 35,367	N - - N N - - N	5 N 5 - N N - N	466 - 15 12 55 5 70 15 178 116	322 4 23 12 40 4 4 44 8 99 88	54 - 6 1 - - 3 - 11 29	184 12 49 3 19 1 16 2 25 57
E.S. CENTRAL Ky. Tenn.** Ala. Miss.	1,528 187 617 360 364	1,699 175 733 391 400	46,722 4,880 18,751 9,382 13,709	46,999 6,896 17,373 12,167 10,563	4 N - 4	1 N - 1	109 39 29 20 21	116 21 37 48 10	50 1 13 13 23	89 11 21 25 32
W.S. CENTRAL Ark. La. Okla. Tex.**	3,581 174 719 154 2,534	4,058 164 520 177 3,197	88,435 5,964 18,539 9,116 54,816	89,059 6,700 16,727 9,635 55,997	2 1 1 N N	- - N N	66 14 3 20 29	99 17 4 13 65	174 12 68 10 84	597 23 92 56 426
MOUNTAIN Mont. Idaho Wyo. Colo. N. Mex. Ariz. Utah Nev.	1,178 6 15 257 152 437 53 242	1,327 13 22 6 327 98 576 60 225	39,926 1,946 2,277 876 9,779 4,333 13,330 3,002 4,383	40,929 1,711 2,057 821 11,018 6,277 11,136 3,156 4,753	3,175 N 2 N 20 3,067 34 52	1,975 N N 1 9 1,924 8 33	144 34 24 3 48 11 17 5 2	120 18 26 5 32 10 5 17 7	232 2 39 30 128 6 25	871 75 - 92 621 74 7 2
PACIFIC Wash. Oreg. Calif. Alaska Hawaii	4,052 313 239 3,357 39 104	5,969 420 229 5,214 18 88	124,208 14,555 6,974 95,226 3,137 4,316	124,986 13,979 6,314 96,905 3,195 4,593	1,724 N - 1,724 -	1,286 N - 1,286 -	262 36 30 194 - 2	328 43 36 248 1	150 - 150 -	2 - - 2 -
Guam P.R. V.I. Amer. Samoa C.N.M.I	2 595 10 U	5 940 31 U	2,858 272 U 32	527 2,255 351 U	N U	- N - U U	N U	- N - U U	- - - U	- - - U

TABLE II. Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending November 6, 2004, and November 1, 2003 (44th Week)*

N: Not notifiable.

N: Not notifiable. U: Unavailable. -: No reported cases. C.N.M.I.: Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands. * Incidence data for reporting years 2003 and 2004 are provisional and cumulative (year-to-date). † Chlamydia refers to genital infections caused by *C. trachomatis.* § Updated weekly from reports to the Division of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases, National Center for Infectious Diseases (ArboNet Surveillance). ¶ Updated monthly from reports to the Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention — Surveillance and Epidemiology, National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention. Last update September 26, 2004.

** Contains data reported through National Electronic Disease Surveillance System (NEDSS).

MMWR

(44th Week)										
		Escher	ichia coli, Ente	rohemorrhagio	EHEC)					
	015	7.47	Shiga tox	serogroup pop-0157		n positive,	Cior	lincia	Con	rrhoo
	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.
Reporting area	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003
UNITED STATES	2,054	2,260	228	210	148	136	14,983	16,143	260,532	279,007
NEW ENGLAND	140	135	46	37	15	12	1,468	1,364	5,806	6,130
Maine	10	10	-	1	-	-	112	163	184	173
N.H. Vt.	∠⊺ 12	17	5	-	-	-	40 148	33 108	73	75
Mass.	57	59	15	8	15	12	623	682	2,610	2,437
R.I.	9 31	1	1	- 25	-	-	107	95 283	712	816 2 525
	244	004	23	23	-	-	430	203	2,120	2,525
Upstate N.Y.	244 112	83	47 34	10	29 14	33 17	1.137	3,208	28,926	34,834 6.609
N.Y. City	33	7	-	-	-	-	838	1,030	9,052	11,491
N.J.	37	30	4	2	5	-	344	432	5,031	6,860
	02	104	9	9	10	10	0.000	0.775	0,724	5,074
Ohio	372	521 119	36 10	30 16	27	17	2,080	2,775	54,085 15 934	59,497 19 301
Ind.	51	74	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,548	5,664
III. Miah	58	115	2	2	1	-	384	809	15,606	18,298
Wich.	100	8∠ 131	17	- 12	6	-	381	655 543	3,767	4,786
WN CENTRAL	442	405	29	48	16	20	1 714	1 773	14 235	14 835
Minn.	107	123	15	21	1	1	626	674	2,531	2,572
Iowa	119	94	-	-	-	-	258	239	938	1,051
Mo. N Dak	74 14	76 12	11	14	6	1	443	438	7,470 87	7,402
S. Dak.	31	26	2	4	-	-	58	70	239	190
Nebr.	60	43	1	5	-	-	117	125	861	1,317
Kans.	37	31	-	-	2	10	191	195	2,109	2,224
S. ATLANTIC	149	127	38	39	50	38	2,372	2,286	65,968	68,522
Md.	20	12	4	3	4	1	100	100	6.826	6.579
D.C.	1	1	-	-	-	-	57	44	2,126	2,100
Va.	35	33	16	11	-	-	461	302	7,405	7,597
N.C.	-	-	-	-	34	30	N	N	12,778	12,786
S.C.	7	2	-	-	-	-	51	123	8,457	7,147
Ga. Fla	22 60	25 41	11 7	5 20	- 12	- 7	691 941	736	11,614 15,235	14,924 15.669
ES CENTRAL	79	75		20	0	6	325	228	20.367	22 554
Ky.	24	24	2	2	6	6	525 N	538 N	2,240	3,070
Tenn.	31	33	2	-	3	-	157	154	7,105	7,217
Ala. Micc	16	14	-	-	-	-	168	184	5,743	7,813
	, 	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,279	26.975
Ark	66 14	10	2 1	4	2 -	4	269 103	∠56 131	34,267	36,875
La.	4	3	-	-	-	-	37	11	8,710	9,649
Okla.	17	25	- 1	-	- 2	-	129 N	114 N	3,879	3,992
	31	43	1	4	2	4	1.005	1 074	10,003	19,001
MOUN IAIN Mont	211	278	25	25	-	6	1,285	1,374	8,660	8,793
Idaho	46	70	15	15	-	-	163	175	79	61
Wyo.	8	3	2	1	-	-	22	20	54	38
COIO. N Mex	44 9	62 10	2	4	-	6	444	394	2,168	2,432
Ariz.	21	31	Ň	N	Ν	Ν	143	211	3,233	3,078
Utah	46	63	3	-	-	-	283	308	467	330
Nev.	21	23	1	I	-	-	102	120	1,998	1,753
PACIFIC	352	414	1	4	-	-	2,299	2,769	28,218	25,967
Oreg.	66	95	1	3	-	-	404	360	1,042	847
Calif.	148	209	-	-	-	-	1,431	1,943	23,468	21,319
Alaska Hawaii	1 10	4 8	-	-	-	-	79 68	/6 73	453 1 015	463 1 017
Guam	N	N					00	2	1,010	55
P.R.	-	1	-	-	-	-	110	282	212	239
V.I.	-	-				-	-		80	77
Amer. Samoa C N M I	U	U	U -	U	U -	U	U -	U	U	U

TABLE II. (*Continued*) Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending November 6, 2004, and November 1, 2003 (44th Week)*

MMWR

			1							
	All	ages	- Corot	uma h	Age <:	years	Unknaus		(viral, acu	te), by type
	All se	Cum	Cum	ype b Cum	Cum	Cum	Cum	Cum	Cum	A I Cum
Reporting area	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003
UNITED STATES	1,537	1,569	13	25	89	97	147	168	4,606	5,883
NEW ENGLAND	133	117	1	2	5	5	3	3	860	276
Maine	12	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	11	12
N.H. Vt	17	12	-	1	2	-	- 1	-	25	15 6
Mass.	52	55	1	1	-	5	2	1	734	155
R.I.	3	6	-	-	-	-	-	1	21	14
	42	32	-	-	3	-	-	-	01	/4
MID. AI LANTIC Upstate N Y	321 103	333	1	3	4	3	35	41 8	565 87	1,115 116
N.Y. City	69	57	-	-	-	-	14	11	221	388
N.J.	64	61	-	-	-	-	3	9	124	186
	60	94	-	-	-	-	13	13	133	425
E.N. CENTRAL Ohio	227 87	263	-	3	6	5	35 15	46 11	464	548 100
Ind.	41	41	-	-	4	-	1	5	88	60
III.	50	95	-	-	-	-	11	20	161	162
Wich. Wis	31	42	-	3	-	5	ь 2	9	41	182
WN CENTRAL	92	98	2	2	3	7	10	12	151	147
Minn.	40	41	1	2	3	7	1	2	32	37
lowa	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	45	25
Mo. N Dak	32	36	-	-	-	-	6	9	38	47
S. Dak.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
Nebr.	8	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	10	12
	/	61	-	-	-	-	2	1	22	25
S. AILANTIC Del	383	348	-	2	- 21	15	- 29	19	921	1,506
Md.	52	83	-	1	4	7	-	1	97	157
D.C.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	37
va. W. Va.	15	47 14	-	-	- 1	-	3	-	6	13
N.C.	52	36	1	-	6	3	1	2	99	92
S.C.	4	6 64	-	-	-	-	- 22	2	24 316	35 710
Fla.	100	97	-	1	10	5	2	3	250	365
E.S. CENTRAL	59	71	1	1	-	3	8	8	140	246
Ky.	5	6	-	-	-	2	-	-	29	29
Tenn.	38	42	-	- 1	-	1	6	5	80	179
Miss.	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	15
W.S. CENTRAL	64	70	1	2	7	10	2	4	311	582
Ark.	3	6	-	-	-	1	1	-	56	30
La. Okla	11 49	20 41	-	-	- 7	2	1	4	47	41 17
Tex.	1	3	1	2	-	-	-	-	189	494
MOUNTAIN	168	141	4	6	25	22	18	16	391	410
Mont.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	8
idano Wyo	5	4	-	-	- 1	-	2 -	-	19	15
Colo.	41	34	-	-	-	-	5	6	48	61
N. Mex.	34	16 64	1	-	7	4	5	1	20	20
Utah	14	12	2	-	2	5	3	4	46	34
Nev.	12	10	1	-	3	4	1	-	12	46
PACIFIC	90	128	2	4	18	27	7	19	803	1,053
Wash. Oreg	3	11	2	-	-	7	1	3	53	57 51
Calif.	33	55	-	4	18	20	1	9	662	925
Alaska	4	18	-	-	-	-	1	5	5	8
	8	11	-	-	-	-	1	-	22	12
Guam PR	-	- 1	-	-	-	-	-	- 1	- 22	2
V.I.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amer. Samoa	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U

TABLE II. (*Continued*) Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending November 6, 2004, and November 1, 2003 (44th Week)*

1056

(44th week)"	н	epatitis (viral	l, acute), by ty	ре							
		В	(Legio	nellosis	Lister	iosis	Lyme disease		
Reporting area	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	
UNITED STATES	5,362	5,963	723	900	1,546	1,821	530	580	15,192	17,839	
NEW ENGLAND Maine N.H. Vt. Mass.	308 2 36 5 174	310 1 16 4 195	10 - 5 4	7 - - 7 -	53 - 10 5 8	103 2 9 5 51	33 7 3 2 5	45 6 4 1 17	2,337 53 183 46 813	3,422 141 153 41 1,466	
Conn.	с 86	81	1	-	15	22	15	17	1,059	1,106	
MID. ATLANTIC Upstate N.Y. N.Y. City N.J. Pa.	1,070 81 94 648 247	645 77 166 159 243	127 15 - 112	107 13 - 94	452 99 46 87 220	531 132 62 78 259	127 42 17 21 47	118 30 22 22 44	10,142 3,455 - 2,858 3,829	11,871 3,960 189 2,697 5,025	
E.N. CENTRAL Ohio Ind. III. Mich. Wis.	467 104 38 71 231 23	447 122 33 60 191 41	102 5 7 12 78	128 7 8 18 90 5	411 197 66 20 121 7	384 203 26 41 97 17	87 38 16 5 25 3	77 22 8 19 19 9	793 60 16 1 30 686	875 64 20 70 7 714	
W.N. CENTRAL Minn. Iowa Mo. N. Dak. S. Dak. Nebr	274 46 13 164 4 -	277 31 10 192 2 2	42 17 25 -	206 8 1 195 - 2	44 7 5 22 2 4 1	61 3 9 31 1 2 5	15 5 2 5 - 1 2	15 4 - 6 - 4	500 399 42 48 - - 7	343 228 48 60 - 1 2	
Kans.	14	16	-	-	3	10	-	1	4	4	
S. ATLANTIC Del. Md. D.C. Va. W. Va. N.C. S.C. Ga. Fla.	1,663 28 143 19 232 34 139 65 572 431	1,725 9 111 10 155 27 148 144 581 540	146 - 15 3 16 23 11 6 17 55	132 8 7 3 11 24 13 66	328 12 67 8 42 8 29 3 39 120	461 24 116 17 85 16 36 7 33 127	98 N 15 - 17 3 21 3 16 23	114 N 23 1 9 6 16 4 29 26	1,228 137 712 9 155 23 109 12 13 58	1,072 186 633 8 20 91 8 10 34	
E.S. CENTRAL Ky. Tenn. Ala. Miss.	382 60 174 62 86	395 61 173 82 79	86 23 35 4 24	71 13 17 5 36	82 35 33 11 3	94 38 32 19 5	21 4 10 5 2	28 8 10 2	44 15 17 3 9	59 15 15 8 21	
W.S. CENTRAL Ark. La. Okla. Tex.	254 65 55 47 87	951 73 109 51 718	106 2 61 3 40	144 3 95 2 44	56 - 4 5 47	66 2 1 7 56	26 2 3 - 21	47 1 4 3 39	34 8 4 - 22	89 - 6 - 83	
MOUNTAIN Mont. Idaho Wyo. Colo. N. Mex. Ariz. Utah Nev.	395 2 10 7 48 12 208 43 65	491 16 7 29 68 32 221 43 75	41 2 8 7 5 4 13	44 2 1 - 10 - 7 - 24	70 2 7 5 17 4 11 20 4	57 4 3 9 2 10 20 7	25 - 1 - 12 1 - 3 8	31 2 9 2 10 2 4	32 6 3 1 6 13 -	14 - - - 1 3 2 3	
PACIFIC Wash. Oreg. Calif. Alaska Hawaii	549 45 99 380 15 10	722 65 97 535 4 21	63 19 14 25 - 5	61 17 13 29 - 2	50 10 N 40	64 8 N 56	98 9 6 79 - 4	105 7 4 89 - 5	82 13 31 36 2 N	94 3 14 74 3 N	
Guam P.R.	- 49	9 116	-	5	- 1	-	-	-	- N	- N	
V.I. Amer. Samoa C.N.M.I.	U	U U	U	- U U	U	- U U	U	- U U	U		

TABLE II. (Continued) Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending November 6, 2004, and November 1, 2003

	Ма	laria	Mening	ococcal	Perti	ussis	Rabies	. animal	Rocky Mountain		
Reporting area	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	
UNITED STATES	1,083	1,142	1,072	1,401	12,125	7,628	4,784	6,025	1,266	787	
NEW ENGLAND Maine N.H. Vt. Mass. R.I. Conn.	67 6 5 4 34 4 14	59 2 6 2 29 2 18	60 9 7 3 32 2 7	67 6 4 3 41 2 11	1,357 2 72 63 1,177 31 12	1,206 12 87 60 975 16 56	577 39 27 33 250 34 194	525 63 23 30 185 62 162	18 - - 15 1 2	8 - - 8 -	
MID. ATLANTIC Upstate N.Y. N.Y. City N.J. Pa.	273 41 139 52 41	310 47 169 58 36	131 31 23 31 46	168 42 38 22 66	2,398 1,667 128 198 405	907 409 125 143 230	493 453 11 29	804 371 6 62 365	80 3 19 30 28	40 - 13 16 11	
E.N. CENTRAL Ohio Ind. III. Mich. Wis.	94 29 14 22 19 10	95 18 3 40 23 11	150 61 23 12 43 11	222 53 39 63 40 27	2,614 505 175 351 255 1,328	847 233 55 79 104 376	145 70 10 47 16 2	158 50 26 23 45 14	25 13 5 2 5	19 8 1 5 5	
W.N. CENTRAL Minn. Iowa Mo. N. Dak. S. Dak. Nebr. Kans.	61 25 4 18 3 1 3 7	43 20 5 5 1 3 - 9	79 22 16 18 2 2 4 15	112 25 23 44 1 7 7	1,592 313 134 268 701 30 43 103	386 141 120 70 6 3 9 37	445 81 100 55 53 10 53 93	591 34 96 40 52 123 93 153	109 - 92 - 4 12 -	60 1 2 48 - 5 3 1	
S. ATLANTIC Del. Md. D.C. Va. W. Va. N.C. S.C. Ga. Fla.	293 6 64 13 45 2 19 9 54 81	284 2 65 13 34 4 20 4 63 79	196 3 10 4 18 5 27 11 21 97	236 8 24 5 24 5 30 21 27 92	575 8 107 4 170 18 79 42 32 115	553 9 76 2 91 16 118 113 29 99	1,690 9 270 410 57 527 125 290 2	2,344 56 312 457 78 703 210 340 188	658 4 60 - 30 4 460 17 64 19	445 1 96 1 30 5 207 32 64 9	
E.S. CENTRAL Ky. Tenn. Ala. Miss.	27 4 7 11 5	27 8 5 7 7	56 11 15 15 15	77 17 22 20 18	243 64 135 30 14	138 44 63 18 13	126 20 36 59 11	189 35 98 55 1	170 2 88 46 34	118 2 62 21 33	
W.S. CENTRAL Ark. La. Okla. Tex.	91 7 5 7 72	115 4 4 103	98 15 34 9 40	155 14 37 14 90	654 63 10 33 548	651 43 10 77 521	954 45 - 96 813	1,033 25 2 178 828	176 98 5 71 2	87 31 - 42 14	
MOUNTAIN Mont. Idaho Wyo. Colo. N. Mex. Ariz. Utah Nev.	40 - 13 3 11 7 5	37 - 1 21 2 7 4 1	58 3 7 3 14 7 12 5 7	72 5 6 2 21 8 21 1 8	1,277 46 35 28 651 129 194 156 38	821 5 70 124 289 65 118 116 34	197 25 7 6 42 5 101 8 3	169 20 15 6 38 5 66 14 5	25 3 4 2 2 8	9 1 2 2 1 - 1	
PACIFIC Wash. Oreg. Calif. Alaska Hawaii	137 16 16 100 2 3	172 23 9 133 1 6	244 29 53 153 3 6	292 29 51 193 7 12	1,415 613 371 399 11 21	2,119 648 404 995 62 10	157 6 143 8	212 - 6 197 9 -	5 - 3 2 -	1 - 1 -	
Guam P.R. V.I. Amer. Samoa C.N.M.I.	- - - U	1 2 - U U	- 7 - U	- 9 - U U	6 - U	1 4 - U U	53 - - -	- 65 - U U	N U	- N - U U	

TABLE II. (*Continued*) Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending November 6, 2004, and November 1, 2003 (44th Week)*

MMWR

(44th Week)*							0(111			
					Streptococc	al disease,	Drug res	asive		
	Salmon	ellosis	Shige	llosis	invasive,	group A	all a	ges	Age <	5 years
Reporting area	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003	Cum. 2004	Cum. 2003
UNITED STATES	33,584	36,842	9,981	19,828	3,841	4,844	1,824	1,694	582	600
NEW ENGLAND	1,757	1,828	253	287	156	414	26	86	59	8
Maine N H	79 124	115 129	4	6 7	8 17	26 29	2	-	3 N	N
Vt.	55	65	3	7	8	19	7	6	3	4
Mass.	998	1,064	159	193	105	181	N 17	N 10	46	N
Conn.	394	347	61	61	-	145	-	70	Ú	Ŭ
MID. ATLANTIC	4,676	4,247	993	2,045	618	839	113	113	101	86
Upstate N.Y.	1,067	998 1 180	383	431	207	312	49	61	71	65
N.J.	785	701	200	319	142	159	-	-	6	2
Pa.	1,773	1,368	86	945	180	238	64	52	24	19
E.N. CENTRAL	4,224	4,945	919	1,622	753	1,139	414	369	136	265
Ind.	504	486	186	∠oo 144	202	200 108	122	130	33	84 26
III.	1,168	1,741	278	877	161	291	-	-	-	106
Mich. Wis.	758 666	683 840	168 136	222 113	261 43	326 148	N N	N	N 36	N 49
W.N. CENTRAL	2,065	2,158	364	690	267	300	17	16	91	65
Minn.	531	471	62	92	130	145	-	-	59	45
Iowa Mo	390 529	335 804	61 137	68 324	N 55	N 67	N 12	N 12	N 13	N 3
N. Dak.	40	33	3	6	11	15	-	3	3	6
S. Dak. Nebr	112 130	103 147	10 22	16 86	17 14	22	5	1	-	- 5
Kans.	333	265	69	98	40	27	Ν	Ν	10	6
S. ATLANTIC	9,522	9,238	2,333	5,890	850	797	953	912	46	18
Del. Md	81 682	93 740	6 121	161	3 138	6 196	4	1 10	N 33	N
D.C.	53	39	34	69	9	8	5	-	3	7
Va.	1,076	912	147	387	65	92	N	N 61	N 10	N 11
N.C.	1,406	1,157	306	837	115	93	N	N	U	U
S.C.	765	653	275	415	37	38	69	126	N	N
Fla.	3,560	3,758	596 842	2,423	199	175	505	203 502	N	N
E.S. CENTRAL	2,193	2,573	685	846	186	171	120	122	5	-
Ky. Topp	297 522	349	61 227	118	54	41	26	16	N	N
Ala.	632	659	251	284	-	-	-	-	N	N
Miss.	742	908	46	163	-	-	1	-	5	-
W.S. CENTRAL	2,897	5,423	2,330	5,107	225	245	53	65	106	96
La.	679	789	244	419	2	1	45	20 45	24	19
Okla.	360	419	408	738	60	77	N	N	39	47
	1,378	3,494	700	3,853	147	101	IN		30	23
Mont.	2,000	95	4	1,061	445	400	- 34	-	- 30	- 62
Idaho	135	155	13	29	8	18	N	N	Ν	Ν
vvyo. Colo.	48 493	73 430	5 140	280	8 134	2 115	10	6	- 35	- 46
N. Mex.	239	234	109	220	70	99	5	-	-	11
Ariz. Utab	614 218	567 196	338	419 43	184	132	N 17	N 1	N 3	N 5
Nev.	143	156	47	61	3	2	2	-	-	-
PACIFIC	4,184	4,524	1,404	2,280	341	539	94	4	-	-
Wash. Oreg	488 376	494 369	96 68	147 201	53 N	56 N	- N	- N	N	N
Calif.	2,945	3,410	1,191	1,883	183	369	N	Ň	N	N
Alaska Hawaii	53 322	62 180	6 43	9 40	-	- 11/	- Q <i>1</i>	- 1	N	N
Guam	-	109		40 22	-	-	-	4	-	-
P.R.	238	564	8	27	N	N	N	N	N	N
V.I. Amer Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C.N.M.I.	3	Ŭ	-	Ŭ	-	Ŭ	-	Ŭ	-	Ŭ

TABLE II. (Continued) Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending November 6, 2004, and November 1, 2003

		Svn	hilis						Varicella		
	Primary	& secondary	Cong	genital	Tube	rculosis	(Chicke	npox)			
Reporting area	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	Cum.	
UNITED STATES	6,183	5,957	282	377	8,770	10,526	245	312	15,045	13,879	
NEW ENGLAND Maine N H	157 2 4	181 7 16	5 - 3	1	310 13	357 19 11	19	26 - 2	607 180	2,763 760	
Vt.	-	1	-	-	-	9	-	-	427	631	
Mass. R.I.	100 21	115 20	- 1	-	206 29	187 43	13 1	15 2	-	147 5	
Conn.	30	22	1	1	62	88	5	7	-	1,220	
MID. ATLANTIC Upstate N.Y. N.Y. City	804 84 486	733 34 421	41 5 13	58 9 31	1,708 226 852	1,848 241 941	58 9 20	72 12 34	76 - -	34 - -	
Pa.	129	131	1	-	278	298	15	5	76	34	
E.N. CENTRAL Ohio Ind. III. Mich.	712 183 46 296 158	777 175 39 326 222	52 1 8 14 29	68 3 12 20 32	999 167 111 457 193	969 171 112 458 175	17 5 - 10	32 2 4 16 10	4,796 1,139 - 3,265	4,722 1,042 - 2,921	
Wis.	29	15	-	1	71	53	2	-	392	759	
W.N. CENTRAL Minn. Iowa Mo.	128 15 5 81	132 40 8 52	5 1 - 2	4 - - 4	370 148 33 94	388 161 28 97	9 5 - 2	6 2 2 1	130 - N 5	48 - N -	
N. Dak. S. Dak. Nebr. Kans	- - 5 22	2 2 5 23	- - - 2	-	4 8 27 56	- 16 16 70	2	- - 1	82 43 -	48	
S. ATLANTIC	1,616	1,573	44 1	74	1,568	2,112	42	44	1,922 4	1,841 29	
Md.	290	265	7	12	196	210	11	9	-	1	
Va.	89	43 72	3	-	223	- 222	- 8	14	487	478	
W.Va. N.C	2 161	2 133	- 10	- 16	17 233	19 268	- 7	- 7	1,156 N	1,084 N	
S.C.	101	87	7	12	151	145	-	-	254	222	
Fla.	624	414 551	14	20	671	437 788	10	5	-	-	
E.S. CENTRAL	338	280	18	12	446	586	7	6	-	-	
Ky. Tenn.	41 110	31 116	1 8	1 2	96 164	102 196	3 4	1 2	-	-	
Ala. Miss	142	102	7	7	153	191 97	-	3	-	-	
W.S. CENTRAL	1,010	790	43	68	921	1,544	19	30	5,366	3,962	
La.	237	140	-	1	-	-	-	-	46	16	
Okla. Tex.	24 714	56 552	2 41	1 64	135 692	124 1.343	1 18	1 29	- 5.320	- 3.946	
MOUNTAIN Mont	299	272	45	30	392 4	373	6	6	2,148	509	
Idaho	18	10	2	2	4	8	-	1	-	-	
Colo.	36	30	-	- 3	4 85	4 88	-	- 3	40 1,644	45	
N. Mex.	46 157	55 160	1 42	7 18	18 175	40 176	- 2	- 2	84	3	
Utah Nev.	7 32	7 10	-	-	34 68	30 22	1 2	-	380	461	
PACIFIC Wash	1,119	1,219	29	62	2,056	2,349	68	90	-	-	
Oreg.	24	40	-	-	74	90	2	4	-	-	
Alaska Hawaii	978 1 6	1,106 1 6	28 - 1	60 - 2	1,665 32 94	1,910 48 96	54 - 6	82 - 1	-	-	
Guam P.R.	- 138	1 182	- 5	- 14	- 84	48 95	-	-	- 251	121 513	
V.I. Amer Samoa	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
C.N.M.I.	2	U	-	U	10	U	-	U	-	U	

TABLE II. (*Continued*) Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending November 6, 2004, and November 1, 2003 (44th Week)*

TABLE III. Deaths in 122 U.S. cities,* week ending November 6, 2004 (44th Week)

	All causes, by age (years)								All causes, by age (years)						
Reporting Area	All Ages	<u>></u> 65	45-64	25–44	1–24	<1	P&I⁺ Total	Reporting Area	All Ages	<u>></u> 65	45-64	25–44	1–24	<1	P&l⁺ Total
NEW ENGLAND Boston, Mass. Bridgeport, Conn.	445 132 29	316 89 20	92 32 5	17 5 4	9 2 -	11 4 -	33 15 3	S. ATLANTIC Atlanta, Ga. Baltimore, Md.	969 152 142	605 86 80	239 44 42	77 17 11	31 3 5	17 2 4	62 4 16
Fall River, Mass. Hartford, Conn.	35 72 22	9 22 48 15	8 17 7	2 5	3	-	1 4 1	Jacksonville, Fla. Miami, Fla.	167 52 44	102 33 26	43 9 9	14 8 6	2 5 2 1	3 - 2	9 10 3 1
Lynn, Mass. New Bedford, Mass. New Haven, Conn.	15 24 U	11 20 U	3 3 U	1 - U	- 1 U	- - U	- 1 U	Richmond, Va. Savannah, Ga. St. Petersburg, Fla.	45 62 66	27 44 44	13 12 9	1 3 8	2 1 5	2	2 7 5
Providence, R.I. Somerville, Mass. Springfield, Mass.	U 2 44	U 2 27	U - 9	U - 2	U - -	U - 6	U - 4	Tampa, Fla. Washington, D.C. Wilmington, Del.	184 U 30	124 U 26	47 U 4	6 U -	6 U	1 U -	9 U 3
Waterbury, Conn. Worcester, Mass. MID. ATLANTIC	27 74 2.137	23 61 1.440	3 10 472	1 1 141	- 1 45	- 1 35	2 5 126	E.S. CENTRAL Birmingham, Ala. Chattanooga, Tenn.	742 148 58	464 88 41	180 36 11	49 10 3	25 8 2	24 6 1	49 8 8
Albany, N.Y. Allentown, Pa. Buffalo, N.Y. Camden, N.J.	54 27 92 19 21	31 23 65 12	19 4 18 4 5	1 - 5 1 2	1 - 3 U	2 - 1 2	3 2 8 1	Knoxville, Tenn. Lexington, Ky. Memphis, Tenn. Mobile, Ala.	95 66 183 53	69 48 112 37	20 14 47 11	3 3 13 2	- 3 1 3 1	- 8 2	3 6 7 4
Erie, Pa. Jersey City, N.J. New York City, N.Y.	47 33 1,203	37 23 838 27	8 5 253	1 1 77	1 1 18	- 3 14 1	4 - 70	Nashville, Tenn. W.S. CENTRAL Austin, Tex.	186 783 77	103 495 52	53 186 14	14 62 4	9 21 2	7 19 5	12 33 2
Paterson, N.J. Philadelphia, Pa. Pittsburgh, Pa. [§] Reading, Pa.	28 333 46 22	15 189 30 17	10 84 9 4	2 35 -	4 - 15 -	1 9 7 1	15 15 1	Baton Rouge, La. Corpus Christi, Tex. Dallas, Tex. El Paso, Tex.	U 43 218 65	U 29 126 42	U 7 56 12	U 3 26 8	U 1 7 1	U 3 2	U 2 12 6
Rochester, N.Y. Schenectady, N.Y. Scranton, Pa. Syracuse, N.Y.	140 23 23 83	91 18 18 59	38 3 5 15	9 - - 5	1 2 - 1	1 - - 3	15 3 - 8	Liver Houston, Tex. Little Rock, Ark. New Orleans, La. San Antonio, Tex	109 347 U 54 252	05 216 U 40 162	30 85 U 14 57	9 30 U - 21	3 12 U - 9	2 4 U - 3	5 23 U - 22
Trenton, N.J. Utica, N.Y. Yonkers, N.Y.	9 15 20	8 14 19	1 1 1	-	- -	-	- - 1	Shreveport, La. Tulsa, Okla.	86 131	51 90	24 29	3	5 2	3 1	6
E.N. CENTRAL Akron, Ohio Canton, Ohio Chicago, III. Cincinati, Ohio	1,230 60 39 315 67	860 43 29 194 51	258 11 7 78 10	64 5 3 27	21 - - 6 1	27 1 - 10 2	91 13 1 24 4	MOUNTAIN Albuquerque, N.M. Boise, Idaho Colo. Springs, Colo. Denver, Colo.	840 114 52 65 105	552 80 29 47 59	186 27 14 11 24	64 4 5 14	18 2 3 2 4	19 1 2 - 4	66 10 4 4 12
Cleveland, Ohio Columbus, Ohio Dayton, Ohio Detroit, Mich.	230 188 U 138	181 117 U 78	35 50 U 43	8 11 U 13	3 6 U 1	3 4 U 3	8 12 U 11	Las Vegas, Nev. Ogden, Utah Phoenix, Ariz. Pueblo, Colo. Salt Lake City. Utah	245 31 93 25 110	158 23 53 20 83	57 5 27 4 17	23 - 7 1 6	3 - 1 - 3	4 3 4 - 1	15 1 6 4 10
Evansville, Ind. Fort Wayne, Ind. Gary, Ind.	35 62 U	24 52 U	9 9 U	- U	2 1 U	- - U	2 6 U	Tucson, Ariz. PACIFIC Barkolay Calif	U 543	U 364	U 117	U 30	U 18	U 14	U 38
Indianapolis, Ind. Lansing, Mich. Milwaukee, Wis. Peoria, III.	97 U U 84 49	U U 55 34	24 U U 21 11	U U 5 4	4 U U -	U U 3	U U 10 4	Fresno, Calif. Glendale, Calif. Honolulu, Hawaii Long Beach, Calif.	66 20 72 59	49 17 56 36	12 2 8 16	4 1 5 2	- - 2 1	- 1 - 1 4	- 7 1 8 4
Rockford, III. South Bend, Ind. Toledo, Ohio Youngstown, Ohio	68 54 108 U	42 42 85 U	19 5 15 U	4 4 2 U	1 - 2 U	2 3 4 U	4 3 5 U	Los Angeles, Calif. Pasadena, Calif. Portland, Oreg. Sacramento, Calif.	U U 129 U	U U 88 U	U U 25 U	U U 11 U	U U 2 U	U U 3 U	U U 13 U
W.N. CENTRAL Des Moines, Iowa Duluth, Minn. Kansas City, Kans	440 53 U	293 40 U	98 7 U	25 4 U	18 2 U	6 - U	20 3 U	San Diego, Calif. San Francisco, Calif. San Jose, Calif. Santa Cruz, Calif.	162 115 U 34	107 63 U 19	34 36 U 7	12 15 U 5	5 1 U 1	4 - U 2	14 12 U 3
Kansas City, No. Lincoln, Nebr. Minneapolis, Minn.	93 29 U	65 21 U	19 5 U	7 2 U	2 - U	- 1 U	3 1 U	Seattle, Wash. Spokane, Wash. Tacoma, Wash.	89 52 105	61 40 70	21 12 23	2 - 3	3 - 8	2 - 1	4 6 5
Omaha, Nebr. St. Louis, Mo. St. Paul, Minn. Wichita, Kans.	84 84 U 97	63 46 U 58	19 26 U 22	1 5 U 6	1 6 U 7	- 1 U 4	8 1 U 4	TOTAL	8,129 [¶]	5,389	1,828	529	206	172	518

U: Unavailable. -: No reported cases.

* Mortality data in this table are voluntarily reported from 122 cities in the United States, most of which have populations of ≥100,000. A death is reported by the place of its

¹ Total includes unknown ages.

The Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) Series is prepared by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and is available free of charge in electronic format and on a paid subscription basis for paper copy. To receive an electronic copy each week, send an e-mail message to *listserv@listserv.cdc.gov*. The body content should read *SUBscribe mmwr-toc*. Electronic copy also is available from CDC's World-Wide Web server at *http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr* or from CDC's file transfer protocol server at *ftp://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/publications/mmwr*. To subscribe for paper copy, contact Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402; telephone 202-512-1800.

Data in the weekly *MMWR* are provisional, based on weekly reports to CDC by state health departments. The reporting week concludes at close of business on Friday; compiled data on a national basis are officially released to the public on the following Friday. Address inquiries about the *MMWR* Series, including material to be considered for publication, to Editor, *MMWR* Series, Mailstop E-96, CDC, 1600 Clifton Rd., N.E., Atlanta, GA 30333; telephone 888-232-3228.

All material in the MMWR Series is in the public domain and may be used and reprinted without permission; citation as to source, however, is appreciated.

All MMWR references are available on the Internet at http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr. Use the search function to find specific articles.

Use of trade names and commercial sources is for identification only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

References to non-CDC sites on the Internet are provided as a service to *MMWR* readers and do not constitute or imply endorsement of these organizations or their programs by CDC or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. CDC is not responsible for the content of these sites. URL addresses listed in *MMWR* were current as of the date of publication.

☆U.S. Government Printing Office: 2005-733-116/00056 Region IV ISSN: 0149-2195