



ERRATA

“METALLOPTYSIS”. E.M. HADLEY AND P.J. REES. *EUR RESPIR J* 2006; 27: 867–868.

Unfortunately, the legend of figure 1 was printed incorrectly. The figure legend should read as follows: Photographs displaying some of the staples the patient expelled. a) The third staple expelled. b) The expelled four linked, closed staples. Scale bars=0.2 mm (a) and 500 μ m (b).

DOI: 10.1183/09031936.06.50137405

“IMPACT OF SMOKE-FREE WORKPLACE LEGISLATION ON EXPOSURES AND HEALTH: POSSIBILITIES FOR PREVENTION.” M.S. JAAKKOLA AND J.J.K. JAAKKOLA. *EUR RESPIR J* 2006; 28: 397–408.

Unfortunately, table 1 was printed incorrectly. Table 1 should have appeared as shown.

DOI: 10.1183/09031936.06.50001306



TABLE 1 Impact of smoke-free workplace legislation on exposure, health and attitudes

First author [ref.], country, year	Legislation	Study population	Effect on exposure			Effect on health/attitudes			
			Daily ETS at work	1994–1995	Exposed % 1995–1996	1998	Preferred smk policy at work	1994–1995	Supporters % 1995–1996
HELOMA [12], Finland, 2003	March 1995 reformed tobacco-control legislation in Finland implemented nationally smoke-free workplaces (prohibition or designated, separately ventilated smoking spaces); legislation on smoke-free bars and restaurants came into effect in 2000	Nine large or middle-sized workplaces representing industry, service sector and offices in both private and public sectors; 880 employees in 1994–1995 (before new act), 940 in 1995–1996 (1 yr after law) and 659 in 1993 (3 yrs after law, eight workplaces)	No <1 h 1–4 h >4 h	20.7 28.8 17.7 32.9	54.2 28.6 9.0 8.2 (p<0.0001)	70.7 17.5 8.4 3.4	Nonsmokers Complete ban Designated smk areas only Allowed/no restrictions	36.0 54.2 9.8	40.7 51.7 7.6 (p<0.0001)
1) WEBER [14], California, USA, 2003	January 1995 statewide, smoke-free workplace legislation in California, USA; January 1998 statewide legislation on smoke-free bars and taverns	1) Annual cross-sectional survey since 1998 of 8–10% of the 9 000 Los Angeles County bars and restaurants with an alcohol licence; 2) Fifty-three bartenders in San Francisco bars or taverns examined 1 month before and after the 1998 law came into effect	1) Compliance with smoke-free law % Bars/restaurants Employees Patrons Freestanding bars Employees Patrons 2) Median self-reported ETS exposure at work declined from 28 h to 2 h week ⁻¹ (p<0.001)	1) 1998 96.5 92.2 86.2 45.7	2002 99.2 98.5 94.7 75.8	p-value 0.0047 0.0001 0.0003 0.0001	2) Upper respiratory symptoms % Lower respiratory symptoms % FEV1 L·s ⁻¹ FVC L	Baseline 74 77 3.38 4.43	Follow-up 32 [#] 19 [#] 3.42 4.62 [#]
SARGENT [16], Montana, USA, 2004	Smoke-free workplace legislation in Helena, MT, USA, from June 5 to December 3, 2002. Helena is a geographically isolated community with a population of 68140.	Comparison of the number of monthly hospital admissions for acute myocardial infarction during the law (June–November 2002) with admissions during a similar 6-month period before (1998–2001) and after (2003) the law in Helena. Also comparison with admissions in communities outside Helena.	No direct assessment of exposure. The city-county health department reported that all but two businesses complied with the law in Helena.				Admissions for acute myocardial infarction during June–November Helena Outside Helena	24 40 -16 (-31.7–-0.3) -21.6 (-40.6–-2.6)	18 12.4 5.6 (-5.2–16.4)
ALLWRIGHT [17], Republic of Ireland (RI), 2005	March 2004 national smoke-free workplace legislation, including pubs and restaurants; no allowance for designated smoking spaces	249 bar staff (including 158 nonsmokers) recruited from three areas in RI and one area in Northern Ireland (NI), who gave saliva sample and answered a questionnaire pre-legislation (September 2003–March 2004) and post-legislation (September 2004–March 2005)	Salivary cotinine nmol·L ⁻¹ RI NI Hours exposed at work in 7 days RI NI Hours exposed outside work in 7 days RI NI	Pre-law 29.0 25.3 40 42 4 0	Post-law 5.1 20.4 0 40 0 2.5	p-value <0.001 0.05 <0.001 0.02 <0.001 0.41	Adjusted rate ratios (95% CI) Pre-law Respiratory symptoms RI NI Sensory symptoms RI NI	1.33 (1.14–1.54) 0.67 (0.39–1.17) 1.19 (1.02–1.39) 1.09 (0.75–1.56)	Post-law 0.98 (0.83–1.16) [#] 0.83 (0.50–1.36) [†] 0.69 (0.57–0.85) [#] 0.65 (0.44–0.97) [†]

ETS: environmental tobacco smoke; smk: smoking; FEV1: forced expiratory volume in one second; FVC: forced vital capacity; CI: confidence interval. [#]: statistically significant; [†]: nonsignificant.