

Commentary on: Hardin GC. Postmortem blood and vitreous humor ethanol concentrations in a victim of a fatal motor vehicle crash. *J Forensic Sci* 2002;47(2):402–403.

Sir:

The case report by Hardin, showing a discrepancy between the cavity blood ethanol and the vitreous ethanol in a traffic fatality (Hardin GG. Postmortem blood and vitreous humor ethanol concentrations in a victim of a fatal motor vehicle crash. *J Forensic Sci* 2002 Mar;47(2):402–3) is just another example of the fact that one should not use cavity blood for forensic toxicology (1).

References

1. Freimuth HC. Forensic aspects of alcohol. In: Spitz WU, editor. *Spitz and Fisher's medicolegal investigation of death*, Third Edition. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1993, 770.

James K. Ribe, M.D., J.D.
Senior Deputy Medical Examiner
Los Angeles County Department of Coroner
1104 North Mission Road
Los Angeles, CA 90033

Author's Response

Sir:

I would like to thank Dr. Ribe for his interest in my case report (1). He has brought up a valuable point, of which apparently some coroners need to be reminded from time to time.

Reference

1. Hardin GG. Postmortem blood and vitreous humor ethanol concentrations in a victim of a fatal motor vehicle crash. *J Forensic Sci* 2002 Mar; 47(2):402–3.

Glenn G. Hardin, MPH, DABFT
Toxicology Supervisor
Forensic Science Laboratory
Minnesota Department of Public Safety
Bureau of Criminal Apprehension
1246 University Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104
Fax: 651-643-3018
E-mail: glenn.hardin@state.mn.us