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Since the group was formed in 1985 the administration and organisation of the group has passed from one senior registrar to the next. The group has successfully promoted a wide interest in clinical research among junior staff.
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Impact of AIDS on neonatal care

Sir,

I greatly enjoyed Tom Lissauer’s annotation on the impact of AIDS (does he mean HIV infection?) on neonatal care.\(^1\) I beg to differ, however, on his conclusion that we should avoid the ‘two tier’ system of neonatal care. At delivery, where there is much blood and liquor and the potential for staff to become infected (although none have yet been shown to have been infected at delivery), the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists have not unreasonably proposed a general improvement in standards of hygiene, and extra precautions for delivery of women who are HIV seropositive or from high risk groups.\(^2\) Their proposals regarding precautions to be taken by paediatric staff at delivery also seem eminently reasonable.

The risk to staff of contracting HIV infection from a baby postnatally, however, is exceedingly low and there may be virtually no risk. To suggest that we should be wearing gloves and eye protection whenever we are taking blood or performing any invasive procedure on any newborn must be an over reaction. Why should the risk stop in the newborn period? The corollary is surely that we should wear gloves whenever we take blood from any child, or adult for that matter. Yet, as Dr Lissauer himself states, the major risk is of accidental autoinoculation with HIV positive blood against which gloves provide very little protection. In many hospitals in New York gloves are worn for all procedures as Dr Lissauer’s statement implies. The annual gloves bill for one hospital in the Bronx is over 5 million dollars (A Mezey, personal communication). I think this is illogical, expensive, and off putting to parents and children. I believe staff with open lesions (cuts, eczema) should cover these with waterproof tape. I will wear gloves to take blood from babies and children I know to be, or suspect of being, HIV positive and try to avoid needle stick injuries at all times. But I will not wear gloves and eye protection to take blood from or handle other newborns or older children.
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Bradycardia associated with chlorhexidine spray

Sir,

We report a possible iatrogenic cause of bradycardia in a term neonate.

Case report

The girl was born by normal delivery after an uneventful antenatal period. Her Apgar scores were 9 and 10 at 1 and 5 minutes respectively. No medication was given during the labour. In order to prevent possible mastitis the mother used chlorhexidine spray on her breasts from the third feed when the baby was 12 hours old. Cyanotic spells associated with bradycardia (<40 per minute) but not with apnoea occurred from 48 hours. The heart rate was lowest during sleep but increased on stimulation. Multiple episodes occurred over the next 48 hours, and some needed treatment with atropine, to which they responded. An electrocardiogram confirmed sinus bradycardia. The chlorhexidine spray was stopped and the bradycardias became less frequent and less severe. By day six they had abated completely and follow up examination at five weeks was normal. Investigations including full blood count, urea and electrolytes, thyroid function tests, cardiac enzymes, and an echocardiogram were all normal. The serum chlorhexidine concentration at 120 hours was 11 pg/l. This was estimated when the spray had been stopped and the worst of the bradycardias had abated.

Adrenergic nerve damage, which was dose dependent but reversible, has been produced in rat iridies after the local injection of as little as 0.25 μg of chlorhexidine.\(^3\) The gastrointestinal absorption of chlorhexidine has not been studied in man but assumed to be low\(^2\) despite studies showing significant absorption through the intact skin of newborn infants.\(^3\) The dose of chlorhexidine in each spray is 430 μg. Over 24 hours (assuming six feeds) 2.5 mg is delivered to the breast and could be ingested by the baby. Studies on absorption of chlorhexidine from the gastrointestinal tract need to be conducted and awareness of possible side effects maintained.
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