LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Rapid responses

If you have a burning desire to respond to a paper published in *Arch Dis Child*, why not make use of our “rapid response” option?

Log on to our website (www.archdischild.com), find the paper that interests you, click on “full text” and send your response by email by clicking on “submit a response”.

Providing it isn’t libellous or obscene, it will be posted within seven days. You can retrieve it by clicking on “read rapid responses” on our homepage.

The editors will decide, as before, whether to also publish it in a future paper issue.

Iron deficiency anaemia, *Helicobacter pylori* infection and delayed pubertal growth

We read with great interest the paper by Choe et al on iron deficiency anaemia (IDA) and *Helicobacter pylori* infection at puberty.1 We read with great interest the paper by Choe et al on iron deficiency anaemia (IDA) and *Helicobacter pylori* infection at puberty.1

We wish to raise two matters not discussed in Dr Morley’s letter.

Firstly, when the paper was published, there was prominent media coverage, erroneously concluding that our paper rendered the diagnosis of *H pylori* infection with iron deficiency anaemia and subnormal growth at puberty.2 The authors concluded that *H pylori* infection and related IDA, rather than bacterial infection alone, might cause delayed pubertal growth. However, we believe that these results need some consideration.

*H pylori* infection may cause IDA in different ways: (a) the bacteria can cause a decrease in the gastric juice of the concentration of ascorbic acid, which is the best promoter of non-heme iron absorption;3 (b) *H pylori* may increase iron demand because of subclinical gastrointestinal bleeding; our study to be as clear as possible.

Alan Lucas

*ABC Childhood Nutrition Research Centre, Institute of Child Health, 30 Guilford Street, London WC1N 1EH, UK*
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Iron status and development

**EDITOR,—**You have recently published a response by Dr Morley to Dr Stevens concerning our paper on iron status and development.3 We wish to raise two matters not discussed in Dr Morley’s letter.

Firstly, when the paper was published, there was prominent media coverage, erroneously concluding that our paper rendered the diagnosis of *H pylori* infection with iron deficiency anaemia and subnormal growth at puberty.2 The authors concluded that *H pylori* infection and related IDA, rather than bacterial infection alone, might cause delayed pubertal growth. However, we believe that these results need some consideration.

*H pylori* infection may cause IDA in different ways: (a) the bacteria can cause a decrease in the gastric juice of the concentration of ascorbic acid, which is the best promoter of non-heme iron absorption;3 (b) *H pylori* may increase iron demand because of subclinical gastrointestinal bleeding; our study to be as clear as possible.

Alan Lucas

*ABC Childhood Nutrition Research Centre, Institute of Child Health, 30 Guilford Street, London WC1N 1EH, UK*
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Consider absolute risks in SIDS prevention

EDITOR,—The demonstration by Blair et al of an association between poor postnatal growth and an increased risk of sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS), is a useful addition to our understanding of the aetiology of this condition. It is unfortunate that the conclusion in the abstract that “Poor postnatal weight gain was independently associated with an increased risk of SIDS” and that “poor postnatal weight gain ‘was independently associated with an increased risk of SIDS’” and also that poor postnatal weight gain “could be identified at the routine six week assessment” goes beyond the data presented.

It can be estimated from the data in this study that the overall risk of SIDS in the first year was 0.77/1000 live births. The risk in babies with birth weights greater than the 15th centile, the group in whom the relation with postnatal growth was detected, was 0.68/1000. Given the reported odds ratio of 1.75 associated with being in the slowest growing 16% who might be identified at six weeks, the data suggest that the absolute risk of SIDS among this group would be about 1.1/1000. Even a programme targeted at infants below the 2nd centile for growth at six weeks, would identify a group whose absolute risk of SIDS was about 4.2/1000—that is, for every infant who might benefit from the intervention, there would be 2 babies for whom it would be of no benefit. Even if it were accepted that this level of risk was sufficient to trigger an intervention, the nature of the intervention remains unclear. To the best of our knowledge, with the exception of the “Back to Sleep” campaign, there is no convincing evidence of the effectiveness of any intervention aimed at preventing SIDS. None of the intervention programmes described in the accompanying commentary have been evaluated appropriately controlled studies.

The discussion in the paper is rather more circumspect than the conclusion in the abstract, but it is the latter which, reinforced by the accompanying commentary, is likely to have disproportionate impact on those readers who do not read the whole paper. In the commentary Dr Carpenter acknowledges that the low rates of SIDS make such interventions difficult to justify but then suggests that “Targeting such infants for weight monitoring at home . . . will also identify numerous other problems at a remedial stage”. This is a suggestion for which there is currently little evidence.

There are clear dangers in recommending population interventions on the basis of relative risks without taking account of absolute risks or of the need for interventions to be of proven effectiveness.

STUART LOGAN
HELEN BEDFORD
Department of Paediatric Epidemiology,
Institute of Child Health, 30 Guilford Street,
London WC1N 1EH, UK
email: slogan@ich.ucl.ac.uk

DAVID ELLIMAN
St George’s Hospital, Blackshaw Road,
London SW17 0QT, UK

Drs Blair, Fleming, and Platt comment:

Poor postnatal weight gain was a significant factor in the multivariate analysis despite controlling for low birth weight, prematurity, neonatal problems, poor socioeconomic sta-

tus, and many other potential confounding factors, and remained significant when further highly predictive covariates of SIDS such as infants put down prone, infants found with head covered, and tobacco exposure were added to the model. In this sense postnatal weight gain was independently associated with an increased risk of SIDS. We also found the difference in weight gain between the SIDS and control infants measured from birthweight to the last known weight was equally apparent if measured from birth to the sixth week assessment. We therefore stand by our conclusion in the abstract that poor postnatal weight gain “was independently associated with an increased risk of SIDS” and also that poor postnatal weight gain “could be identified at the routine six week assessment”.

We find it difficult to understand how this conclusion advocates an intervention campaign on the basis of these two statements and disagree with Logan and colleagues that our discussion on this matter was circumspect. We point out clearly that poor weight gain itself is not a sensitive marker and that it “should be seen as a thread in a web of factors that render an infant at increased risk to SIDS and is both a consequence of adverse health and social conditions”.

We agree that absolute risks must be used for targeted prevention campaigns but do not advocate such a campaign based on our solitary finding. Preliminary analysis of risk scoring systems showed on the first two years of our dataset, tested inappropriately controlled studies.

To our knowledge the “Back to Sleep” campaign initiated in October 1991 has not been evaluated in an appropriately controlled study yet the SIDS rate in England and Wales more than halved from 1.7 deaths per 1000 live births in 1990 to 0.77 deaths in 1992. Findings from our study have helped build on the advice regarding safe sleeping practices; parents are now advised not only to avoid placing infants in the prone position but also the side position, bed sharing under certain circumstances, sharing a sofa to sleep, and to avoid head covering while in bed. The feet of the infant at the foot of the cot. In 1998 the SIDS rate fell a further 25% in England and Wales to 0.45 deaths per 1000 livebirths. There is no direct evidence that these recommendations and fall in SIDS rates are linked although the dramatic fall in the prevalence of parents placing their infant in the prone position to sleep (57% before the campaign to 3% after the campaign) suggest many parents take up such recommendations.

A targeted population intervention would perhaps be inappropriate given the reduced number of SIDS deaths in this country but risk scoring systems could be used to identify and study “high risk” families to both increase our understanding of the risks associated with the infant sleeping environment and improve the advice we give parents in the hope that the number of SIDS deaths reduces still further.

SUDHIR PATIL
St George’s Hospital, Blackshaw Road,
London SW17 0QT, UK
email: s.pati@ich.ucl.ac.uk

Are we requesting too many DMSA scans?

EDITOR,—The recent article by Christian et al highlights the benefits of clinical features in assessing the risk of renal scarring and therefore the need for dimercaptosuccinic acid (DMSA) scan after urinary tract infection (UTI). We recently performed a study to assess the recording of fever, malaise, recurrent UTI, and urine culture results in children investigated with DMSA scan after UTI. Between April 1996 and October 1997 there were 171 DMSA scans in our hospital that fitted these criteria; 30 case notes could not be traced. There were 105 girls (74%) and 36 boys. Age at UTI was diagnosed ranged from 9 days to 15.3 years (mean 4.2 years, SD 3.2).

Urine culture results were: UTI (>10⁵ cfu/ml) in 82 cases (58%), contaminant (>10⁴ cfu/ml) in 27 cases (19%), no growth in 21 cases (15%), and no urine culture in 11 cases (8%). There were 17 (12%) cases of definite or probable renal scar, none of which followed a sterile or contaminated urine culture.

Of the 141 case notes, there was no mention of fever in 48 (34%), and no mention of malaise in 76 (54%). In 69 case notes reviewed there was no mention of previous history of UTI in 14 (20%) cases. Of those with a history of fever, 19 (10%) had an abnormal DMSA scan compared to 10% (4/40) in those without fever. Eighteen percent (9/50) of those unwell at the time of UTI had an abnormal scan compared to 13% (2/13) of those not ill.

These data suggest that in a substantial proportion of cases, the decision to request a DMSA scan is apparently not influenced by salient clinical features and urine culture results. In this series, however, that children with sterile or contaminated urine cultures should not have had a DMSA scan. This would have saved the cost and burden of 48 scans, 34% of this series, over an 18 month period. It is likely that these findings are peculiar to our district.

A H SACKLEY
Leighton Hospital,
Middlewich Road, Crewe CW1 4QJ, UK
email: abshack@alinet.net
