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Rapid responses

If you have a burning desire to respond to a paper published in
ADC or F&N, 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 letters” on our
homepage.

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

The management of fever and petechiae: collaborative studies are needed

EDITOR,—We were interested to read Brogan and
Raffles’ audit of the management of fever
and petechiae.1 This is an important audit for
many general paediatricians in the UK. In
Newcastle 36% of children with petechiae
were treated with antibiotics, and only 10%
had meningococcal disease (MCD). Brogan
and Raffles correctly state that more studies
are required to validate their proposed guide-
line. We offer two such studies:

1. The ILL criteria (irritability, lethargy,
low capillary refill) were applied retrospec-
tively to a cohort of children presenting with
petechiae. Only one child had meningococcal disease. The algo-
mith was correctly followed in 34 (68%) chil-
dren; this included prompt treatment for the
child with MCD. For 15 children the algo-
mith was not followed; 7 were given antibiot-
cs when not indicated, 8 were not treated
when the algorithm suggested they should be.
It is obviously vitally important that antibiotics
are not withheld from children with possible
MCD. When paediatricians suspect MCD, they
should give prompt antibiotic treatment and
then seek to confirm the diagnosis.

Any algorithm for the management of children with fever and petechiae must be
shown to be clinically valid. A large number of
cases will be needed to show our algorithm is
safe and effective. This requires collaboration
between a number of centres. Any centre
wishing to help validate our algorithm would
be welcome to do so: please contact one of the
authors.
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Replies

EDITOR,—We read with interest the study and
recommendations by Brogan and Raffles.1 We
agree with them on a number of issues and
wish to draw attention to the following points.

(1) Previous international studies do not
support a temperature of >37.4°C as an inclu-
sion criterion of significant fever for significant
bacterial sepsis (SBS).2,3 A minimum temperature
of 38°C for 0–2 month old and 39°C for
3–36 month old children is recognised as an
indicator of SBS. Hypothermia may also be
significant. In children older than 3 years, the
highest recorded temperature of 40°C or
more, in association with other parameters,
may be more significant. Interestingly, in their
own series, 4 out of 5 children with SBS had
temperatures of 38.9–40.4°C. We propose that
a temperature of at least 38°C should be con-
sidered as significant fever.

(2) Lethargy has been mentioned as one of
diagnostic criteria of SBS. As a diagnostic
value, it should be defined more objec-
tively rather than as proposed by the authors.

It may be defined as “a level of consciousness
caracterised by poor or absent eye contact or
as the failure of a child to recognise parents or
caregivers or to interact with persons or
objects in the environment.”

(3) Although we fully agree with the
cautious interpretation of total white blood
cell count in relation to serious sepsis, we
would like to mention the importance of
absolute neutrophil count (ANC) more than
10 000/μl, especially in pneumococcal and to
some extent in meningococcal sepsis. ANC of
more than 10 000 has 76% sensitivity, 78% speci-
city, and 99.2% negative predictive value in
meningococcal sepsis.2

(4) The term toxic needs to be defined as
a clinical picture consistent with a varied
constellation of lethargy, poor perusion, or
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Figure 1
marked hypo-/hyperventilation. We therefore suggest that the side armor of significant bacterial sepsis should be modified from ILL to ILLNESS: Irritability, Lethargy, Low capillary refill, Neuropathia/Neutropenia, Elevated (or low) temperature suggests Significant Sepsis.
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EDITOR,—Although studies on children with anaemia is more thoroughly sought. This is of the children to the study are not the man-

prospective trial. The recruiters and assessors were discharged, having received no antibiot-
counts. Nineteen had C reactive protein—9 were given antibiotics, which were discontinued after 48 hours. Nineteen (despite this, 9 were given antibiotics, which were admitted, all remained well.

Capillary refill, Neutrophilia/Neutropenia, abnormal C reactive protein. As far as we are aware, no children subse-
quently developed clinical sepsis. The results of their study show that management of well children with petechiae is variable. Lack of consensus among paediatricians on the management of techial rashes has been well documented.1 In our own department, we are considering implementation of the following guidelines for the management of well, febrile children with petechiae, although we acknowledge that larger prospective studies are required.

Paul A Brogan Institute of Child Health, London, UK PBrogan@ich.ucl.ac.uk


Methodology for assessing patterns of interstitial pneumonia in children

EDITOR.—The report of Hacking et al,1 of a series of infants with very early onset interstitial lung disease (ILD) with good prognosis, is of great clinical interest but sadly represents a lost investigative opportunity. Firstly, their statement that percutaneous open lung biopsy has fewer side effects than open lung biopsy (OLB) is not supported by any direct comparative trial, and cannot be allowed to stand. Indeed, the largest published series using this technique was heavily criticised both for the number of complications and the often non-diagnostic samples obtained.2 By contrast OLB is safe,3 permits direct inspection of the site of biopsy, and allows the acquisition of specimens large


enough to determine the lung architecture in order more precisely to classify the different types of paediatric ILD. OLB thus allows appreciation of the distribution of disease involvement within the acinus, allowing more precise identification of different histopathological patterns. There is therefore no reason to favour percutaneous biopsy over OLB in skilled hands; indeed the weight of evidence is in favour of OLB. Secondly, their selected nomenclature of paediatric ILD is open to criticism. It is questionable whether the use of term “idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF)” is still appropriate in children. IPF is generally used synonymously with the cryptogenic fibrosing alveolitis, which in adults is most often represented histopathologically by the pattern of “usual interstitial pneumonia (UIP)”. However UIP is rarely if ever seen in children; much more common are lymphocytic interstitial pneumonitis (LIP), desquamative interstitial pneumonitis (DIP), non-specific interstitial pneumonitis (NSIP), and chronic pneumonitis of infancy.2 Identifying these histological patterns may point towards specific investigations with regard to aetiology, and may also provide prognostic and treatment data, and we consider that it is a pity that this or a similar histopathological classification was not used in this report.

We suggest that more will be learned about these rare conditions if diagnostic precision is maximised by comparison of pre-biopsy computed tomography with properly classified histological findings.3 Interdisciplinary collaboration is needed to achieve this, and it is unfortunate that more details of imaging and an up to date classification of histology were not included in an otherwise informative paper.

ANDREW G NICHOLSON
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Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Trust,
Rydown Brompton Hospital, London SW3 6NP, UK
a.nicholson@rbh.nthames.nhs.uk
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Dr Hacking et al respond

EDITOR.—In their response to our article, Nicholson and Bush suggest that an investigative opportunity has been missed. We do not agree. These authors have repeated their previously reported criticism of percutaneous lung biopsy (PLB)4 and have suggested that this technique is prone both to more complications and to a greater number of non-diagnostic samples. We have shown that PLB in a series of nine patients was adequate for diagnosis in all cases and did not result in pneumothoraces significant enough to require thoracocentesis. In our present report of 11 patients, PLB was not associated with any major complications and failed to provide a histological diagnosis in only one patient. This compares favourably to Nicholson and Bush’s own report of open lung biopsy (OLB) in 27 cases where three patients experienced significant complications—that is, a pneumothorax, a haemothorax, and a pleural space infection.5 Moreover, five previously self ventilating patients required ventilation after biopsy, and five patients returned from biopsy with a chest drain which had been inserted in the course of the procedure. We do not agree that OLB is superior to PLB. Nicholson and Bush go on to question the nomenclature of paediatric idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis and briefly describe the histological classifications of usual pneumonia (UIP) and desquamative interstitial pneumonia (DIP) as we did in the introduction to our article. They suggest the “these histological patterns may . . . provide prognostic and treatment data”. However, the distinction between UIP and DIP is questionable,6 as they may represent different stages in the same disease process.7 In common with previous reports,8 we have shown that the severity of histological change did not relate to patient’s response to steroids or their eventual outcome.

We agree with Nicholson and Bush when they state that “diagnostic precision is maximised by comparison of pre-biopsy computed tomography with properly classified histological findings” as this was practised throughout our series. We fear that they have missed the most important aspect of our report which is that idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis in children has a diverse natural history and a variable prognosis that can be favourable. The good prognosis seen in our series is different from previous case reports indicating a greater than 50% mortality.8

DOUG HACKING
ROSSALIND SMYTH
NIGEL SHAW
GEORGE KOKAI
HELEN CARTY
DAVID HEAF

Dr D Hacking, Paediatric Registrar, Department of Paediatrics, Wexham Park Hospital, Slough, UK (hackandmack@wcdial.net).


Medication errors are NOT uncommon

EDITOR.—We welcome the coverage given to the major, and potentially fatal, problem of medication errors within managed health care. We disagree, however, with the key message that medication errors are uncommon. They are endemic, extremely common, overlooked and often ignored.

Observational studies of medicine administration within hospitals in the UK report an error rate of 3% to 8%.1 In contrast, Ross et al report 195 errors, collated from a mandatory error reporting policy, in 65 months.2 While mandatory reporting is a commendable principle, the reality remains that the majority of healthcare professionals will not report errors, and the majority of medication errors, will not be reported.

Reasons for lack of reporting by nursing staff include confusion regarding the definition of drug errors and the appropriate action to take when they occurred, fear of disciplinary action, loss of clinical confidence and variation in managerial response.3

Voluntary, non-punitive error reporting programmes have been advocated as the most effective way to promote candid disclosure of medical error.4 Unless we are aware of what errors occur, we cannot expect to implement an appropriate system fix.

We suggest that the occurrence of three errors/month, represents a tremendous under reporting of the extent of medication error.5 If patient through put totalled 335 835 patient bed days, and we assume that each day the average patient received 6 doses of medicine, an error rate of 5%, suggests that a more realistic interpretation of the extent of the error iceberg is an incidence of greater than 100 000.

The conclusion therefore that medication errors are uncommon is unfortunately not true. The reality is that reported medication errors are uncommon.

NEIL A CALDWELL
Principal Pharmacist/Lecturer,
Wirral Hospital NHS Trust/Liverpool John Moores University,
Wirral, UK
neil.caldwell@ccmail.wirralh-tr.nwest.nhs.uk

DON K HUGHES
Principal Pharmacist/Honorary Lecturer
Clinical Services,
Wirral Hospital NHS Trust/Liverpool John Moores University,
Wirral, UK

Dr Ross responds

Editor—We welcome the debate stimulated by our paper. Indeed, this was our aim in publishing it. We agree with Mr Caldwell that a degree of under reporting is likely. Our system provides a clear definition to all staff of what constitutes a reportable medication error (listed in the appendix). It does not include errors that are averted—such as, misprescribed errors corrected by pharmacists before dispensing. We also noted that error reporting rates vary widely in the literature. We discussed some of the reasons advanced to explain such variations—for example, whether the reporting system is mandatory or voluntary, and the intensity of the search for errors. However, the published evidence about medication error rates in paediatric settings is very limited especially in the context of a nationally funded, universal, healthcare system like the NHS. There is, therefore, little firm paediatric evidence to support Mr Caldwell’s opposite view that errors are “...extremely common, overlooked and often ignored.”

In our experience, most reported errors were minor. Serious events with adverse outcomes were uncommon and, we think, are unlikely not to be reported. If anything, we would suspect that minor errors are more likely to go unrecorded. This may be of considerable importance if analysis of minor events highlights system problems whose correction may help avoid future serious incidents.

Mr Caldwell suggests that voluntary systems may increase error reporting. It needs to be recognised that voluntary systems are not a panacea but may also detect only a fraction of overall errors. Again, we would suspect that minor errors might be those most likely to be missed. The thrust of the editorial by Cohen seems to relate to errors with serious adverse outcomes. There are also some potential difficulties with voluntary systems. For example, how do we ensure that parents are notified about error occurrence if reporting is voluntary? What happens about errors of such seriousness that issues of criminal negligence arise?

Whether a reporting system is mandatory or voluntary is probably less important than that the system is non-punitive. This is borne out by the findings of Vincer and colleagues who found an approximately four to six fold increase in error reporting when the punitive aspect of the form were reduced by making it an “incident” rather than an “error” form. We have no doubt that the critical challenge for us all is to make the shift from assuming “errors” arise from individual negligence to recognising that “incidents” more usually arise because of systemic organisational failures. We urgently need to move away from a culture of fixing the blame towards one of recognising and fixing the problem.

LINDA ROSS
Department of Child Health, University of Glasgow, UK
lindaross@gm.cox.co.uk

BOOK REVIEWS

The Chailey approach to postural management. Pountney TE, Mulcahy CM, Clarke SM, Green EM. (Pp 157, spiral bound, (25.00) Active Design Ltd. ISBN 09538262 0 1.

When teaching about children with neuro-developmental disability or when advising their parents or when, wearing an editorial hat, advising on publishability, the feedback I receive consistently includes requests for information on personal practice and “how to do it”. Responding usefully to these requests is challenging.

What a pleasure it has been therefore to have made available to me for review, the Chailey approach to postural management. Chailey Heritage Clinical Services is an NHS provision that works in conjunction with the independent Chailey Heritage School. The authors of this manual are a physiotherapist, two occupational therapists, and a consultant in paediatric rehabilitation. They have taken as their remit to provide an explanation of the theoretical aspects of posture management and thereafter its practical application through treatment and equipment. Active Design Ltd, the publisher of this manual, develops and manufactures the equipment detailed in this publication. What is provided within it are sections describing posture; a detailed exposition of assessment based upon the Chailey levels of ability; a good section on the relevant knowledge base, including discussion on subjects as diverse as biomechanics and motor learning theory; and helpful descriptions of assessment and putting theory into practice.

Having read through the volume as a textbook I consider that I have acquired some useful understanding of postural management.

This, however, is not the book’s main strength. Rather, it has been prepared and bound as a bench manual and its whole approach is one of practical instruction. Within that context, I have no doubt that it would be most useful as an accomplishment to attending a series of workshops and practical demonstrations given by the authors. Used in its own right as a training manual, I have major doubts that the very directing pedagogic style might limit the attentional capacity of readers, the majority of whom are likely to be therapists with significant experience in this field.

I nevertheless recommend this manual as one that should be both available and used in centres offering multidisciplinary services for children with disabilities.

It would be nice to believe also that future editions of this and similar volumes would be able to illustrate more sophisticated technology than is usually available for children with disabilities.

L. ROSENBLoom
Consultant Paediatric Neurologist, Alder Hey Children’s Hospital, UK


If I was a betting man, and one could bet on such matters, I would stake the price of a new telescope that chicken pox is relevant to the subject of media and thus public (and thus political) interest, at least in the UK. The vaccine—developed twenty five years ago—has been in general use in the USA for around five years and it cannot be long before it is more widely in Europe too. The most likely formulation to find general acceptance in national programmes will be a combination with the existing MMR vaccine and, as at least readers of the Daily Mail will know, the current word on the block is that combining vaccine viruses in this way is “a bad thing”. I have already been interviewed at length by a journalist purporting to be interested in the primary prevention of varicella who then proceeded to piece a paper about an actually non-existent but implicitly fiendish sounding study of MMRV vaccine “going on” under my supervision.

So it may be a good time for paediatricians to inform themselves about this common but little discussed infection, which is most commonly acquired in childhood. Right on queue, this opportunity arrives to do so. It has recently become fashionable in certain circles to assert that various infectious scourges of the past, now gone thanks to immunisation, were actually really rather innocuous (or perhaps even beneficial!) and—in a vaguely contradictory way—that there were very significant ways, not thanks to vaccines at all. In the case of varicella the former notion (or at least the first part of it: I’ve not yet heard the assertion that chickenpox, specifically, is good for you) is widely prevalent, despite the continuing ubiquity of the infection. Paediatricians will be aware that such dismissals are misplaced. Not only do their oncology patients, those on steroids and children undergoing transplantation, to name a few, risk severe illness or rapid death following exposure to varicella, but many more healthy children develop common but unpleasant complications of varicella such as bacterial cellulitis, and a few more serious ones, such as ataxia or purpura fulminans. To be sure, many children are little troubled by primary infection, like my youngest son whose three lesions, which appeared while he remained entirely well and were dismissed as mosquito bites by me, were correctly diagnosed by my non-medical wife. Some of these folk might be glad to be without residual facial scars but, among those many infected but hardly touched by varicella-zoster virus in childhood, there are those whose later lives will be blighted by zoster and post-herpetic neuralgia—a growing problem with rising longevity.

This monograph is timed to give an account of the enormous recent advances in understanding of the pathogenesis of human infection with this herpes virus and of the availability of tools with which to treat, attenuate, and prevent infection. But it also points out that the tale remains far from over: there is an infection that, unlike the superficially clinically similar and, now defunct, smallpox, lies latent lifelong in the human host and, worryingly, is more likely to cause severe primary illness in a non-immune adult than in a children. This story is set to run and run, with no easy bets on global eradication.

LINDA ROSS
Department of Child Health, University of Glasgow, UK
lindavoss@gm.cox.co.uk
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