Prevalence of behavioural disorders in low birthweight infants

EDITOR,—We wish to comment on some methodological and conceptual ambiguities in the report by Pharoah et al on behaviour disorders in low birthweight infants.1

First, in their methods section, dealing with the assessment of hyperactivity, the authors refer to ‘the Conners’s teacher scale’. We believe that the Rutter teacher scale2 used in this study should be referred to. The Conners paper to which they refer does not cite Rutter’s work, describes no modification of the Rutter teacher scale, and does not mention hyperactivity cut-off points. 

Second, in the discussion section, the authors fail to make the necessary distinction between ‘diagnosis of cases with disorder/disease and identification of cases with possible behaviour problems’. The former is a function of judgment by a clinician, often drawing on a variety of sources of information, while the latter is all that screening tests can do. Screening tests do not diagnose.

The overdiagnosis and management of hyperactivity often requires collaboration across a number of disciplines: the same holds true for its assessment, and consultation with colleagues in psychology and psychiatry might have led to a more meaningful report from this study. The information given is inadequate for discussion of the clinical and social implications of the findings reported.

ANGUS MACMILLAN
Ladybird Department of Family Psychiatry, Glencaple Road, Dundee DD1 4TE


Professor Pharoah and coauthors comment: Drs MacMillan and Morton are correct in stating that the Connors paper does not cite Rutter’s work and describes no modification of the Rutter teacher scale. We used a modified Connors’ scale and should have cited Taylor and Sandberg (1984); this was an unfortunate omission on our part. Our failure to mention the use of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children in the methods section was because it was stated in the immediately preceding paper in the same issue of the journal. The comment that we trawled our
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Prevalence of disorders in the Intelligence Scale instruments and problems.


Professor Pharoah and coauthors comment: Drs MacMillan and Morton are correct in stating that the Connors paper does not cite Rutter’s work and describes no modification of the Rutter teacher scale. We used a modified Connors’ scale and should have cited Taylor and Sandberg (1984); this was an unfortunate omission on our part. Our failure to mention the use of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children in the methods section was because it was stated in the immediately preceding paper in the same issue of the journal. The comment that we trawled our

data bank and reported only positive findings is unwarranted and MacMillan and Morton are welcome to inspect the raw data.

The second point raised is that we fail to make the distinction between ‘diagnosis of cases and identification of those with possible behaviour problems’. This is not so. The opening part of the discussion states that ‘The Rutter parent and teacher scales are screening instruments’ and that ‘The validity of any screening test is determined by its sensitivity and its specificity’. We also indicate, in the second paragraph, that there is only a mild correlation in behaviour ratings at ages 7, 11, and 16 years, as determined by the former and screening questionnaires. We clearly state that the long term morbidity needs to be determined. The important point that we wish to make is that there is a significant difference between the cases and controls as shown by behaviour screening instruments.

The final point made is that we failed to consult with colleagues in psychiatry and psychology. This is also not so, we consulted with colleagues in both of these disciplines in Liverpool and London. Furthermore, two of the research workers on the project were themselves graduates in psychology.


Studies on the cure rates in acute lymphoblastic leukaemia in children from urban and rural areas

EDITOR,—Acute lymphoblastic leukaemia (ALL) is at present cured in approximately 70% of children.1,2 Successful treatment is very costly and consequently cure rates in ALL are much lower in developing countries than in affluent countries.3 There are almost no data indicating whether children from urban and rural areas within one country or one region have the same chances for cure as children living in rural areas.2,3 For many years in Poland there were great differences between urban and rural areas in accessibility to doctors. When the present studies were started medical care for rural children had greatly improved.

The studies were carried out at least four years after the completion of treatment for ALL and included 17 children registered in the Polish Cancer Project 1967-86. The group included 191 children from urban and 226 patients from rural areas. The cure rates from ALL among urban and rural children were analysed. Comparative studies were carried out in three periods (see table) in which markedly different treatment protocols had been used, and the observations were completed on 31 December 1993. The shortest maintained remission after cessation of treatment was 58 months. The comparative analysis was based on the $\chi^2$ test, with the significance level accepted as $p<0.05$.

The percentage of children cured from ALL was higher among urban than rural areas, the differences being statistically significant only in the third period. Further observations and comparative studies are necessary to explain the differences in cure rates among urban and rural areas. Doctors should make further efforts, particularly in improving the cooperation of parents, so that children with leukaemia have similar chances for a cure, irrespective of their place of residence.

J ARMATA
SKOCZEN
W BALWIERZ
Department of Paediatrics, Polish-American Children’s Hospital, Collegium Medicum, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland


Renal scarring after acute pyelonephritis

EDITOR,—Dr Jakobsson and colleagues have confirmed the value of technetium-99m dimercaptosuccinic acid (DMSA) imaging in urinary tract infection (UTI) in children both on initial presentation and follow up.1 The authors highlight the superiority of DMSA imaging in detecting renal cortical defects; however, we feel that the apparent 37% incidence of renal scarring following an episode of acute pyelonephritis in their study is over pessimistic.

We feel it is extremely important, when describing DMSA abnormalities, to state whether the abnormality is associated with or without loss of the normal cortical outline.2 The definition of DMSA abnormality used in Jakobsson’s report was ‘one or more areas of decreased cortical uptake with or without preservation of the cortical outline’. It is therefore unclear to us whether the DMSA abnormalities found on follow up were felt to be consistent with cortical scarring.

We found a relatively high proportion of children presenting with a first documented UTI have reduced uptake on DMSA but with preservation of the cortical outline.2 In the majority of patients, these changes resolved completely; however, we have anecdotal evidence of these changes persisting up to 36 months after an episode of UTI.

There is no doubt that DMSA imaging will enable the development of a more complete understanding of the natural history of UTI, however, if as is likely, this imaging modality...