for those at the extremes of the normal range for fat/thin, short/tall, clever/stupid, clumsy/"normal" traits?

My own puberty was late. Not much fun at the time but the resultant temporary exclusion from full membership of the peer group has produced a useful long term lesson in coping with the natural ups and downs of life. Explanation, empathy, and reassurance are in my view better medicine in this area, as in many others, than use of medication.

R D H BOYD
Department of Child Health,
St Mary's Hospital,
Hathersage Road,
Manchester M13 OJH


Dr Kelnar comments.

I am grateful to Professor Boyd for his comments on my annotation. I hope that I emphasised sufficiently that explanation and reassurance must be all that is required. A decision has to be made on clinical grounds as to whether that is the case - a situation frequently faced by paediatric endocrinologists and many general paediatricians.

I also discussed the poor quality of some previous studies and the need for more scientific information before definitive recommendations can be given. In that regard, studies are in progress in a number of centres and a further contribution from this department is soon to be published in this complete. After selective and appropriate hormone treatment is not designed to "narrow the range of normality" (nor will it do so) but to relieve distress. 2 The extent to which it achieves that must also be assessed scientifically and such studies are also in progress in this department and elsewhere. Not all boys presenting with short stature and pubertal delay are 'future Professor Boys' and some are likely to be significantly socially and psychologically disadvantaged at a time which is critically important for determining future work or career prospects. Potential physical consequences of delayed puberty also require proper prospective evaluation.

I believe, with Professor Boyd, that 'explanation, empathy, and reassurance' are often enough. Where they are not, my view is that effective hormone treatments are now available and can reasonably be considered and prescribed on the basis of currently available scientific knowledge.


Minoxidil induced hair growth after leukaemia treatment?

EDITOR—Although hair loss is an invariable accompaniment of chemotherapy for acute lymphoblastic leukaemia (ALL), regrowth is usually prompt and complete. After unusually intense and prolonged chemotherapy hair may not regrow properly. We report the successful treatment of one such case.

Case report
A 4 year old boy presented with common ALL. He was entered into the Medical Research Council (MRC) UKALL X trial, receiving 18 Gy as central nervous system prophylaxis.

After two years of treatment he was found to have central nervous system leukaemia and therefore was started on a relapse protocol (subsequently formulated as MRC UKALL R1). He tolerated this intensive regimen poorly and developed multidormatome shingles, so that after 16 weeks he was put on a maintenance regimen (vincristine, prednisolone, mercaptopurine, and methotrexate). He received a further 24 Gy of craniospinal irradiation.

After the later two year course of treatment the hair that regrew was only thin and wispy. It remained in this state for a period of 14 months. Minoxidil solution 2% was applied daily to the scalp. Over a period of nine months an almost normal head of hair was regained.

Abnormal hair growth was first noted as a side effect of the antihypertensive agent minoxidil. Topical minoxidil also stimulates hair growth and can cause male pattern baldness. 1 It has been tried, unsuccessfully, to modify acute hair loss during chemotherapy; we cannot find any examples of the use described here.

This patient's hair did not improve for 14 months before the application of minoxidil, leading us to believe that minoxidil caused the hair regrowth. It would be of interest to hear of other's experience in alleviating this distressing side effect.

MARK A VICKERS
CAROL J BARTON
Department of Pathology,
Royal Berkshire Hospital,
Reading,
Berkshire RG1 2AN


Abdominal pain is a very common symptom in patients with cystic fibrosis, but because of the recent concern about fibrotic strictures, radiological investigations into the cause of such pain are now being performed early. Our practice is to perform a plain abdominal radiograph and ultrasound of the bowel. If these investigations are normal, then there is little to be gained by proceeding to contrast studies.

Rosalind SMYTH
Peter CARTER
David HEAP
Respiratory Unit and Department of Radiology,
Royal Liverpool Children's Hospital,
Alder Hey,
Liverpool L12 2AP


Dr Green and coauthors comment:

We agree that bowel ultrasonography has a place in the diagnosis of colonic strictures, however, we feel that it is an observer dependent investigation. While it is a valuable screening procedure, in Dr. Green's hands this may not be the case with less experienced interpretation. In the child with recurrent and troublesome abdominal pain it would be unfortunate to miss the occasional intussusception or the case stricture by not proceeding to contrast studies. We would therefore be reluctant to suggest relying entirely on a normal plain abdominal film and ultrasound as routine practice in every centre.

Management of anaphylactic reactions to food

EDITOR—Pate1 et al draw attention to the use of food badges for children with potentially life threatening anaphylactic reactions. 1 As a community paediatrician who has been responsible for the support of over 20 children with this problem over the last two years I must strongly disagree with their conclusions and practice. Detailed discussion with the parents of children in our area shows that they are keen that their children should not be labelled, either by badges or 'minders' in school. We must remember that these children are normal, but with a risk of serious reactions to foods. Support to schools must emphasise prevention (that is, exclusion of allergens from the environment) and management of the (unlikely) reaction. Labelling children may in fact reduce the focus of removing the allergen from the environment and thereby increase the risk to the child. Many food allergens are not obvious (for example, nut oils in foods) and we must not rely on badges to protect these children. The labelling approach is dangerous and may lead to the segregation of these children from their peers. It may also lead to bullying of these children, and encourage other children to offer them the 'forbidden' food. I would urge all paediatricians involved with these children to reject this approach and concentrate on working with schools and parents to support these children.
children in a sensitive way. After all, we do not put a badge on the child with a learning problem saying 'I'm stupid, please give me extra teaching'. Surely we can apply the same principles and sensitivity to children with potential anaphylactic reactions.

DAVID VICKERS
Lifespan Healthcare NHS Trust, Ida Darwin, Fulbourn, Cambridge CB1 5EE


How to write a scientific paper

EDITOR,—I enjoyed Professor Lilleyman’s excellent article on how to write a scientific paper. Unfortunately he doesn’t mention the importance of acknowledgments and thanks. More and more papers it seems to me are based on other people’s data and are largely the results of postal surveys, with the authors merely analysing the data and writing the paper, but not seeing any patients or collecting any data themselves. I think it is even more important in these circumstances to acknowledge and thank those who have taken the trouble to reply to the questionnaires. This lack of courtesy might even be the reason why some surveys have an unsatisfactory response rate.

MARTIN MONCRIEFF
Paediatric Department, John Radcliffe Hospital, Headley Way, Headington, Oxford OX3 9DU


Ectodermal dysplasia and immunodeficiency

EDITOR,—Immunodeficiency has been previously described in patients with ectodermal dysplasia1; surprisingly it was not mentioned at all in the recent review article on ectodermal dysplasia in this journal.2 Immunodeficiency is not a constant feature in all patients with ectodermal dysplasia, it is often transient and variable and no consistent T or B cell abnormality has been found.1 The exact nature of the association between these two rare conditions is unclear and the question remains as to whether different immune defects in patients with ectodermal dysplasia represent a coincidental association or whether immunodeficiency is an underrecognised feature of the ectodermal dysplasia syndrome. In two recent classifications of primary immunodeficiency disorders ectodermal dysplasia is listed under ‘syndromes associated with immunodeficiency’.3 4

MARIO ABINUN
Children’s Department, Newcastle General Hospital, Westgate Road, Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 6BE