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

Calibration of the paediatric index of mortality in UK paediatric intensive care units

Pearson et al should be congratulated on successfully collecting the data required for calculating the PIM Score on 7253 children admitted to 5 UK paediatric intensive care units (PICUs). It is reassuring to note that the authors did not find any systematic differences between these five units in terms of their standardised mortality ratios. Leaving aside the controversies involved in cross country comparisons, it is further pleasing that they appear to conclude that mortality following admission for paediatric intensive care in the UK is less than it was in 1994–95. The current results imply that 78 more children have survived following treatment in these 5 PICUs than were predicted by the 1994–99 PIM derivation model.

Before this can be considered a major clinical advance, it is important to consider the health status of the additional survivors. Very different conclusions might be drawn if the additional children who survived have a very poor health status than if they have a very good health status.

The United Kingdom Paediatric Intensive Care Outcome Study (UK PICOS) was set up in response to the “Paediatric Intensive Care: A framework for the future” document and a joint United Kingdom Medical Research Council and Department of Health working paper. Both these publications recognised that, as mortality following paediatric intensive care is less than 10%, morbidity or health status may be a more important outcome of paediatric intensive care than mortality. UK PICOS is currently collecting health status measurements of children who survive following admission for paediatric intensive care in a representative sample of 21 UK PICUs. By seeking to differentiate between the survivors of paediatric intensive care, UK PICOS may lead to a risk adjustment method for health status in addition to mortality. Furthermore, UK PICOS has the potential to provide the methodology to enable cost effectiveness studies to be set up in paediatric intensive care. In the longer term this will allow organisational structures, service management, and new interventions in paediatric intensive care to be evaluated in a more rigorous manner than at present. Further details of UK PICOS are available at www.shef.ac.uk/~scharr/ukpicos.

G Parry
School for Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Regent Street, Sheffield S1 4DA, UK g.parry@sheffield.ac.uk
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Calibration of the paediatric index of mortality score for UK paediatric intensive care

Pearson and colleagues have presented data highlighting the use of the paediatric index of mortality (PIM) score as a tool for auditing paediatric intensive care unit (PICU) performance. Whilst we would agree with the authors’ message that PIM has many advantages over other scoring systems, we feel it is normal for SMRs to fall with time as standards of care have improved in PICUs in the UK. Calibration of PIM-derived SMR from 910 patients seen during the 2000 calendar year is 0.54 (95% CI 0.39–0.69). The authors acknowledge the shortcomings and state that a revised version of PIM will soon be available. However, recalibration is only worthwhile if a very broad sample of UK units participates. The UK PICOS study (paediatric intensive care outcome study) will attempt to address this, by collecting data used in the calculation of several scoring systems for the whole of the UK over a one year period commencing March 2001. From this study it is hoped that an optimal indicator of PIM performance will be derived.

S M Tibby, J A Murdock
Paediatric Intensive Care Unit, Guy’s Hospital, London, UK Shane.Tibby@gstt.shrmes.nhs.uk
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Authors’ reply

Dr Tibby and Dr Murdock note that, in our study of paediatric intensive care units (PICUs) in the UK, PIM discriminated well between children who died and children who survived, with an area under the ROC curve of 0.84. However, they are concerned that PIM had “poor calibration” because the standardised mortality rate (SMR) in the UK units was 0.87 (95% CI 0.81–0.94)—that is, the actual number of deaths was only 87% of the number predicted by PIM. In fact, this figure is almost identical to the PIM SMR for all PICUs in Australia in 1997–99, where the SMR was also 0.87 (95% CI 0.81–0.92). It is very encouraging that PIM gives such similar results in Australia and the leading PICUs in the UK, as it suggests that standards are comparable between the two groups of units and that PIM performs similarly in Australian and UK children.

It is normal for SMRs to fall with time as intensive care improves, and for mortality prediction models to need recalibration. This has happened with PRISM, MPM and APACHE, as well as PIM. Despite Dr Tibby and Dr Murdock’s reservations, the fact that the SMR has fallen from a similar outcome in both Australia and the UK suggests that standards of care have improved in PICUs in those countries in recent years.

Dr Tibby and Dr Murdock point out that the Hosmer-Lemeshow test gives a low p value for...
PIM's performance in the UK data. This test divides the sample into 10 groups, ranging from very low to very high risk of death, and compares the actual number of survivors and non-survivors in each group with the number predicted by PIM. Because PIM predicts too many deaths in the leading units in the UK, it follows that the number of actual deaths differs from the number predicted—so the Hosmer-Lemeshow $p$ value is low. However, table 2 in our paper shows that the ratio of observed to expected deaths was similar across the 10 groups, so that the recalibrated model is likely to fit well. The fact that the Hosmer-Lemeshow test gives a low $p$ value does not necessarily mean that a model (such as PIM) is invalid—it often means only that the standard of care in the test PICUs differs from that in the units in which the model was derived.

The PICUs that contributed the data from which the PIM score was derived were all leading units that deliver a high standard of care, so the score reflects best practice in 1994–96 when the data were collected. We are recalibrating PIM using data from units in the UK and Australia, and the new model will be available this year. Unfortunately, the quality of paediatric intensive care is not uniform in the UK, and there is evidence that some units do not perform at an optimal standard. Surely it would be preferable for the UK to use an international standard based on best practice (such as PIM), rather than the average of good and not-so-good units from the whole of the UK (PICOs). The UK should aim for best practice rather than being content with average practice.

F Shann
Royal Children’s Hospital,
Parkville, Victoria 3051, Australia
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G.Pearson@bhamchildrens.wmids.nhs.uk
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Long term results of lung resection in cystic fibrosis patients with localised lung disease

We have previously reported favourable short term outcomes following lobectomy in six children with cystic fibrosis and severe localised bronchiectasis (range 6 months to 6 years post-operation). Prior to surgery all had significant respiratory symptoms despite aggressive conventional treatment, including chronic signs (cases 3 and 6). There were no preoperative risk factors predictive of a less favourable outcome in these patients. Lung function has been maintained in all except one case (case 6).

Follow up chest x rays were assessed by a consultant paediatric radiologist, using the Chrispin Norman Scoring system. New radiological changes have tended to occur in the zones previously occupied by the resected lobe (table 2). One of the patients has had a bronchoscopy following right upper lobectomy (case 3). Upwards displacement of the right middle lobe bronchus appeared to be causing airway narrowing. Such distortion of the lung anatomy may predispose to bronchiectasis in lobes that have shifted to occupy the spaces previously occupied by the resected lobe.

Our long term results suggest that surgical resection is a worthwhile option in selected children with severe localised symptomatic bronchiectasis. Detailed preoperative assessment is essential to exclude patients with more extensive lung damage. While there is a good long term improvement of symptoms and preservation of lung function in the majority of patients, there is a tendency for new radiological abnormalities to occur in the zones previously occupied by resected lobes.

J S A Lucas, G J Connett
Department of Paediatrics, Southampton General Hospital, Tremona Road, Southampton SO16 6DY, UK
Gale.Pearson@bhamchildrens.wmids.nhs.uk
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Anti-neutrophil cytoplasmic autoantibody positive glomerulonephritis in monozygotic twins

Scleritis is a rare complication among young adults with ANCA associated disease (GPA, MPA). It is often bilateral and may involve the small vessels of the skin, conjunctiva, or peripheral nervous system. The incidence of scleritis in GPA is estimated to be between 5% and 10%. The pathogenesis of scleritis is not fully understood, and the role of ANCA in the pathogenesis of scleritis remains controversial.

We have observed two monozygotic twins developing ANCA nerosis of glomerulonephritis (GN). The boy developed ANCA-associated GN with hepatitis C virus infection. The disease was characterised by a rapid decline in renal function, with proteinuria, haematuria, and a positive ANCA test. The disease was successfully treated with pulse intravenous cyclophosphamide and intravenous methylprednisolone.

Data are the Chrispin-Norman scores in the lung quadrant within which the patients had developed focal bronchiectasis and for which they underwent lobectomy (maximum score 8).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Preop</th>
<th>Postop</th>
<th>Long term follow up</th>
<th>Preop</th>
<th>Postop</th>
<th>Long term follow up</th>
<th>Number of years followed up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>94 (6 y)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Local Chrispin–Norman scores</th>
<th>Preop</th>
<th>Postop</th>
<th>Long term follow up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LLL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RUL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LUL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RUL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RUL and RML</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are the Chrispin-Norman scores in the lung quadrant within which the patients had developed focal bronchiectasis and for which they underwent lobectomy (maximum score 8).
Persistent proteinuria appeared four years after transplantation, when a renal biopsy revealed focal necrotising GN.

At the age of 10 years, the identical male twin was found to have microscopic haematuria and proteinuria of >1 g/24 h with normal renal function. Renal biopsy showed focal necrotising GN with 20% cellular and segmental crescents. Perineuclear ANCAcs were observed at a dilution of 1/160. The stored samples of the first twin were tested and pANCAcs were detected by indirect immunofluorescence.

This second twin was given intravenous methylprednisolone and cyclophosphamide. The clinical scenario was characterised by acute episodes resolving with repeated courses of methylprednisolone pulses.

ANCA positivity in the second twin (also found retrospectively in the first twin’s swab) allowed us to classify the disease as a renal limited vasculitis expressed by necrotising and crescentic GN.

The HLA antigen profiles of the two boys are A3,11; B27,35; DR12; DQ1.

Acute nephritis or urinary abnormalities were the initial onset symptoms in our patients. They occur in about 40% of children with ANCA associated GN.1 This emphasises the need for a precise diagnosis and aggressive treatment in such patients. ANCAcs could be sought in the presence of acute nephritis or persistent urinary abnormalities of unclear aetiology, and not only in children with frank vasculitis or rapidly progressive GN.

We believe this to be the first report of the recurrence of pauciimmune crescentic GN in a transplanted kidney in a child. Anti-rejection treatment with steroids and cyclosporine A seems to be a useful means of controlling disease flare ups.

Furthermore, as far as we are aware, this is the first report of pANCA GN in HLA-identical twins. The pathogenesis of ANCA-GN is unknown but likely implicates genetic and/or environmental influences.2

The onset of disease at different times in two identical twins seems to suggest a genetically determined susceptibility rather than environmental triggers. Review of the literature revealed few reports of familial vasculitis, with some evidence suggesting a genetic predisposition of the HLA class I antigens present in our twins (A11, B35), and antigen B35 alone have also been found in two identical twins.1

In conclusion, a pANCA test should always be performed in children with acute nephritis or recurrent urinary abnormality. ANCA positivity in the second twin (also found retrospectively in the first twin’s swab) allowed us to classify the disease as a renal limited vasculitis expressed by necrotising and crescentic GN.

H Lipid and glucose metabolism in HIV-1-infected children treated with protease inhibitors

The use of protease inhibitors (PIs) in patients with HIV-1/AIDS has been associated with peripheral lipodystrophy, hyperlipidaemia and insulin resistance. Whether all studies have been done in adults. The aim of this study was to evaluate the influence of highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) on lipid metabolism in children treated with protease inhibitors (PIs).

Methods: A cross-sectional descriptive study was undertaken in HIV-1-infected children aged between 3 and 17 years, who were in stable clinical condition with 6 months to 5 years of PI therapy. To determine the prevalence of hepatitis B, screening was done at the time of starting HAART. A single blood specimen was collected and tested for HBsAg, anti-HBs, anti-HBc and HBeAg. These were performed in a local centre that participates in the national programme for hepatitis B screening.

Results: A total of 439 subjects were screened, of whom 194 (43.3%) were children aged less than 15 years. It was found that 5.7% per cent of the study population were carriers of HBsAg. None of the children had detectable hepatitis B virus DNA in serum.

Conclusions: Highly active antiretroviral therapy in children may not only be attributed to the effects of HAART, but may also be partially the result of a normalisation of pre-existing lipid abnormalities.
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Treating childhood hyperhidrosis with botulinum toxin type A

Recently there have been a number of published studies on the use of botulinum toxin type A for hyperhidrosis. These studies focus on its use in adults and we would like to highlight that it can also be useful in treating childhood hyperhidrosis. As in adults, hyperhidrosis can have considerable impact on quality of life in children. This is illustrated by a 13 year old healthy girl referred for treatment of refractory hyperhidrosis. Excessive palmar sweating caused difficulty with school work (difficulty holding a pen, with the ink smudging the paper because of sweating) and social embarrassment. Botulinum toxin type A (Dysport; 20 mouse units) was administered intradermally using a 27G needle to the finger tips and the area over the hypothenar and thenar eminences of both hands. EMG cream was used for topical anaesthesia. She reported sufficient reduction in palmar sweating within one week to improve her school work. She noticed grip strength reduction that lasted three weeks but did not affect hand function significantly. The beneficial effect of botulinum toxin lasted four months after which she requested further treatment. Repeat injections were given to the fingertips only. No adverse effect on grip strength was reported despite some functional benefit from reduced sweating. To date she has had four courses of treatment over a period of two years with good effect.

If you would like to buy a gentle gift for a littlegirl medical friend, you could do worse than this lighthearted escapade, all royalties from which are paid to the Royal Medical Benevolent Fund.

The editor, Dr Saleem Goolamali, has persuaded various of the great, good (and Lord Archer) to provide an anecdot or two, often with a medical basis. Sir Edward Heath professes his love of American football, Rabbi Lionel Blue provides a recipe which will please encopretologists everywhere and a recently retired Regius Professor reminisces on how fate might have led him to be a ballet dancer instead. Would Covent Garden’s gain have balanced Oxford’s loss? Lord Archer relates a childhood memory which might amuse the editor.

You won’t split your sides but there are plenty of chuckles—and the RMBF is well worth supporting in its aim to provide help for doctors or their families who have fallen on hard times. You can order your copy from MedBem, 25 Highfield Road, Northwood, HA6 1EU, UK.

H Marcovitch

Caring for Muslim Patients


Islam is the religion of one-fifth of humanity and, with an estimated population of 1.6 billion Muslims form Britain’s largest religious minority group. There is, therefore, a need for doctors or their families who have fallen on hard times. These practices may have developed over centuries, specific to a particular Islamic society and as an Arab, some customs described in the book are as unfamiliar to me as they would be to a non-Muslim. This book tells us a lot about customs and practices in Muslims of Asian roots and in that respect, would be an invaluable reference.

R Tawfik

The Child with Headache: diagnosis and treatment


Over the past 10–15 years there has been a large volume of research into headache, in general, and childhood headache in particular. Research interest and publications have covered vast areas of previously neglected aspects of childhood headache including epidemiology, pathogenesis, clinical features, classification, impact on child’s life and education, management, psychological adjustment, and medical treatment. Two major developments have helped to drive research into childhood headache and migraine. Firstly, the publication of the classification and diagnostic criteria for headache disorders, cranial neuralgias, and facial pain by the International Headache Society in 1988 triggered better understanding, research interest and debate into headache. Secondly, the introduction of a new generation of specific anti-migraine medications in the early 1990s has started a huge wave of research into migraine. Sumatriptan was the first of many 5HT, agonists to show effective relief of migraine headache in adults associated with
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high expectation for a strong potential in children. The two factors drove the research into childhood migraine many steps forwards. Unfortunately despite the huge amount of new knowledge on the subject and, possibly, the increased prevalence of headache and migraine in children, there is more need now than ever for an up-to-date publication on the subject. Until now, only two books on childhood headache and migraine are available on the paediatric bookshelf. The Classical books of Charles Barlow (Headache and migraine in childhood, Oxford: Blackwell Scientific, 1984) and that of Judith Hockaday (Migraine in childhood, London: Butterworth, 1988) remained the most recent sources of information and advice for practising paediatricians and general practitioners. Therefore, this book comes at an appropriate time to fill some of the gaps in the paediatric literature.

The book deals mainly with the diagnostic issues, differential diagnosis, and the management of childhood headache in a simple and practical way. Complex concepts and mechanisms were introduced and discussed with simplicity that made the reading of the book flow easily. Headache was introduced as a pain syndrome that has its own methods of measurement and management in the early parts of the book. The general direction of the book was determined, therefore, by the fact that 7 out of the 10 contributing authors been pain scientists, clinical psychologists, or child psychiatrists. Such an influence towards the psychology of pain has enhanced the quality of the book and enriched its value and contents. Therefore, the book provides the researcher on the subject of pain and headache a valuable reference to understand difficult issues in relation to pain measurement, impact of pain and headache on child’s life and also the management of headache including behavioural modification.

From the point of view of the practising general paediatricians who deal with children with headache in busy medical paediatric clinics, the book provides a good brief overview of the causes of headache, diagnostic assessment, and treatment. The use of simple data collection sheet would be very useful to assist the attending physician in establishing the diagnosis of the type of headache and also in identifying both the trigger and relieving factors. The editors propose, in two appendices, lengthy interviews of the child and the parents that may defy the practicality of the consultation. It would be more appropriate to the clinician if those interviews were short and direct. Also, diaries would be a useful tool to help understand the child’s headache by recording symptoms as they occur.

There is no doubt that this book will prove to be an important and useful resource for paediatricians treating children with headache. Other publications dealing with the practical issues and the organisation of headache services for children are also needed.

I Abu-Arafeh

Core Paediatrics and Child Health


Another textbook of paediatrics finds its way to market, to take its place alongside those already in print. In their introduction, Haddad et al. write that they have written this for undergraduates and junior doctors undertaking their first paediatric post. The underlying concepts arise from prior collaborative work undertaken by departments of Child Health in Scottish Universities in response to the GMC guidelines contained in “Tomorrow’s Doctor”. This work, reported in Medical Education, provides a structure that gives uniformity of approach for each organ system and indeed the textbook is clearly and consistently laid out.

As with many other authors of textbooks, the authors start with an assumption that the layout of texts will influence learning. It is difficult to find any supportive evidence in educational literature and any research suggests that it is assessment rather than course material that drives acquisition of knowledge and reasoning skills. Nevertheless it seems reasonable to assume that those learning paediatrics should be able to choose from a selection of texts written and laid out differently. As such, it could be commended to students if they are considering the purchase of a textbook to support their learning, and I feel sure it will take its place in the “top five” of UK paediatric textbooks.

“Although system based, the authors claim they do not lose sight of the clinical context and they aim to pull the reader through an approach rather than to leave the reader to find his or her own way through the book.” This difference highlights the difficulty of writing a text for both students and practising doctors. Anecdotally, students, who seem to prefer topic based teaching while SHOs, may find a true problem based approach more suited to their needs. They do, nevertheless, include “Key problems”, and have useful sections that review underpinning science, such as “Essential background”. For the enthusiastic student who wishes to pursue any topic further, they have included “Beyond core” material and sections entitled “Highlights and hypotheses”. At over 300 pages, it probably contains more than is needed at undergraduate level but could be seen as core and a suitable text for reference. SHOs might find its system based layout less helpful in their learning how to practice paediatrics, but it would be a useful starting point for revision for postgraduate exams.

Teachers need to look at evaluation from a different perspective. How should they evaluate material for students undertaking their course? Fundamentally, any text should support and NOT divert student effort from the learning objectives of the course. The editors have adopted a “problem orientated approach” which should help the teachers by providing them an agreed core curriculum. As a collaboration between Scottish departments of paediatrics, this should not present a problem north of the border, but others will need to analyse it mindful of their own course objectives. As a tutor at Imperial College School of Medicine this would raise problems. Our main course objectives are that:

1. Students should acquire understanding of families, their structure and how children are supported within this.
2. Students should acquire the skills of history taking and examination of children along with the necessary communication skills.
3. Students should acquire a basic knowledge of common and important childhood diseases.

This textbook clearly supports the last objective but neither 1 nor 2, although it is only fair to say that this criticism could be levelled against other similar textbooks. This could be seen as an argument for radical redesign of all undergraduate texts. While the basic course aims rather than a “topic based” core curriculum, but such discussion is outside the remit of a book review such as this.

On my one major criticism is that it divides up history taking and examination according to body systems. Development of these clinical skills must be the cornerstone of undergraduate education, and dissection of history taking and examination makes it a difficult text from which to teach these essential practical skills. Having said that, this book offers a fresh, innovative problem based medical school. This difference highlights the difficulty of writing a text for both students and practising doctors. Anecdotally, students, who seem to prefer topic based teaching while SHOs, may find a true problem based approach more suited to their needs. They do, nevertheless, include “Key problems”, and have useful sections that review underpinning science, such as “Essential background”. For the enthusiastic student who wishes to pursue any topic further, they have included “Beyond core” material and sections entitled “Highlights and hypotheses”. At over 300 pages, it probably contains more than is needed at undergraduate level but could be seen as core and a suitable text for reference. SHOs might find its system based layout less helpful in their learning how to practice paediatrics, but it would be a useful starting point for revision for postgraduate exams.

Teachers need to look at evaluation from a different perspective. How should they evaluate material for students undertaking their course? Fundamentally, any text should support and NOT divert student effort from the learning objectives of the course. The editors have adopted a “problem orientated approach” which should help the teachers by providing them an agreed core curriculum. As a collaboration between Scottish departments of paediatrics, this should not present a problem north of the border, but others will need to analyse it mindful of their own course objectives. As a tutor at Imperial College School of Medicine this would raise problems. Our main course objectives are that:

1. Students should acquire understanding of families, their structure and how children are supported within this.
2. Students should acquire the skills of history taking and examination of children along with the necessary communication skills.
3. Students should acquire a basic knowledge of common and important childhood diseases.

This textbook clearly supports the last objective but neither 1 nor 2, although it is only fair to say that this criticism could be levelled against other similar textbooks. This could be seen as an argument for radical redesign of all undergraduate texts. While the basic course aims rather than a “topic based” core curriculum, but such discussion is outside the remit of a book review such as this.

My one major criticism is that it divides up history taking and examination according to body systems. Development of these clinical skills must be the cornerstone of undergraduate education, and dissection of history taking and examination makes it a difficult text from which to teach these essential practical skills. Having said that, this book offers a fresh, innovative problem based medical school.

M D C Donaldson
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