Acrodynia: a case report of two siblings

Acrodynia, a rare disorder, is a form of chronic mercury poisoning. We report two siblings who developed the classic clinical picture of acrodynia.

A 4½ year old boy was admitted with dysuria, general weakness, and loss of appetite. He had hypertension (140/95 mm Hg) and tachycardia (141 beats/min). He was irritable and depressed, and had a diffuse itching papular rash with palmar erythema and superficial desquamation (fig 1). Initial evaluation revealed a normal complete blood count and a normal blood chemistry. Urine analysis and complement levels were normal. Vanillmandelic acid in a 24 hour urine collection was 22.2 µmol/24h. Duplex scan of the renal arteries, abdominal ultrasound, and computerised tomography (CT) of the chest and abdomen, were all normal. Heart echocardiography showed mild hypertrophy of the myocardium. TSH was 5.53 mIU/L, and free thyroxine 24.45 pmol/L. A brain CT scan revealed a point calcification at the right caudate nucleus and several bilateral areas of low density in the white matter. EEG was normal. A successive complete blood count revealed haemoconcentration (haemoglobin 165 g/l and haematocrit 48.1%).

After eight days, the patient’s 6 year old brother was admitted with general weakness, pain in his lower extremities, and a diffuse itching papular rash with palmar erythema and superficial desquamation. He was hypertensive (126/87 mm Hg) and tachycardic (140 beats/min).

Due to the fact that both siblings presented, at the same time, with more or less the same complaints and physical findings, it was suspected that their condition may have been the result of an environmental exposure. It was discovered that three months previously, the children had played with a broken sphygmomanometer. The editors will decide, as before, whether to also publish it in a future paper issue.
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therapy to be initiated in the early phase of lung hypertension in order to improve prognosis.
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Sudden infant death syndrome: problems, progress and possibilities

As an internationally recognised disease classification, sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) is unique in that the diagnosis is reached by exclusion, by failing to demonstrate an adequate cause of death. By definition it is imprecise; the diagnosis of SIDS depends on the thoroughness of the post-mortem examination, the extent of detail given in the clinical history and the meticulous nature with which the death scene investigation is carried out. Even if these conditions are satisfied to some chosen specification, this is not an endpoint but rather a beginning, as we are still left with the question of “why did these babies die?”

The tragedy of SIDS is not a modern phenomenon but was only christened a syndrome 40 years ago and, after extensive research, the possibility of finding a collection of symptoms and signs manifesting as a single cause appears extremely unlikely. Some experts suggest a triple risk causal mechanism for SIDS involving a vulnerable infant, a critical development period and an exogenous event that would not normally put a healthy child at risk. Other experts, frustrated with what they see as a definition of convenience, want to restrict the liberal use of such a designation to exclude suspected cases of accidental suffocation and infanticide. Hypotheses continue to proliferate and, as the evidence for risk factors mount, the debate has widened from causation to the relative safety of accepted infant care practices.

In trying to understand how infants die, we have come to the realisation that we must first understand how infants survive. SIDS research has developed from basic epidemiological and pathological findings at death to a wider investigation of infant sleep structure, care practices, physiology, and genetics. This multidisciplinary approach is elegant but still in its infancy. The choice of contributing experts gives a clear insight into current thinking and recent discoveries in different fields, while challenging the reader with a subtle consensus of disagreement. The book gives detailed background of each debate but is more than a reference manual for other researchers in the field. Given the rarity of SIDS, many medical professionals may not have come across the syndrome before, although it is not a subject that will have suddenly and unexpectedly, but if SIDS research is to be truly effective, the number of young lives so far saved then the endeavours of those involved should be highly commended.

P Blair

Coming back to the new edition of this book is like coming back to an old friend. Like many paediatricians, I have used the first edition as a valuable reference in child protection cases. The expertise and experience of all three authors are well recognised internationally and there is no doubt that this edition will continue to be a valuable aid to all clinicians working with children.

All aspects of abuse are covered and there are helpful summaries in each chapter. It is an easy book to read but also I find it easy to get information on individual issues in child protection. There is an interesting historical introduction: although I would have liked rather more before modern times.

The problem I find with this book is that it is not really evidence based in a modern sense. Papers are quoted with no real attempt to assess their quality. This is partially because there are so few quantitative studies in child protection but I think readers would have liked to have more descriptions on the quality of the methodology of the papers that are quoted. I would have liked the references tabulated in each area of abuse. There are also concerns regarding the section on epidemiology of child abuse. The histogram that is used as an illustration does not give incidence rates nor is it population based.

I particularly studied areas in the book that I know cause diagnostic difficulty and where there is controversy. One of these is subdural haemorrhage. I was disappointed that the section was quite short: only four pages. I was also disappointed at the number of references, only 14, in what is the most common cause of serious physical harm in physical child abuse.
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I find that neglect and emotional abuse are areas where it is difficult to put facts together for a clear diagnosis. The section on neglect has a helpful list of points to look for in the potentially neglected child and also ways of assessing the whole family. I found the section on emotional abuse less helpful.

Child protection is a very difficult area for clinicians and many shy away from committing themselves to clear diagnoses. This new edition will help give more confidence in dealing with these difficult cases. It is a pity that at nearly £70 it will not be accessible to young doctors outside libraries. Perhaps fewer photographs and being in paperback would make it less expensive and more accessible.

J R Sibert

Mosby’s atlas and text of pediatrics and child health


I enjoyed reviewing this book aimed at students and doctors in training, and I also learned from it. I must add that it is a good source of information for doctors who are preparing for examinations.

The book gives useful information, is highly illustrated and the format with text boxes and lists levels itself for easy reading and reference (revision for examinations).

The photographs are well placed with the text and with excellent explanations, which accompany the photographs, x rays, and scans. The quality of the photographs are superb too, thus the clinical phenotypes, which the authors want to illustrate are clearly visible. I found the book easy to read and understand.

I am sure that this book will prove very useful and will fill the gap in the market, as it will attract those adult learners who learn visually. It lends itself for scan reading for revision.

I teach examination preparation courses and I will bring this book to the attention of candidates sitting the DCH and MRCPCH exams. I would think that the GP tutors who come across this book would find it helpful in their teaching too. Many of the illustrations and slides will enhance anyone’s teaching methods.

More books like this are needed in paediatrics and child health as the pictures and illustrations that the doctors see will enhance their learning (and retention) skills. With problem orientated teaching (and learning) that we now practise, this type of book and presentations would be a most welcome addition. The market is not saturated, and I hope it will never be.

S Lingam
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