LETTERS TO
THE EDITOR

Low soluble FcRIII receptor demonstrates reduced neutrophil reserves in preterm neonates

Editor,—Studies of human neonate granulopoiesis have been hampered by the lack of a marker of overall neutrophil cell mass. Assumptions about neonate granulopoiesis have therefore largely been extrapolated from rat data. Direct measurement of total neutrophil cell mass (in terms of neutrophils per kg body weight) in newborn rats has shown that they have about one quarter the neutrophil mass of adult animals and that their neutrophil mass in- creases to adult levels by the time they are 4 weeks old.1 In addition, newborn rodents do not have the reserve pool of quiescent granulocyte progenitors, as found in adults, to recruit into production during sepsis. Circum- stances that have been given as a similar immaturity of the reserve pool are diseases such as PDA, patent ductus arteriosus.

Our data also show that neutrophil reserves have about one quarter the neutrophil mass of normal adult values (mean (SE) 15.3 (1.3)%), which shows minimal numbers of neutrophils in haemopoietic tissue before 24 weeks gestation. Until now, direct quantification of total body neutrophil cell mass in human neonates between 24 weeks and term has remained elusive.

In 1992 we reported2 that preterm neonates born before 32 weeks gestation have very low plasma concentrations of the soluble FcRRII receptor (sFcRII), sFcRII is the plasma form of the neutrophil membrane receptor FcγRII, which, together with other membrane receptors, is responsible for binding to and initiating phagocytosis. We observed that, between 24 and 32 weeks gestation, sFcRII concentrations are about 15% of normal adult values (mean (SE) 15.3 (3.1)%), while sFcRII concentrations in fetal spleens collected between 19 and 23 weeks are even lower (mean (SE) 8.3 (1.4)%). Between 33 and 36 weeks in utero, sFcRII increases rapidly so that both term and preterm have concentrations similar to adults. In babies born before 32 weeks, sFcRII increases gradually after birth to achieve adult concentrations by the fourth week of postnatal life. At the time, we interpreted these data to indicate reduced FcRII production by individual cells and thus immaturity of neonatal neutrophil function.

Since we published these data, further work has clarified the origins and significance of plasma sFcRII. These studies have shown that sFcRII is derived from apoptotic neutrophils, and its concentration in plasma reflects the total body neutrophil cell mass as well as the overall production of neutrophils in the bone marrow.3

This new understanding of sFcRII alters the interpretation of our original observation. It is now apparent that our data confirm what was previously only suspected: preterm human infants of less than 32 weeks gestation have reduced neutrophil production and a reduced total neutrophil cell mass at birth. Our data also show that neutrophil reserves remain low for about three weeks after preterm birth. Term infants, by contrast, have neutrophil production and stores that are similar to those of adults.

The reduced neutrophil mass of preterm neonates explains the common occurrence of postnatal and sepsis induced neutropenia. The relevance of this finding to the high sepsis incidence associated with prematurity is emphasised by a recent study of patients with idiopathic neutropenia, which has shown that a low sFcRII concentration is a more accurate predictor of infection risk than the peripheral blood neutrophil count.4 Furthermore, this new insight into neonatal immune development suggests that stimulation of neutrophil production by colony stimulating factors early in postnatal life would reduce the incidence and severity of sepsis in preterm neonates by accelerating expansion of their deficient neutrophil reserves.

ROBERT CARR
Department of Haematology, King’s College, St Thomas’ Hospital, London, UK

TOM W J HUIZINGA
Department of Rheumatology, University Hospital Leiden, Leiden, The Netherlands


Suxamethonium is safe in safe hands; mivacurium should also be considered

Editor,—We thank Whyte et al5 for detailing the premedication policies for intubation in United Kingdom neonatal units. There is a wide disparity in both the type and dosage of drugs. Whyte et al mention that, as a muscle relaxant, suxamethonium, has important safety benefits. It has a rapid onset and offset of action, and therefore there is a “get out clause” for the difficult intubation or intuba- tion by an inexperienced operator. How- ever, other considerations need to be taken into account when suxamethonium is used.

Firstly, intravenous premedication is con-traindicated in conditions known to be associated with difficult intubations, such as the Pierre Robin sequence. Further, suxametho- nium is a depolarising muscle relaxant and therefore can cause sinus bradycardia. Atro- pine can be given in an attempt to avoid this.

Suxamethonium causes depolarisation at the neuromuscular junction, rarely leading to hyperkalaemic induced cardiac arrest.6 Undi- agnosed myopathic conditions were found in a number of affected children, and paediatric licensing for this drug was therefore removed in the United States. However, no other very rap- idly acting drug has been manufactured, and, because of its popularity, suxamethonium was reinstated. Before its use, a detailed family his- tory for myopathic conditions must be taken.

In our neonatal unit, we have started to use fentanyl, an opioid, with mivacurium as the muscle relaxant.7 The disadvantage of miva- curium is that it is only a rapidly acting mus- cle relaxant.8 Its major advantages are that it is non-depolarising muscle relaxant and there- fore carries no risk of life threatening arrhyth- mias. The routine use of atropine is not nec- essary.

Table 1 Summary of the events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day no</th>
<th>Total fluids (ml/kg)</th>
<th>Urinary output (ml/kg)</th>
<th>Sodium input (mmol/dl)</th>
<th>Serum sodium (mmol/dl)</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>940 (PDA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We agree that a randomised trial needs to be undertaken to prove that premedication has the desired end point of reducing neonatal morbidity, particularly intraventricular haemorrhage.

ASRAR RASHID
Specialist Paediatric Registrar
Neonatal Unit
Birmingham Heartlands Hospital
Bordesley Green, Birmingham B9 5SS
e-mail: Draarar@ifnome.net
MICHAEL WATKINSON
Consultant Neonatologist
Neonatal Unit
Birmingham Heartlands Hospital

Premedication for intubation in neonates

EDITOR,—We were very interested in the recent papers by Bhutada et al and Whyte et al on the use of premedication for sedative intubation in neonates. It is now well accepted that term and preterm neonates tolerate awake intubation poorly, often exhibiting increased need for cardiopulmonary resuscitation during nasotracheal or orotracheal intubation. Analgesia and sedation are still used infrequently in nurseries for intubation and other “routine”, but invasive, therapeutic or diagnostic procedures.

We recently performed a randomised, double blind, placebo controlled trial to assess whether sedation with midazolam in premature infants would improve physiological stability and the success rate of endotracheal intubation. Eight premature infants underwent 16 intubation procedures after being randomly assigned to one of three groups: I (n = 3), the control group, received placebo only; II (n = 6) received atropine and placebo; III (n = 7) received atropine and midazolam. Infants could be randomised again to a different group after completion of each intubation procedure. Heart rate, blood pressure, and oxyhaemoglobin saturation were recorded at 10 minute intervals for each infant. The study was terminated when data collected was reviewed early because of concerns over adverse events. The number of episodes of oxyhaemoglobin desaturation around the time of intubation was significantly greater in group III (86%) than in group I (0%; P = 0.01). Cardiopulmonary resuscitation was required in 29% of group III compared with 0% of group II (P = 0.16).

In our trial, premature infants who received midazolam were at increased risk of oxyhaemoglobin desaturation during tracheal intubation. There was also a trend toward an increased need for cardiopulmonary resuscitation in these infants. Although regrettably underpowered because of the early termination, our study indicates caution in the use of midazolam as routine premedication for tracheal intubation in premature infants. Further investigation with a larger number of infants is needed to clarify its safety and efficacy profile.

Although we agree that an important goal in neonatal medicine is to minimise pain and stress, more information is needed on the effects of intravenous anaesthetic agents, such as thiopental and methohexitol, in both stable and unstable preterm neonates before these medications can be recommended for routine use. Further randomised controlled trials are needed to help formulate specific premedication guidelines for the variety of noxious procedures that infants undergo in neonatal intensive care units.

DIANE M ATTARDI
Division of Neonatology
Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia

Incidence of severe retinopathy of prematurity

EDITOR,—We were interested to read the article of Vy as et al on the incidence of severe retinopathy of prematurity (ROP) in 11 neonatal units in five cities in England in 1994. We have published similar data from eight neonatal units in New South Wales (NSW) Australia in 1993 and 1994. These data were prospectively collected in the NSW Neonatal Intensive Care Unit’s data collection and is stored and maintained in the NSW Centre for Perinatal Health Services Research, University of Sydney, NSW.

For infants of < 29 weeks gestation, there was no significant difference in severe ROP (≥ stage 3) between the five cities in England and NSW (table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Incidence of severe retinopathy of prematurity (ROP) in five cities in England and in New South Wales (NSW), Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestation &lt;27 weeks 20/95 (21.0) 44/157 (28.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are expressed as number of severe ROP/number examined with the percentage in parentheses. The differences are not statistically significant.

Unlike Vy as et al, we could not find an association between improved survival and the development of severe ROP. In six of the neonatal units in our study (two have been excluded from this analysis as they are children’s hospitals and have very few small premature infants), survival in infants of < 27 weeks gestation ranged from 51.3% to 68.8%. The percentage with severe ROP for the two units with the lowest and highest survival was 15 (3/20) and 24 (5/21) respectively, while the range of severe ROP in the six neonatal units was 15% (3/20) to 36% (9/25). In infants of 27–28 weeks gestation, survival ranged from 85.1% to 96.7% and the percentage with severe ROP for the two units with the lowest and highest survival was 7 (4/56) and 3 (2/58) respectively, while the range of severe ROP in this group of infants was 2% (1/50) to 7% (4/56) (unpublished observations). We have also shown that, despite an increase in survival of preterm infants following the introduction of surfactant, there was no significant impact on the incidence or severity of ROP.

In infants of 29–31 weeks gestation, six of 443 infants (1.4%) developed severe ROP and one required Cryo/Laser treatment. This infant was 30 weeks gestation with a birth weight of 1305 g. We therefore agree with Vy as et al that there should be no reduction in the upper limit of gestation or birth weight for screening for ROP.

DAVID A TODD
The Princess Anne Hospital
Coxford Road, Southampton
Hants, UK


Blood pressure standards for very low birthweight infants

EDITOR,—Based on careful invasive blood pressure measurements in a cohort of 61 very low birthweight (VLBW) infants weighing <1251 g birth weight, and 12 hours of life, Lee et al report on blood pressure standards in this population. The quality of the blood pressure readings was assessed using continuous video recording during the first wave forms. The inclusion of a relatively large number (n = 28) of extremely low birthweight infants is another strength of this study.

In an attempt to define normal blood pressure values in a population that by definition is not “normal”, the authors have excluded very ill infants and infants requiring inotropic support. They have also excluded infants who developed intraventricular haemorrhage (IVH) grades III and IV and during the first few days of life. They suggest that the lower limits of mean arterial blood pressure (MAP) for infants between 26 and 32 weeks of gestation are numerically similar to the gestational ages. With the exclusion of infants who developed severe IVH, it became impossible to detect any association between blood pressure and IVH. Decreases in cerebral blood flow may play an important role in the pathogenesis of IVH, and although MAP is not a reliable parameter to assess cerebral blood flow,6 at least two published studies have shown that the incidence of IVH was higher in infants with lower MAP. Perhaps the authors could indicate how many infants

with IVH grades III and IV were excluded and what blood pressures were recorded in these infants. For similar reasons, it remains uncertain whether the proposed blood pressure standards are applicable to very ill infants or infants who require isotropic support. It is conceivable that cerebral vascular resistance in sick preterm infants differs from that in the study patients, and consequently the application of the suggested blood pressure standards to sick preterm infants would result in different—and possibly inadequate—cerebral blood flows.

The data presented add to our knowledge on blood pressure in VLBW infants, but do not allow the conclusion that the suggested blood pressure standards are safe for all VLBW infants.

THOMAS M BERGER
Neonatal and Paediatric Intensive Care Unit
Kinderspital Luzern, CH-6000 Luzern 16
Switzerland


Drs Juin, Rajadurai, and Wee respond:

We would like to thank Dr Berger for his comments. Our objective was to define the normal range of blood pressures for very small infants and this would logically exclude those with IVH and those on inotropes, both of which could affect blood pressure. We did not compare infants with and without IVH because that was not our aim. There may very well be a correlation between hypotension and IVH, but studies looking at this association were not optimal because there is controversy as to what constitutes hypotension. We hope that our standards will provide norms for such studies. Blood pressure is the practical surrogate for cerebral blood flow because with present technology we cannot continuously monitor the latter by the bedside. Tyszczuk et al determined that cerebral blood flow was independent of blood pressure in preterm infants, but again the selection of a mean arterial pressure of 30 mm Hg as the cut off is open to debate. We think that choosing such an arbitrary number was not appropriate and more such studies are needed with particular attention being paid to the very different normal blood pressures among preterm infants with various birth weights and gestational ages.


Patient triggered ventilation in neonatal respiratory distress syndrome

EDITOR,—Baumer reports the results of a large multicentre study comparing the effects of patient triggered ventilation (PTV) with conventional ventilation (IMV).1 There appears to be no benefit from PTV compared with IMV in death rate, development of chronic lung disease, pneumothorax rates, and cerebral ultrasonographic abnormality. In addition, because of an increased trend toward a higher pneumothorax rate, Baumer concludes that, at present, PTV delivered with either the SLE 2000 or the Dräger babylog 8000 should not be recommended for infants of less than 28 weeks gestation with respiratory distress syndrome (RDS).

However, we are concerned that this may be a premature conclusion given the significant difference in PTV delivery by the two main ventilators used and the potential heterogeneity of clinical practice within the different centres involved, despite agreed ventilation protocols. Dimitriou et al showed that neonates and infants trigger a significantly lower proportion of breaths using the SLE 2000, an airway triggered ventilator that provides synchronised intermittent positive pressure ventilation (SIPPV). Attempts to optimise the trigger rate of the SLE 2000 ventilator by increasing pressure sensitivity often results in alarms as discussed by Baumer. Therefore the PTV modes of the two ventilators are substantially different. This prompts us to ask whether the findings of this multicentre study are only applicable to PTV provided by the Dräger babylog 8000? Would there have been a different outcome if all the triggered babies had received SIPPV?

It is not known how many of the 40/213 babies of less than 28 weeks gestation who had pneumothorax were receiving SIPPV. As only 11% (52/465) of all triggered babies ever received SIPPV, we surmise that very few of the 40 were ventilated in this way. Is it fair to conclude that the Dräger babylog 8000 has a trend to pneumothorax on SIPPV?

In a separate smaller study, Baumer also reports 120 patients in three centres randomly assigned to either the Dräger babylog 8000 or the SLE 2000 ventilator, and found a non-significant trend to higher pneumothorax rate, chronic lung disease, and death for the former group. But we are not told how many of the babies were actually on trigger mode (PTV or SIPPV). They could all have been receiving IMV or their infants were larger babies ventilated with SIMV (synchronised intermittent mandatory ventilation) where the baby’s breaths, selected during a “time window”, trigger the ventilator with the preset number of breaths per minute.

The results were reported in the way that they were for a reason. The original study design allowed a four way randomisation between the two makes of ventilator and the two modes of ventilation. As was reported, only three centres had enough of both ventilators to allow this to occur. Other centres ventilating infants with the Dräger babylog had a two way randomisation between PTV and IMV.

Therefore the possibility of confounding by differences in practice between centres needed to be excluded. If the centres using the SLE as well as the Dräger ventilators delivered different outcomes from those using only one make of ventilator, this may have led to inappropriate conclusions being drawn if all infants being ventilated with one ventilator were simply compared with those being ventilated with another. A logistic regression model was therefore used to allow for possible centre effects (as well as other significant factors such as gestation).

With that caveat, I have computed the numbers from the database giving details of the crude observed rates of pneumothorax in the infants of less than 28 weeks gestation, separately reported for the two makes of ventilator (table 1).

The observed rate of pneumothorax was substantially (but not significantly, $\chi^2 2.8$, p > 0.05 < 0.1) higher in the infants ventilated in PTV mode than in IMV mode using the SLE 2000. Although the numbers are small, the observed pneumothorax rate was higher in infants ventilated with the Dräger babylog 8000 than in those ventilated with the SLE ventilator. If that seems somewhat illogical to recommend caution in using
PTV, patient triggered ventilation; IMV, intermittent mandatory ventilation.

the SLE 2000 in PTV mode in infants less than 28 weeks gestation, but not extend this caution to ventilating infants with the Dräger babylog 8000.

Given that none of these differences were statistically significant, no clear recommendation can be given. This is why the wording used in the publication was “it might be prudent to avoid . . .”.

As regards the number of infants departing from their assigned mode of ventilation, several points should be emphasised. The study protocol permitted changing the mode of ventilation at the discretion of the attending clinicians. This was inevitably interpreted differently by each clinical team. Departure from the assigned mode of ventilation was not an intended outcome, and it is evident that this occurred more commonly in the more immature infants and those that subsequently died. High rates of departure from the assigned mode of ventilation cannot therefore readily be interpreted as evidence of failure of the assigned mode. Table 2 shows the numbers of infants of all gestations departing from the assigned mode of ventilation.

There was therefore a higher crude rate of departure from the assigned mode of ventilation in infants ventilated with the Dräger babylog 8000, with a similar proportion returning to the Dräger ventilator.

It would be difficult to interpret the pneumothorax rates for infants who were actually being ventilated with their assigned mode of ventilation. Some infants were switched to another mode of ventilation after sustaining their pneumothorax. Most of the pneumothoraces occurred while infants were receiving their assigned mode of ventilation, and this included infants being trigger ventilated using the Dräger ventilator.

Burmester and Petros ask whether centres contributing fewer patients may have higher morbidity rates, correcting for potential confounding factors by using a logistic regression model. The pneumothorax rate from centres contributing less than 20 patients was the same as the centres contributing more infants.

We have used a model to identify outcome differences in infants randomised within three months of the first infant being entered into the study, correcting for individual centre effects, gestation, birth weight, and mode of ventilation. There was no significant difference in rates of death and chronic lung disease, abnormal cranial ultrasound scan, or duration of ventilation. However, an appreciable and statistically significant difference was found for pneumothorax rates. The 139 infants randomised within three months had a pneumothorax rate of 5% compared with a rate of 13% for those randomised more than three months into the trial (odds ratio 0.30; 95% confidence intervals 0.12 to 0.74; p = 0.009). This was seen equally for both modes of ventilation.

This finding suggests that the initial educational visit by the trial coordinator had a beneficial effect on ventilator management which disappeared as infants continued to be enrolled.

In summary, there is no evidence from this study of any trend towards better outcomes with the Dräger babylog 8000 ventilator, although the small numbers enrolled make any conclusions less robust. There is evidence that suggests there may have been a short term reduction in pneumothorax rates from the educational package offered at the start of the trial.

In conclusion, there was no convincing evidence of a beneficial effect of a policy of using PTV in preterm infants with RDS with the ventilators used. Regular attention to staff education on ventilator techniques is recommended.

I would like to use this opportunity to pay tribute to the two trial coordinators (Sue Ellis and Tom Mill), to the trial statistician (David Wright), and to the data monitoring committee (David Field and Diana Elbourne), whose details were inadvertently omitted from the final paper and without whom, together with the trial collaborators, the study would not have been possible.

Pyridoxine dependent epilepsy: a suggestive electroclinical pattern

EDITOR,—There are several problems with describing the electroclinical pattern in pyridoxine dependent seizures. 1 One is defining the electroclinical features. 2 Certainly the EEG, as suggested by the Dräger ventilator, is accompanied by encephalopathy (both of respiratory distress, usually accompanied by irritable behaviour, again followed by seizures. In some reports, seizures have been precipitated by sudden sounds or movements, although some of these could be an exaggerated startle response. Although we too found that a variety of seizures, especially generalised tonic and generalised clonic, occurred in most of these cases, 3 some only had one or two seizure types. In the UK study, five of the 20 definite and probable cases with an early onset were reported to have a single seizure type (unpublished data).

The third concern in the Nabbout and colleagues did not include later presenting cases (older than 28 days) in their report. These also appear to be pyridoxine dependent as judged by trials of withdrawal and occurrence in siblings. They accounted for three of the 23 definite and probable cases in the UK population study, although a further five had early seizures that responded to routine anticonvulsants and then remained seizure free for several months. In these, both the clinical and electrical features can differ from neonates. For example, the inter-ictal EEG can be normal, or show focal or generalised spikes or sharp waves with or without high voltage slow waves. The clinical features include recurrent episodes of status and less varied seizure types. Concentrating on a possible neonatal pattern risks overlooking such cases.

As Nabbout and colleagues emphasise, there needs to be a high index of suspicion. Clinically it is important that pyridoxine dependency should be considered in all early childhood seizures, because (a) it may be misleading and (b) early treatment does appear to be beneficial.

PETER BAXTER
Sheffield Childrens Hospital
Western Bank
Sheffield S10 2TH, UK

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTV mode</th>
<th>IMV mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dräger</td>
<td>19 (20%)</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLE</td>
<td>154 (50%)</td>
<td>164 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dräger</td>
<td>35 (18.5%)</td>
<td>36 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTV</th>
<th>IMV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dräger not</td>
<td>35 (40)</td>
<td>40 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dräger</td>
<td>16 (31%)</td>
<td>15 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLE not</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLE departing</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>147 (41.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PTV, patient triggered ventilation; IMV, intermittent mandatory ventilation.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTV</th>
<th>IMV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dräger</td>
<td>19 (20%)</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLE</td>
<td>154 (50%)</td>
<td>164 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dräger</td>
<td>35 (18.5%)</td>
<td>36 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTV</th>
<th>IMV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dräger not</td>
<td>35 (40)</td>
<td>40 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dräger</td>
<td>16 (31%)</td>
<td>15 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLE not</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLE departing</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>147 (41.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PTV, patient triggered ventilation; IMV, intermittent mandatory ventilation.

Parental visiting in neonatal units

EDITOR,—We read with interest the paper by Cuttini et al. 1 Although policy on parental visiting is an easier issue to evaluate, parental participation in decision making, particularly in decisions with strong ethical overtones, is much more complex. It is difficult to evaluate with accuracy, and by its nature is much more controversial. The paper does not stress that data collected from each participating unit, through a structured questionnaire completed by the unit coordinator, represent policy—that is, the intention and stance of each unit towards the particular issue for evaluation. Data collected through questionnaires and interviews involving both unit staff and parents would have provided a better understanding of the actual practice of each participating unit.

No unit from Greece took part in the study by Cuttini et al. 2, but Greece is briefly mentioned in the Discussion, using results from a previous study in which, in a sample
of 38 units from 11 European countries, it was shown that the nine units that imposed visiting restrictions were in France, Greece, Italy, and Portugal.

We would like to provide further information on visiting policy in Greek neonatal intensive care units (NICUs). There are 15, two of which are private; 12 are attached to maternity hospitals and the remaining three are in children’s hospitals and accept distant referrals. At one unit (Aglaia Kyriakou Children’s Hospital), visiting restrictions are imposed. These allow parents only, and the usual practice is 30 minutes to one hour visiting time in the morning and afternoon (except for mothers). The most common reasons given for imposing restrictions are increased danger of infection and a disruptive effect on the unit.

We conducted a survey, through questionnaire and interview, of parents with a baby who had been cared for in another NICU that imposed visiting restrictions before it was transferred to our NICU and/or parents who had had a previous baby in another NICU that imposed restrictions. The overwhelming majority (98.6%) said that they preferred our liberal policy on visiting. One mother of a preterm baby with bronchopulmonary dysplasia said that “if I had delivered at term I would be with my baby; if I had not delivered prematurely I would also be with my baby (in my womb); now that I have delivered prematurely why can’t I be with my baby?”

We conclude that in Greece there is a demand for unrestricted parental visiting, but most Greek NICUs do not meet this demand for reasons not based on medical or sociological evidence.

It is worth noting that, in Greece, infants beyond the neonatal period have been admitted to children’s wards with their mothers for many years.

H D DELLAGRAMMATITAS
NICOLA IOANNIDOU
NICU, 2nd Department of Paediatrics,
University of Athens,
Aglaia Kyriakou Children’s Hospital,
115 27 Athens, Greece


Ureaplasma colonisation and chronic lung disease in neonates

EDITOR,—We read the article by Hannaford et al with interest. We would like to point out that in our recent retrospective analysis, our findings of the colonisation rate of genital mycoplasmas (Ureaplasma urealyticum and Mycoplasma hominis) in the respiratory tract of premature infants of 27% were similar to their study. We also found a higher incidence of chronic lung disease (CLD) in our cohort colonised with genital mycoplasmas.

We are, however, intrigued by the implication of a “protective effect” of Ureaplasma urealyticum (Uu) colonisation on respiratory distress syndrome (RDS) in this study. The hypothesis that this may be related to the “stimulatory effect of subacute intrauterine infection on lung maturation...” is interesting but unsubstantiated. Current evidence suggests that the sicker infant with RDS has an increased early inflammatory response and a higher rate of CLD. In the present study, the incidence of RDS in Uu colonised infants was lower—but their incidence of CLD at 36 weeks was higher. Were there other factors—for example, increased incidence of PDA, more IV fluid use, that imposed these infants to develop CLD? Another issue is that in the multivariate analyses, Uu colonisation was a significant risk factor for CLD only in singleton infants, but the relationship did not hold true when all infants were analysed. Based on these observations, we wonder if the “protective effect” is real or a statistical aberration? More research needs to be done to study this “protective effect” of Uu colonisation on RDS before any conclusions can be drawn.

The treatment of Uu colonisation was not discussed in this paper. In our experience, erythromycin alone was not effective in clearing the organism from the respiratory tract. We found a short course of postnatal steroids alone or in combination with erythromycin more effective.1 We wonder if infants receiving postnatal steroids were confounders in the discrepancy between the incidence of RDS and CLD.

VINEET BHANDARI
Department of Paediatrics,
Alpert Einstein Medical Center,
Philadelphia 19141, USA

NAVEED HUSSAIN
Department of Paediatrics,
University of Connecticut Health Center,
Mailcode 2203, Farmington, CT 06030–2203, USA


Dr Gilbert et al respond:

EDITOR,—We thank Drs Bhandari and Hussain for their interest in our paper. We too were intrigued by the apparently contradictory effects of ureaplasma colonisation on the lungs of affected infants and the correlation of increased early inflammatory response and a higher rate of CLD. In the present study, the incidence of RDS in Uu colonised infants was lower—but their incidence of CLD at 36 weeks was higher. Were there other factors—for example, increased incidence of PDA, more IV fluid use, that imposed these infants to develop CLD? Another issue is that in the multivariate analyses, Uu colonisation was a significant risk factor for CLD only in singleton infants, but the relationship did not hold true when all infants were analysed. Based on these observations, we wonder if the “protective effect” is real or a statistical aberration? More research needs to be done to study this “protective effect” of Uu colonisation on RDS before any conclusions can be drawn.

The treatment of Uu colonisation was not discussed in this paper. In our experience, erythromycin alone was not effective in clearing the organism from the respiratory tract. We found a short course of postnatal steroids alone or in combination with erythromycin more effective. We wonder if infants receiving postnatal steroids were confounders in the discrepancy between the incidence of RDS and CLD.
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CORRECTION

The authors of the paper “Risk adjusted and population based studies of the outcome for high risk infants in Scotland and Australia” Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed 2000;82:F118–F123 have asked us to publish the following corrected version of table 6. The authors apologise for the error.