

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Journal welcomes Letters to the Editor; if found suitable, they will be published as space allows. Letters should be typed double-spaced, should not exceed 400 words, and are subject to abridgment and other editorial changes in accordance with journal style.

COMPUTER LANGUAGES FOR GENERALISTS

To the Editor:

The article by Mullins¹ in the September 1984 issue of *The Journal* posed a trivial question and inescapably reached a trivial answer. Unfortunately some of your readers may be misled by his conclusion, much as they might by the answer to "Have you stopped beating your spouse yet?" Mullins infers that disenchantment with BASIC is endemic to university computer science departments, but indeed such feeling is very widespread for a number of reasons. First and foremost, readers must be aware that BASIC is not a computer language but is a rubric for a collection of computer languages that bear considerable similarity to one another. No standard exists for the syntax or vocabulary of BASIC, thus a program written in one version will not run in a computer that implements a different version; it must be rewritten. BASIC programs are not portable from one system to another!

BASIC is a verbose language. Mullins shows that Pascal is more verbose than BASIC, but does not mention other languages that are less verbose and more powerful than either. One such is MUMPS (an acronym for Massachusetts General Hospital Utility MultiPro-

gramming System). MUMPS was developed, as its full name implies, for the data-handling needs of the medical user and is compact, powerful and—perhaps most important—subject to standards of the American National Standards Institute.² A program written in MUMPS for a 40-user minicomputer system runs on a home microcomputer and vice-versa. Moreover, in direct comparison, MUMPS programs run faster and take up less disc storage space than those written in BASIC (or several other languages).³ This last is especially significant for the user of a personal microcomputer, whose disc space is necessarily limited.

Best of all, MUMPS is now available at nominal cost in a version for most personal microcomputers that use either CP/M or MS-DOS operating systems.* At the Department of Family Practice of UC, Davis, residents routinely take two weeks to learn enough MUMPS to be able to write useful programs, several of which we have started to incorporate into our clinical practice. (I suppose that Mullins would consider this compares favorably with Burton's three months.) In short, it would appear that the best answer to the question

For information on MicroMUMPS contact: Richard F. Walters, PhD, Department of Medical Computing, School of Engineering, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA 95616

posed in the title of Mullins' article is, "neither."

Martin Mendelson, MD, PhD
Department of Family Practice
University of California, Davis,
School of Medicine
Davis, California

References

1. Mullins P: BASIC or Pascal: Which is the language for the generalist? *J Fam Pract* 1984; 19:393
2. Krieg AF, Bongiovanni MB, Volkstorf JE: MUMPS versus BASIC: A comparison of two options for a first computer language. *Software in Healthcare*, Aug/Sept 1984
3. Alonzo CM: System performance: A benchmark study on MUMPS and other systems. *MUG Q* 1984; 13(3/4):13

The preceding letter was referred to Mr. Mullins, who responds as follows:

Dr. Mendelson raises several points that are of interest in discussing any computer languages, but comes to a rather strange conclusion.

The first of these points is whether BASIC is a "language." Languages are classically defined (in the mathematical sense) as sets of strings. Consequently any well-defined grammar defines a language. There are, of course, many dialects of BASIC, just as there are many dialects of FORTRAN, Pascal, FORTH, and for that matter, English. There are two main purposes to any computer language: to communicate a method of performing a task, and to im-

Continued on page 20

ULTRACEF® (Cefadroxil)

Capsules, Tablets and Oral Suspension

Brief Summary of Prescribing Information (4) 7/82

For complete prescribing information, please consult product literature.

CONTRAINDICATION

ULTRACEF (cefadroxil) is contraindicated in patients with known allergy to the cephalosporin group of antibiotics.

WARNING

IN PENICILLIN-ALLERGIC PATIENTS, CEPHALOSPORIN ANTIBIOTICS SHOULD BE USED WITH GREAT CAUTION. THERE IS CLINICAL AND LABORATORY EVIDENCE OF PARTIAL CROSS-ALLERGENICITY OF THE PENICILLINS AND THE CEPHALOSPORINS, AND THERE ARE INSTANCES OF PATIENTS WHO HAVE HAD REACTIONS TO BOTH DRUGS (INCLUDING FATAL ANAPHYLAXIS AFTER PARENTERAL USE).

Any patient who has demonstrated a history of some form of allergy, particularly to drugs, should receive antibiotics cautiously and then only when absolutely necessary. No exception should be made with regard to ULTRACEF (cefadroxil).

Pseudomembranous colitis has been reported with the use of cephalosporins (and other broad spectrum antibiotics); therefore, it is important to consider its diagnosis in patients who develop diarrhea in association with antibiotic use.

Treatment with broad spectrum antibiotics alters normal flora of the colon and may permit overgrowth of clostridia. Studies indicate a toxin produced by *Clostridium difficile* is one primary cause of antibiotic-associated colitis. Cholestyramine and colestipol resins have been shown to bind the toxin *in vitro*.

Mild cases of colitis may respond to drug discontinuance alone. Moderate to severe cases should be managed with fluid, electrolyte and protein supplementation as indicated.

When the colitis is not relieved by drug discontinuance or when it is severe, oral vancomycin is the treatment of choice for antibiotic-associated pseudomembranous colitis produced by *C. difficile*. Other causes of colitis should also be considered.

PRECAUTIONS

Patients should be followed carefully so that any side effects or unusual manifestations of drug idiosyncrasy may be detected. If a hypersensitivity reaction occurs, the drug should be discontinued and the patient treated with the usual agents (e.g. epinephrine or other pressor amines, antihistamines, or corticosteroids).

ULTRACEF (cefadroxil) should be used with caution in the presence of markedly impaired renal function (creatinine clearance rate of less than 50 ml/min/1.73M²). (See DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION). In patients with known or suspected renal impairment, careful clinical observation and appropriate laboratory studies should be made prior to and during therapy.

Prolonged use of ULTRACEF may result in the overgrowth of nonsusceptible organisms. Careful observation of the patient is essential. If superinfection occurs during therapy, appropriate measures should be taken.

Positive direct Coombs' tests have been reported during treatment with the cephalosporin antibiotics. In hematologic studies or in transfusion cross-matching procedures when antiglobulin tests are performed on the minor side or in Coombs' testing of newborns whose mothers have received cephalosporin antibiotics before parturition, it should be recognized that a positive Coombs' test may be due to the drug.

ULTRACEF should be prescribed with caution in individuals with a history of gastrointestinal disease, particularly colitis.

USAGE IN PREGNANCY

Pregnancy Category B: Reproduction studies have been performed in mice and rats at doses up to 11 times the human dose and have revealed no evidence of impaired fertility or harm to the fetus due to cefadroxil. There are, however, no adequate and well controlled studies in pregnant women. Because animal reproduction studies are not always predictive of human response, this drug should be used during pregnancy only if clearly needed.

Nursing Mothers: Caution should be exercised when cefadroxil is administered to a nursing mother.

ADVERSE REACTIONS

Gastrointestinal—Symptoms of pseudomembranous colitis can appear during antibiotic treatment. Nausea and vomiting have been reported rarely. Administration with food decreases nausea and does not decrease absorption. Diarrhea and dysuria have also occurred.

Hypersensitivity—Allergies (in the form of rash, urticaria, and angioedema) have been observed. These reactions usually subsided upon discontinuation of the drug.

Other reactions have included genital pruritus, genital moniliasis, vaginitis, and moderate transient neutropenia.

HOW SUPPLIED

ULTRACEF (cefadroxil) tablets. Each tablet contains cefadroxil equivalent to 1 gram cefadroxil.

NDC 0015-7286—1 gram

ULTRACEF (cefadroxil) capsules. Each capsule contains cefadroxil equivalent to 500 mg cefadroxil.

NDC 0015-7271—500 mg

ULTRACEF (cefadroxil) for oral suspension. Each 5 ml of reconstituted suspension contains cefadroxil equivalent to 125 mg, or 250 mg cefadroxil.

NDC 0015-7283—125 mg

NDC 0015-7284—250 mg

REFERENCES

1. Ultracef (cefadroxil) Official Prescribing Information.
2. Santella PJ et al.: Clinical evaluation of cefadroxil, a new oral cephalosporin. *Curr Chemother*, 2:1046-1049, 1978.
3. Simon VC, Malerczyk V: Serum and skin blister levels of cefadroxil in comparison to cephalixin. Abstract #225, 18th Interc Conf Antimicrob Agents Chemother, Atlanta, 1978.
4. Hartstein AL et al.: Comparison of pharmacological and antimicrobial properties of cefadroxil and cephalixin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*, 12:93-97, 1977.
5. Ayd FJ, Jr: Editorial. *JAMA*, 230:263-264, 1974.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Continued from page 18

plement the performance of that task. Languages that are suitable for the first of these tasks are not necessarily the most efficient for the second (more later).

The second point raised by Mendelson is that of portability. This concept has changed a little over the last few years, since the advent of the microcomputer. Previously computing was done on relatively few machines, and these machines were supplied with compilers, for example, for FORTRAN. Programs written in Seattle needed to be capable of implementation in Auckland, New Zealand, and also in Turku, Finland. Hence the need for portability. Now, however, there are millions of sites that support the BASIC dialect called Applesoft alone! There are millions more that support Microsoft BASIC. My point is that portability is now applied to portability across space, but not necessarily across machines.

Mendelson's third point sounds more like an advertisement for MUMPS, couched as a plea for compactness, power, and efficiency. The most compact, most powerful, and most efficient programming language for any computer is specific to that computer, and is of course, machine code. Development time for machine-coded programs, however, can be very large. In this situation the ultimate market justifies the enormous investment in development. VISICALC was written in machine code—imagine how it might perform were it written in MUMPS!

Mendelson's fourth point seems to be the price of MUMPS—I am not sure what 'nominal cost' is, nor whether MUMPS is available for the million and one-half or so Apple

computers, as well as the CP/M family of computers and the IBM Personal range of computers, but all of these are supplied with BASIC more or less as part of the purchase.

Perhaps I did not make the point very clearly in my article: I shall try again.

1. Microcomputers are very widespread: almost all professionals will have one by the end of the decade if not sooner.

2. These machines usually come equipped with BASIC. However, the next most popular language for these machines is Pascal. There are many other languages available, all having their own advantages and disadvantages. I chose only the two most widespread to compare.

3. My conclusion was not so much a trivial answer as a non-answer: it depends. For small tasks, it is difficult to find a language that will produce an answer as quickly as BASIC. For medium-to-large tasks, it is difficult to find a language as badly suited as BASIC. Pascal, on the other hand, is very well suited, and in spite of Mendelson's pleas on behalf of MUMPS, p-system Pascal is quite portable across machines as well.

Peter R. Mullins

Birkenhead

Auckland, New Zealand

NEONATAL CIRCUMCISION

To the Editor:

In 1975, almost ten years ago, the Committee on Fetus and Newborn of the American Academy of Pediatrics issued a report which concluded that there were no valid medical indications for circumcision in the newborn.¹ It is estimated that the procedure is still performed on more than 90 percent

Continued on page 22

HYDERGINE[®] LC

(ergoloid mesylates) liquid capsules
1 mg



Indications: Symptomatic relief of signs and symptoms of idiopathic decline in mental capacity (i.e., cognitive and interpersonal skills, mood, self-care, apparent motivation) in patients over sixty. It appears that individuals who respond to HYDERGINE therapy are those who would be considered clinically to suffer from some ill-defined process related to aging or to have some underlying dementing condition, such as primary progressive dementia, Alzheimer's dementia, senile onset, or multi-infarct dementia. Before prescribing HYDERGINE[®] (ergoloid mesylates), the physician should exclude the possibility that signs and symptoms arise from a potentially reversible and treatable condition, particularly delirium and dementia-form illness secondary to systemic disease, primary neurological disease, or primary disturbance of mood. Not indicated for acute or chronic psychosis regardless of etiology (see Contraindications).

Use of HYDERGINE therapy should be continually reviewed, since presenting clinical picture may evolve to allow specific diagnosis and specific alternative treatment, and to determine whether any initial benefit persists. Modest but statistically significant changes observed at the end of twelve weeks of therapy include: mental alertness, confusion, recent memory, orientation, emotional lability, self-care, depression, anxiety/fears, cooperation, sociability, appetite, dizziness, fatigue, bothersome(ness), and overall impression of clinical status.

Contraindications: Hypersensitivity to the drug; psychosis, acute or chronic, regardless of etiology.

Precautions: Because the target symptoms are of unknown etiology, careful diagnosis should be attempted before prescribing HYDERGINE (ergoloid mesylates) preparations.

Adverse Reactions: Serious side effects have not been found. Some transient nausea and gastric disturbances have been reported, and sublingual irritation with the sublingual tablets.

Dosage and Administration: 1 mg three times daily. Alleviation of symptoms is usually gradual and results may not be observed for 3-4 weeks.

How Supplied: HYDERGINE LC (liquid capsules); 1 mg, oblong, off-white, branded "HYDERGINE LC 1 mg" on one side, "Δ" other side. Packages of 100 and 500. (Encapsulated by R. P. Scherer, N.A., Clearwater, Florida 33518).

HYDERGINE (ergoloid mesylates) tablets (for oral use); 1 mg, round, white, embossed "HYDERGINE 1" on one side, "Δ" other side. Packages of 100 and 500.

Each liquid capsule or tablet contains ergoloid mesylates USP as follows: dihydroergocornine mesylate 0.333 mg, dihydroergocristine mesylate 0.333 mg, and dihydroergocryptine (dihydro-alpha-ergocryptine and dihydro-beta-ergocryptine in the proportion of 2:1) mesylate 0.333 mg, representing a total of 1 mg.

Also available: HYDERGINE sublingual tablets; 1 mg, oval, white, embossed "HYDERGINE" on one side, "78-77" other side. Packages of 100 and 1000. 0.5 mg, round, white, embossed "HYDERGINE 0.5" on one side, "Δ" other side. Packages of 100 and 1000.

HYDERGINE liquid; 1 mg/ml. Bottles of 100 mg with an accompanying dropper graduated to deliver 1 mg.

[HYD-ZZ24-6 15 84]

HYD-1285-18

Before prescribing, see package circular for full product information.

DORSEY PHARMACEUTICALS

Division of
Sandoz Pharmaceuticals Corporation
East Hanover, NJ 07936

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Continued from page 20

of newborn male infants in this country,² making it the most frequently performed surgical procedure on male patients in the United States. A wide variety of cultural, medical, psychological, and religious reasons are commonly offered to justify circumcision. Cultural and religious reasons aside, the widespread support for this practice among physicians is surprising in light of the contrary evidence published in the medical literature.

Reports of complications in the literature arising from neonatal circumcision range from minor bleeding to total ablation of the penis, necessitating reconstruction or sex-reassignment of the infant.³ Investigations that have measured physiologic parameters during circumcision including heart rate, transcutaneous oxygen pressure levels, and time spent crying indicate discomfort in the infant.⁴

There is evidence that physicians themselves are influential protagonists for circumcision,⁵ though a recent article in *The Journal of Family Practice* shows that parents are subject to many other influences.⁶ If physicians are committed to performing the procedure—and family physicians should reconsider doing a painful, unnecessary, potentially complicated procedure—it is appropriate that such be done with as little discomfort to the infant as possible. In 1978 Kirya and Werthmann⁷ described a technique of penile dorsal block to provide anesthesia for neonatal circumcision. This procedure involves the subcutaneous injection of 0.2 to 0.4 cc of one percent lidocaine at the 10 and 2 o'clock positions on the dorsal aspect of the penis approximately 0.5-cm distal to the penile

root. This procedure has been used and reported upon repeatedly since the initial article and has been consistently shown to relieve the pain in the procedure and cause less physiological stress.

Debate will continue to swirl around the question of performing infant circumcisions: established traditions are notoriously hardy. It would seem appropriate that physicians in training be taught the penile nerve block as part of the circumcision procedure as long as family medicine training programs continue to allow or instruct students or residents to circumcise newborns.

Mary Swaykus, MD
Assistant Professor of
Family Practice
Quillen-Dishner
College of Medicine
Kingsport Family Practice Center
Kingsport, Tennessee

References

1. Committee on Fetus and Newborn: Report of the Ad Hoc Task Force on Circumcision. *Pediatrics* 1975; 56:610
2. Kaplan GW: Complications of circumcision. *Urol Clin North Am* 1983; 10:543
3. Osborn LM, Metcalf TJ, Mariani EM: Hygienic care in uncircumcised infants. *Pediatrics* 1981; 67:365
4. Williamson PS, Williamson M: Physiologic stress reduction by a local anesthetic during newborn circumcision. *Pediatrics* 1983; 7:36
5. Grimes DA: Routine circumcision of the newborn infant: A reappraisal. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1978; 130:125
6. Bean GO, Egelhoff C: Neonatal circumcision: when is the decision made? *J Fam Pract* 1984; 18:883
7. Kirya C, Werthmann MW: Neonatal circumcision and penile dorsal nerve block—A painless procedure. *J Pediatr* 1978; 92:998