

The following is a brief summary only. Before prescribing, see complete prescribing information in CEFTIN® (cefuroxime axetil, Glaxo) Tablets product labeling.

CONTRAINDICATIONS: CEFTIN® is contraindicated in patients with known allergy to the cephalosporin group of antibiotics.

WARNINGS: BEFORE THERAPY WITH CEFTIN® IS INSTITUTED, CAREFUL INQUIRY SHOULD BE MADE TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE PATIENT HAS HAD PREVIOUS HYPERSENSITIVITY REACTIONS TO CEPHALOSPORINS, PENICILLINS, OR OTHER DRUGS. THIS PRODUCT SHOULD BE GIVEN CAUTIOUSLY TO PENICILLIN-SENSITIVE PATIENTS. ANTIBIOTICS SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED WITH CAUTION TO ANY PATIENT WHO HAS DEMONSTRATED SOME FORM OF ALLERGY, PARTICULARLY TO DRUGS. IF AN ALLERGIC REACTION TO CEFTIN OCCURS, DISCONTINUE THE DRUG. SERIOUS ACUTE HYPERSENSITIVITY REACTIONS MAY REQUIRE EPINEPHRINE AND OTHER EMERGENCY MEASURES.

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 that 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 choice for antibiotic-associated pseudomembranous colitis produced by *C. difficile*. Other causes of colitis should also be considered.

PRECAUTIONS: General: If an allergic reaction to CEFTIN® occurs, the drug should be discontinued, and, if necessary, the patient should be treated with appropriate agents, eg, antihistamines, pressor amines, or corticosteroids.

As with other antibiotics, prolonged use of CEFTIN may result in overgrowth of non-susceptible organisms. If superinfection occurs during therapy, appropriate measures should be taken.

Broad-spectrum antibiotics should be prescribed with caution for individuals with a history of colitis.

Information for Patients: (Pediatric) CEFTIN is only available in tablet form. During clinical trials, the tablet was well tolerated by children who could swallow the tablet whole. Children who cannot swallow the tablet whole may have the tablet crushed and mixed with food (eg, applesauce, ice cream). However, it should be noted that the crushed tablet has a strong, persistent, bitter taste. Discontinuation of therapy due to the taste and/or problems of administering this drug occurred in 13% of children (range, 2% to 28% across centers). Thus, the physician and parent should ascertain, preferably while still in the physician's office, that the child can ingest CEFTIN reliably. If not, alternative therapy should be considered.

Interference with Laboratory Tests: A false-positive reaction for glucose in the urine may occur with copper reduction tests (Benedict's or Fehling's solution or with Clinistix® tablets), but not with enzyme-based tests for glycosuria (eg, Clinistix®, Tes-Tape®). As a false-negative result may occur in the ferricyanide test, it is recommended that either the glucose oxidase or hexokinase method be used to determine blood plasma glucose levels in patients receiving CEFTIN. Cefuroxime does not interfere with the assay of serum and urine creatinine by the alkaline picrate method.

Carcinogenesis, Mutagenesis, Impairment of Fertility: Although no long-term studies in animals have been performed to evaluate carcinogenic potential, no mutagenic potential of cefuroxime was found in standard laboratory tests.

Reproductive studies revealed no impairment of fertility in animals.

Pregnancy: Pregnancy Category B: Reproduction studies have been performed in rats and mice at doses up to 50 to 160 times the human dose and have revealed no evidence of impaired fertility or harm to the fetus due to cefuroxime axetil. 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: Since cefuroxime is excreted in human milk, consideration should be given to discontinuing nursing temporarily during treatment with CEFTIN® (cefuroxime axetil, Glaxo).

ADVERSE REACTIONS: The adverse reactions to CEFTIN® are similar to reactions to other orally administered cephalosporins. CEFTIN was usually well tolerated in controlled clinical trials. Pediatric patients taking crushed tablets during clinical trials complained of the bitter taste of CEFTIN Tablets [see ADVERSE REACTIONS: Gastrointestinal and PRECAUTIONS: Information for Patients (Pediatric)]. The majority of adverse events were mild, reversible in nature, and did not require discontinuance of the drug. The incidence of gastrointestinal adverse events increased with the higher recommended doses. Twenty-five (25) patients have received CEFTIN 500 mg twice a day for one to 2.5 months with no increase in frequency or severity of adverse events. The following adverse reactions have been reported.

Gastrointestinal: Nausea occurred in 2.4% of patients. Vomiting occurred in 2.0% of patients. Diarrhea occurred in 3.5% of patients. Loose stools occurred in 1.3% of patients. There have been rare reports of pseudomembranous colitis. Crushed tablets have a bitter taste. In pediatric clinical studies conducted with crushed tablets, complaints due to taste ranged from 0/8 (0% in one center to 47/71 (66%) in another center.

Hypersensitivity: Rash (0.6% of patients), pruritus (0.3% of patients), and urticaria (0.2% of patients) have been observed. One case of severe bronchospasm has been reported among the approximately 1600 patients treated with CEFTIN. Of the patients treated with CEFTIN who reported a history of delayed hypersensitivity to a penicillin and not a cephalosporin, 2.9% of patients experienced a delayed hypersensitivity reaction to CEFTIN.

Central Nervous System: Headache occurred in less than 0.7% of patients, and dizziness occurred in less than 0.2% of patients.

Other: Vaginitis occurred in 1.9% of female patients.

Clinical Laboratory Tests: Transient elevations in AST (SGOT, 2.0% of patients), ALT (SGPT, 1.6% of patients), and LDH (1.0% of patients) have been observed. Eosinophilia (1.1% of patients) and positive Coombs' test (0.4% of patients) have been reported.

In addition to the adverse reactions listed above that have been observed in patients treated with CEFTIN, the following adverse reactions and altered laboratory tests have been reported for cephalosporin class antibiotics:

Adverse Reactions: Allergic reactions including anaphylaxis, fever, colitis, renal dysfunction, toxic nephropathy, and hepatic dysfunction including cholestasis.

Several cephalosporins have been implicated in triggering seizures, particularly in patients with renal impairment when the dosage was not reduced. If seizures associated with drug therapy should occur, the drug should be discontinued.

Anticonvulsant therapy can be given if clinically indicated.

Altered Laboratory Tests: Increased prothrombin time, increased BUN, increased creatinine, false-positive test for urinary glucose, increased alkaline phosphatase, neutropenia, thrombocytopenia, and leukopenia.

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.

OBSTETRICS IN FAMILY PRACTICE

To the Editor:

Regarding the article by Smucker and the guest editorial by Rosenblatt in the February issue of The Journal,^{1,2} with all due respect to the concept of natural childbirth and non-interventional obstetrics, and with a hearty seconding of the motion for a critical review of different obstetric approaches, the unpleasant fact remains that obstetric protocols currently are being "assembled from courtroom dockets." In such a practice environment, in which it is stated that a physician is seldom, if ever, sued for doing a cesarean section but often sued for not doing one, an alternative interpretation of the Ohio data emerges. Specifically, with only one out of 282 respondent family physicians currently doing cesarean sections, and only 21 of that total number ever having done cesarean sections, coupled with 47 percent of these respondent physicians not being residency trained, it is entirely possible that inadequate training or at least the perception of inadequate training is a prime factor in forcing these individuals out of obstetric practice. When one couples this with the much-publicized insurance news from Alabama in the summer of 1985, that the Mutual Assurance Society of Alabama would "no longer cover deliveries by family practitioners unless the physician is prepared and willing to perform Cesarean sections" (*Family Practice News*, vol 15, No. 22, 1985), it becomes imperative that, in creating a "new paradigm" of family practice obstetrics, we do not equate adequate family practice residency training in obstetrics with that train-

ing provided to nurse midwives. As an individual residency-trained in performing and continuing to perform cesarean sections for a variety of well-accepted indications, and also as one on excellent consultative terms with the two board-certified obstetricians in my community, I can attest that there are alternative definitions of low-risk vs high-risk obstetrics other than simply leaving all interventions to the obstetricians.

H. E. Salyards, MD
Hastings Family Practice
Hastings, Nebraska

References

1. Smucker DR: Obstetrics in family practice in the state of Ohio. *J Fam Pract* 1988; 26:165-168
2. Rosenblatt RR: The future of obstetrics in family practice: Time for a new direction. *J Fam Pract* 1988; 26:127-129

MONOCLONAL ANTIBODY PREGNANCY TEST

To the Editor:

We read Dr. Andolsek's recent article describing presentation of unruptured ectopic pregnancies¹ with interest and enjoyment. In her recommendations Andolsek favors the use of serum beta subunit human chorionic gonadotrophin radioimmunoassays over "less sensitive" urine pregnancy tests. We are curious as to whether the urine test employed in her study was based on monoclonal antibody technology.

Tests of this type (monoclonal antibody) are available for use in ambulatory settings and approach serum

radioimmunoassays in sensitivity. The advertised lower limits of sensitivity for most tests range from 20 to 50 IU/L (20 to 50 mIU/mL) of human chorionic gonadotrophin; actual sensitivity may be even better.² Another study suggests that sensitivity may be amplified, when urinary human chorionic gonadotrophin concentrations are very low, by use of 20 drops of urine rather than the usual 5.³

We have conducted our own observations to judge the extent to which these reports apply in our setting. Using the Abbott "Testpack" (urine), whose advertised lower limit of sensitivity is 50 IU/L (50 mIU/mL),⁴ we measured urinary human chorionic gonadotrophin concentrations that were confirmed by radioimmunoassay. Positive results were obtained from urine samples with concentrations of 48, 35, and 26 IU/L (48, 35, and 26 mIU/mL), while urine samples with concentrations of 8 IU/L (8 mIU/mL) and less than 1 IU/L (1 mIU/mL) tested negative. Use of the 20-drop method did not yield a positive result with urine containing 8 IU/L (8 mIU/mL) that had tested negative with five urine drops.

Based on these results, we conclude the sensitivity of the monoclonal antibody pregnancy test we use approaches reported limits. Hence, we rely on it both for clinical use in detecting early gestations and in diagnosis of ectopic pregnancies and also as a pregnancy outcome measure for research purposes. We are using serum radioimmunoassays only for quantitation and for those few instances when clinical suspicion persists despite a negative urine test. We found the 20-drop method did not amplify sensitivity over the range of concentrations evaluated and, hence, have not adopted it for this purpose, although we did not measure concentrations between 8 and 26 IU/L (8 and 26 mIU/mL).

We welcome any observations from Dr. Andolsek and others re-

garding their experiences with monoclonal antibody urine pregnancy tests.

Daniel Bluestein, MD, MS
Raymond van Wolckenten, MD, PhD
Carol Eugley, MT
Regina Anderson, MLT
Eastern Virginia Medical
School Norfolk

References

1. Andolsek KM: Ectopic pregnancy: "Classic" vs common presentation. *J Fam Pract* 1987; 24:481-485
2. Bandi ZL, Schoen I, DeLara M: Enzyme-linked immuno-adsorbent urine pregnancy tests, clinical specificity studies. *Am J Clin Pathol* 1987; 87:236-242
3. Cartwright PS, et al: Performance of a new enzyme linked immunoassay urine pregnancy test for the detection of ectopic gestation. *Ann Emerg Med* 1986; 15: 1198-1199
4. Document List No. 1196. North Chicago, Ill, Abbott Laboratories, Technical Service Department, 1986

INFLUENZA IMMUNIZATION OF ELDERLY

To the Editor:

I read with a great deal of interest the commentaries on vaccination of persons over 65 years of age for influenza that appeared in the *Journal of Family Practice (Is routine influenza immunization indicated for people over 65 years of age? Thompson MD: An affirmative view. Frame PS: An opposing view. J Fam Pract* 1988; 26: 211-214). We have recently published a study¹ that has led me to believe that this should not be a controversy; that it is controversial among primary care physicians probably contributes to the poor vaccine compliance among elderly persons. I am in general agreement with the statement of Thompson; therefore, I would like to direct my comments to Frame.

The first problem that I have with Frame's approach is defining, from the public health standpoint, who is chronically ill. I am concerned that many persons are not aware they have ischemic heart disease or mild chronic

obstructive pulmonary disease or both until, perhaps, they have been hospitalized with pneumonia or some other complication during an influenza epidemic. Our estimate of the proportion of elderly persons with high-risk conditions, however, is considerably higher than the 40 percent stated by Frame. Using the National Health Survey data for prevalence of selected chronic conditions, we estimated that at least 54 percent of persons 65 years of age or older have conditions for which the Immunization Practices Advisory Committee now currently recommends influenza vaccination for persons of all ages. Our estimate represents the patient's own perception because it was obtained by household interview. In actuality a higher proportion may have chronic conditions.

Using the National Health Survey rates for the prevalence of the high-risk conditions to estimate denominators, we calculated the rates of hospitalization for acute respiratory disease (usually pneumonia) during influenza epidemics. We found only a small difference in the rate of hospitalization for persons ≥ 65 years of age with or without an accompanying discharge diagnosis of one or more high-risk conditions. The rate for persons with high-risk conditions—usually cardiac or pulmonary disease—was 47 per 10,000 and the rate for persons without a high-risk diagnosis was 37 per 10,000. In fact, the rate for persons ≥ 65 years of age without high-risk conditions was twice as high as the rate for persons < 65 years of age with high-risk conditions. This finding has brought us to the conclusion that all persons ≥ 65 years of age, regardless of their condition, should have highest priority for influenza immunization. Our goal should be to keep active elderly persons out of the hospital.

Frame has made some unwarranted assumptions about morbidity associated with influenza infection. We would agree with the assessment

continued on page 256

BACTROBAN®

(mupirocin)

Ointment 2%

For Dermatologic Use

DESCRIPTION

Each gram of BACTROBAN® Ointment 2% contains 20 mg mupirocin in a bland water miscible ointment base consisting of polyethylene glycol 400 and polyethylene glycol 3350 (polyethylene glycol ointment, N.F.). Mupirocin is a naturally-occurring antibiotic. The chemical name is 9-(4-[5S-(2S,3S-epoxy-5S-hydroxy-4S-methylhexyl)-3R,4R-dihydroxytetrahydropyran-2S-yl]-3-methylbut-2(E)-enoxyloxy-nonanoic acid.

CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY

Mupirocin is produced by fermentation of the organism *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. Mupirocin inhibits bacterial protein synthesis by reversibly and specifically binding to bacterial isoleucyl transfer-RNA synthetase. Due to this mode of action, mupirocin shows no cross resistance with chloramphenicol, erythromycin, fusidic acid, gentamicin, lincomycin, methicillin, neomycin, novobiocin, penicillin, streptomycin, and tetracycline.

Application of ¹⁴C-labeled mupirocin ointment to the lower arm of normal male subjects followed by occlusion for 24 hours showed no measurable systemic absorption (<1.1 nanogram mupirocin per milliliter of whole blood). Measurable radioactivity was present in the stratum corneum of these subjects 72 hours after application.

Microbiology: The following bacteria are susceptible to the action of mupirocin *in vitro*: the aerobic isolates of *Staphylococcus aureus* (including methicillin-resistant and β -lactamase producing strains), *Staphylococcus epidermidis*, *Staphylococcus saprophyticus*, and *Streptococcus pyogenes*.

Only the organisms listed in the **INDICATIONS AND USAGE** section have been shown to be clinically susceptible to mupirocin.

INDICATIONS AND USAGE

BACTROBAN® (mupirocin) Ointment is indicated for the topical treatment of impetigo due to: *Staphylococcus aureus*, beta hemolytic *Streptococcus*, and *Streptococcus pyogenes*.

*Efficacy for this organism in this organ system was studied in fewer than ten infections.

CONTRAINDICATIONS

This drug is contraindicated in individuals with a history of sensitivity reactions to any of its components.

WARNINGS

BACTROBAN® Ointment is not for ophthalmic use.

PRECAUTIONS

If a reaction suggesting sensitivity or chemical irritation should occur with the use of BACTROBAN® Ointment, treatment should be discontinued and appropriate alternative therapy for the infection instituted.

As with other antibacterial products prolonged use may result in overgrowth of nonsusceptible organisms, including fungi.

Pregnancy category B: Reproduction studies have been performed in rats and rabbits at systemic doses, i.e., orally, subcutaneously, and intramuscularly, up to 100 times the human topical dose and have revealed no evidence of impaired fertility or harm to the fetus due to mupirocin. There are, however, no adequate and well-controlled studies in pregnant women. Because animal studies are not always predictive of human response, this drug should be used during pregnancy only if clearly needed.

Nursing mothers: It is not known whether BACTROBAN® is present in breast milk. Nursing should be temporarily discontinued while using BACTROBAN®.

ADVERSE REACTIONS

The following local adverse reactions have been reported in connection with the use of BACTROBAN® Ointment: burning, stinging, or pain in 1.5% of patients; itching in 1% of patients; rash, nausea, erythema, dry skin, tenderness, swelling, contact dermatitis, and increased exudate in less than 1% of patients.

DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION

A small amount of BACTROBAN® Ointment should be applied to the affected area three times daily. The area treated may be covered with a gauze dressing if desired. Patients not showing a clinical response within 3 to 5 days should be re-evaluated.

HOW SUPPLIED

BACTROBAN® (mupirocin) Ointment 2% is supplied in 15 gram tubes. (NDC #0029-1525-22)

Store between 15° and 30°C (59° and 86°F).

0938020/B88-B8

Beecham
laboratories
BRISTOL, TENNESSEE 37620

References:

1. Data on file, Beecham Laboratories.
2. Parenti MA, Hatfield SM, Leyden JJ: Mupirocin: A topical antibiotic with a unique structure and mechanism of action. *Clinical Pharmacy* 1987;6:761-770.

continued from page 253

of Marine² that Barker and Mullooly have underestimated the serious morbidity caused by influenza in their studies because they attributed to influenza only the excess of cases that occurred during influenza A (H3N2) epidemic years as compared with influenza B epidemic years. Frame mistakenly assumed that Barker and Mullooly overestimated the risk because public health laboratories report positive cultures from fewer than 25 percent of patients during influenza epidemics. Systematic surveillance by the Influenza Research Center in Houston for 14 years has demonstrated that up to 50 percent of patients presenting for medical care with acute respiratory tract disease during influenza epidemics will have positive cultures under less than optimal conditions for virus recovery.^{3,4} Furthermore, other respiratory tract viruses are relatively inactive during the most intense periods of influenza epidemics, leading to the conclusion that most of the acute respiratory illness during epidemics is caused or initiated by influenza virus infections.

Frame's best argument against immunization is the less-than-perfect efficacy of influenza vaccines, especially in the elderly. Several factors contribute to this problem. One is the mutability of the viruses, which results in epidemics caused by variants that have drifted antigenically from the viruses used to make the vaccine. Despite worldwide surveillance by the World Health Organization laboratories to detect antigenic changes at the earliest possible moment, the lag time for producing and distributing vaccine makes it inevitable that this will happen. It does not mean, however, on those occasions when drift occurs that the vaccine is not useful. Some immunity usually results, which, although it may not prevent infection, may be sufficient to prevent serious complications and death.

Another problem is that elderly debilitated persons may not have optimal antibody responses to current

vaccines; therefore, other adjunctive measures must be taken to protect these vulnerable persons. Amantadine can be used to reinforce vaccine protection during influenza A epidemics. Healthy contacts should be vaccinated to reduce the likelihood that high-risk persons are exposed to infection. Efforts of this nature are particularly indicated for nursing homes to prevent nosocomial exposures. Better vaccines and strategies are needed to protect the elderly, but we are sure that Frame understands that, under current recommendations, placebo-controlled studies are not ethical. Most evaluations must be performed comparing outcomes in persons who do or do not accept vaccine.

In summary, the best information available indicates that all persons over 65 years of age are at highest risk for influenza and deserve vaccination. New efforts must be put forth to improve vaccine acceptance for this vulnerable age group.

W. Paul Glezen, MD
Department of Microbiology
and Pediatrics
Baylor College of Medicine
Houston, Texas

References

1. Glezen WP, Decker M, Perrotta DM: Survey of underlying conditions of persons hospitalized with acute respiratory disease during influenza epidemics. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1987; 136:550-555
2. Marine WM: Influenza prevention—The key to reduction in morbidity and mortality from acute respiratory disease (ARD). *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1987; 136:546-547
3. Couch RB, Kasel JA, Glezen WP, et al: Influenza: Its control in persons and populations. *J Infect Dis* 1987; 153:431-440
4. Glezen WP, Decker M, Joseph SW, et al: Acute respiratory disease associated with influenza epidemics in Houston, 1981-1983. *J Infect Dis* 1987; 155:1119-1126

The preceding letter was referred to Dr. Frame, who responds as follows:

The letter by Dr. Paul Glezen certainly demonstrates that indeed in-

continued on page 258

Nalfon[®] fenoprofen calcium

Brief Summary.

Consult the package literature for prescribing information.

Indications and Usage: Nalfon[®] (fenoprofen calcium, Distal) is indicated for relief of signs and symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis and osteoarthritis during acute flares and in long-term management.

Nalfon 200 is indicated for relief of mild to moderate pain.

Controlled trials are currently in progress to establish the safety and efficacy of Nalfon in children.

Contraindications: Patients who have shown hypersensitivity to Nalfon, those with a history of significantly impaired renal function, or those in whom aspirin and other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs induce the symptoms of asthma, rhinitis, or urticaria.

Warnings: Use cautiously in patients with upper gastrointestinal tract disease (See Adverse Reactions). Gastrointestinal bleeding, sometimes severe (with fatalities having been reported), may occur as with other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.

Patients with an active peptic ulcer should be on vigorous antilulcer treatment and be closely supervised for signs of ulcer perforation or severe gastrointestinal bleeding.

Genitourinary tract problems most frequently reported in patients taking Nalfon have been dysuria, cystitis, hematuria, interstitial nephritis, and the nephrotic syndrome. This syndrome may be preceded by fever, rash, arthralgia, oliguria, and azotemia and may progress to anuria. There may also be substantial proteinuria, and, on renal biopsy, electron microscopy has shown foot process fusion and T-lymphocyte infiltration in the renal interstitium. Early recognition of the syndrome and withdrawal of the drug have been followed by rapid recovery. Administration of steroids and the use of dialysis have also been included in the treatment. Because this syndrome with some of these characteristics has also been reported with other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, it is recommended that patients who have had these reactions with other such drugs not be treated with Nalfon. In patients with possibly compromised renal function, periodic renal function examinations should be done.

Precautions: Since Nalfon is eliminated primarily by the kidneys, patients with possibly compromised renal function (such as the elderly) should be closely monitored; a lower daily dosage should be anticipated to avoid excessive drug accumulation. Nalfon should be discontinued if any significant liver abnormalities occur.

As with other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, borderline elevations of one or more liver tests may occur in up to 15% of patients. These abnormalities may progress, may remain essentially unchanged, or may be transient with continued therapy. The SGPT (ALT) test is probably the most sensitive indicator of liver dysfunction. Meaningful (three times the upper limit of normal) elevations of SGPT or SGOT (AST) occurred in controlled clinical trials in less than 1% of patients. A patient with symptoms and/or signs suggesting liver dysfunction, or in whom an abnormal liver test has occurred, should be evaluated for evidence of the development of more severe hepatic reaction while on therapy with Nalfon. Severe hepatic reactions, including jaundice and cases of fatal hepatitis, have been reported with Nalfon as with other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Although such reactions are rare, if abnormal liver tests persist or worsen, if clinical signs and symptoms consistent with liver disease develop, or if systemic manifestations occur (eg, eosinophilia, rash, etc), Nalfon should be discontinued.

Administration to pregnant patients and nursing mothers is not recommended.

In patients receiving Nalfon and a steroid concomitantly, any reduction in steroid dosage should be gradual to avoid the possible complications of sudden steroid withdrawal.

Patients with initial low hemoglobin values who are receiving long-term therapy should have a hemoglobin determination at reasonable intervals.

Peripheral edema has been observed in some patients. Use with caution in patients with compromised cardiac function or hypertension. The possibility of renal involvement should be considered.

Eye examinations are recommended if visual disturbances occur.

Patients with impaired hearing should have periodic tests of auditory function during chronic therapy.

Nalfon decreases platelet aggregation and may prolong bleeding time.

Laboratory Test Interactions—Amerlex-M kit assay values of total and free triiodothyronine in patients receiving Nalfon have been reported as falsely elevated on the basis of a chemical cross-reaction that directly interferes with the assay. Thyroid-stimulating hormone, total thyroxine, and thyrotropin-releasing hormone response are not affected.

Adverse Reactions: The adverse reactions reported below were compiled during clinical trials of 3,391 arthritic patients, including 188 observed for at least 52 weeks of continuous therapy. During short-term studies for analgesia, the incidence of adverse reactions was markedly lower than in longer-term studies.

Incidence Greater Than 1%

Probable Causal Relationship—Digestive System: The most common adverse reactions were gastrointestinal and involved 14% of patients; in descending order of frequency, they included dyspepsia,* constipation,* nausea,* vomiting,* abdominal pain, anorexia, occult blood in the stool, diarrhea, flatulence, dry mouth. **Nervous System:** headache* and somnolence* occurred in 15% of patients; dizziness,* tremor, confusion, and insomnia were noted less frequently. **Skin and Appendages:** pruritus,* rash, increased sweating, urticaria. **Special Senses:** tinnitus, blurred vision, decreased hearing. **Cardiovascular:** palpitations,* tachycardia. **Miscellaneous:** nervousness,* asthenia,* dyspnea, fatigue, malaise.

Incidence Less Than 1%

Probable Causal Relationship—Digestive System: gastritis, peptic ulcer with or without perforation, and/or gastrointestinal hemorrhage. **Genitourinary Tract:** dysuria, cystitis, hematuria, oliguria, azotemia, anuria, interstitial nephritis, nephrosis, papillary necrosis. **Hematologic:** purpura, bruising, hemorrhage, thrombocytopenia, hemolytic anemia, aplastic anemia, agranulocytosis, pancytopenia. **Miscellaneous:** peripheral edema, anaphylaxis.

Incidence Less Than 1%

Causal Relationship Unknown—Skin and Appendages: Stevens-Johnson syndrome, angioneurotic edema, exfoliative dermatitis, alopecia. **Digestive System:** aphthous ulcerations of buccal mucosa, metallic taste, pancreatitis. **Cardiovascular:** atrial fibrillation, pulmonary edema, electrocardiographic changes, supraventricular tachycardia. **Nervous System:** depression, disorientation, seizures, trigeminal neuralgia. **Special Senses:** burning tongue, diplopia, optic neuritis. **Miscellaneous:** personality change, lymphadenopathy, mastodynia, fever.

Dosage and Administration: Rheumatoid Arthritis and Osteoarthritis—suggested dosage: 300 to 600 mg t.i.d. or q.i.d.

Mild to Moderate Pain—Nalfon 200 q. 4-5 h, as needed. Do not exceed 3,200 mg per day.

*Incidence 3% to 9%.

PV 1026

Additional information available to the profession on request.

 **Distal Products Company**
Division of Eli Lilly and Company
Indianapolis, Indiana 46285

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

continued from page 256

fluenza vaccination of healthy persons over age 65 years is a controversial issue. The articles Glezen references demonstrate that hospitalizations for acute respiratory disease in Houston, Texas, correspond to periods of high influenza activity in the community. This is certainly not a new finding, but it does suggest a causative role for influenza in some of these cases. It is certainly not, however, a sufficient reason to recommend influenza vaccination for all persons aged over 65 years. The studies say nothing about whether these persons had or had not received influenza vaccination and make no attempt to evaluate vaccination effectiveness.

Glezen mentions the calculation that 54 percent of persons over the age of 65 years are high risk. In his paper (reference 1) he presents the finding that 60 percent of persons hospitalized for acute respiratory disease were high risk. In contrast, Barker and Mullooly took their data on the prevalence of risk factors from a defined population of health maintenance organization participants in Portland, Oregon. The vast majority of these persons did not require hospitalization and were ambulatory. Thus, when talking about prevalence of risk factors, we must be certain to know whether we are talking about persons hospitalized for acute respiratory tract disease or about the general population.

I am surprised by Glezen's finding that there were only small differences in the rate of hospitalization between persons with and without risk factors. This is certainly not my experience or that reported by other studies.

My statement that only about 25 percent of persons presenting to physicians with respiratory complaints during an influenza epidemic will have positive influenza cultures comes from work by Sabin published in JAMA in 1975, not from the work of Barker and Mullooly. Glezen (reference 1) reports one epidemic in which 47 percent of persons presenting to sentinel practices with respiratory complaints had positive influenza cultures, but he also presents

data from two other epidemics in which the rates were 17 percent and 20 percent. In any case, his data support my statement that the majority of patients presenting to physicians during an influenza epidemic with respiratory complaints will not have culture-provable influenza.

I do not believe that a prospective placebo-controlled study of influenza vaccination in healthy persons would be unethical. After all, less than 25 percent of the population are currently receiving influenza vaccination, and thus there should be no great concern if some people were randomized into a group that did not receive vaccination. I believe such a study would be most useful and should be undertaken. In the absence of a prospective controlled study of influenza vaccination, the retrospective case-control method used by Barker and Mullooly provides the best data and the only controlled data we have. I would reiterate that these data show little benefit for healthy persons of any age from influenza vaccination.

Paul S. Frame, MD
Danville, New York

SCREENING FOR ENDOMETRIAL CANCER

To the Editor:

I was very happy to read Jaber's article on screening for endometrial cancer (*Jaber R: Detection of and screening for endometrial cancer. J Fam Pract 1988; 26:67-72.*). This is certainly one area where family physicians can have a major impact on long-term health of female patients, both those who are postmenopausal and those with dysfunctional bleeding.

While several devices for obtaining endometrial cell samples were mentioned, the "Pipelle endometrial suction curette" was not mentioned. The device is a 24-cm strawlike plastic catheter which includes a piston that allows the creation of negative pressure. The device is introduced through the cervical canal and the

continued on page 329

continued from page 258

specimen is drawn in through a small hole at the end. After withdrawal, the tip is cut off and the specimen pushed out into the biopsy container. The specimen is then handled as a tissue biopsy.

I have had excellent results using this device. A tenaculum is necessary about one half of the time and the uterine sound in about one quarter of cases. Only in situations where the cervical os was stenotic and the sound could not be passed without considerable discomfort were we unable to obtain adequate specimens.

The device was originally produced in France and is available from Unimar in Wilton, Connecticut.

Maury J. Greenberg, MD
Stony Brook, New York

PROPHYLAXIS OF ENDOCARDITIS

To the Editor:

I have recently read the article "Infective Endocarditis" by Richard H. Birrer, Mitchell Karl, and Salvatore Volpe (*J Fam Pract* 1987; 24:289-295) in which they discuss the pathogenesis, diagnosis, medical therapy, prophylaxis, surgery, and prognosis of infective endocarditis. As an oral and maxillofacial surgeon, I was especially interested in their comments concerning antimicrobial prophylaxis for the prevention of infective endocarditis.

The recommendations that they presented on p 294 of their article quoted the American Heart Association recommendations for prophylaxis, which were advocated in the 1977 recommendations. Since that time, however, the American Heart Association has updated its recommendations with several very significant changes.¹ The major changes are that the penicillin prophylaxis is given preoperatively, one hour before the procedure and only one time postoperatively, instead of the eight doses

recommended in 1977. The second change is that instead of recommending penicillin and streptomycin for higher risk patients, the 1984 recommendations suggest the use of ampicillin and gentamicin.

One of the major thrusts of the current recommendation, as it has been in the past also, is that the physician and the dentist must work closely together with each patient. My concern is that if dentists are using the 1984 recommendations and the patient's physician is still adhering to the 1977 recommendations, as recommended by Birrer, et al, then there will be confusion and disagreement. While it is clear that no hard data exist to support one protocol over another, a consistent policy among health care professionals would seem to be highly desirable.

Larry J. Peterson, DDS
Professor and Chairman
Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery
Ohio State University, Columbus

Reference

1. American Heart Association: Prevention of bacterial endocarditis. *Circulation* 1984; 70:1123A-1127A

OBSTETRICS IN FAMILY PRACTICE

To the Editor:

The articles on obstetrics in the February issue of the *Journal of Family Practice* were very timely and informative.¹⁻³ The Health Care Services Committee of the Oregon Academy of Family Physicians (OAFP) recently completed a survey that extends the findings of the Ohio and Alabama studies.⁴

Family physicians were polled via a questionnaire mailed with the summer 1987 issue of the *Oregon Family Physician*. Three hundred twenty-seven questionnaires were returned.

Two hundred thirty-two respondents were academy members, representing approximately 45 percent of the 521 active OAFP members. Mean age was 46 years. Ninety percent were male.

One hundred thirty-two respondents (42 percent) reported currently performing nonoperative obstetrics. One hundred forty-eight (47 percent) reported formerly doing obstetrics. Of this group, 75 (51 percent) listed malpractice premiums as the primary reason they abandoned obstetrics. Sixty-seven (45 percent) listed lifestyle considerations, 16 (11 percent) other legal, and 7 (5 percent) other economic. Only one person reported stopping primarily because of inability to obtain or maintain privileges. Forty-nine physicians gave up obstetrics in the last year, a 27 percent decrease in one year. One hundred seventeen (37 percent) reported currently performing outlet forceps or vacuum extractions. One hundred thirty individuals reported formerly offering these services. The primary reasons given for stopping were malpractice premiums (52 percent), and other legal reasons (13 percent). Sixty respondents reported performing cesarean deliveries (19 percent), while 80 reported having given up this service.

The Oregon Medical Association (OMA) published a special report to the OMA House of Delegates in 1986, which included some similar findings.⁵ They mailed 1,032 questionnaires to Oregon family physicians, to which they received 839 responses (81 percent). Of these, 314 (37 percent) reported having engaged in obstetrics within the prior two years. Of the 314, 83.7 percent were currently doing obstetrics, while the remainder had recently stopped. An additional 11 percent reported planning to stop, and 29 percent more were considering stopping. The reasons given for restricting obstetrical practice were as follows: malpractice insurance too expensive (65.6 percent), malpractice exposure too risky (56.1 percent), not

enough patients paying full fees (34.4 percent), and too stressful (25.6 percent).

It is clear that a crisis in obstetrical practice by family physicians also exists in this state. The problem demands attention.

Michael A. Krall, MD
Kaiser Permanente
Salem, Oregon

References

1. Smucker DR: Obstetrics in family practice in the state of Ohio. *J Fam Pract* 1988; 26:165-167
2. Tietze PE, Gaskins SE, McGinnis MJ: Attrition from obstetrical practice among family practice residency graduates. *J Fam Pract* 1988; 26:204-205
3. Rosenblatt RA: The future of obstetrics in family practice: Time for a new direction. *J Fam Pract* 1988; 26:127-129
4. Krall MA: Practice survey, 1987. Summary of findings. *Oregon Family Physician*, Winter, 1988, pp 4, 13
5. The Impact of Professional Liability Issues on Access to Obstetrical Care in Oregon. A Special Report to the OMA House of Delegates. Portland, Oregon Medical Association 1986, pp 1-25

ADVERSE DRUG REACTIONS

To the Editor:

Having read the data presented in their article by Davidson et al (*Davidson KW, Kahn A, Price RD: Reduction of adverse drug reactions by*

computerized drug interaction screening. J Fam Pract 1987; 25:371-375), I come to an opposite conclusion from theirs.

Very few of their drug/drug interactions were felt even by them to be significant, and a reminder that drugs and alcohol are likely not to mix is not worth the burden, financially and timewise, of a computerized drug interaction program to be invoked at every or nearly every clinical contact. Such a system would, in my opinion, be little more than expensive busy-work.

I would personally prefer for those who believe these types of systems are necessary safeguards to repeat in a prospective fashion the studies they quote that say avoidable adverse drug reactions are significantly prevalent. The studies cited by these authors are rather old, and even if they were, not so important that they bear repeating.

As do all able physicians, I see patients with adverse drug reactions. Many of these are unpredictable and for many, if not most, of the others the risk of their development was warranted by their clinical need for the prescription of the drugs which caused them. Furthermore, I have an uneasy feeling that the side effects reported in many computer lists are often overemphasized trivia. They have been trumpeted until they assume the force of more important truths in advertisements for new drugs, which deliberately, for mercantile reasons, speak against their usually cheaper predecessors.

Bernadine Z. Paulshock, MD
The Medical Center of Delaware
Wilmington

OBSTETRICS IN FAMILY PRACTICE

To the Editor:

This is just a note to congratulate Dr. Rosenblatt on his excellent guest editorial in the February issue of *The Journal of Family Practice* (Rosenblatt RA: *The future of obstetrics in family practice: Time for a new direction. J Fam Pract* 1988; 26:127-129).

I found this to be one of the landmark articles that hit the very core of a problem, diagnosed what was going on, and came up with a very workable and positive solution. This three-page article formulates what had been going through my head for the past five years. Something is wrong with the way family physicians are doing obstetrics! I could not put my finger on what it was, but Dr. Rosenblatt did. We basically are "living a lie" by trying to be mini-obstetricians. Truly, a different paradigm is needed.

The approach to bonding with midwives and become expert in a different type of obstetrics is exciting, innovative, and just what the United States needs. I hope the leaders in family medicine can further explore this approach.

William D. Manahn, MD
The Wellness Center of
Minnesota, Mankato