

Translating Best Evidence into Best Care

EDITOR'S NOTE: Studies for this column are identified using the Clinical Queries feature of PubMed, “hand” searching *JAMA*, *JAMA Pediatrics*, *Pediatrics*, *The Journal of Pediatrics*, and *The New England Journal of Medicine*, and from customized EvidenceUpdates alerts.

EBM PEARL: SCREENING: Screening is a population-based tool to identify asymptomatic or unrecognized symptomatic individuals with a treatable disease (at least somewhat treatable). Screening is, fundamentally, a diagnostic test. The diagnostic test characteristics in screening are adjusted to balance sensitivity and specificity in favor of sensitivity—few false negatives. Enhancing sensitivity typically leads to worsening specificity by increasing false positives. The balance attempts to minimize harms: (1) not identifying patients with disease, and (2) treating, further testing, or both in patients who do not have disease but test positive. While diagnostic testing is the key issue in screening, there are a number of other notably important issues that require attention in a screening program. In 2008, the World Health Organization (WHO) modified an earlier version of screening criteria.¹ What follows are a few of the salient points of that revision. “The objectives of the screening should be defined at the outset. There should be a defined target population. There should be scientific evidence of screening program effectiveness. The program should integrate education, testing, clinical services, and program management. The overall benefits of screening should outweigh the harms.” Please see the WHO bulletin for additional details. Three articles in this volume’s Current Best Evidence discuss screening (celiac disease, congenital heart disease, and autism).

APPLICATION/TRANSLATION PEARL: INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION: With this edition of Current Best Evidence, we begin a series of “Pearls” discussing the fairly weighty issue of how to bring the evidence back to the bedside. Let us start at the beginning: the EBM definition, upon which we base EBM practice. “EBM is a systematic approach to clinical problem solving which allows the integration of the best available research evidence with clinical expertise and patient values.”² From the definition, we see the goal and the promise of EBM. The “research evidence” part of the definition has notably improved over the past 30 years. This is the part of the EBM definition that clinicians and others typically associate with EBM. It is also the most easily quantifiable in terms of research methodology, medical treatment effects, and diagnostic test characteristics. The clinical expertise (weighing diagnostic test and therapy benefits and harms) within the context of patient values (broadly considered as the patient’s environmental and personal frame of reference) part of the definition is currently less quantified and often highly complex. However, without this aspect of the definition, EBM practice is impossible. In the coming issues of Current Best Evidence, we will discuss these application and translation details as they emerge from the EBM definition.

—Jordan Hupert, MD

References

1. Andermann A, Blancquaert I, Beauchamp S, Déry V. World Health Organization. Revisiting Wilson and Jungner in the genomic age: a review of screening criteria over the past 40 years. <http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/86/4/07-050112/en/>. Accessed June 18, 2017.
2. Sackett DL, Strauss SE, Richardson WS, Rosenberg W, Haynes RB. Evidence-based medicine: how to practice and teach EBM. London: Churchill-Livingstone; 2000.

Perfusion index, in addition to pulse oximetry may enhance detection of neonatal severe congenital heart disease

Schena F, Picciolli I, Agosti M, Zuppa AA, Zuccotti G, Parola L, et al. Perfusion Index and Pulse Oximetry Screening for Congenital Heart Defects. *J Pediatr* 2017;183:74-9.

Question Among asymptomatic newborns, what is the diagnostic accuracy of combined pulse oximetry (POX) and perfusion index (PI) screening, in diagnosing severe congenital heart disease (sCHD)?

Design Multicenter, prospective cohort study.

Setting 10 tertiary and 6 nontertiary maternity hospitals in Italy.

Participants 42 169 asymptomatic neonates.

Intervention Combined pre- and postductal POX and PI screening.

Outcomes Detection of sCHD.

Main Results 3 babies with sCHD were detected, post-test probability for a positive test 0.42% (95%CI, 0.14%-1.22%). Four babies with sCHD were missed, post-test probability for a negative test 0.0096% (95% CI, 0.0002%, 0.0191%).

Conclusions PI may have a role in enhancing sCHD screening.

Commentary We recently demonstrated that PI is significantly correlated with left ventricular output in healthy term infants.¹ Schena et al now demonstrate that a combination of POX and PI may be used for sCHD screening. The study methods were well thought out and were clearly detailed. The chosen PI cut-off value <0.90 may affect the results, as Granelli et al reported that values of PI <0.70 may indicate illness and a value <0.50 indicates definite underperfusion.² The authors explained that their PI cutoff choice was based on previously unreported data suggesting that the PI is slightly higher after 48 hour of life. Data by Granelli et al come from infants 1 to 120 hours of age.² It is noteworthy that the POX and PI combination seemed to provide most benefit in nontertiary hospitals, where sCHD detection resources may have been less available than in tertiary hospitals. The hope is that this study will encourage future trials confirming a role for PI in neonatal sCHD-screening.

Carlo Dani, MD

Careggi University Hospital of Florence
Florence, Italy

References

1. Corsini I, Cecchi A, Coviello C, Dani C. Perfusion index and left ventricular output correlation in healthy term infants. *Eur J Pediatr* 2017; in press.
2. Granelli A, Ostman-Smith I. Noninvasive peripheral perfusion index as a possible tool for screening for critical left heart obstruction. *Acta Paediatr* 2007;96:1455-9.

Response to name may enhance autism spectrum disorder screening

Miller M, Iosif AM, Hill M, Young GS, Schwichtenberg AJ, Ozonoff S. Response to name in infants developing autism spectrum disorder: a prospective study. *J Pediatr* 2017;183:141-6.

Question Among infants, what is the diagnostic accuracy of response to name, compared with more extensive testing, in diagnosing autism spectrum disorder (ASD)?

Design Prospective study of siblings of children with ASD (high risk [HR]) and controls (low risk [LR]).

Setting University-based outpatient setting in California.

Participants HR and LR infants with first assessment between 6 and 9 months of age.

Intervention Response to name compared with definitive testing.

Outcomes Development of ASD.

Main Results Both overall sensitivity and specificity for at least 1 failure between 12-24 months were 70% with wide 95% CIs: 50%-90% and 62%-78%, respectively.

Conclusions Response to name may enhance ASD screening detection.

Commentary Despite the excitement of recent advances in biomarker research that might lead to pre-symptomatic

detection, the development of simple early detection strategies for ASD that can be administered in primary care remains a major priority. Miller et al report that failing to respond to name on 1 or more visits between 12 and 24 months was associated with 70% sensitivity and 70% specificity for ASD at age 36 months, although the classification accuracy at individual time points was less favorable. Nevertheless, failure to respond to name is one of the most consistently reported early concerns of parents,¹ and the ease of incorporating the task into a brief office visit suggests that this could be a valuable addition. There are a few caveats. First, the findings were mainly derived from HR infants and in the controlled context of a university-based research study. Replication will be needed in a primary care context, with the task administered by the child's clinician, in the usual office environment. Second, although one of the study's unique strengths is the interactive nature of the task, one should be cautious in assuming that a clinician's observation during a brief interaction would be more accurate than parental report. Indeed, in a recent study² of the parent-report analog of the observational scale from which the task used in the current study was derived, classification accuracy of the corresponding "response to name" item at 12 months was similar. Finally, the relative merits focusing on a single vs a larger set of markers warrants further consideration. That said, because of its brevity and ease of use, uptake of a briefer test might be greater in community practice. It is important that we continue to consider how surveillance for early signs of ASD may benefit from a multi-pronged approach over time, and how brief, low-cost methods might complement and augment more time- and/or resource-intensive approaches.

Lonnie Zwaigenbaum, MD

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

References

1. Zwaigenbaum L, Bryson S, Garon N. Early identification of autism spectrum disorders. *Behav Brain Res* 2013;251:133-46.
2. Sacrey L, Bryson S, Zwaigenbaum L, Brian J, Smith I, Roberts W, et al. The Autism Parent Screen for Infants: predicting risk of autism spectrum disorder based on parent-reported behavior observed at 6-24 months of age. *Autism* 2016; in press.

The Quick-Wee infant urine collection method

Faster clean catch urine collection (Quick-Wee method) from infants: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2017;357:j1341.

Question Among infants requiring a clean urine sample, what is the efficacy of the Quick-Wee method, compared with a standard clean-catch technique, in obtaining a urine sample?

Design Randomized controlled trial.

Setting Pediatric emergency department, Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia.

Participants Infants, 1-12 months of age (corrected for prematurity as needed).

Intervention Suprapubic cutaneous stimulation with gauze soaked in cold fluid or routine clean catch (holding a cup, wait for infant to spontaneously urinate), within 5 minutes.

Outcomes Satisfactory urine sample.

Main Results Number needed to treat, 5 (95% CI, 4-10). Contamination rates were similar: 27% vs 45%, $P = .29$.

Conclusions The Quick-Wee urine collection method is more efficient than the standard method.

Commentary Strategies for using non-invasive methods to collect urine samples from pre-continent children is a prime concern of clinicians aiming to avoid the use of invasive techniques in the diagnosis of urinary tract infection (UTI).^{1,2} Although this was a single center study, this randomized controlled trial was well designed, with a moderate sample size. The Quick-Wee method is a simple procedure that can be widely performed by clinicians. However, the success rate remains low and there are some points that warrant additional analysis. First, it would be valuable to estimate the success rate according to age of infant, with an expected higher success rate among younger infants, suggesting an age limit beyond which this method would not be recommended. Second, it is not clear if the infants were uncomfortable during the procedure. Although the authors did not observe any adverse events, discomfort of infants during the procedure, which may hinder the success of this method,² was not evaluated. Distraction techniques or music that are often used during procedures in infants may reduce discomfort and may improve the success rate. Finally, focusing on contamination rates, only 55 urine cultures were performed (out of 66 samples); the authors should have processed all urine samples for culture. Additionally, as the study was not focused on recruiting infants suspected of UTI, estimation of the contamination rates may be inaccurate (due to inclusion bias).³ The innovative Quick-Wee method requires minimal resources with good acceptance by both parents and clinicians. Additional research is needed before enabling its wide distribution to pediatric emergency departments.

Antoine Tran, MD

Hôpitaux Pédiatriques de Nice CHU-Lenval
Nice, France

References

1. Herreros Fernández ML, González Merino N, Tagarro García A, Pérez Seoane B, de la Serna Martínez M, Contreras Abad MT, et al. A new technique for fast and safe collection of urine in newborns. *Arch Dis Child* 2013;98:27-9.
2. Tran A, Fortier C, Giovannini-Chami L, Demonchy D, Caci H, Desmontils J, et al. Evaluation of the bladder stimulation technique to collect mid-stream urine in infants in a pediatric emergency department. *PLoS ONE* 2016;11:e0152598.
3. Glissmeyer EW, Korgenski EK, Wilkes J, Schunk JE, Sheng X, Blaschke AJ, et al. Dipstick screening for urinary tract infection in febrile infants. *Pediatrics* 2014;133:e1121-7.

USPSTF celiac disease screening recommendations

Chou R, Bougatsos C, Blazina I, Mackey K, Grusing S, Selph S. Screening for Celiac Disease: Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA* 2017;317:1258-68.

Question What is the current evidence for asymptomatic patient celiac disease screening?

Design Systematic review.

Setting Worldwide (except Africa).

Participants Asymptomatic patients 3 years old and greater.

Intervention Celiac disease screening tests.

Outcomes Benefits and harms of asymptomatic patient screening.

Main Results No screening trials were identified. Two small studies demonstrated poor diagnostic test characteristics for serologic tests in asymptomatic patients.

Conclusions Due to limited evidence, additional research is required to characterize benefits and harms in screening for celiac disease in asymptomatic patients.

Commentary Based on limited evidence for either benefit or harm in asymptomatic-patient celiac disease screening, the US Preventive Services Task Force concluded that additional research was needed prior to issuing screening recommendations. Based on our experience,¹ gathering an adequate number of asymptomatic patients for sufficient statistical power requires screening thousands of people. An ideal study design is further complicated by the slow development of intestinal damage and possible complications of celiac disease. A long-term randomized study may be ethically problematic, as asymptomatic patients may also have histologically advanced disease and be at subsequent risk for adverse outcomes.² In addition, classification of patients based on clinical presentation is not straightforward, as they may suffer from unrecognized symptoms only later understood to be caused by untreated celiac disease. The authors of the evidence report clarified the main questions that require answers prior to advocating wide-scale screening. We feel that an accurate screening program is important, as most asymptomatic celiac disease patients will remain unrecognized with an increased risk for long-term complications.

Laura Kivelä, MD

Kalle Kurppa, MD, PhD

University of Tampere and Tampere University Hospital
Tampere, Finland

References

1. Kurppa K, Paavola A, Collin P, Sievänen H, Laurila K, Huhtala H, et al. Benefits of a gluten-free diet for asymptomatic patients with serologic markers of celiac disease. *Gastroenterology* 2014;147:610-7.

2. Kivelä L, Kaukinen K, Huhtala H, Lähdeaho M-L, Mäki M, Kurppa K. At-risk screened children with celiac disease are comparable in disease severity and dietary adherence to those found because of clinical suspicion: a large cohort study. *J Pediatr* 2017;183:115-21.

Most children labeled as penicillin allergic are at low risk for true penicillin allergy

Vyles D, Chiu A, Simpson P, Nimmer M, Adams J, Brousseau DC. Parent-Reported Penicillin Allergy Symptoms in the Pediatric Emergency Department. *Acad Pediatr* 2017;17:251-5.

Question Among children with parental-reported penicillin allergy, what is the diagnostic accuracy of parental report, compared with an allergist-evaluated allergy questionnaire, in diagnosing probable penicillin allergy?

Design Cross-sectional survey.

Setting Pediatric emergency department in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Participants Parents of children (birth-18 years old) with parental-reported penicillin allergy.

Intervention Allergy questionnaire.

Outcomes Allergist-assisted dichotomization of high and low risk for penicillin allergy.

Main Results 76% of children (95% CI, 72%-80%) had exclusively low-risk symptoms.

Conclusions Almost 80% of parentally-reported penicillin-allergic children are unlikely to have true allergy.

Commentary This was a cross-sectional study that highlighted a major diagnostic problem related to drug allergy: the potential mislabeling of children as allergic to penicillin. Up to 10% of children develop rashes while on antibiotics.¹ The majority are diagnosed as being allergic to the prescribed antibiotic. Surprisingly, this often occurs without further evaluation. True allergy to antibiotics is an immunologically mediated

response in a sensitized person and includes IgE, IgG, or T-cell-mediated mechanisms. Among children suspected to have an immediate allergy to penicillin derivatives, less than 10% will be confirmed by challenge as having a true drug allergy.² Diagnosis of immune-mediated reactions is challenging. Available skin tests have a questionable role in the diagnosis of immediate reactions (occurring within 1 hour after exposure) and no role in the diagnosis of non-immediate reactions.³ Although a drug-specific oral provocation test is considered the gold standard for diagnosis, it is rarely used in practice, owing to a lack of data regarding its safety and accuracy in children and due to limited access to specialists performing this test. Given that almost 80% of pediatric cases in the study had low risk symptoms and given that in the majority of cases treating physicians did not witness the symptoms, the study exemplifies the need for a more rigorous diagnostic approach to establish true penicillin allergy. An appropriate and accurate diagnostic approach will reduce the use of less effective, more toxic, and more expensive alternatives.

Moshe Ben-Shoshan, MD

Montreal Children's Hospital
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

References

1. Seitz CS, Brocker EB, Trautmann A. Diagnosis of drug hypersensitivity in children and adolescents: discrepancy between physician-based assessment and results of testing. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol* 2011;22:405-10.
2. Mill C, Primeau MN, Medoff E, Lejtenyi C, O'Keefe A, Netchiporouk E, et al. Assessing the diagnostic properties of a graded oral provocation challenge for the diagnosis of immediate and nonimmediate reactions to amoxicillin in children. *JAMA Pediatr* 2016;170:e160033.
3. Tannert LK, Mortz CG, Skov PS, Bindslev-Jensen C. Positive skin test or specific IgE to penicillin does not reliably predict penicillin allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2017;6:76-83.