Perhaps the most chronic complaint of childhood presenting to family practitioners is the infant with recurrent wheezing. Before one even gets to grip with the rational choice of medicines in this group, one has to make the difficult choice between asthma and viral-induced wheezing, coupled with the understanding that many children stop wheezing without any long-term medication. However, once a decision is made to treat, one then has to face two additional hurdles: the first is the difficulty in administering medication to this age group. The second, perhaps even more daunting, is that few medicines have been tested in clinical trials in infants. "Off-label" use is therefore often an unavoidable necessity.

This short article will review how the World Health Organisation's P-drug process might be of help in this difficult selection task. (SA Fam Pract 2003;45(1):66-68)

Therapeutic objectives have been well described in the latest GINA guidelines:

- Minimal or no chronic symptoms.
- Minimal episodes or attacks.
- No emergency visits.
- Minimal use of "as needed" β₂ agonists.
- No limitations on normal activities.
- Near-normal lung function.
- Minimal or no adverse effects from the medicines prescribed.

Not only can these be used to guide monitoring once an infant is put on such medication, but they can also be the basis for a search of the available literature for evidence of safety and efficacy. Of particular relevance are studies that directly compare two or more of the classes of medicines from which the initial choice must be made. In this case, an initial choice could be made from the following: inhaled or nebulised corticosteroids, inhaled cromoglycate, leukotriene receptor antagonists, ketotifen or theophylline. That regular β₂ agonists or anticholinergics (such as ipratropium) should not be considered was made clear in recent Cochrane reviews.¹

A recent podium presentation at a European congress reported on a year-long, multi-centre, open-label, parallel group study comparing the safety and efficacy of inhaled fluticasone (100µg bd) and inhaled sodium chromoglycate (5mg qid) in 625 children aged 12-23 months.¹ The proportion of symptom-free days and days with no rescue medication used - both of direct relevance to the therapeutic objectives - was significantly higher in the steroid group (p<0.001 and p=0.023 respectively). A similar study, in 335 children aged 2-6 years showed that those using nebulised budesonide (0.5mg daily) had fewer exacerbations (mean of 1.23 per year) than did those on nebulised sodium chromoglycate (20mg qid; mean of 2.24 per year).² Other relevant efficacy measures were also significantly better with the steroid, such as the use of rescue medications and the need for emergency visits.

Similarly, evidence can be sought on comparative safety - a study of lower leg length growth in 40 children aged 1-3 years on either inhaled fluticasone (200µg bd) or budesonide (200µg bd) or placebo showed a significant reduction after 4 weeks with the steroids, but no difference between the two agents. However, translating such data into clinically relevant safety assessments is not easy. Longer experience (and a richer literature) with older agents allows far easier conclusions to be reached: for example, that nebulised cromoglycate is very safe, that theophylline is associated with significant adverse effects (such as nausea and vomiting) and that ketotifen is safe causing only transient drowsiness.

Suitability considerations are also easier - for example, nebulisation is tedious and requires access to expensive equipment. Inhalers, when used with appropriate spacer devices, are convenient and quick. Orally administered medications (such as theophylline, ketotifen and montelukast) are also easy to administer, especially when presented as oral sprinkles or solutions. However, multiple daily doses can be a significant barrier to use. Costs per month are also easily obtained, showing that nebulised solutions are considerably more expensive than any other options.

Combining each of the elements in...
simple table can then be used to guide selection, with elements rated as either positive or negative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebulised corticosteroids (e.g. budesonide inhaler solution)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhaled corticosteroids (e.g. fluticasone or budesonide)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhaled cromolyn</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukotriene receptor antagonists (e.g. montelukast)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketotifen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophylline</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this it can be seen that the **inhaled corticosteroids** are the best first-line options (perhaps with choice between the two being guided by price). In those cases where there is resistance to the use of a steroid, inability to use a spacer and mask, or perhaps a lack of response, **montelukast** might offer a suitable alternative. However, as with so many other diseases of childhood, sufficient comparative trials of the available therapeutic classes in children aged less than 5 years are still lacking. For example, while there is one large randomised placebo-controlled trial showing that montelukast is better than placebo in children aged 2-5 years, comparative trials and systematic reviews will have to await the generation of far more data in this particular age group. The current consensus though would indicate that this might well be the convenient first choice of the future in children. Please refer to CPD Questionnaire on pg 51.

**References**


---

**Quality Locum Services Overseas**

As well as being the largest independent Medical, Care and Education Agency in the UK, Quality Locum Services (QLS) are now established as agency suppliers globally with branches in Sydney, Australia; Cape Town, South Africa; Durban, South Africa; with plans to expand in the near future.

Experienced consultants who are trained in recruitment both overseas and in the UK manage all offices and divisions of QLS. Their expertise is not as limited as you might think. QLS consultants are friendly, polite and most of all helpful. QLS understand how difficult it can be to work in another country and we are aware of the complexities of qualifying to enter the UK.

They recognise that overseas candidates are highly sought after by UK employers and their aim is to get you to the UK and work with a seamless, one-stop service. That's why all QLS consultants are equipped to handle and overcome any queries/obstacles, e.g. visas, travelling costs, accommodation, that you may encounter.

Lucy Martino, QLS UK Liaison, corresponds daily with our overseas branches ensuring that we are able to meet both client and candidate requirements as effectively and efficiently as we do in the UK.

All offices are equipped with our state of the art computer systems enabling our overseas consultants to use the latest stringent policy of verification for all locums who wish to work in the UK.

Quality Locum Service, Quality and Education and Quality Recruitment, are, as a whole, differentiated from other Recruitment Agents by a number of factors which when brought together ensure clients a premier quality, value for money and cost effective service. QLS offer a comprehensive, professional, search and selection service.

No matter the needs, their professional approach ensures the widest choice of the best possible candidates and assignments.
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Sonja Lewis - Quality Locums Cape Town
Tel: 021 422 2895
Fax: 021 422 2899
Email: qualitylocums@worldonline.co.za

Matt Wagner - Quality Locums Durban
Tel: 031 309 1471
Fax: 031 309 1382
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**The SABC network of forensic laboratories for GPs**

**MEMBERSHIP**

- Medlab
- South African Medical Laboratory Analysts Association
- Medical Laboratory Technicians Association of Southern Africa
- South African Association of Clinical Pathologists
- South African Society of Pathology
- South African Society of Toxicology

**ACCREDITATION**

- CMIA
- Disc
- Acc
- The CMIA's Code of practice for independent forensic pathology laboratories
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