

half the cases of assisted death are without consent — is the least supported. The evidence clearly does not permit such an interpretation.

Victor Cellarius MD

Temmy Latner Centre for Palliative Care,
Mount Sinai Hospital, Toronto, Ont.

REFERENCE

1. Inghelbrecht E, Bilsen J, Mortier, et al. The role of nurses in physician-assisted deaths in Belgium. *CMAJ* 2010;182:905-910.

For the full letter, go to: www.cmaj.ca/cgi/eletters/182/9/905#532533

DOI: 10.1503/cmaj.110-2073

In our article, the finding that half of cases of assisted death are performed without the patient's explicit request is very much supported by the data. There was patient consent or a patient's wish in some of these cases, but for the administration of life-ending drugs, this is legally not sufficient. A request or wish from relatives acting as surrogate decision-makers is also insufficient to justify such an act. But ethical and legal criteria aside, it is true that most decisions to administer life-ending drugs without explicit patient request are discussed between physicians and nurses as well as relatives.

In another study, also set in Belgium but surveying physicians instead of nurses, Chambaere and colleagues found that in only 6.5% of such cases, the physician had made the decision without consulting others.¹ The relatives were involved in 79.4% of cases, and other professional caregivers (colleague physicians or nurses) were consulted in 71%. Given these figures, it is safe to assume that a decision to administer life-ending drugs without explicit patient request is rarely made without some form of consent or agreement, be it from the patient, relatives or colleague caregivers. However, consent (even from the patient) does not constitute sufficient legal grounds to perform this act.

Our article focused explicitly on the role of nurses in decision-making and the preparation and administration of life-ending drugs in cases of assisted death with and without explicit patient request. Our questionnaire asked whether there was discussion between the nurse and the relatives in those

cases — which happened in 68.9% of cases. We did not include this finding in the article because involving the relatives, especially in the case of patient incompetence, is ultimately the responsibility of the physician, as is the decision itself, with input from relatives and nurses.

Els Inghelbrecht MA

Johan Bilsen RN PhD

Freddy Mortier PhD

Luc Deliens PhD

End-of-Life Care Research Group, Vrije
Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium

REFERENCE

1. Chambaere K, Bilsen J, Cohen J, et al. Physician-assisted deaths under the euthanasia law in Belgium: a population-based survey. *CMAJ* 2010;182:895-901.

For the full letter, go to: www.cmaj.ca/cgi/eletters/182/9/905#569310

DOI: 10.1503/cmaj.110-2074

Increasing rates of flu vaccination in primary care staff

We recently reported on a randomized trial of a program to increase staff influenza vaccination in primary care clinics.¹

As mentioned in the review by Lam and colleagues,² previous studies were in hospital and long-term care settings, and only one study had an arm in primary care (with an unsuccessful campaign). The difference between inpatient settings (hospitals and institutions) and outpatient settings (primary care clinics) is obvious but often ignored in the literature. The authors should have been more careful about generalizing analysis of data from staff in nursing homes to “nonhospital settings,” which erroneously suggests that the conclusions also refer to primary care.

Our study showed that a promotional and educational intervention program can be highly effective in increasing the rates of influenza vaccination among staff. The campaign included local vaccination “champions,” whose effectiveness was recently demonstrated in a hospital setting.³

Although we performed an intervention to increase rates of vaccination among staff, we think that the evidence

about the benefits of such an intervention is weak. Lam and colleagues base the recommendation that all health care personnel should be vaccinated on a 2006 Cochrane review.⁴ However, the Cochrane review concluded that there was no credible evidence of the benefit to elderly patients of vaccinating nursing home personnel.

Zvi Howard Abramson

Ian Nigel Miskin

Clalit Health Services and Department of
Family Medicine, Hebrew University —
Hadassah Medical School, Jerusalem,
Israel

REFERENCES

1. Abramson ZH, Avni O, Levi O, et al. Randomized trial of a program to increase staff influenza vaccination in primary care clinics. *Ann Fam Physician* 2010;8:293-8.
2. Lam P-P, Chambers LW, Pierrynowski MacDougall DM, et al. Seasonal influenza vaccination campaigns for health care personnel: systematic review. *CMAJ* 2010 July 19. [Epub ahead of print].
3. Slaunwhite JM, Smith SM, Fleming MT, et al. Increasing vaccination rates among health care workers using unit “champions” as a motivator. *Can J Infect Control* 2009;24:159-64.
4. Thomas RE, Jefferson T, Demicheli V, et al. Influenza vaccination for healthcare workers who work with the elderly [review]. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2006;(3):CD005187.

For the full letter, go to: www.cmaj.ca/cgi/eletters/cmaj.091304v1#593856

DOI: 10.1503/cmaj.110-2099

Ontario immunization rate for polio

The editorial about the polio outbreak in Tajikistan incorrectly states that immunization rates for polio in Ontario are between 70% and 80%.¹

The most recent data from Ontario's Immunization Record Information System shows that 83% of 7-year-old children and 94% of 17-year-old adolescents are immunized against polio. Although immunization coverage rates for 7-year-olds have been relatively stable over the last decade, the rates have improved steadily by 17 years of age.

Under the Immunization of School Pupils Act, medical officers of health are required to maintain vaccination records of all school students for designated diseases. A written vaccination record or proof of vaccination is required by law for diphtheria, tetanus, polio, measles, mumps and rubella unless there is a valid written exemp-

tion. Parents and guardians are required to provide this information to their local public health unit and to update the information as necessary. There are specific vaccines required for children attending licensed daycare centres. The “publicly funded routine immunization schedule for children beginning immunization in early infancy” is available on the website of the Ministry for Health and Long-term Care (www.health.gov.on.ca/english/public/program/immunization.html).

I agree with your opinion that vaccination — on time, every time — is our best defence against polio. This province will continue to strive to achieve the highest possible rates of immunization coverage to protect our population.

Arlene King MD

Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health,
Toronto, Ont.

REFERENCE

- MacDonald N, Hébert PC. Polio outbreak in Tajikistan is cause for alarm. *CMAJ* 2010;182:1013.

For the full letter, go to: www.cmaj.ca/cgi/eletters/182/10/1013#555555

DOI: 10.1503/cmaj.110-2094

Urine cultures for kids

I welcomed Shaikh’s article about acute urinary tract infection in infants and young children.¹ Fever of unknown origin is a frequent issue in family practice, and confidence in excluding this diagnosis is helpful for both practitioner and parent.

I was puzzled, however, at the description of the necessity of urine test cultures. Shaikh states that a bag urine specimen is helpful if the results are negative, yet he goes on to quote a 12% false-negative rate and a requirement that “all urine specimens should be sent for culture.” My teaching was always that it is not appropriate to send a bag urine specimen for culture owing to contamination.

My question is this: Is it useful to obtain a bag urine specimen rather than a catheter specimen if a culture is always necessary to avoid a false-negative result? Is Shaikh suggesting that a bag specimen should be sent for culture? This is highly relevant in my

office, where we can readily obtain a bag urine specimen but have to refer a patient to the local hospital for a catheter specimen.

Sarah J. Polk

Cambridge, Ont.

REFERENCE

- Shaikh N. Acute urinary tract infection in infants and young children. *CMAJ* 2010;182:800-1.

For the full letter, go to: www.cmaj.ca/cgi/eletters/182/8/800#593791

DOI: 10.1503/cmaj.110-2100

I thank Kolk for her request for clarification. Suppose you are seeing a 1-year-old infant who has had a fever for two days but whose results of physical examination are unremarkable. The pretest probability of urinary tract infection is about 20%.¹ My preference would be to obtain a catheter specimen for both urinalysis and culture.

If, however, the parents are strongly opposed to catheterization or obtaining a catheter specimen is not feasible, a bag urine specimen can be used to guide further management. If the dipstick from the urine bag specimen gives negative results for both leukocytes and nitrites, the probability of urinary tract infection in this child would be < 5%.¹ The child can be followed up without any additional testing. If the results are positive, a catheter specimen should be obtained for urinalysis and culture.

With the extra time and effort involved in obtaining a repeat catheter specimen from the large number of children with positive results of bag urine analysis, we do not routinely use bags to collect urine. In our outpatient practice of > 25 000 patients, we use bags to collect urine samples for only a few patients each year.

Nader Shaikh MD MPH

Assistant Professor of Pediatrics,
Children’s Hospital of Pittsburgh,
Pittsburgh, USA

REFERENCE

- Shaikh N, Morone NE, Lopez J, et al. Does this child have a urinary tract infection? *JAMA* 2007; 298:285-804.

For the full letter, go to: www.cmaj.ca/cgi/eletters/182/8/800#446860

DOI: 10.1503/cmaj.110-2101

Cervarix™ is a prophylactic vaccine. It does not prevent progression of HPV-related lesions present at vaccination. Cervarix™ does not protect against all oncogenic HPV types and may not prevent infection with HPV 16/18 or subsequent progression to cervical carcinoma in all vaccinees. Cervarix™ is not a treatment for current HPV infection, precancerous lesions, or cervical cancer. Vaccination is for primary prevention and is not a substitute for regular cervical screening (secondary prevention) or for precautions against exposure to HPV and sexually transmitted diseases.

Vaccination should not be undertaken in pregnant women and vaccinees should be advised to take adequate precautions to avoid pregnancy for 2 months following vaccination.

The most commonly reported adverse events within 7 days of vaccination with Cervarix™/control were: Local [pain (91.8%/87.2%), redness (48.0%/24.4%) and swelling (44.1%/21.3%)]; General [fatigue (55.0%/53.6%), headache (53.4%/61.4%)].*

Please see the full Product Monograph.

*Control = Al(OH)₃ control containing 500 µg Al(OH)₃

Reference: 1. Data on file. GSKBio_WWMA_DoF025_5_2010.

Cervarix™ is used under license by GlaxoSmithKline Inc.
©2010 GlaxoSmithKline Inc. All rights reserved.

