Committee on Infectious Diseases

‘Red Book’ Update

As before, we suggest you clip this update and insert it into your copy of the “Red Book.”

ERRATA

Please note the following errata in the 1982 Red Book, and correct your copy:

Pages 26-27. The bottom line of page 26 and the top two lines of page 27 are duplications. Cross them out.

Page 277. Lines 7-9 are duplications. Cross them out.

Page 188. The 8th line under “Treatment” should read “not to exceed 4 gm per day” NOT “not to exceed 4 mg per day.”

UPDATE

The Red Book Committee met on May 10, 1982 and considered a number of issues, including:

1. The 1982 edition (19th) of the Red Book has been distributed beginning on June 4, 1982. We welcome comments and suggestions for the 20th edition.

2. IMPORTANT REVISION IN RED BOOK RECOMMENDATIONS: After the Committee meeting it came to our attention that three children who had anaphylactoid reactions to egg ingestion experienced immediate allergic reactions to chick-embryo-grown live measles virus vaccine; two had difficulty breathing and one had hypotension. Persons who are egg-allergic but do not have a history of anaphylactoid reactions appear to be at little or no risk from live measles virus (LMV) vaccine; two had difficulty breathing and one had hypotension. Persons who are egg-allergic but do not have a history of anaphylactoid reactions appear to be at little or no risk from live measles virus (LMV) vaccine (See Morbidity Mortality Weekly Rep 31:217–231, May 7, 1982). Because previous experience indicated no adverse reactions in egg-allergic children given vaccine prepared in chick embryo tissue culture, the 1982 Red Book contains the following statement:

The vaccine currently used in the United States is prepared in chick embryo tissue culture by inoculation with a further attenuated passage of the Edmonston B strain of measles virus. This preparation is virtually devoid of allergenic substances derived from the chick embryo cell cultures used for growth of the live vaccine viruses. However, there is a remote potential risk of hypersensitivity reactions in patients allergic to eggs, chicken, or chicken feathers; large scale use of the vaccine for more than a decade has resulted in only rare, isolated reports of minor allergic reactions. In a study in which children known to be allergic to eggs, chicken, or chicken feathers were vaccinated with a chick embryo cell culture-derived vaccine, no allergic reactions were observed. The Committee does not believe that egg sensitivity contradicts the use of chick embryo tissue culture vaccines (live measles virus or live mumps virus vaccine).

In view of these very recent reports, this statement is too liberal. If a child has experienced an anaphylactoid reaction to egg ingestion we recommend either: (a) deferment of LMV (or live mumps vaccine) until measures are reported that indicate a safer method of administration of chick embryo vaccines; one unreported method uses a “desensitization” procedure, details of which are currently not in print; or (b) very cautious administration of LMV (or live mumps virus vaccine also prepared in chick embryo tissue culture) in a setting where an immediate allergic reaction can be detected and treated.

The Committee reminds pediatricians that influenza vaccine is prepared in eggs and should not be given to egg-allergic persons. On the other hand, live rubella virus vaccine and oral polio vaccine are prepared in nonavian systems and egg-allergy is not a contraindication.

3. The Committee reaffirmed its conclusions and recommendations concerning the treatment of fever with antipyretics, especially salicylates. An extensive review is to be found in the June issue (Pediatrics 69:810, 1982).

4. Dr Roger Barkin presented data on 40 children immunized with a 0.25-ml dose of DTP in contrast with those receiving the standard 0.5 ml. These as yet unreported results suggest no loss in the capacity to induce agglutinating antibody to pertussis and a reduction in side-effects. (Barkin RM, Samuelson JS, Gotlin L: Diphtheria-pertussis-tetanus}
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The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is located on the World Wide Web at:
/content/70/5/819.2