characteristics of FD in children with eosinophilic gastrointestinal diseases (EGIDs).

STUDY POPULATION. The study included children previously evaluated in the multidisciplinary EGID program at Children’s Hospital National Jewish Health (Aurora, CO) between January and December 2008.

METHODS. Retrospective analysis of medical records (N = 200) assessed patients for EGID and FD (determined by feeding therapists using a feeding assessment that addressed symptoms, observation of functional skills, learned behaviors, mealtime dynamics with caregivers, and developmental skills).

RESULTS. Thirty-three (16.5%) patients (age range: 14–113 months) were identified as having both EGID and FD. Food sensitivity was noted in 88% of the patients, and 52% of them had clinical evidence of other allergic disease. Twenty-five of the 33 patients (76%) had eosinophilic esophagitis, defined by ≥15 eosinophils per high-powered field. Learned maladaptive feeding behaviors were the predominant form of FD and were noted in 93.9% of the children; gagging or vomiting was seen in 84.8% of them. Twenty-one percent were diagnosed with failure to thrive, and nearly 70% required individual or group feeding therapy.

CONCLUSIONS. Feeding difficulties are prevalent in children with EGIDs and might persist even after eosinophilic inflammation is treated.

REVIEWER COMMENTS. This study highlights the importance of assessing for FD in children with EGIDs and vice versa, because appropriate management of both disease states might enhance outcomes. The authors were able to examine the records of a relatively large number of patients. Potential limitations of the study were its retrospective design, lack of a universally accepted feeding-assessment protocol, and possible referral bias.

Incidental Gastric Eosinophils in Patients With Eosinophilic Esophagitis: Do They Matter?


PURPOSE OF THE STUDY. Some patients with eosinophilic esophagitis (EoE) demonstrate an increased number of eosinophils in gastric mucosa. These researchers sought to assess clinical and therapeutic differences in children with EoE and either no gastric eosinophils (EE-N) or an increased number of gastric eosinophils (EE-A).

STUDY POPULATION. Children aged 1 to 18 years who had had an esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD) over an 8-year period (1999–2007) were assessed. The study was conducted at a children’s hospital in Indianapolis, Indiana.

METHODS. A retrospective chart review was performed to identify children with EE-A, defined as EoE with ≥10 eosinophils per high-powered field in a gastric biopsy. Clinical characteristics and response to swallowed fluticasone between children with EE-A and children with EE-N were compared by using 2-sample t and χ2 tests.

RESULTS. A total of 356 children with EoE were identified: 41 (12%) met criteria for EE-A. When compared to a randomly selected group of 50 children with EE-N, there was no difference regarding gender, age, presenting symptoms, atopy history, or esophageal histology. Both groups had similar responses to swallowed fluticasone (significant reductions in the number of esophageal eosinophils). In 11 children with EE-A treated with swallowed fluticasone, 9 (82%) had a reduction in the number of gastric eosinophils (to ≤5 eosinophils per high-powered field). No differences were observed between responders and nonresponders.

CONCLUSIONS. Twelve percent of the children with EoE had an increased number of gastric eosinophils; however, the presence of increased numbers of gastric eosinophils does not portend a worse clinical presentation or result in a reduced response to swallowed fluticasone.

REVIEWER COMMENTS. Just when we thought we were starting to understand EoE, gastroenterologists are now identifying children with clinical symptoms and an increased number of eosinophils in areas distal to the gastroesophageal junction. Although the authors admitted that they did not have a study group of patients with only eosinophilic gastritis, the lack of differences between EE-N and EE-A was reassuring. This study’s results offer another twist in the continuing story of eosinophilic gastrointestinal disorders.

Safe Vaccination of Patients With Egg Allergy With an Adjuvanted Pandemic H1N1 Vaccine


PURPOSE OF THE STUDY. Influenza vaccines are produced from embryonated hens’ eggs and contain residual, variable amounts of egg protein. This study attempted to better characterize reaction risk in a large population of egg-allergic persons.
However, these results add to others that indicate that published study of this much smaller, highest-risk group. Avoided vaccination altogether. There is still no published study of this much smaller, highest-risk group. With the most severe egg-allergy histories might have avoided vaccination altogether. There is still no published study of this much smaller, highest-risk group.

METHODS. This study involved 2 stages, the first of which was conducted by allergists in the population described above. Because the results suggested minimal risk, an expanded program of vaccination was undertaken for patients who self-reported egg allergy. Vaccine was administered in the study population in a single dose to patients deemed at low risk (mild gastrointestinal/skin reactions) and in 2 doses (10% and 90%) at 30-minute intervals for those deemed at higher risk (asthma or cardiovascular reactions). Patients were observed for 60 minutes after vaccination. After the first stage revealed limited risk of anaphylaxis in the first 900 egg-allergic patients, special clinics began a rapid vaccination program with a mandatory surveillance protocol.

RESULTS. Among 830 patients with confirmed egg allergy, 9% had vaccine administered in divided doses. No patient had an anaphylactic reaction. Nine patients had minor allergic symptoms. The proportion of patients who presented with signs/symptoms compatible with an allergic reaction was similar (3.1%) in the control group and the group of patients with egg allergy. In the second stage of expanded vaccination of 3640 additional patients, 2 were treated with epinephrine, although neither of them fulfilled study criteria for anaphylaxis.

CONCLUSIONS. Vaccination of patients with egg allergy with adjuvanted pandemic H1N1 vaccine seems to be safe, and the results of this study are in line with those of previous studies performed with seasonal influenza vaccine. Vaccines in this study had low levels of ovalbumin. Further studies might assess the risk after administering vaccine with the higher ovalbumin levels found in seasonal vaccine.

REVIEWER COMMENTS. The authors pointed out that patients with the most severe egg-allergy histories might have avoided vaccination altogether. There is still no published study of this much smaller, highest-risk group. However, these results add to others that indicate that vaccination can safely proceed in most children with egg allergy, particularly with vaccines that now have lower egg content.
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