Human Metapneumovirus and Lower Respiratory Tract Disease in Children

TO THE EDITOR: The case definition of croup given by Williams et al. in their study of metapneumovirus (Jan. 29 issue) seems misleading. The authors state that croup is an “acute lower respiratory tract infection characterized by hoarseness, cough, and stridor.” On the contrary, croup is classified as an acute upper-airway disease in several textbooks of pediatrics. Recognizing croup as an important cause of acute upper-airway obstruction and its pertinent features, as distinct from life-threatening bacterial epiglottitis, is the classic point made in medical teaching worldwide.
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TO THE EDITOR: Williams et al. show that “human metapneumovirus infection is a leading cause of respiratory tract infection in the first years of life, with a spectrum of disease similar to that of respiratory syncytial virus.” In a surveillance study performed from November 1, 2002, to March 31, 2003, among 1331 healthy children younger than 15 years of age who were seen for acute respiratory infection in an emergency department in Milan, Italy, we found evidence of human metapneumovirus in 41 children (3.1 percent), of respiratory syncytial virus in 117 (8.8 percent, P<0.001 for the comparison with human metapneumovirus), and of influenzavirus in 209 (15.7 percent; P<0.001 for the comparison with human metapneumovirus) (Table 1). Although the overall prevalence of human metapneumovirus in our study population appeared to be lower than the prevalence of respiratory syncytial virus and that of influenzavirus, we showed that this pathogen has multiple effects. We confirmed that infection with human metapneumovirus has clinical characteristics similar to those of infection with respiratory syncytial virus, but its socioeconomic effect appeared to be greater than that of respiratory syncytial virus infection and similar to that of influenzavirus infection. We would like to know whether the authors observed the same socioeconomic burden on children and their families in association with human metapneumovirus infection.
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In response to Dr. Ho: we agree that the croup is usually poorly defined, partly because of differences between anatomical and physiological descriptions of this illness. Two standard textbooks of pediatrics define croup, or laryngotracheobronchitis, as both a cause of "upper airway obstruction" and "lower respiratory tract" infection.1,2 The classic pathophysiology involves subglottic tracheal edema (the "steeple sign" seen on radiographs of the airway). The World Health Organization defines lower respiratory tract infection as the presence of tachypnea, retractions, stridor, wheezing, or apnea.3 We think that recognition of croup as a distinct clinical syndrome is more valuable than a definition based on anatomical terms and define it as such in our article. There are an estimated 65,000 annual hospitalizations for croup in children less than five years old in the United States, thus warranting such a distinction and underscoring the importance of croup as a clinical entity.4

In response to the interesting data presented by Dr. Principi and colleagues: information about the age distribution of the patients they describe would help in the interpretation of the data. As we state in our article, all the children we studied were less than five years old and thus not in school. We did not collect data on parents' time off from work or other socioeconomic costs associated with illnesses due to human metapneumovirus infection. However, since the mean duration of symptoms before medical attention was sought was 4.4 days, and 37 percent of the children had concomitant acute otitis media, it is likely that there is a significant socioeconomic burden associated with disease caused by human metapneumovirus, as has been described for other respiratory viruses.4

Finally, we would like to clarify the financial support of our research. The work was supported by grants (T-32 AI07474 and R03 AI054790 [both to Dr. Williams] and R00095 [to the General Clini-
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**Table 1. Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes among Children Seen in the Emergency Department for Acute Respiratory Infection and Effects among Their Household Contacts, According to Viral RNA Detection.***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>hMPV-Positive (N=41)</th>
<th>RSV-Positive (N=117)</th>
<th>Influenzavirus-Positive (N=209)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical presentation — no. (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common cold</td>
<td>3 (7.3)</td>
<td>20 (17.1)</td>
<td>43 (20.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharyngitis</td>
<td>11 (26.8)</td>
<td>20 (17.1)</td>
<td>73 (34.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute otitis media</td>
<td>5 (12.2)</td>
<td>10 (8.5)</td>
<td>34 (16.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croup</td>
<td>3 (7.3)</td>
<td>4 (3.4)</td>
<td>7 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute bronchitis</td>
<td>4 (9.8)</td>
<td>15 (12.8)</td>
<td>20 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheezing</td>
<td>10 (24.4)</td>
<td>30 (25.6)</td>
<td>14 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>5 (12.2)</td>
<td>18 (15.4)</td>
<td>18 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitalization — no. (%)</strong></td>
<td>2 (4.9)</td>
<td>16 (13.7)</td>
<td>11 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3–15</td>
<td>3–12</td>
<td>5–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects among household contacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar disease — no./total no. (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>18/149 (12.1)</td>
<td>20/420 (4.8)</td>
<td>74/767 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost school days — no.</td>
<td>2–10‡</td>
<td>2–7</td>
<td>1–10‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3–15‡</td>
<td>2–4</td>
<td>1–15‡</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* RSV denotes respiratory syncytial virus, and hMPV human metapneumovirus.
† P<0.001 for the comparison with influenzavirus-positive children.
‡ P<0.05 for the comparison with RSV-positive children.
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TO THE EDITOR: Infection control was a major issue for investigators attempting to minimize the emergence of monkeypox in the United States, as reported by Reed et al. (Jan. 22 issue). On June 7, 2003, three Illinois residents with a febrile rash syndrome presented to a community hospital. Hospital staff reported the cases that evening to the Illinois Department of Public Health, which recommended diagnostic testing, collection of contact information, and admission under contact and airborne precautions.

Infection control was efficiently implemented, despite the absence of preexisting policies specific to this pathogen and uncertainty regarding best practices for the prevention of person-to-person transmission. The hospital’s participation in the Top Officials 2 (TOPOFF 2) bioterrorism exercise in May 2003, smallpox training activities, and past management of an imported case of Lassa fever enhanced the execution of infection-control protocols.

This outbreak tested a hospital’s preparedness to respond to an unusual communicable agent. Had the outbreak been larger, the hospital’s isolation facilities would have been insufficient. Hospitals should critically evaluate their capacity to implement rapid syndrome-based isolation precautions for emerging disease outbreaks.
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