Oseltamivir (2–5 mg/kg/day as currently recommended) was administered to 52% A/H1N1+ve and 12% A/H1N1−ve patients. In the A/H1N1+ve group, treatment was started within 24–48 h from symptoms onset upon virological confirmation. Oseltamivir was well tolerated and no treatment cessation was required. In one A/H1N1+ve patient complications were associated with development of oseltamivir resistance.3

Clinical course and duration of disease are reported in Table 1. In the entire CF patient population, shorter disease duration was seen in oseltamivir treated patients (5, 4–11 vs 10, 6–14 days; p = 0.008), a difference apparently limited to the A/H1N1−ve subset.

During illness, 68% A/H1N1+ve and 80% A/H1N1−ve patients developed pulmonary exacerbations (p = 0.127). Disease course was uncomplicated in 85% and 88% patients, respectively (p = 0.639). Of note, immuno-suppressive therapy for organ transplantation did not increase risk of complications in either group.

Four patients with severe pulmonary disease (3 A/H1N1+ve, 1 A/H1N1−ve) died of respiratory failure: none had been vaccinated and all had received antiviral therapy (online supplementary table S2).

No significant FEV1 decline was observed in both groups after 1 and 6 months from symptoms onset (online supplementary figure S2). In none of the cases, new isolation of Pseudomonas aeruginosa or Burkholderia cepacia complex was documented.

In conclusion, in a cohort of patients who consecutively presented to Italian CF centres for flu-like symptoms during the 2009 pandemic period, accurate diagnostic testing did not identify clinical characteristics specifically associated with A/H1N1 infection, the only exception being younger age in A/H1N1+ve patients. The use of a reliable identification method allowed appropriate treatment to be initiated.

Systematic collection of data at patient presentation and subsequent follow-up provided further information on A/H1N1 infection in CF, which will be useful to patients for the next influenza season.

Influenza A/H1N1 has no major impact in CF, but patients with poor clinical conditions due to the disease are exposed to substantial risk of complications and unfavourable outcomes. Annual vaccination for seasonal influenza and A/H1N1 influenza is recommended in CF, with continuing efforts towards higher vaccination coverage levels especially in adult subjects.

Table 1. Clinical course of influenza illness and major complications according to the results of influenza A/H1N1 testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complication</th>
<th>A/H1N1+ ve</th>
<th>A/H1N1− ve</th>
<th>All patients</th>
<th>RR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of disease (days)*</td>
<td>5 (3–11)</td>
<td>10 (6–14)</td>
<td>7 (4–14)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary exacerbation†</td>
<td>46 (67.6%)</td>
<td>47 (79.7%)</td>
<td>93 (73.2%)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.69–1.05)</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalisation</td>
<td>47 (69.1%)</td>
<td>41 (69.5%)</td>
<td>88 (68.3%)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.79–1.25)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiviral therapy ‡</td>
<td>56 (82.4%)</td>
<td>7 (11.1%)</td>
<td>63 (46.9%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complications</td>
<td>10 (14.7%)</td>
<td>7 (11.9%)</td>
<td>17 (13.4%)</td>
<td>1.24 (0.50–3.05)</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent need for oxygen therapy</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory failure</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumothorax</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemoptysis</td>
<td>2 (3.0%)</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
<td>4 (3.1%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atelectasis</td>
<td>0 (1.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>3 (4.4%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>4 (3.1%)</td>
<td>2.60 (0.28–24)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Among the 68 patients with A/H1N1 infection, duration of disease was 5 (3–9) days in the 56 patients treated with oseltamivir and 5 (3–11) days in the 12 patients who did not receive antiviral treatment (p = 0.874).
†Among the 68 patients with A/H1N1 infection, pulmonary exacerbations occurred in 69.6% of patients treated with oseltamivir and in 58.3% of those who did not receive antiviral therapy (p = 0.505).
‡Among the 68 patients with A/H1N1 infection, complications occurred in 17.9% of patients treated with oseltamivir and in none of those who did not receive antiviral therapy (p = 0.189).
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The mortality of treated acute PE

I read with interest the editorial in Thorax entitled ‘Identification of those at risk after acute pulmonary embolism’.1 In the second paragraph, the authors state and reference the inpatient mortality for normotensive patients with acute PE as ~10%.

My concern is twofold. First is that readers may surmise that the mortality of acute treated PE is as quoted, when in reality the all-cause out of hospital 3 month mortality of those with PE is 9% in the reference quoted. This level of mortality relates not just to the PE but to the co-morbidities, such as cancer, that this cohort frequently possess. Secondly, in clinical experience it seems a rarity that those even with a large clot burden identified on CT pulmonary angiography (CTPA) and without life-threatening co-morbidities do not improve their clinical state once treated with anticoagulation. Do the editors know of any studies that clearly identify the cause of death systematically in those with PE so that we can truly pick out the mortality associated with this diagnosis?
mortality rate for normotensive patients who did not receive thrombolysis was 7.2 per 1000 person days.6 We therefore believe that it would be wrong to underestimate the early acute PE-associated mortality risk, even in normotensive patients. We believe this is significant in those with objective evidence on echocardiography or on cardiac biomarkers of RVD. It is this association which is eloquently described in the original article on which our editorial was based, stressing its importance to the literature.6
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Predicting CAP-related mortality with CRB-65

Ewig et al are to be commended for their very large study of 388 406 patients admitted with community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) in German hospitals from 2005 to 2006.1 Using the CRB-65 tool (confusion, respiratory rate ≥30 min, low blood pressure (either systolic <90 mm Hg or diastolic ≤60 mm Hg) and age ≥65 years), the authors found 30-day mortality rates of 2.4, 13.4 and 34.4% in those with 0 points, 1–2 points and 3–4 points, respectively. As a result, the authors promote this tool as being accurate for predicting CAP-related deaths. However, while this appears impressive, it is notable that of the >54 700 deaths, only 29.0% were classed as high risk, whereas 68.1% were only intermediate risk and 2.8% were low risk. In addition, many of those patients who died had treatment limitations applied and only 15.7% of the patients who died received ventilatory support. These two points raise the question of how clinically useful this tool really is. If over two-thirds of deaths were classed as having clinically ‘moderate’ CAP, then the tool cannot really be described as being accurate for this purpose. Furthermore, if the vast majority of people who died did so after active treatment was withdrawn, then the identification of such patients does not appear to serve much purpose. It would be more relevant to assess such a tool for its ability to identify those patients in whom every effort is made to save their lives—that is, those admitted to the intensive care unit.

Patrick G P Charles
Department of Infectious Diseases, Austin Health, Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia
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Authors’ response

We thank Dr Charles for his important comments.1 He raises the important question of whether CRB-65 is a useful tool to advise treatment limitations. If only 29% of those who finally died were at high risk of death at initial presentation (CRB-65 risk class 3), such a tool may be of limited value in this regard. In fact, we agree that the CRB-65 score (like any other such as the PSI) is not helpful for the decision to apply treatment restrictions. Such restrictions up to fully palliative treatment cannot be based primarily on considerations about the current risk of death but should be the result of a careful evaluation of the clinical state and overall prognosis of the patient, both initially and during follow-up, and such decisions should be decided with the patient or his legal social worker.

In this context, the CRB-65 severity score remains important as part of the initial clinical evaluation of all patients. Treatment restrictions must not follow a hidden agenda
The mortality of treated acute PE

Stephen Iles
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