the absence of published data specifically relating to serotype distribution of pneumococcal pneumonia for children, this is the only up-to-date national reference source available spanning our study time frame. It provides data on pneumococcal serotype distribution for cases of invasive pneumococcal disease for 2000/1 to 2005/6 and shows differences in common serotypes present prior to the introduction of PCV7, which was relevant to our study.

We agree that it is not possible to determine fully the exact aetiology of pneumonia from an HES diagnosis, although we have made every attempt to do so. However, we do think the trends in diagnosed pneumonia following the introduction of PCV7 remain of interest.
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Ultrasound performs better than radiographs

We applaud the British Thoracic Society (BTS) for its efforts to improve patient care through scientific evidence. We thus recognise the recent guidelines on pleural procedures and thoracic ultrasound (TUS) as an important attempt to develop a rational approach to chest sonography. However, we are concerned that the BTS has reached conclusions based on a less complete review of TUS. The guidelines state that ‘the utility of thoracic ultrasound for diagnosing a pneumothorax is limited in hospital practice due to the ready availability of chest x-rays (CXR)’ and that TUS is not recommended for this indication. This conclusion appears to be based on a small (but landmark) study of 11 patients from 1986 to 1989, two small studies with only four pneumothoraces in one and another small series whose ultrasounds were retrospectively reviewed. Against these small and somewhat dated studies, a large number of recent investigations support a quite different conclusion.

Many well-performed retrospective reviews and a number of prospective studies have compared TUS to chest radiographs (CXR) in the detection of pneumothoraces using CXR as the criterion standard. Noting the limitations of CXR in detecting pneumothoraces, we feel that only prospective studies utilising CT as the reference criterion are valid to assess the relative merits of ultrasound versus radiography. Although methodology and populations have varied, at least nine comparative trials, conducted in the last decade, have noted a higher sensitivity for TUS than CXR in the detection of pneumothorax. While the widely reported sensitivities (49%–100%) for TUS detection of pneumothoraces has not been explained, a more important point is that, in each of these studies, the sensitivity of TUS was significantly higher than CXR. Sonographic specificities were not significantly different from those of CXR, ranging from 94% to 100%. Furthermore, in the studies where it is reported, the likelihood ratios have ranged from 36 to 153.2–4 Since a typical benchmark of a useful test is one that can generate positive likelihood ratios of greater than 10, these test characteristics have persuaded many, including the authors of two systematic reviews, that TUS is a more accurate test than supine anteroposterior CXR for the detection of pneumothorax. Finally, we would also like to take issue with the assumptions underlying the phrase ‘ready availability of chest x-rays’. For many critical and emergency department patients with sudden unexplained dyspnoea, the delay involved in obtaining a ‘stat’ portable CXR can be lethal. For such patients, bedside TUS may allow for rapid initiation of life-saving interventions.

We are keenly aware that TUS has pitfalls, and that its use requires due caution by properly trained sonographers. However, recognising that guidelines are living documents reflecting best evidence, we respectfully submit that the BTS guidelines in question are thus somewhat incomplete. In our view, after further review and consensus development according to the GRADE criteria, data reported from the 21st century, far from being conflict, provide strong and consistent evidence regarding the superiority of sonography over CXR in the diagnosis of pneumothorax (see online supplement).

The World Interactive Network Focused on Critical Ultrasound (WINFOCUS) International Liaison Committee on Pleural and Lung Ultrasound (ILCPLUS) is constituted by experts in pleural and lung ultrasound and clinical epidemiology experts in the process of evidence assessment, including GRADE and RAND Appropriateness Methodologies for the development of evidence-based clinical recommendations and consensus statements.
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Authors’ response
We thank Agricola and colleagues for their compliments on our guideline and their contribution to the discussion on the role of ultrasound in the detection of pneumothorax, but we maintain that the medical community should proceed with caution when using ultrasound in the detection and management of pneumothoraces. If the reviews referenced are not considered (5 papers), 13 of the remaining 24 papers referenced are in two well-defined patient groups—trauma and post-intervention. None of the papers published prospectively demonstrated improved outcomes and management change using ultrasound in comparison with chest x-ray (CXR), and perhaps more significantly only one prospective blinded study in medical patients with varying degrees of respiratory compromise has been reported and this demonstrated an unacceptable false positive rate.

We maintain that ultrasound is limited in its usefulness in the assessment of cases of spontaneous pneumothorax and following pleural procedures particularly in settings outside critical care. Many of these patients have underlying lung disease, particularly chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, which reduces the accuracy of pneumothorax detection by ultrasound. If a pneumothorax is detected by ultrasound, a CXR is usually required to assess its size (unless a CTT scan is then performed). If the pneumothorax is so small as to be undetectable on CXR, then it is unlikely to require intervention and the use of ultrasound will not have changed the management.

We acknowledge that in the assessment of a supine patient thoracic ultrasound performed by a skilled operator may detect even small pneumothoraces (and effusions) and that if these patients require positive pressure ventilation detecting even a small amount of pleural air may be relevant. Even so, in this group, caution is needed because, as shown in the prospective study by Goodman et al using CT as the gold standard, small pneumothoraces may fail to be detected. The CXT is undoubtedly unreliable in the detection of small pneumothoraces in the supine patient and in specific clinical circumstances, as suggested by Agricola et al, ultrasound may be of value. This being the case, we agree that if a suitably skilled operator and ultrasound equipment are available at the patient’s bedside then ultrasound may provide useful diagnostic information, but we maintain that it is unlikely to obviate the need for a formal CXR.

We are surprised that the authors experienced significant delays in obtaining ‘stat’ portable CXRs in their critical care and emergency departments and that patients may have died as a consequence. Clinicians managing critically ill trauma patients require rapid access to portable CXRs and all institutions managing such patients should be able to deliver this.

In conclusion, we agree that in supine and trauma patients ultrasound may be a valuable tool in the detection of pneumothorax. In these patients, ultrasound may have increased sensitivity compared with a CXR, although difficulty with pneumothorax quantification suggests that ultrasound is unlikely to completely replace the need for a radiograph. In the majority of cases of spontaneous or postprocedure pneumothorax, ultrasound is unlikely to provide additional benefit over the combination of CXR and clinical judgement when deciding management.
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