



Community-acquired pneumonia in children[☆]



Fabio Cardinale^{a,*}, Anna Rita Cappiello^a, Maria Felicia Mastrototaro^a,
Mariacristina Pignatelli^a, Susanna Esposito^b

^a Pediatric Unit, Division of Pulmonology, Allergy, and Immunology, AOU "Policlinico-Giovanni XXIII", Bari, Italy

^b Pediatric Clinic 1, Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, Università degli Studi di Milano, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Antibiotics
Antimicrobial treatment
Community-acquired pneumonia
Pneumonia
Respiratory infection

ABSTRACT

Community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) remains a frequent cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide even in industrialised countries, and its incidence is highest among children aged <5 years. Over the last two years, three international guidelines have been updated with new evidence concerning the incidence, aetiology and management of childhood CAP, but there are still some major problems in standardisation. The main aim of this review is to consider the available data concerning the aetiology, diagnosis, evaluation of severity, and treatment of paediatric CAP. Analysis of the literature shows that there are a number of unanswered questions concerning the management of CAP, including its definition, the absence of a paediatric CAP severity score, the difficulty of identifying its aetiology, the emergence of resistance of the most frequent respiratory pathogens to the most widely used anti-infectious agents, and the lack of information concerning the changes in CAP epidemiology following the introduction of vaccines against respiratory pathogens. More research is clearly required in various areas, and further efforts are needed to increase vaccination coverage with the already available vaccines in order to reduce the occurrence of the disease.

© 2013 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) remains a frequent cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide, even in industrialised countries, and its incidence is highest among children aged <5 years [1]. It is estimated that CAP is responsible for one-fifth of the deaths of young children, with two million deaths per year in the developing and developed world: the incidence of CAP among children aged <5 years in developing countries is 0.29 per child-year, with a mortality rate of 1.3–2.6% and, in North America and Europe, its incidence in preschool children is still approximately 36 per 1,000 child-years [2]. Extensive infant vaccinations with pneumococcal conjugate vaccines in developed countries have significantly decreased the rates of hospital admissions due to childhood CAP (1,3,4), but concerns have been raised by the increase in complicated CAP cases due to *Streptococcus pneumoniae* serotypes 1, 3, 5 and 19A over the last few years [3,4]. Furthermore, an increase in deaths due to Staphylococcal pneumonia has been reported in North America, mainly following influenza infection [5].

During the last two years, three international guidelines have been updated with new evidence concerning the incidence, aetiology and management of childhood CAP [1,6,7]. However, there are still some major problems in standardising the management of paediatric CAP,

including the lack of a true diagnostic standard and the difficulty in identifying the causative micro-organisms before selecting antibiotics.

The definition of CAP varies widely worldwide depending on whether chest radiography is used or not; furthermore, although chest radiography is still the main means of confirming a clinical suspicion of CAP in everyday practice, its diagnostic accuracy is limited by significant intra- and inter-observer differences in interpreting plain chest radiographs [8]. Furthermore, as the recent international guidelines for the management of paediatric CAP do not recommend routine radiological investigations in patients suspected of having uncomplicated CAP or CAP not requiring hospitalisation [1,6,7], it is difficult to establish the real incidence of childhood CAP.

In terms of therapy, the first-line antimicrobial approach varies from country to country, and there is no clear consensus concerning second-line treatment [1,6,7].

The main aim of this review is to consider the available data concerning the aetiology, diagnosis, evaluation of severity, and treatment of paediatric CAP.

2. Aetiology

The use of molecular methods to detect microbial products in biological fluids has greatly improved our knowledge of CAP aetiology. New respiratory pathogens have been discovered over the last ten years, including human metapneumovirus, bocavirus and some coronaviruses [9], and new data concerning the importance of the different pneumococcal serotypes and the impact of the use of pneumococcal conjugate

[☆] This article is published on behalf of the Italian Paediatric Respiratory Society (SIMRI) as part of a themed issue series on paediatric respiratory diseases.

* Corresponding author at: Pediatric Unit, Division of Pulmonology, Allergy, and Immunology, AOU "Policlinico-Giovanni XXIII", 70126 Bari, Italy.

E-mail address: fabiocardinale@libero.it (F. Cardinale).

vaccines have been collected using polymerase chain reaction [3,4]. However, determining the aetiology of CAP is still difficult in routine clinical settings because appropriate lower respiratory tract specimens can rarely be obtained from children; the evaluation of upper respiratory tract secretions is only useful for viruses and atypical bacteria because typical bacteria are part of the normal flora colonising the upper respiratory tract [1]; and the detection of bacterial antigens in urine is related to the same flora and cannot be considered an aetiological marker of infection in children [2].

The aetiology of CAP varies significantly depending on the age of the patient. Respiratory viruses are the most frequent pathogens in children aged between four months and five years (with syncytial virus and rhinovirus the main viruses), and are responsible for approximately 40% of the CAP episodes in hospitalised children [1,10,11]. *S. pneumoniae* accounts for one-third of the cases of all ages, and *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* is the main pathogen in children aged 5–15 years [1–3,12] and also accounts for 30% of the cases in children aged 2–5 years [13]. Untypeable *Haemophilus influenzae*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Chlamydia pneumoniae* are much less frequently observed, partly because of the lack of reliable diagnostic tests [1,2,6,7]. However, many studies published over the last ten years have recorded mixed viral/bacterial infections in up to 45% of cases of childhood, with *S. pneumoniae* being the most frequently involved bacteria [14,15]. Dual viral infections have also been reported, with two or three viruses being detected in 10–20% of cases [11,16]. Some viruses (e.g. bocavirus) are detected more frequently than others in such multiple infections, but it is not clear what this means in clinical practice or whether viral infection always precedes bacterial infection or not.

Although some clinical and radiological pictures and laboratory findings are more characteristics of particular etiological agents (e.g. “paroxysmal” cough in viral or atypical bacterial infections, necrotising pneumonia in infections due to *S. aureus* or *S. pneumoniae*, with the latter also inducing a significant increase), none is sufficiently sensitive or specific to identify them definitely.

3. Assessing severity

Many factors are associated with a complicated CAP course, including microbial load; the type and virulence of the pathogen, and its susceptibility to anti-infective drugs; and host susceptibility to infections [1]. Individual susceptibility to CAP is also related to the presence of comorbidities, pre-existing lung disease (such as bronchodysplasia, bronchiectasis or adenomatoid cystic malformations), previous vaccinations against respiratory pathogens, and genetic susceptibility to infections [1].

This last may play an under-estimated role in the incidence and clinical course of CAP in patients of all ages. The risk of CAP is five times higher in adult patients discharged after being hospitalised because of CAP than in those discharged with any other diagnosis [17] and, in primary care settings, it seems that subjects with CAP are also more likely to have experienced previously recurrent upper respiratory infections [18]. Moreover, studies of adopted patients have shown that the risk of a fatal outcome is greatly conditioned by genetic factors [19], which seem to confirm their major role in determining individual susceptibility [20]. Single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in many of the genes involved in innate and adaptive immune responses have been associated with host susceptibility [21–26], and some of these genes have also been associated with protection against [27] or susceptibility to infectious diseases other than CAP [28].

The international guidelines have suggested various criteria for assessing the severity of CAP in infants and older children [1,6,7]. In general, signs and symptoms suggesting a respiratory distress, such as age-adjusted tachypnea, SpO₂ levels of less than 90–92% in room air, cyanosis, chest retractions, nasal flaring or grunting, suggest a need for hospitalisation [1,6,7] but, unlike in the case of adults, there is no validated scoring system that is sensitive and specific enough to predict

which children have sufficiently severe CAP to warrant such a course [10]. The guidelines also point out that a child’s overall clinical appearance and behaviour may predict severity, and so any child with a “toxic” appearance (including a temperature of >39 °C and tachycardia, a capillary refill time of >2 s, dehydration and respiratory distress) should be admitted to hospital [1,6,7]. Further criteria for hospitalisation include a younger age (i.e. <3–6 months), pre-existing comorbidities, suspected infection due to methicillin-resistant *S. aureus*, feeding difficulties, an inability to take oral medication because of vomiting, or the possibility of non-compliance with oral treatment because of the family environment [1].

Some interesting perspectives have been opened up by the discovery of some new blood biomarkers of CAP severity in adults, including natriuretic peptide [29], mid-regional pro-adrenomedullin [30], and the triggering receptor expressed on myeloid cells (TREM-1) [31]. However, there are still no data concerning the role of these biomarkers in paediatric CAP.

4. Diagnosis

Although the radiographic detection of infiltration is currently the gold standard for a diagnosis of CAP, experts agree that routine imaging studies are not essential to confirm the diagnosis in children, at least in those who are well enough to be treated as outpatients and do not present recurrent episodes [1,6,7]. However, they are essential in the management of severe and/or recurrent CAP because, in addition to confirming the diagnosis, they can also document the characteristics of the parenchymal infiltrates and the presence of complications requiring specific therapy [10].

Computed tomography (CT) is usually reserved for patients with CAP complicated by parapneumonic effusions, necrotising pneumonia or lung abscesses, especially when surgery needs to be considered [2]. Chest radiographs are less sensitive in detecting lung abscesses than CT scans, and fail in approximately 20% of cases [2]. Severe parapneumonic effusions and empyema (i.e. with more than half of the chest X-ray opacified) often require a CT scan before the placement of a chest tube, especially when loculated effusion is suspected [2]. In such cases, lung ultrasonography (LUS) may be an alternative as it has the advantage of avoiding radiation exposure, even though it is less accurate and gives rise to more inter-observer disagreement than CT [7]. A recent prospective multicentre study aimed at comparing the accuracy of LUS, plain chest radiography and low-dose CT in diagnosing adult CAP found a sensitivity of 93.4% (95% confidence interval [CI] 89.2–96.3%) and a specificity of 97.7% (95% CI 93.4–99.6%) [32].

Aetiologically, a number of studies have shown that the signs and symptoms of viral and bacterial CAP may be surprisingly similar, that radiological characteristics cannot be used to distinguish different aetiological agents, and that non-microbiological laboratory tests (such as total and differential white blood cell counts, serum C-reactive protein levels and the erythrocyte sedimentation rate) are often not useful for decision making in individual cases [1,2,10]. Procalcitonin levels currently seem to be the best marker for distinguishing bacterial from viral CAP and reducing the duration of antimicrobial therapy [33].

Identifying the aetiology of paediatric CAP is also a problem when microbiological methods are used to detect bacteria. The risk of complications means that punctured lung puncture, bronchoalveolar lavage and thoracoscopic lung biopsy should be reserved for complicated and life-threatening cases that do not respond to theoretically adequate antibiotic therapy [1,2,6,7]. Blood cultures are positive in 13–26.5% of children with complicated CAP, but in fewer than 5% of those with mild or moderate disease [10]. Molecular methods can increase the sensitivity of identifying bacterial pathogens in blood samples, but they are not routinely used in all laboratories [3]. Gram staining and cultured expectorated sputum are widely used to identify the bacteria responsible for adult CAP, but most children (particularly those in the first years of life) cannot provide adequate specimens for

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/3918284>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/3918284>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)