

## Suspected neutropenic sepsis during chemotherapy is a medical emergency

### Diagnosis

- Neutropenia ( $\leq 0.5 \times 10^9/l$ )
- Temperature  $>38^\circ\text{C}$
- Other symptoms or signs of significant sepsis such as:
  - > systolic blood pressure  $<90$  mmHg
  - > heart rate  $>130$  bpm
  - > respiratory rate  $>25/\text{min}$
  - > sats  $<91\%$  or lactate  $>2$
  - > purpuric rash
  - > reduced responsiveness

### Investigations

- Urgent FBC, U&E, LFTs, CRP and lactate.
- Send peripheral blood cultures (and central blood cultures if an *in situ* device is accessible).
- Send urine sample in children under 5 years.

### Avoid

- Do not request a chest X-ray unless clinically indicated.
- Do not remove a central venous access device.
- Do not use glycopeptide (eg vancomycin or teicoplanin) or aminoglycoside (eg gentamicin) antibiotics without specific microbiological reasons.
- Do not give GCS-F prophylactically unless part of the current chemotherapy regimen.

### Management

- Start piperacillin and tazobactam (Tazocin) immediately unless contraindicated.
- Ask for experienced senior assistance.

### Prophylaxis in adults ( $>18$ years)

- If neutropenia is anticipated in response to chemotherapy, consider fluoroquinolone (eg ciprofloxacin) prophylaxis (depending on local microbiological sensitivities).

**Fig 1. Revised protocol.** CRP = C-reactive protein; FBC = full blood count; GCS-F = granulocyte-colony stimulating factor; LFTs = liver function tests; U&E = urea & electrolytes.

## Reference

- 1 Beersma MF, Dirven K, van Dam AP, Templeton KE, Claas EC, Goossens H. Evaluation of 12 commercial tests and the complement fixation test for *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*-specific immunoglobulin G (IgG) and IgM antibodies, with PCR used as the "gold standard". *J Clin Microbiol* 2005;43:2277–85.

## Communication is key

Editor – Protocols are increasingly important in clinical practice. They are the fingerprint, the biometric, the iris recognition of evidence-based medicine. In the article 'Neutropenic sepsis: a potentially life-threatening complication of chemotherapy' (*Clin Med* 2014;14:538–42), the authors reproduce an algorithm from NICE guidelines [CG151]. The original NICE version contains poorly sequenced, disorganised, repetitive and often self-evident copy. In adapting this original for printing in the journal, *Clinical Medicine* staff have exacerbated these problems by introducing dominant, asymmetrical colour bars that draw the eye away from a spatter of five-point text that is far too small to see comfortably, while typographical errors (eg Examination and spetic) and script that breaches the edge of densely coloured boxes further reduce clarity.

If communication is key and timely intervention critical, why is so little care taken by the National Institute of Health and Care Excellence and others to incorporate even the most basic elements of graphic design?

Not very much is missing from the following 155 words (Fig 1), compared with the original 461 words. ■

ANDY LEVY

*Professor of endocrinology, University of Bristol  
University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, UK*

## References

- 1 Underwood SR, Harbinson MT, Kelion AD, Sabharwal N. CMR versus SPECT for diagnosis of coronary heart disease. *Lancet* 2012;379:2146–6.
- 2 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Chest pain of recent onset: assessment and diagnosis of recent onset chest pain or discomfort of suspected cardiac origin*. 2010. Available online at [www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg95](http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg95) [Accessed 12 October 2014].
- 3 Montalescot G, Sechtem U, Achenbach S *et al*. 2013 ESC guidelines on the management of stable coronary artery disease. *Eur Heart J* 2013;34:2949–3003.

- 4 Shaw LJ, Berman DS, Maron DJ *et al*. Optimal medical therapy with or without percutaneous coronary intervention to reduce ischemic burden. Results from the clinical outcomes utilizing revascularization and aggressive drug evaluation (COURAGE) trial nuclear substudy. *Circulation* 2008;117:1283–91.
- 5 Hachamovitch R, Rozanski A, Shaw LJ *et al*. Impact of ischaemia and scar on the therapeutic benefit derived from myocardial revascularization vs. medical therapy among patients undergoing stress-rest myocardial perfusion scintigraphy. *Eur Heart J* 2011;32:1012–24.
- 6 Abraham A, Nichol G, Williams KA *et al*. <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET imaging of myocardial viability in an experienced center with access to <sup>18</sup>F-FDG and integration with clinical management teams: the Ottawa-FIVE substudy of the PARR 2 trial. *J Nucl Med* 2010;51:567–74.
- 7 Einstein AJ, Knuuti J. Cardiac imaging: does radiation matter? *Eur Heart J* 2012;33:573–78.
- 8 Knuuti J, Saraste A, Kallio M, Minn H. Is cardiac magnetic resonance imaging causing DNA damage? *Eur Heart J* 2013;34:2337–9.
- 9 Brenner DJ. What we know and what we don't know about cancer risks associated with radiation doses from radiological imaging. *Br J Radiol* 2013;87:20130629.
- 10 Underwood SR, Godman B, Salyani S, Ogle J, Ell PJ. Economics of myocardial perfusion imaging in Europe: the EMPIRE Study. *Eur Heart J* 1999;20:157–66.
- 11 Shaw LJ, Hachamovitch R, Berman DS *et al*. The economic consequences of available diagnostic and prognostic strategies for the evaluation of stable angina patients: an observational assessment of the value of precatheterisation ischaemia. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999;33 661–9.
- 12 Thom H, West NEJ, Hughes V *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of initial stress cardiovascular MR, stress SPECT or stress echocardiography as a gate-keeper test, compared with upfront invasive coronary angiography in the investigation and management of patients with stable chest pain: mid-term outcomes from the CECaT randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open* 2014;4:e003419.

### Steroid use for patients with brain metastases and spinal cord compression

Editor – I read with interest ‘Brain metastases’ (*Clin Med* 2014;14:535–7) and ‘Metastatic spinal cord compression: a rare but important complication of cancer’ (*Clin Med* 2014;14:542–5). I would like to make a few further points regarding the use of steroids. Spencer *et al* advise high-dose dexamethasone for patients with brain metastases, with a suggested regimen of 16 mg daily, reducing to a maintenance dose of 2–4 mg daily. Dexamethasone provides symptomatic relief for patients with raised intracranial pressure from cerebral oedema but this relief reduces over time and undesirable side effects increase. Thus, ideally, the dose of dexamethasone should be discontinued after 2–4 weeks.<sup>1</sup> No benefit is seen in patients with asymptomatic brain metastases.<sup>2</sup> Robson advises administering 16 mg dexamethasone daily if metastatic cord compression is suspected, but eventual steroid reduction is not discussed. Following radiotherapy or surgery, steroids should be tailed off gradually and completely over 4–6 weeks, or to the lowest dose that maintains stability. Corticosteroids may result in a rapid improvement of neurological function but long-term benefit is limited, and there is no evidence that survival is improved.<sup>3</sup> High-dose, long-duration treatment with corticosteroids causes significant side effects which can be debilitating and occasionally fatal. For those patients who do not proceed to

surgery or radiotherapy, dexamethasone should be reduced gradually and stopped. We undertook an audit of the patients known to St Luke's Hospice in Plymouth in a six-month period this year (n=1,152), and found one-third of them had taken steroids. Oncologists had prescribed steroids in nearly half of cases. 20% of patients were taking steroids for brain metastases and 10% for spinal cord compression. Steroid dose was not regularly reviewed and patients often remained on steroids for far too long, resulting in 40% of patients suffering side-effects, most commonly proximal myopathy and peripheral oedema. 50% of patients were taking steroids until their death. GPs and palliative nurse specialists are often underconfident in reducing and stopping steroid courses and therefore clear guidance needs to be given to indicate duration of steroid course and plans for reduction. ■

DR FAY MURRAY-BROWN  
ST4 palliative medicine, Hospiscare, Exeter, UK

### References

- 1 Vecht CJ, Hovestadt A, Verbiest HB, van Vliet JJ, van Putten WL. Dose effect relationship of dexamethasone on Karnofsky performance in metastatic brain tumours. A randomised study of doses of 4, 8 and 16mg per day. *Neurology* 1994;44:675–80.
- 2 Twycross R and Wilcock A (eds). *Palliative care formulary*, 4th edn. Nottingham: Palliativedrugs.com Ltd, 2011.
- 3 National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *Metastatic spinal cord compression: diagnosis and management of patients at risk of or with metastatic spinal cord compression*. London: NICE, 2008.

### Response

Editor – My thanks to Dr Murray-Brown for raising this important issue. In my article ‘Metastatic spinal cord compression: a rare but important complication of cancer’ I concentrated primarily on the presentation and initial management of these cases. In the short section on rehabilitation I did not discuss the reduction of steroids and I agree that this is a very important part of the management.

In metastatic spinal cord compression patients the high dose steroids are used to reduce swelling and neurological symptoms whilst they start their definitive treatment. In our practice, once patients have commenced their fractionated radiotherapy treatment we reduce the steroids rapidly by half every two days. Most patients will have stopped taking their steroids just after their discharge on completion of radiotherapy treatment. Occasional patients require longer term treatment to control symptoms but this is kept at the lowest dose possible. If the patient deteriorates on reduction then higher doses are resumed short term to try to improve their symptoms.

I agree that patients who are not fit enough for definitive treatment, or who have received a single fraction of radiotherapy should have their steroids reduced gradually. Ideally they should be reduced gradually and then stopped over a 3–4 week period, or reduced and then maintained at the lowest possible dose at which their symptoms are controlled. ■

DR PETER ROBSON  
Consultant clinical oncologist, Clatterbridge Cancer Centre  
Liverpool, UK