

had a chest CT scan on referral. They fail, however, to describe a role for chest CT, but do imply that it may be indicated for patients undergoing video-assisted thoracoscopic drainage (VATS). There is no evidence in the current literature supporting the use of CT scans before VATS. The British Thoracic Society guidelines do not recommend routine CT scans in children with empyema.²

In our centre all patients with empyema requiring intervention undergo VATS (approximately 40/year). We would suggest that chest CT scanning is not indicated before VATS in nearly all cases. We have found chest CT scans to be helpful, however, in situations where the patient has not responded to appropriate treatment with antibiotics and VATS. In this situation the possibilities are reaccumulation of pleural fluid, abscess formation or more extensive parenchymal involvement, differential diagnoses that are distinguished by CT scanning and information that is critical to the decision to reoperate (or not).

In addition, Jaffe *et al* do not take the opportunity to critically examine the role of chest ultrasound scans in patients with empyema. In our experience, clinical examination and chest radiography can determine the presence of pleural fluid. If the purpose of the ultrasound scan is to determine whether the fluid is simple (a parapneumonic effusion) or organised (empyema), this can be achieved more simply with a lateral decubitus or erect chest radiograph. The decision to undertake definitive management with urokinase or VATS is determined by the presence of unremitting infection and/or fluid volume in the pleural space. It is an outdated paradigm that the distinction between simple and organised pleural fluid makes any difference to subsequent treatment or outcome. The main use for ultrasound scanning should be for those children who are found to have a unilateral white-out on the chest radiograph at presentation and for whom the distinction between pleural space and parenchymal disease is difficult to make.

J Massie, N Pillarisetti, S Ranganathan

Department of Respiratory Medicine, Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia

Correspondence to: Associate Professor J Massie, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, Melbourne 3052, Australia; john.massie@rch.org.au

Competing interests: None.

Accepted 26 June 2008

REFERENCES

1. Jaffe A, Calder AD, Owens CM, *et al*. The role of routine computed tomography in paediatric pleural empyema. *Thorax*. Published Online First 20 May 2008. doi: 10.1136/thx.2007.094250.
2. Balfour-Lynn IM, Abrahamson GC, Cohen G, *et al*. BTS guidelines for the management of pleural infection in children. *Thorax* 2005;**60**(Suppl 1):i1–21.

Author's response

We thank Massie *et al* for correctly questioning the clinical need for routine chest CT scanning before performing video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery (VATS). Our study was pragmatically designed to reflect clinical practice in our institute, where thoracic surgeons routinely request a pre-operative CT scan for use as a "road map" when performing minimally invasive endoscopic surgery where direct visual access is limited. This helps to plan and assist in placement of the ports and instruments in order to decrease risk and avoid potential complications such as bronchopleural fistula which would result as a consequence of puncturing the lung parenchyma in close proximity to the pleura. We agree with them that there is no evidence base to support this practice in terms of risk, and our study was not designed to answer this question.

The principle of providing surgical "road maps" (which cross-sectional imaging now provides) is prevalent in many areas of cardiothoracic imaging where CT and MRI are added as an adjunct to echocardiography and ultrasound scans in order to enhance anatomical (and, indeed, sometimes functional) information to enhance quality and provide a safer more informed patient journey.

We are surprised that Massie *et al* advocate the use of a lateral decubitus chest radiograph in place of an ultrasound scan which is not, in fact, a recommendation of the BTS guidelines. Indeed, this would be a retrograde step in terms of the quality of information and the radiation burden, and should only be advocated where there is no access to ultrasound.

As discussed in our paper, ultrasound is an invaluable tool as it is cheap, mobile, easy to use, can differentiate transonic from purulent fluid, solid lung from fluid and enables the radiologist to mark the spot for chest drain insertion. Although it has been used to stage the disease, we agree that it is not useful in predicting the clinical outcome as was evident in our study. Importantly, ultrasound does not carry a radiation burden.

One of the key messages we had hoped to emphasise in our study is the critical need to reduce exposure of children to unnecessary radiation. With this in mind, we disagree with Massie *et al* and continue to advocate the use of ultrasound as the most important imaging modality in managing children with empyema. The BTS guidelines also support this view.

A Jaffe,¹ A D Calder,² C M Owens,² S Stanojevic,³ S Sonnappa^{3,4}

¹ Sydney Children's Hospital, Randwick and University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia; ² Department of Radiology, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Trust, London, UK; ³ Portex Anaesthesia, Intensive Therapy and Respiratory Unit, Institute of Child Health, London, UK; ⁴ Department of Respiratory Medicine, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Trust, London, UK

Correspondence to: Dr A Jaffe, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Sydney Children's Hospital, High Street,

Randwick, Sydney, NSW 2031, Australia; adam.jaffe@sesiahs.health.nsw.gov.au

Competing interests: None.

CORRECTIONS

doi:10.1136/thx.2008.101691corr1

A U Wells, N Hirani, and on behalf of the British Thoracic Society Interstitial Lung Disease Guideline Group, a subgroup of the British Thoracic Society Standards of Care Committee, in collaboration with the Thoracic Society of Australia and New Zealand and the Irish Thoracic Soc. Interstitial lung disease guideline: the British Thoracic Society in collaboration with the Thoracic Society of Australia and New Zealand and the Irish Thoracic Society. *Thorax* 2008;**63**(Suppl V):v1–v58.

The correct list of authors for these guidelines is: B Bradley, H M Branley, J J Egan (Irish Thoracic Society), M S Greaves, D M Hansell, N K Harrison, N Hirani, R Hubbard, F Lake (TSANZ), A B Millar, W A H Wallace, A U Wells, M K Whyte, M L Wilsher (TSANZ), The British Thoracic Society Standards of Care Committee, in collaboration with the Thoracic Society of Australia and New Zealand, and the Irish Thoracic Society.

doi:10.1136/thx.2005.047803corr1

G J Rodrigo, J A Castro-Rodriguez. Anticholinergics in the treatment of children and adults with acute asthma: a systematic review with meta-analysis (*Thorax* 2005;**60**:740–6). This article was originally published with an incorrect digital object identifier (doi). It has been updated with the correct doi: 10.1136/thx.2005.047803. We apologise for any inconvenience caused.

doi:10.1136/thx.2005.058156corr1

T Hirano, T Yamagata, M Gohda, *et al*. Inhibition of reactive nitrogen species production in COPD airways: comparison of inhaled corticosteroid and oral theophylline (*Thorax* 2006;**61**:761–6). This article was originally published with an incorrect digital object identifier (doi). It has been updated with the correct doi: 10.1136/thx.2005.058156. We apologise for any inconvenience caused.

doi:10.1136/thx.2005.057935corr1

J Batra, T P Singh, U Mabalirajan, *et al*. Association of inducible nitric oxide synthase with asthma severity, total serum immunoglobulin E and blood eosinophil levels (*Thorax* 2007;**62**:16–22). This article was originally published with an incorrect digital object identifier (doi). It has been updated with the correct doi: 10.1136/thx.2005.057935. We apologise for any inconvenience caused.