

Imaging Febrile Urinary Tract Infections in Children: Great Clinical Gain may be obtained at a Low Cost

*Diego De Palma

Department of Nuclear Medicine, Circolo Hospital, Varese, Italy

*Corresponding author: Diego De Palma, Department of Nuclear Medicine, Circolo Hospital, Varese, Italy, Tel: 39332278667; E-mail: didepal@tin.it

Rec date: Mar 13, 2014, Acc date: May 24, 2014, Pub date: May 27, 2014

Copyright: © 2014 Palma DD, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Keywords: Febrile UTI; Scintigraphy; DMSA; Pediatrics; Top-Down

Urinary Tract Infection

Urinary Tract Infections (UTI), i.e. “the growth of at least 5×10^4 colony forming units of bacteria in a clean urine specimen” [1] are a common problem in childhood. They can have variable clinical presentation, but dividing them in febrile (f-UTI) and non-febrile, is a rough but practical way.

The need for imaging in children with f-UTIs is debated, in the search for a balance between reducing hospitalization, cost and irradiation but nevertheless minimizing renal damage. Different guidelines have been recently published [1-3].

One of the most “hot topic” is the best use of radionuclide imaging. It is beyond any doubt that Ultrasound (US) is an unreliable method for identifying either acute or chronic renal damage [4,5], whilst, on the contrary, cortical renal scintigraphy (CRS) with Dimercapto-succinic Acid (DMSA) is so highly accurate [6] that it is considered actually the clinical gold standard, as confirmed by all guidelines published [1-3].

Another way to look at f-UTI then arouse, first foresaw by Hansson and coworkers [7]: To perform a CRS during the acute phase of the infection and then searching for vesicoureteral reflux (VUR) only in children with renal damage. This strategy was named “Top-Down”, taking care of upper urinary tract (TOP) before the lower one (DOWN), and received the endorsement of the European Society of Paediatric Radiology [8].

The most feared drawbacks against this use of CRS are an increase in costs and radiation burden.

A paper recently published by La Scola et al [9] reviewed these aspects, and found that the top-down effectively implies a higher cost and radiation burden. This increase, on the other hand, is very limited. The cost in fact is calculated about 88-172 euros pro-patient, very small in comparison to the mean cost of one day of hospital staying or the expenses in case of relapse of f-UTI. The radiation burden is below 1 mSv [10], i.e. less than half the yearly natural background. This low cost offers us the greater gain of maximizing the detection of renal damage, a definite flaw of the published guidelines. The above mentioned review in fact, notes that the National Institute for Clinical Excellence Guidelines allow to identify only 38% of patients with acquired renal damage, the American Academy of Pediatrics none (!), the Italian Society of Paediatric Nephrology 47%. Very poor figures compared to the round 100% of the top-down....

So, the “top-down” approach in children with normal US, definitely improves the identification of children at risk for renal damage [11-13]. A normal CRS during the acute phase of UTI allows to safely

dismiss the child without programming further investigation(s) as outpatient. On the contrary, in case of true acute pyelonephritis, investigation for VUR can be scheduled without waiting for a relapse. A first paper lends further support to this approach. Suson & Mathews [14], retrospectively analysing the clinical application of the AAP guidelines to a population of children with the first episode of f-UTI, found that one third of those with abnormal renal scan has a normal US and 62% had an undiagnosed grade 3 or more VUR.

References

1. American Academy Of Pediatrics (2011), Steering Committee on Quality Improvement, Subcommittee on Urinary Tract Infection: Urinary Tract Infection: Clinical Practice Guideline for the Diagnosis and Management of the Initial UTI in Febrile Infants and Children 2 to 24 Months. *Pediatrics* 128: 595-610.
2. Ammenti A1, Cataldi L, Chimenz R, Fanos V, La Manna A, et al. (2012) Febrile urinary tract infections in young children: recommendations for the diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Acta Paediatr* 101: 451-457.
3. Tullus K, Jadresic L, Lakhanpaul M (2008) on behalf of urinary tract infection in children guideline development group. A new imaging strategy for children following UTI: results of an evidence based approach to guideline development carried out for the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) UK. *Pediatr Nephrol*; 23: 1596
4. Sinha MD, Gibson P, Kane T, Lewis MA (2007) Accuracy of ultrasonic detection of renal scarring in different centres using DMSA as the gold standard. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 22: 2213-2216.
5. Yoo JM, Koh JS, Han CH, Lee SL, Ha US, et al. (2010) Diagnosing Acute Pyelonephritis with CT, Tc-DMSA SPECT, and Doppler Ultrasound: A Comparative Study. *Korean J Urol* 51: 260-265.
6. Majd M, Nussbaum Blask AR, Markle BM, Shalaby-Rana E, Pohl HG, et al. (2001) Acute pyelonephritis: comparison of diagnosis with 99mTc-DMSA, SPECT, spiral CT, MR imaging, and power Doppler US in an experimental pig model. *Radiology* 218: 101-108.
7. Hansson S, Dhamey M, Sigström O, Sixt R, Stokland E, et al. (2004) Dimercapto-succinic acid scintigraphy instead of voiding cystourethrography for infants with urinary tract infection. *J Urol* 172: 1071-1073.
8. Riccabona M, Avni FE, Blickman JG, Dacher JN, Darge K, et al. (2008) Imaging recommendations in paediatric urology: minutes of the ESPR workgroup session on urinary tract infection, fetal hydronephrosis, urinary tract ultrasonography and voiding cystourethrography, Barcelona, Spain, June 2007. *Pediatr Radiol*; 38: 138-145.
9. La Scola C, De Mutiis C, Hewitt IK, Puccio G, Toffolo A, et al. (2013) Different guidelines for imaging after first UTI in febrile infants: yield, cost, and radiation. *Pediatrics* 131: e665-671.
10. Piepsz A, Colarinha P, Gordon I, Hahn K, Olivier P, et al. (2001) Guidelines for 99mTc-DMSA scintigraphy in children. *Eur J Nucl Med* 28: BP37-41.
11. Herz D, Merguerian P, McQuiston L, Danielson C, Gheen M, et al. (2010) 5-year prospective results of dimercapto-succinic acid imaging in children with febrile urinary tract infection: proof that the top-down approach works. *J Urol* 184: 1703-1709.

-
12. Ording Müller LS. (2011) Imaging in urinary tract infection: top-down or down-up? *Pediatr Radiol*; 41 [Suppl 1]: S96-S98.
 13. Preda I, Jodal U, Sixt R, Stokland E, Hansson S (2011) Imaging strategy for infants with urinary tract infection: a new algorithm. *J Urol* 185: 1046-1052.
 14. Suson KD, Mathews R2 (2014) Evaluation of children with urinary tract infection--impact of the 2011 AAP guidelines on the diagnosis of vesicoureteral reflux using a historical series. *J Pediatr Urol* 10: 182-185.