PCP Prophylaxis in Perinatally HIV-Exposed Infant

CDC and WHO recommendations for PCP prophylaxis for HIV-exposed infants state that co-trimoxazole is indicated for HIV-exposed infants at 4-6 weeks and it needs to be continued till HIV PCR DNA tests on the infant on 2 occasions are negative; one done after 1 month of age and second after 4 months of age(1). With introduction of PACTG 076 protocol, risk of perinatal transmission of HIV infection has shown a dramatic decline from 24 to <5%(2). This implies that out of 100 mothers who are HIV-positive and on PACTG 076 management, only 5 unlucky infants will develop HIV infection. If above WHO PCP prophylaxis recommendations are followed, 95% of infants would have unnecessarily received PCP prophylaxis when in fact they are not infected with this deadly virus. Such a mass usage of co-trimoxazole carries with it risk of causing bacterial and malarial resistance. Besides, co-trimoxazole is not devoid of adverse-effects. I personally feel that some sort of a risk scoring should be done and co-trimoxazole prophylaxis offered only to those with high risk of acquiring the vertical infection. What is the recent opinion on it?

Sukhbir Kaur Shahid,
Consultant Pediatrician and Neonatologist,
Mumbai, Maharashtra,
India.
s_kaur_shahid@yahoo.com

REFERENCES

1. Revised guidelines for prophylaxis against *Pneumocystis carinii* pneumonia for children infected with or perinatally exposed to human immunodeficiency virus. MMWR Recommendations and Reports, 1995; 44(RR-4): 1-11.
2. Conner EM, Sperling RS, Gelber R, Kiselev P, Scott G, O'Sullivan MJ, *et al*. Reduction of maternal-infant transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 with zidovudine treatment. N Engl J Med 1994; 331: 1173-1180.

Reply

The recommendations for cotrimoxazole prophylaxis to infants born to HIV-positive mothers are mainly based on the following facts: high number of deaths from *Pneumocystis carinii (jirovecii)* pneumonia (PCP) in HIV-infected infants (especially between 2-6 months of age), efficacy of cotrimoxazole in preventing PCP in adults, and difficulties in determining the HIV infection in exposed infants due to persistence of maternal antibodies(1). Cotrimoxazole prophylaxis not only prevents PCP infection, but also prevents other opportunistic parasitic infections (toxoplasmosis, isosporiasis, etc), bacterial infections and malaria, and also decreases HIV-related mortality(1-3).

The side effects of cotrimoxazole-like rashes, fever, leucopenia, hepatitis, thrombocytopenia, etc. rarely require discontinuation of the prophylaxis (exception-Stevens Johnson syndrome) or therapy as most of these side effects are easily treatable(1,4). The drug appears to be better tolerated in children and risk of toxicity has been considered to be negligible(1,2,4,5). Desensitization and supportive therapy allow us to continue the prophylaxis. Other alternatives (dapsone, atovaquone, or pentamidine) are available in patients with severe adverse reactions. The dose of cotrimoxazole used for PCP prophylaxis is much lower than that used for treatment of PCP.

Resistance of *Pneumocystis jirovecii* to sulfonamides (and resistance of malarial parasite to sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine) is a possibility, but is usually not associated with treatment failure(3). Gill, *et al*.(1) (in a conceptual model of benefits and risks of cotrimoxazole prophylaxis) argue that the empirical prophylaxis is justifiable only at a higher level of HIV prevalence and by reduction of perinatal transmission (by drugs like nevirapine), the PCP risk is also indirectly lowered. However, the clinical importance of these theoretical concerns of drug resistance is not well understood or well