

Clinical characteristics of new patients attending neurology outpatient clinics. Values are numbers (percentages) unless indicated otherwise

	Patients with suicidal ideation* (n=26)	Patients without suicidal ideation (n=274)	Relative risk (95% CI)
Men	12 (46)	114 (42)	1.11 (0.71 to 1.72)
Women	14 (54)	160 (58)	0.84 (0.40 to 1.76)
Age ≤40 years	15 (58)	128 (47)	1.50 (0.71 to 3.15)
Has medically unexplained symptoms	12 (46)	78 (28)	1.62 (1.03 to 2.56)
Has non-progressive neurological disease†	12 (46)	153 (56)	0.83 (0.54 to 1.27)
Has potentially progressive neurological disease‡	2 (8)	43 (16)	0.49 (0.13 to 1.91)
Major depressive disorder diagnosed	23 (88)	54 (20)	4.49 (3.40 to 5.92)
Identified as needing psychiatric assessment:§			
By general practitioner	8 (31)	43 (16)	NA
By neurologist	12 (46)	40 (15)	NA
Not identified	11 (42)	170 (62)	NA

NA=not applicable.

\*Prevalence is 9% (95% CI 6% to 12%).

†Includes conditions such as epilepsy, headache, migraine, and neuropathy.

‡Includes conditions such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, and brain tumours.

§Not specifically identified as being suicidal.

## Comment

Our findings do not support the view that suicidal ideation occurring in neurology patients is largely a rational response to progressive physical illness. Instead, the findings underscore the importance of major depressive disorder in influencing the ways that medically ill patients think about their illnesses and themselves.

The prevalence of 9% (95% confidence interval 6% to 12%) for significant suicidal ideation described in this study is higher than the 2-3% described as occurring in primary care and community settings in the United States.<sup>5</sup> We are unaware of any data that indicate what proportion of those who are medically ill

and who report suicidal ideation actually go on to kill themselves. None the less, suicidal ideation of the type considered important in this study is clinically significant: it would be taken seriously during a psychiatric consultation.

It is encouraging that 58% of those patients with suicidal ideation were identified by either the general practitioner or the neurologist as needing psychiatric or psychological assessment or treatment. However, general practitioners and neurologists did not always identify the same patients. This highlights the importance of assessing the mental state of medically ill patients and the importance of communication of the findings between general practitioners and specialists.

Contributors: AC developed the primary hypothesis, discussed core ideas and study design, contributed to data collection and analysis, and participated in writing of the paper. SB assisted with data collection and analysis and contributed to writing the paper. CW and MS discussed core ideas and the design of the study and contributed to writing the paper. MS is guarantor for the paper.

Funding: This study was supported by the University of Edinburgh.

Competing interests: None declared.

- 1 Diekstra RFW. The epidemiology of suicide and parasuicide. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1993;371(suppl):9-20.
- 2 Feinstein A. Multiple sclerosis, depression, and suicide: clinicians should pay more attention to psychopathology. *BMJ* 1997;315:691-2.
- 3 Carson AJ, Ringbauer B, MacKenzie L, Warlow C, Sharpe M. Neurological disease, emotional disorder and disability: they are related. A study of 300 consecutive new referrals to neurology outpatient clinics. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2000;68:202-6.
- 4 Spitzer RL, Williams JB, Kroenke K, Linzer M, deGruy FV, Hahn SR, et al. Utility of a new procedure for diagnosing mental disorders in primary care. The PRIME-MD 1000 study. *JAMA* 1994;272:1749-56.
- 5 Paykel ES, Myers JK, Lindenthal JJ, Tanner J. Suicidal feelings in the general population. A prevalence study. *Br J Psychiatry* 1974;124:460-9. (Accepted 24 February 2000)

## Home collection of urine for culture from infants by three methods: survey of parents' preferences and bacterial contamination rates

Lynster C T Liaw, Deepa M Nayar, Stephen J Pedler, Malcolm G Coulthard

Royal Victoria Infirmary, Queen Victoria Road, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4LP

Lynster C T Liaw specialist registrar in paediatric nephrology

Malcolm G Coulthard consultant paediatric nephrologist

Deepa M Nayar specialist registrar in microbiology

Stephen J Pedler consultant microbiologist

Correspondence to: M G Coulthard malcolm.coulthard@ncl.ac.uk

BMJ 2000;320:1312-3

Urinary tract infection is common in childhood. Infants are most likely to scar and often have non-specific symptoms. Because of practical difficulties with collecting urine, samples are often not obtained.<sup>1</sup> Most samples are collected by parents,<sup>2</sup> yet nobody has sought parents' views on available methods. We assessed contamination rates and parents' opinions of three common methods used at home.

## Subject, methods, and results

Parents of children aged 1 to 18 months volunteered to collect urine at home by pads, bags, and clean catch in a randomised order, on one day. The study had ethics committee approval. Demonstrations and instruction sheets were given. Parents washed their hands before each procedure and the child's perineum before each collection. Pads (Newcastle sterile urine collection packs, Ontex UK, Corby) were placed inside the nappy and checked every 10 minutes until wet (but not soiled), then

urine aspirated with a syringe. Bags (Hollister U-Bag, Hollister, Libertyville, IL) were applied and inspected every 10 minutes and removed to decant the urine. For clean catch samples, infants were nursed with a sterile bottle ready. Samples were immediately instilled on to dipslides (Till-U-Test, Dimanco, Bedfordshire) with sterile swabsticks and returned with forms recording parents' collection times, comments, and rankings. Equipment costs were: pads 40 pence for 10 (or 59p for a pack containing syringe, bottle, and two pads); bag 89p; sterile bottle 7p; dipslide and swabstick 59p.

Forty four parents attempted collections (29 boys, median age 4 months, range 1 to 18 months). No samples were obtained from one baby with diarrhoea, and no other child had a urine infection. Bacterial counts were <10<sup>4</sup>/ml (typically reported as "insignificant" or "no growth") from 31 (70%) pads, 29 (66%) bags, and 33 (75%) clean catch collections. Seven samples from pads, eight from bags, and one from clean catch collection had contamination (>10<sup>4</sup>/ml of one or more

Assessments by 44 parents of three methods of home urine collection

Parents' assessments	No of parents:		
	Pad	Bag	Clean catch
<b>Preference order</b>			
First	21	18	5
Second	19	12	13
Third	4	14	26
<b>Open comments</b>			
<b>Positive</b>			
Easy, hygienic, or quick	25	24	8
Comfortable for child	10	3	0
<b>Negative</b>			
Uncomfortable or distressing	1	26	3
Fiddly or messy	9	10	20
Impractical or time consuming	10	0	36
Difficult to get urine out of pad	8	—	—
Red marks left on skin	—	11	—
Too much trouble—gave up (boys)	1 (0)	4 (3)	9 (5)

organism). Nine samples (8%) from five children (four boys) grew  $>10^5$  coliforms/ml, suggesting infection. However, this was excluded by sterile samples collected on the same day or on immediate repeat in hospital.

Parents found the pads and bags easy to use and preferred them to clean catch collections (table) for both sexes. The pad was considered comfortable, whereas the bag was distressing, particularly on removal, often leaking and leaving red marks. Some found extracting the urine from the pad or emptying it from the bag to be awkward. Most parents complained that clean catch collections were time consuming and often messy; nine gave up after prolonged attempts. Five parents whose infants voided immediately ranked it best. The median collection time was 25 minutes for each method, but parents resented constraining their children this long for clean catch collections.

## Comment

This is the first study of parents' views of infant urine collection methods. Pad, bag, and clean catch samples were equally effective at excluding an infection; variations in contamination rates balanced collection failures. Most parents disliked clean catch collections; their views should be heeded. Most preferred pads to bags, and they are cheaper. They also found inoculating dipslides with swabsticks easy; this technique may have contributed to their relatively low contamination rates.<sup>3,4</sup>

Since Kass suggested a diagnostic cut off of a single bacterial species cultured at  $>10^5$ /ml, it has been widely taken as proof of a urine infection and assumed not to occur from skin contamination, even though his study<sup>5</sup> and others<sup>3</sup> recorded similar false positive rates to ours. False positive results potentially lead to inappropriate treatment and imaging. Suprapubic puncture is an unrealistic alternative in primary care. Although collecting multiple samples would reduce the false positive rate, it might delay antibiotic treatment.

We thank the parents for volunteering and their thoughtful comments and Dr Mohammad Raza for microbiological help.

Contributors: MGC had the original idea for the study and is the guarantor. The study was designed, the data analysed, and the paper written jointly by all the authors. LDTL carried out the clinical aspects and DMN and SJP the laboratory aspects of the study.

Funding: None.

Competing interests: The Children's Kidney Fund of the Newcastle University Hospitals special trustees receives royalties from Ontex UK from sales of Newcastle sterile urine collection packs.

- Jadresic L, Cartwright K, Cowie N, Witcombe B, Stevens D. Investigation of urinary tract infection in childhood. *BMJ* 1993;307:761-4.
- Vernon S, Foo CK, Coulthard MG. General practice management of children with urinary tract infection: an audit in the former Northern region. *Br J Gen Pract* 1997;47:297-300.
- Hardy JD, Furnell PM, Brumfit W. Comparison of sterile bag, clean catch and suprapubic aspiration in the diagnosis of urinary infection in early childhood. *Br J Urol* 1976;48:279-83.
- Macfarlane PI, Houghton C, Hughes C. Pad urine collection for early childhood urinary-tract infection. *Lancet* 1999;354:571.
- Kass EH. Asymptomatic infections of the urinary tract. *Trans Assoc Am Phys* 1956;69:56-63.

(Accepted 22 February 2000)

## Corrections and clarifications

*ABC of vascular disease: Vascular complications of diabetes*

An error crept into a figure in this article by Richard Donnelly and colleagues (15 April, pp 1062-6). In the Kaplan-Meier plot at the top of p 1065, the definition of less tight control should be  $<180/105$  (not  $<180/85$ ) mm Hg.

*Mimerva*

Minerva slipped up on two names, one personal and one taxonomic, in the picture article in the issue of 18 March (p 814). The third author's name is R Whitfield; the culture grown was *Mycobacterium marinum*.

## Email submissions from outside the United Kingdom

We are now offering an email submission service for authors from outside the UK. The address is [papers@bmj.com](mailto:papers@bmj.com)

Ideally our email server would link seamlessly with our manuscript tracking system, but for now it does not, which is why we are offering the service only to authors outside the UK. Most post in the UK arrives the next day, so UK authors have the least to gain in speed of delivery from email delivery. As soon as our systems improve we will invite email submissions from everyone.

If you choose to send your submission by email please would you send the text and any tables and figures as attached files, together with a covering letter giving all your contact details (postal

address, phone, fax, and email address). We can read files created with most word processing, graphics, and spreadsheet programs.

When your submission is received in our email box you will receive an automatic acknowledgment to show that it has arrived. If the submission is incomplete we will contact you and ask you to resend the missing information.

Once the submission is complete we will register it on our manuscript tracking system and you will receive a standard acknowledgment in the post.

Letters to the editor should continue to be sent direct to [bmj.com](mailto:bmj.com) as rapid responses or to [letters@bmj.com](mailto:letters@bmj.com)