Correspondence

Safety of the Rifampin and Pyrazinamide Short-Course Regimen for Treating Latent Tuberculosis Infection

To the Editor—The recent article by Cook et al. [1], wherein they compared the outcomes of treating latent tuberculosis infection with short-course regimens of either rifampin and pyrazinamide (RZ) or rifampin alone versus isoniazid, deserves further comment. The investigators’ careful monitoring of the Pitt County Health Department (Greenville, NC) patients treated with these 3 regimens, plus their analysis of 5 years of treatment-outcome data, complements our previous reports [2–4].

First, although not specifically calculated in their article, the rate of hospitalization for liver injury among the patients receiving RZ was 1 in 291 persons (3.4 cases per 1000 patients), in spite of pre-selecting away from the RZ regimen those patients who might have been at greater risk for liver injury. This rate is similar to our reported point estimate of 3.7 cases per 1000 initiations of RZ [3].

We agree that the study by Cook et al. “provides a more realistic picture of the true toxicity of this regimen” [1, p. 274]. Thus, we question advocating the use of RZ despite the high observed rates of adverse events, even with intensive monitoring. Surveillance data indicate that RZ-associated fatalities continued despite revised recommendations for increased monitoring of patients [4]. Given the treatment options, the risk of liver injury outweighs the benefits of the RZ regimen.

The 2003 recommendation to generally not use RZ for the treatment of latent tuberculosis infection [2] reflected a consensus recommendation by a panel of experts. The data-driven guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American Thoracic Society was endorsed by the Infectious Diseases Society of America [2–4]. The preferred regimen is 9 months of daily or biweekly isoniazid therapy, with an alternative of 4 months of daily rifampin therapy [2]. Contrary to the authors’ interpretation, their findings reinforce the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American Thoracic Society’s recommendation that RZ should generally not be offered to persons with latent tuberculosis infection [2].
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Reply to Ijaz et al.

To the Editor—The hepatotoxicity of the 2-month pyrazinamide and rifampin (PZA-RIF) regimen for the treatment of latent tuberculosis infection (LTBI) is well described [1, 2]. Our article [3] confirmed that the toxicity of the PZA-RIF regimen was greater than the isoniazid (INH) regimen. However, before we throw the baby out with the bathwater, we should reexamine the purpose of treatment of LTBI and look at an unjaundiced eye at the efficacy of the “gold standard” of the 9-month regimen of INH.

Numerous studies have determined that certain high-risk populations are at increased risk for reactivation of dormant tuberculosis [4]. The efficacy of a 9-month regimen of INH in preventing reactivation of LTBI is well known. What is also known is that only 30%–60% of persons who begin treatment with INH actually complete therapy [4–6]. A recent study from Johns Hopkins [7] revealed that only 52.6% of 770 patients who were treated with INH took at least 80% of their medications over the 9-month period. Treatment with INH, although less toxic than PZA-RIF, still carries a significant risk of serious adverse effects, particularly among the elderly population and in patients who are treated with immunosuppressive agents for rheumatoid arthritis [8, 9]. Severe hepatotoxicity resulting in liver transplantation and death have been reported for many years in patients treated with INH for LTBI [10, 11]. There have been 3 INH-associated deaths in North Carolina in the past 4 years (unpublished data). Unlike it is for patients receiving PZA-RIF regimen, monitoring of liver functions is not routinely performed in patients who are treated with INH. This policy may lead to an underestimation of the actual incidence of hepatotoxicity in patients treated with INH.

In our cohort, none of the patients who developed hepatotoxicity because of PZA-RIF died. In fact, liver functions returned to normal in all patients when either PZA alone or both drugs were discontinued. We are increasingly using the 4-month regimen of rifampin to treat our patients with LTBI, because the hepatotoxicity is low and the completion rates are high for this regimen [7].

The authors from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention would have us believe that treatment of LTBI is a choice between good (INH) and evil (PZA-RIF). Would that the argument were simple. Our goal is for patients to complete therapy with whatever regimen is chosen. Given the greater likelihood of completing the short-course regimens (PZA-RIF for 2 months and RIF for 4 months) and the self-limited hepatotoxicity (in our hands) of the PZA-RIF regimen, we will continue to use both regimens in selected patients.
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Prevalence of Antibodies against Rubella Virus in Spain

To the Editor—Hyde et al. [1] report the results of a prevalence study of rubella immunity levels in the US population. In relation to their findings, we present our experience in a European country. The importance of the strategy of anticipating rubella revaccination, improved surveillance, and the implementation of specific vaccination programs against rubella addressing susceptible groups needs no emphasis [2, 3]. Recommendations by committees of experts and the prevailing childhood immunization schedules are unanimous in including the above-mentioned strategies [4]. In this context, ser-