

PEARLS Practical Evidence About Real Life Situations

Short course of antibiotics as effective as standard duration for streptococcal pharyngitis in children

Clinical question	How effective is 2 to 6 days of oral antibiotics (short
United question	duration) compared to 10 days of oral penicillin (standard
	duration) in treating children with acute group A beta haemolytic streptococcus (GABHS) pharyngitis?
Dettem line	Threeto 6 days' treatment with oral antibiotics
Bottom line	(macrolides, cephalosporinsor amoxicillin) has
	comparable efficacy to the standard-duration 10days of
1	oral penicillin in treating children with acute
	GABHSpharyngitis. Compared to standard-duration
	treatment, theshort-duration treatment had shorter
	periods of fever, and throatsoreness, lower risk of early
	clinical treatment failure, nosignificant difference in early
	bacteriological treatment failure orlate clinical recurrence.
	The shorter duration of antibiotic treatmentmay be more convenient to the patient, will improve compliance
	and reduce failure rate, reduce return visits to the
	physician, andultimately overall cost. No conclusions can
	be drawn on the comparisonof complication rates of
	acute rheumatic fever and acutepoststreptococcal
	glomerulonephritis.
Caveat	The short-duration treatment (2-6 days) resulted in better
	compliance, butmore side effects (mostly self-limiting
	mild to moderate diarrhoea, vomiting and abdominal
	pain). In areas where the prevalence of rheumatic heart
	disease is still high, these results must beinterpreted with
	caution.
Context	Thestandard-duration treatment for acute GABHS
	pharyngitis with oralpenicillin is 10 days. Shorter-duration
	antibiotics may have comparableefficacy.
Cochrane Systematic	AltamimiS et al. Short versus standard duration antibiotic
Review	therapy for acutestreptococcal pharyngitis in
	children.Cochrane Reviews 2009, Issue 1.Article No.
series many, is not or	CD004872. DOI: 10.1002/ 14651858.CD004872.pub2.
	This reviewcontains 20 studies involving 13,102
1 1 21141	participants.
PEARLS 160, May 2009, written by Brian R McAvoy	
[References]	ARE FIELD

PEARLS provide guidance on whether a treatment is effective or ineffective. PEARLS are prepared as an educational resource and do not replace clinician judgement in the management of individual cases.

View PEARLS online at:

• www.cochraneprimarycare.org

PEARLS are succinct summaries of Cochrane Systematic Reviews for primary care practitioners. They are funded by the New Zealand Guidelines Group.