John’s wort, echinacea, saw palmetto, and glucosamine following negative studies. Despite studies showing that echinacea does not treat cold symptoms, it is one of the best selling supplements in the United States with estimated sales exceeding $300 million per year.6

Dr Leach claims that I supported my position “through the selective reporting of a few clinical studies.” However, all studies are not equal. The studies I selected regarding ginkgo, chondroitin sulfate, glucosamine, garlic, St John’s wort, milk thistle, and echinacea were the best controlled, most rigorous, and most internally consistent. Indeed, most of these excellent studies were supported by NCCAM.

Briggs and Killen and Leach argue that refraining from studying alternative medicine would deny the public much-needed clinical data to make informed health care decisions. In a better world, of course, this discussion would not be happening. In a better world, dietary supplements and alternative therapies would be subject to testing before claims were allowed, as is required by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for licensure of drugs, biologicals, and medical devices. Now patients are stuck with a system in which some alternative medicines might be tested after claims have been made and after nutraceutical companies have spent millions of dollars “educating” the public. At best, NCCAM functions as a post-hoc FDA, except without the FDA’s regulatory authority and without the communication skills or dollars to confront a well-heeled nutraceutical industry. Sadly, until the 1994 Dietary Supplement and Health Education Act—which essentially freed the nutraceutical industry from FDA oversight—is repealed, consumers will continue to receive bad information that could lead to bad medical decisions, NCCAM or no NCCAM.

Paul Offit, MD
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Incomplete Financial Disclosure in a Viewpoint on Complementary and Alternative Therapies

To the Editor: I would like to report an incomplete financial disclosure related to a Viewpoint published in JAMA.1 While the topic of the Viewpoint was complementary and alternative therapies, vaccine safety was mentioned. I did not understand then that conflicts of interest related to vaccines needed to be reported. I would like to disclose that I am the co-inventor and co-patent holder of the bovine-human reassortant rotavirus vaccine Rotateq. My hospital sold the patent more than 3 years ago, but I retained interest in the vaccine through the Wistar Institute. I sold that interest 2 years ago and do not currently receive royalties from the sales of Rotateq. In addition, I have been the author of a number of books related to vaccine safety; all profits from the sales of these books are donated to charity.

I apologize to the readers and editors of JAMA for failing to report this disclosure.

Paul A. Offit, MD
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Number and Order of Whole Cell Pertussis Vaccines in Infancy and Disease Protection

To the Editor: Due to their lower rate of adverse events, acellular pertussis vaccines (diphtheria-tetanus-acellular pertussis; DTaP) replaced whole cell vaccines (diphtheria-tetanus-whole cell pertussis; DTwP) in many developed countries during the 1990s. DTaP became available in Queensland, Australia, in 1996 and replaced DTwP for publicly funded primary course immunizations delivered at ages 2 months, 4 months, and 6 months in March 1999. This meant children born in 1998 could receive a primary course consisting of only DTwP, only DTaP, or a mixed schedule. Similar to North America,1 Australia is experiencing a sustained pertussis epidemic,2 with the highest incidence rates in Queensland during 2011 in children aged 6 to 11 years. The recent changes in pertussis epidemiology may be related to the shift from DTwP to DTaP. To test this hypothesis, we compared pertussis reporting rates by primary course vaccination in the 1998 birth cohort.

Methods. Reporting pertussis cases to the health department is mandatory in Queensland. For children born in 1998, we calculated pertussis reporting rates in both the preepidemic (1998-2008) and outbreak periods (2009-2011), by number and order of DTwP doses given before their first birthday. We linked data from the Queensland vaccination registry (QVR) with case reports of pertussis. The QVR is not a population-based register so we could not construct a group of wholly unvaccinated children for comparison. Children were censored following initial reporting. We calculated average annual incidence rates, incidence rate differences, incidence rate ratios, and 95% confidence intervals using Stata version 12 (StataCorp). The Queensland Children’s Health Services ethics committee approved the study.

Results. Of 58 233 children born in 1998 identified in the QVR, 40494 (69.5%) received at least 3 doses of any per-
tussis-containing vaccine during the first year from a Queensland vaccine service provider and were included in the analysis. Overall, 267 first pertussis cases were reported from this cohort between 1999 and 2011; 2 second reports were excluded.

Children who received a 3-dose DTaP primary course had higher rates of pertussis than those who received a 3-dose DTwP primary course in the preepidemic and outbreak periods (TABLE and FIGURE). Among those who received mixed courses, rates in the current epidemic were highest for children receiving DTaP as their first dose. This pattern remained when looking at subgroups with 1 or 2 DTwP doses in the first year of life, although it did not reach statistical significance (Table). Children who received a mixed course with DTwP as the initial dose had incidence rates that were between rates for the pure course DTwP and DTaP cohorts (Table).

**Comment.** Infant priming with DTwP was associated with a lower risk of subsequent pertussis than DTaP only primed children in this cohort. This difference persisted for more than a decade, being evident in preepidemic and outbreak periods. A primary course using even a moderately effective DTwP vaccine may be more protective than DTaP.3 In the preacellular era, Australia used a locally produced DTwP.

### Table. Pertussis Reports Between 1999 and 2011 for Children Born in 1998 (N = 40,694)†

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preepidemic (1999-2008)</th>
<th>Incidence (95% CI)</th>
<th>No. of Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTaP primary course (n = 9827)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.2 (7.0 to 22.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTwP primary course (n = 22,956)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2 (2.7 to 9.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outbreak (2009-2011)</th>
<th>Incidence (95% CI)</th>
<th>No. of Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTaP primary course (n = 9827)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>373.1 (306.7 to 449.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTwP primary course (n = 22,956)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>113.3 (89.5 to 141.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed course</th>
<th>Incidence (95% CI)</th>
<th>No. of Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First dose of DTaP (n = 978)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>409.0 (211.3 to 714.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First dose of DTwP (n = 6093)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>201.9 (145.5 to 273.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed course by No. of DTwP doses</th>
<th>Incidence (95% CI)</th>
<th>No. of Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 dose of DTwP only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First dose of DTaP (n = 549)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>364.3 (133.7 to 792.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First dose of DTwP (n = 2501)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>266.6 (162.8 to 411.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2 doses of DTwP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>466.2 (171.1 to 1014.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First dose of DTwP (n = 4,432)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>165.5 (103.7 to 250.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: DTaP, diphtheria-tetanus-acellular pertussis; DTwP, diphtheria-tetanus-whole cell pertussis.

†A primary vaccination course is defined as 3 or more doses of a pertussis-containing vaccine for infants younger than 12 months of age. Analysis excludes records for infants with no vaccination history recorded before 12 months of age (n = 6806), those with vaccination history provided by outside source (not a Queensland vaccine service provider; n = 4129), those with irregularity of the vaccine dose by number or description (n = 191), and those with less than 3 vaccination doses recorded (n = 6412).

©2012 American Medical Association. All rights reserved.

**Figure.** Pertussis Reporting Rates Between 1999 and 2011 by Primary Course of Pertussis Vaccination for Children Born in 1998

DTaP indicates diphtheria-tetanus-acellular pertussis; DTwP, diphtheria-tetanus-whole cell pertussis.
vaccine with very good to excellent effectiveness. Our findings suggest the most important factor, in this cohort, may be the initial vaccine received.

It is unlikely our findings during the current outbreak are the result of detection bias because this would require health care–seeking behavior, or the likelihood of laboratory testing or reporting, to be associated with the primary course received by children over a decade previously.

Possible explanations for our findings could include antigenic shifts in circulating *Bordetella pertussis* strains or the different immune responses from acellular and whole-cell priming. The lesser protection provided by DTaP, both as the initial vaccine or full primary course, may be due to linked epitope suppression, when the initial exposure locks in the immune response to certain epitopes and inhibits response to other linked epitopes on subsequent exposures.

The challenge for future pertussis vaccine development is to address the benefit-risk trade-off highlighted by our study, and to develop vaccines that induce long-lasting protection from the first dose, without the adverse events associated with DTwP use.

Sarah L. Sheridan, BMEd, MAppEpid
Robert S. Ware, PhD
Keith Grimwood, MB, ChB, MD

Stephen B. Lambert, MBBS, PhD

Author Affiliations: Queensland Children’s Medical Research Institute, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia (s.sheridan@uq.edu.au).

Author Contributions: Dr Sheridan had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: Sheridan, Ware, Grimwood, Lambert.
Analysis and interpretation of data: Sheridan, Ware, Lambert.
Drafting of the manuscript: Sheridan, Lambert.
Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Sheridan, Ware, Grimwood, Lambert.
Statistical analysis: Sheridan.
Administrative, technical, or material support: Sheridan, Ware.
Study supervision: Grimwood, Lambert.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: The authors have completed and submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest. Drs Grimwood and Lambert reported receiving honoraria for serving on GlaxoSmithKline and sanofi-pasteur advisory boards for pneumococcal and influenza vaccines, respectively. Drs Sheridan and Ware did not report any disclosures.

Funding/Support: Dr Sheridan is supported by an Australian postgraduate award from the Australian government and a clinical scholarship from Queensland Children’s Medical Research Institute. Dr Lambert is supported by an early career fellowship from the National Health and Medical Research Council and is a Queensland Children’s Medical Research Institute senior research fellow.

Role of the Sponsor: None of the funding sources had a role in the design and conduct of the study; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data; or in the preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript.

Additional Contributions: We recognize Christine E. Selvey, MBBS, MSc (senior director of Communicable Diseases Branch, Queensland Health), for supporting the research; Craig A. Davis, MAppSc, BA, MAppEpid, and Angela Wakefield, BHSs (both with Communicable Diseases Branch, Queensland Health), for data extraction; and Vicki Bryant, BNurs, and Madeline A. Hall, BNurs (both with the Immunisation Program, Queensland Health), for assisting in vaccination record interpretation. The persons listed in this section provided assistance while employed by Queensland Health and did not receive additional financial compensation for their contributions.


**CORRECTION**

Clarification of Conflict of Interest Disclosure: In a Viewpoint entitled “Studying Complementary and Alternative Therapies” published in the May 2, 2012, issue of *JAMA* (2012;307[17]:1803-1804), the conflict of interest disclosure for Dr Offit should have read as follows: “Dr Offit reports having held the patent and received royalties from the sale of Rotarix vaccine within the last 3 years, although his interest in the vaccine was sold 2 years ago.” A letter regarding the correction appears in this issue. The article has been corrected online.