surgery might potentate the focal undetected circulatory perturbations. The brain on the ischaemic side may be more sensitive to sedation and anaesthesia resulting in a differential action between the two hemispheres that persisted to PACU and precipitated a TIA.

Weiwu Pang
J. Collins
Rick Sai-Chuen Wu

1Lakeland, USA
2Taichung, Taiwan

*E-mail: sungfangrong@aol.com
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Psoas compartment block for lower extremity surgery

Editor—we read Touray and colleagues’ review of psoas compartment block (PCB) for lower extremity surgery with considerable interest. Although our own practice mirrors the benefits of PCB suggested by their meta-analysis, namely superior analgesia after hip surgery compared with either opioid or ‘3-in-1’ block analgesia, we were surprised by the conclusion that the duration of analgesia after single-injection PCB is limited to the first 4–8 h after operation.

We have recently completed an audit of morphine requirements in the immediate postoperative phase of 100 patients receiving PCB for hip surgery (elective and emergency). Eighty patients did not require any morphine in the post-anaesthesia care unit; 20 required 5–10 mg morphine. Analysis up to 48 h after operation suggests a morphine-sparing effect greater than that suggested, with a mean morphine requirement of 10 mg over this time period.

Our findings are more in line with those reported by Stevens and colleagues, and support the recommendations of the PROSPECT working group’s conclusion that PCB is a valuable technique in the management of analgesia for patients who have undergone total hip arthroplasty. Furthermore, we suggest that the extended duration of single-shot PCB may be of greatest benefit to elderly patients undergoing hip fracture surgery, in whom renal and respiratory co-morbidities may preclude excessive perioperative opioid analgesia although research remains to be done to support this hypothesis.

R. R. Byreddy*
C. M. Harper
S. M. White
Brighton, UK
*E-mail: raj_byreddy@yahoo.co.uk

Editor—we thank Dr Byreddy and colleagues for their interest in our review and the interesting data presented. In response to the question concerning the duration of analgesia with PCB, it is important to distinguish between pain quantified using a visual analogue scale (VAS) and opioid consumption. Although they are both measures of pain intensity, the two do not necessarily correlate.

To determine the duration of blockade with PCB, it makes more sense to analyse VAS scores as the VAS is a patient-centred outcome and direct measure of analgesia. In our meta-analysis, Figure 1 demonstrates that compared with opioids, single-injection PCB results in lower VAS scores only during first 4–8 h after block injection. A continuous
infusion, however, reduces VAS scores for the duration of the infusion as demonstrated in Figure 3 in our article. Opioid consumption on the other hand is an indirect measure of pain intensity. We agree that PCB is associated with an opioid-sparing effect, and therefore a lower cumulative opioid intake after surgery. Our review shows significantly lower opioid consumption up to 24 h after surgery.

Cumulative opioid consumption, however, provides no information on the duration of block with PCB. In fact, as a result of opioid sparing in the early postoperative period, cumulative opioid consumption would be expected to be lower in patients who have received a PCB at all time periods after surgery. To estimate the duration of block with PCB using opioid consumption, it makes more sense to analyse hourly opioid consumption or opioid consumption over short time intervals within a 48 h period. Unfortunately, these data are not available in the literature we identified for review.

We therefore reiterate our finding that compared with the gold standard (postoperative opioid titration), PCB is only effective for analgesia during the first 4–8 h after surgery. This analgesic effect results in reduced opioid titration in the early postoperative period which in turn results in a lower cumulative opioid intake after surgery. This conclusion is consistent with Dr Byreddy’s findings, although we cannot confirm his observation of reduced cumulative opioid consumption beyond 24 h as a result of lack of data in the studies we analysed. Our conclusion also supports the PROSPECT guidelines3 on single-injection PCB for hip surgery which recommends a cautious appraisal of the risk/benefit ratio of single-injection PCB on a case-by-case basis.

S. T. Touray
M. A. de Leeuw*
W. W. A. Zuurmond
R. S. G. M. Perez
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
*E-mail: madeleew@quicknet.nl
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Chlorhexidine anaphylaxis in Auckland

Editor—Parkes and colleagues1 case presentations and thorough discussion relating to chlorhexidine anaphylaxis prompted me to review our experience of chlorhexidine anaphylaxis at the Anaesthetic Allergy Testing Clinic within the Auckland City Hospital. This Clinic provides an anaesthetic allergy testing service for the Greater Auckland region of New Zealand. Some referrals from smaller centres in the country are also received.

Since 1998, we have encountered 26 patients with a clinical picture in keeping with anaphylaxis to chlorhexidine. Most of these patients had raised mast-cell tryptase (MCT) levels and all tested positive on skin-prick testing, using 2% aqueous skin wash. In every case (except one), we performed skin tests against all agents administered before the adverse event. These include anaesthetic agents, antibiotics, and ancillary drugs such as latex and chlorhexidine.

Parkes and colleagues noted responses to Instillagel® which contains chlorhexidine 0.25% in lidocaine gel 2%. The urinary lubricant used in Auckland is produced by Pfizer. This contains chlorhexidine 0.05% in lidocaine gel 2%. Our first patient, a woman, in 1998, responded adversely to the skin wash Hibitane® (chlorhexidine 1% in alcohol 70%). However, the majority of cases were in response to the urinary lubricant. Most were men, and three occurred in the recovery room when awake. Three patients have anaphylaxis to chlorhexidine immediately after the insertion of chlorhexidine-impregnated central lines.

It is of interest that chlorhexidine products are increasingly being recommended for dental hygiene, periodontal care, and implant surgery. Savacol® (Colgate) is frequently used by dental surgeons. The concentrated solution contains 2 mg ml⁻¹, but when appropriately diluted, it becomes a 0.2% solution of chlorhexidine as the dental wash. We receive many referrals each year from dental surgeons and general practitioners requesting testing for the local anaesthetic agents, on the grounds of the patients’ history, although all are aware that allergy to the now commonly used amide–amide local anaesthetics is extremely rare. Adverse reactions are usually due to vasovagal responses, hyperventilation, or inadvertent intravascular injection. Nevertheless, latex testing has been included in testing these patients. Now, based on our perception that chlorhexidine is a significant cause of type 1 hypersensitivity reactions, we are including the skin-prick test for this agent in the protocol for assessment of these patients.

Another issue raised by the authors was the fact that the serum MCT is not always raised in an anaphylactic reaction. As mentioned, this is probably due to an immediate basophylic response. Basophils are circulating blood cells that contain virtually no tryptase; in contrast, tryptase-rich mast-cells are present mainly in connective tissue and also in mucosae. We too have noted an increase in referrals of subjects with possible anaphylactic reactions in the absence of an MCT increase. There is an increasing awareness of among Auckland anaesthetists