

## CORRESPONDENCE

Anesthesiology  
1996; 84:1516  
© 1996 American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc.  
Lippincott-Raven Publishers

### Early Application of the Cross-suture Splint to Teeth Avulsed at Tracheal Intubation

**To the Editor:**—A 53-yr-old, 152-cm, 41-kg woman was scheduled for removal of a pheochromocytoma. The patient had no obvious dental caries or periodontal disease. After induction of anesthesia with 250 mg intravenous thiamylal and 10 mg vecuronium, the anesthetic resident ventilated the lungs with 5% sevoflurane for 3 min and attempted tracheal intubation. However, more than 30 s passed before the vocal cords were seen, and arterial blood pressure increased to 243/96 mmHg. The resident rushed the intubation, which led to complete avulsion of the maxillary incisors. We immediately consulted a dentist, who strongly recommended early stabilization of the teeth. The teeth were replaced into the socket in their original position, and a cross-suture splint was applied within 10 min. The patient was instructed to report to the dental clinic for subsequent observation and treatment.

On replantation, the durability of the teeth depends on which of three courses is followed: (1) Nearly normal function of the periodontal ligament is restored, in which the durability is almost the same as untraumatized teeth. (2) The root of the replanted tooth undergoes osseous replacement and eventually may cause loss of the tooth. (3) Root resorption occurs with a necrosed tooth pulp and early loss of the tooth.<sup>1</sup> The outcome depends largely on the first-aid treatment. Teeth are held to the alveolar bone by collagenous tissue that forms the periodontal ligament. It is imperative not to damage or dry the ligament if avulsed teeth are to be replanted successfully. The less time the tooth is out of its socket, the more suc-

cessful the replantation will be. A 90% success rate occurs if the extraoral period of the teeth avulsed does not exceed 30 min.<sup>1,2</sup> Early dental consultation even before surgery is crucial to achieve satisfactory replantation.

**Motoshi Kainuma, M.D.**  
Associate Professor of Anesthesiology  
**Morimasa Yamada, D.D.S.**  
Associate Professor of Anesthesiology  
**Toshiyuki Miyake, M.D.**  
Professor of Anesthesiology  
Department of Anesthesiology  
Fujita Health University  
1-98 Dengakugakubo, Kutsukake-cho  
Toyoake, Aichi, Japan

### References

1. Lind GL, Spiegel EH, Munson ES: Treatment of traumatic tooth avulsion. *Anesth Analg* 1982; 61:469-70
2. Scott JN, Zelikow R: Replantation: A clinical philosophy. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1980; 101:17-9

(Accepted for publication February 23, 1996.)

Anesthesiology  
1996; 84:1516-7  
© 1996 American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc.  
Lippincott-Raven Publishers

### Vasomotor Effects of Isoflurane in the Coronary Circulation

**To the Editor:**—Park *et al.*<sup>1</sup> reported that isoflurane caused constriction of isolated coronary resistance vessels obtained from rat. This finding conflicts with observations obtained *in vivo* in several laboratories, including ours,<sup>2-4</sup> demonstrating that, when hemodynamic conditions are controlled, isoflurane causes significant increases in coronary blood flow (CBF). Because most of the resistance to CBF, by far, resides in the arteriolar segments,<sup>5</sup> these latter findings suggest that isoflurane is a dilator, rather than a constrictor, of coronary resistance vessels.

Park *et al.* acknowledge the increases in CBF caused by isoflurane in our *in vivo* studies and, in light of their *in vitro* findings, theorize that they are due to an opening of "nonnutritive" shunts. However, Park *et al.* provide no anatomic or functional evidence for these

shunts, nor do they explain why isoflurane would cause opposite changes in vasomotor tone of the shunts and the coronary resistance vessels. Their use of the study of Gelman *et al.*<sup>6</sup> as support for their theory is puzzling, because Gelman *et al.* found that isoflurane anesthesia had no effect on shunting of 9- $\mu$  microspheres in the coronary circulation. These findings from Gelman *et al.* are consistent with those from our laboratory<sup>2,7</sup> and others<sup>8</sup> that indicate that coronary vasodilators, including isoflurane, do not increase the coronary shunting of microspheres.

We disagree with two points raised by Park *et al.* in their discussion. First, they state that our method of direct venous collection for assessing the amount of microsphere shunting in the coronary circulation<sup>2</sup> is inferior to the technique used by Gelman *et al.*, in