

CORRESPONDENCE

Anesthesiology
1998; 89:275

© 1998 American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc.
Lippincott-Raven Publishers

In Reply:—Tanaka *et al.*¹ introduce an additional, intriguing factor (with an historical past) in the search for the explanation as to why phenylephrine might be associated with such a high incidence of transient neurologic symptoms (TNS). The subsequent comments by Sakura *et al.*² put this concern about sodium bisulfite into sharp perspective—a critical step that helps us maintain an appreciation for the clinical relevance of the actual doses of sodium bisulfite given and one that discourages us from unduly focusing on just one potential contributor.

Lambert³ voices the anticipated reaction to the rhetorical emphasis of the Editorial View.⁴ The valid question posed is, is tetracaine a safer anesthetic (whether it increases blood flow or not)? He provides the reasonable opinion that the answer is no. Further, we learn that commonly used local anesthetics share the potential for neurotoxicity. *This* is an important reality, especially as we consider the contemporary manifestations thereof through TNS.

John C. Rowlingson, M.D.
Professor of Anesthesiology
Director, Pain Management Services

Department of Anesthesiology
University of Virginia Health Sciences Center
Charlottesville, Virginia 22906-0010

References

1. Tanaka M, Nishikawa T: Is phenylephrine or sodium bisulfite neurotoxic? *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 1998; 89:272–273
2. Sakura S, Sumi M, Sakaguchi Y, Saito Y, Kosaka Y, Drasner K: The addition of phenylephrine contributes to the development of transient neurologic symptoms after spinal anesthesia with 0.5% tetracaine. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 1997; 87:771–8
3. Lambert DH: Transient neurologic symptoms when phenylephrine is added to tetracaine spinal anesthesia—An alternative. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 1998; 89:273
4. Rowlingson JC: Transient neurologic symptoms. Now, with phenylephrine? *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 1997; 87:737–8

(Accepted for publication March 20, 1998.)

Anesthesiology
1998; 89:275–6

© 1998 American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc.
Lippincott-Raven Publishers

Blood Loss from a Defective Needleless Arterial Sampling Port

To the Editor:—To decrease the risk of needle sticks, our institution uses a closed system for sampling of arterial blood (Triple Line Safeset Kit #46076-27, Abbott Laboratories, Chicago, IL). At the sampling port, a thick rubber cap with a built-in slit is penetrated with a blunt needle. Recently we had a case in which flushing of the arterial tubing resulted in dislodgment of the rubber cap from the sampling port. This led to an open arterial line with bleeding and loss of the arterial trace. Attempts to plug off the hole were unsuccessful because standard Luer-lock caps are too small for the size of the resulting defect. In this patient, the arm in which the arterial catheter had been placed was tucked at his side and was not readily accessible. We stopped the bleeding by covering the open port with a sterile transparent dressing (Tegaderm, 3M company, St. Paul, MN). A silk string was wrapped around the sides of the dressing to prevent the arterial pressure from displacing it. This restored the arterial tracing, but the sampling port could not be used, and subsequent arterial samples had to be taken at the transducer site. At the end of the procedure, the arterial line system was replaced with a new one. Inspection of the malfunctioning sampling port revealed that the plastic housing had not been molded over the rubber cap (fig. 1). Without the molding, there is nothing to hold the rubber cap, and it can easily be displaced during flushing.

We estimated the blood loss caused by the defective sampling port at approximately 20 cc. However, the system we were using had an identical sampling port close to the insertion site. If the defect had




Fig. 1. Close-up view of a standard arterial sampling port (*left*) and the defective one (*right*).

been on that sampling port, the blood loss would not have been immediately apparent because it was covered by surgical drapes, and larger amounts of blood would have been lost. We have contacted the manufacturer and informed them of this defect so that hopefully this type of problem can be avoided in the future.

Luis G. Michelsen, M.D.
 Department of Anesthesiology
 Emory University Hospital
 1364 Clifton Road NE
 Atlanta, Georgia 30322
 Luis_Michelsen@emory.org

Rashid Zaffer, M.D.
 Fellow, Cardiac Anesthesia
 Department of Anesthesiology
 Emory University Hospital
 Atlanta, Georgia

(Accepted for publication March 11, 1998.)

Anesthesiology
 1998; 89:276
 © 1998 American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc.
 Lippincott-Raven Publishers

Peripherally Administered NSAIDs Provide for Patient Benefit

To the Editor:—We read with interest the excellent review article by Callesea and Kehlet¹ regarding pain after hernia repair. The authors conclude that intrawound nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) have not been shown to have been beneficial in patients having herniorrhaphy.

We would like to cite our recently published article² in which we studied patients undergoing inguinal hernia repair during local anesthesia. The patients were randomized to receive ketorolac either intravenously or in the surgical wound. We were able to demonstrate an increased time to first analgesics, a decreased oral analgesic requirement, and lower 24-h movement-associated pain scores in the surgical site group.

We believe that our data, taken in concert with our studies in patients undergoing arthroscopy,^{3,4} provide evidence that peripherally administered NSAIDs provide for patient benefit.

Neil Roy Connelly, M.D.
Scott S. Reuben, M.D.
 Department of Anesthesiology
 Baystate Medical Center
 Tufts University School of Medicine
 Springfield, Massachusetts 01199

References

1. Callesen T, Kehlet H: Postherniorrhaphy pain. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 1997; 87:1219–30
2. Connelly NR, Reuben SS, Albert M, Page D: Use of preincisional ketorolac in hernia patients. *Reg Anesth* 1997; 22(3):229–32
3. Reuben SS, Connelly NR: Postoperative analgesia for outpatients arthroscopic knee surgery with intraarticular bupivacaine and ketorolac. *Anesth Analg* 1995; 80:1154–7
4. Reuben SS, Connelly NR: Postarthroscopic meniscus repair analgesia with intraarticular ketorolac or morphine. *Anesth Analg* 1996; 82:1036–9

(Accepted for publication March 17, 1998.)

Anesthesiology
 1998; 89:276–7
 © 1998 American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc.
 Lippincott-Raven Publishers

Unusual Cause of Intravenous Catheter Obstruction

To the Editor:—Intravenous catheters occasionally obstruct because of blood clots or kinking of the catheter. We experienced a case of intravenous catheter obstruction caused by a cored fragment of a medication vial stopper.

A patient had a 20-gauge, 1-inch intravenous catheter placed in the dorsum of the hand. An intravenous induction of anesthesia was uneventful. Thirty minutes into the procedure (near the end of the surgery), observation of the drip chamber showed that the gravity-

driven infusion had ceased. All attempts at restarting the infusion by gentle aspiration or flushing solution through the ports failed. When the intravenous catheter was later removed, a small gray fragment was seen occluding the catheter. The fragment was removed from the catheter. It was roughly spherical, measured about 1 mm in diameter, and was similar in consistency and color to the stopper of the succinylcholine used during induction of anesthesia.

We believe that the fragment was a small piece of the stopper of