general managers. Aspirin and streptokinase remain the treatment of choice in myocardial infarction; there seems little justification for adding heparin.¹ This is not good news for those patients who, after myocardial infarction, have to proceed to urgent or semiurgent cardiac surgery for unstable angina or other aspects of the infarction.

The effect of aspirin on platelets results in difficult and sometimes uncontrollable and fatal bleeding. Cobbe's conclusions are not good news for cardiac surgeons or managers or for patients if they have to sit around in hospital for several days waiting for "urgent" surgery for their unstable angina while the effects of the aspirin wear off. Nor is this good news for the cardiologists, cardiac surgeons, and haematologists who have to decide when it is safe to operate.

I have two questions. Firstly, is it not possible to use a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory agent other than aspirin which would have a similar effect on platelets but a much shorter half life so that cardiac surgery could proceed safely within 24 hours of the drug being stopped? Secondly, could members of the British Cardiac Society and the British Society of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgeons produce guidelines on this contentious aspect of cardiac surgery?

M P HOLDEN

Freeman Hospital,
Newcastle upon Tyne NE7 7DN

1 Cobbe SM. ISIS 3: the last word on thrombolysis? *BMJ* 1992;304:1454-5. (6 June.)

AUTHOR'S REPLY.—It is important to emphasise that only a small minority of patients who have received thrombolytic treatment for acute myocardial infarction require cardiac surgical intervention. In the few patients with persisting unstable angina after myocardial infarction, withdrawal of aspirin before coronary artery bypass grafting may increase the risk of acute coronary occlusion and reinfarction. As a result of this the cardiac surgeons in this hospital undertake coronary bypass grafting on such patients without stopping aspirin. Their recent study indicated that the median post-operative blood loss was increased by 490 ml in patients receiving 150 mg of aspirin compared with controls.¹ This was associated with a median increase in the transfusion requirement of two units of red cell concentrates, and fresh frozen plasma, platelets, or cryoprecipitate were required in 20% of patients treated with aspirin compared with 5% of controls ($p < 0.01$). There was no increase in the median postoperative hospital stay.

Use of other non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs has not been validated in terms of their effect on mortality after myocardial infarction. Furthermore, experimental studies suggest that these drugs may impair the healing of an infarct and lead to its expansion and an increased risk of cardiac failure.²

I do not disagree with Holden's view that aspirin increases bleeding after coronary bypass grafting. In my view, the small risk of excess surgical bleeding associated with aspirin has to be accepted as the price to be paid for avoiding preoperative coronary occlusion in the small proportion of patients who develop unstable angina after thrombolytic treatment for acute myocardial infarction. These considerations should not be allowed to detract from the clear benefit associated with treatment with aspirin.

S M COBBE

Department of Medical Cardiology,
Royal Infirmary,
Glasgow G3 7ER

1 Taggart DP, Siddiqui A, Wheatley DJ. Low-dose preoperative aspirin therapy, postoperative blood loss, and transfusion requirements. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1990;50:425-8.

2 Jugdutt BI. Delayed effects of early infarct-limiting therapies on healing after myocardial infarction. *Circulation* 1985;72: 907-14.

Diarrhoea, dysentery, and food poisoning

AUTHOR'S REPLY.—J K Anand raises a valid point. My intention, however, was to point out the role of notification and control of infection in the overall management of infectious diarrhoea and not to discuss specific cases. Owing to the similar presentation of many of these diseases, I consider barrier nursing prudent for patients with these diseases on admission to hospital pending a firm microbiological diagnosis. After diagnosis the infection control procedure can be reviewed and revised—hence the need to consult the local infection control policy, as I stated in my letter.

A J HAY

King's College Hospital,
London SE5 9RS

AUTHOR'S REPLY.—J K Anand raises a valid point. My intention, however, was to point out the role of notification and control of infection in the overall management of infectious diarrhoea and not to discuss specific cases. Owing to the similar presentation of many of these diseases, I consider barrier nursing prudent for patients with these diseases on admission to hospital pending a firm microbiological diagnosis. After diagnosis the infection control procedure can be reviewed and revised—hence the need to consult the local infection control policy, as I stated in my letter.

A J HAY

King's College Hospital,
London SE5 9RS

Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors

EDITOR.—In his editorial on selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors J Guy Edwards presents a conservative view of the current situation with regard to the prescription of antidepressants.¹ He comments that "those recently marketed in Britain include fluvoxamine, fluoxetine, sertraline, and paroxetine." Fluvoxamine has been available since 1987 and fluoxetine since 1989. He rightly states that in terms of efficacy selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors are not superior to tricyclic antidepressants, but the profile of their side effects does offer advantages for patients.

Edwards says that "clinical anecdotes . . . do not provide good evidence of cause and effect" yet reports several single cases of adverse reactions. He mentions that prescription event monitoring showed that 24 women had become pregnant while taking a selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor but does not state at what point the pregnancy occurred. None of these drugs is recommended in pregnancy, but patients commonly become pregnant during treatment.

With particular reference to fluoxetine Edwards makes an erroneous statement—that six weeks is required before treatment with a monoamine oxidase inhibitor is started. The datasheet states that at least five weeks should elapse.

I believe that many psychiatrists would take issue with Edwards over his suggestion that the "main uses of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors would seem to be in clinically depressed patients who are unable to tolerate tricyclic antidepressants and those with associated troublesome obesity or heart disease." The selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors have been an enormous advance not only in the treatment of depression but in developing the understanding of other disorders such as anxiety, panic disorder, obsessive compulsive disorder, and bulimia nervosa.

Disappointingly, Edwards concludes with a price comparison and the comment, "Whether they are worth the extra cost is something that

individual doctors and patients will have to decide." It sounds as though Edwards has already made up his mind, which presumably also means that of his patients.

DEBBIE HARRISON

Lilly Industries,
Basingstoke,
Hampshire RG21 2SY

1 Edwards JG. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. *BMJ* 1992;304:1644-6. (27 June.)

EDITOR.—If there are two classes of drug that are equally effective in treating depression, one of which is cheap but highly toxic and the other of which is safe but perceived to be expensive, a doctor cannot decide between the two on economic grounds. This ethical crisis, however, faces general practitioners daily when balancing their patients' welfare.

I believe that it is only a matter of time before a general practitioner is asked to defend himself or herself, in a civil suit brought by relatives of a patient who has committed suicide, against charges of having negligently provided that patient with the means to commit suicide. If I was that general practitioner and I had not at least tried one of the newer selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors I would find it difficult to defend my position. The process of litigation is exceedingly slow, and by the time such a case was resolved there would be thousands more in the pipeline.

J Guy Edwards, I believe, has overlooked these overwhelming moral and economic reasons why we should have professional agreement that tricyclic antidepressants are no longer acceptable as first line antidepressant treatment.

S O FRADD

Sneinton Health Centre,
Sneinton,
Nottingham NG2 4PJ

1 Edwards JG. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. *BMJ* 1992;304:1644-6. (27 June.)

Adrenaline in allergic emergencies

EDITOR.—We think that G B Smith and B L Taylor's comments on the treatment of allergic emergencies¹ in reply to our original letter² are misleading. They conclude that "when adrenaline is required in an anaphylactic emergency it should be given . . . intravenously." We are concerned about the implications of such a recommendation. Firstly, it is contrary to current recommendations in the *British National Formulary*.³ In the section on allergic emergencies (section 3.4.3) in the formulary the use of adrenaline is emphasised: "IMPORTANT. Intravenous route is for cardiac resuscitation only." In the section on sympathomimetics (section 2.7) it is similarly emphasised: "IMPORTANT. For acute anaphylaxis use intramuscular route."⁴

Smith and Taylor say that "vasodilatation is a major pathophysiological characteristic of anaphylaxis," but this is not always the case, and venous access can be difficult, particularly outside hospital. Furthermore, intravenous adrenaline has been reported to lead to serious adverse reactions, and this concern cannot just be dismissed by the statement, "Concerns for the potential dangers . . . are largely misfounded." This is particularly relevant as there are only limited reports on its use other than to point out the problems encountered with intravenous administration.⁴ Smith and Taylor's conclusion may result in a trend towards intravenous administration of adrenaline in allergic emergencies without due consideration of the potential hazards.¹

In conclusion, we do not entirely disagree with