In reply: — We thank Dr. Cullen for his eloquent and thoughtful comments. We share the philosophy that direct anesthetist–patient contact is paramount. We believe that much of the present-day technology in anesthesia tends to distract rather than to assist the anesthetist. Better organization and presentation of more accurate and complete information can free the anesthetist to concentrate more on direct observation of and contact with the patient. Certainly the availability of new measured variables should enhance the practice of anesthesia. Appropriate use of technology can extend the anesthetist’s limited senses. However, presentation of additional information can easily be mishandled in such a way as to be detrimental to the anesthetist’s performance. The solution to that problem is not only technological, as in the Boston Anesthesia System, but educational, as in emphasizing the paramount importance of physician–patient or nurse–patient contact and communication (in all its forms).
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Erratum

The article, “Two Approaches to Cannulation of a Child’s Internal Jugular Vein” (Anesthesiology 50:371–373, 1979) contains an error. In table 1 (p 372) under high approach, Prince et al., Arterial puncture, the reported percentage is 2.5. This should read 23.0.