

the degree of preservation of useful vision afterward. The fact that some of the most serious eye injuries result from scleral rupture, after which one may be unable to observe extrusion of eye contents until after exploration of the globe and orbit, is not discussed.

Before surgery for penetrating eye injury, adequate examination is often not feasible until after the patient is anesthetized, prepped, and draped. Prolapse of eye contents is not unusual. Just because the surgeons in Libonati *et al.*'s report did not complain of extrusion after anesthetic induction and use of succinylcholine does not mean that there was none or that there was no additional loss of contents.

We are fortunate to have alternatives to use of succinylcholine for intubation. Given the potential for good visual outcome, we feel that the literature supports evidence for avoidance of use of succinylcholine in penetrating eye injuries.^{7,8}

MARK J. WEINER, M.D.
Instructor

R. JOSEPH OLK, M.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Ophthalmology

Anesthesiology
65:110, 1986

In reply:—I thank Drs. Rich and Weiner and their colleagues for their interest and sharing their experience. However, the effect of succinylcholine during a rapid-sequence induction has not been well described in the literature. In fact, one of their own references summarizes "We found that Dtc, 3 mg . . . given three or more minutes prior to the use of Sch, will prevent an increase in intraocular pressure."¹ My point remains that the report by Libonati *et al.*² demonstrates that succinylcholine can be used safely for open eye injuries. This gives the anesthesiologist another option in considering the total care of patients.

Anesthesiology
65:110-111, 1986

Assay for Serum Sufentanil Level Is Not Sensitive

To the Editor:—We agree with Weldon *et al.*¹ that there are no assays that allow one to estimate accurately the elimination clearance of sufentanil after small standard doses. Unfortunately, their capillary gas chromatographic

ELSIE F. MEYERS, M.D.

Associate Clinical Professor, Department of Ophthalmology
Associate Professor, Department of Anesthesiology

Washington University School of Medicine
660 South Euclid Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63110

REFERENCES

1. Bourke DL: Open eye injuries. ANESTHESIOLOGY 63:727, 1985
2. Libonati MM, Leahy JJ, Ellison N: The use of succinylcholine in open eye surgery. ANESTHESIOLOGY 62:637-640, 1985
3. Edmund J: The prognosis of perforating eye injuries. Acta Ophthalmol 46:1165-1174, 1968
4. Adhikary HP, Taylor P, Fitzmaurice DJ: Prognosis of perforating eye injury. Br J Ophthalmol 60:737-739, 1976
5. Eagling EM: Perforating injuries of the eye. Br J Ophthalmol 60:732-736, 1976
6. Niiranen M: Perforating eye injuries treated at Helsinki University Eye Hospital 1970 to 1977. Ann Ophthalmol 13:957-961, 1981
7. Bowen DJ, McGrand JC, Palmer RJ: Intraocular pressures after suxamethonium and endotracheal intubation in patients pretreated with pancuronium. Anaesthesia 48:1201-1204, 1976
8. Meyers EF, Krupin T, Johnson M, Zink H: Failure of nondepolarizing neuromuscular blockers to inhibit succinylcholine-induced increased intraocular pressure: A controlled study. ANESTHESIOLOGY 48:149-151, 1978

(Accepted for publication February 18, 1986)

DENIS L. BOURKE, M.D.

Department of Anesthesia
Boston University Medical Center
75 East Newton Street
Boston, MA 02118

REFERENCES

1. Miller RD, Way WL, Hickey RF: Inhibition of succinylcholine-induced increased intraocular pressure by nondepolarizing muscle relaxants. ANESTHESIOLOGY 29:123-126, 1968
2. Libonati MM, Leahy JJ, Ellison N: The use of succinylcholine in open eye surgery. ANESTHESIOLOGY 62:637-640, 1985

(Accepted for publication February 24, 1986.)

method, as it is presented,¹ does not seem to change this situation and may actually lend confusion to what might otherwise have been a straightforward clinical report.²

The most serious deficiency in the report of this new