

surement. If the measurements could, somehow, have been repeated, since a similar experiment has not been done, the aspects of consistency and reliability could be determined. Finally, patients with gastrointestinal disorders should have been studied as well. After all, it will be these patients, especially those with hypersecretory diseases, who will benefit the most from prophylactic administration of ranitidine.

KEITH P. KITTELBERGER  
*Third-year medical student*

Anesthesiology  
66:442, 1987

*In Reply:*—We would like to thank Keith P. Kittelberger for his comments. In response to his question about whether intra- or inter-observer error may have played a part in measurement of gastric contents, this was not a blind study. We believe, however, that observer bias was not a major factor in this study, as those evaluating the stomach contents, as well as laboratory technicians determining the pH, were not aware of premedication. To address the questions of repeating the measurements, as well

Anesthesiology  
66:442, 1987

### Questions Concerning Aspiration Prophylaxis Study

*To the Editor:*—I am disturbed by an apparent inconsistency in the anesthetic management of patients in the study by Manchikanti *et al.*, dealing with the effectiveness of intravenous ranitidine in outpatients.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of their study was to establish the dose of ranitidine required to reduce gastric contents below 0.4 ml · kg<sup>-1</sup> and to elevate gastric pH above 2.5. Inherent in the study design is the need to have a control group with no pharmacologic protection and groups in which pharmacologic protection may be incomplete. The authors fail to state whether an endotracheal tube was used. Yet, a gastric tube was passed which would further increase the risk of regurgitation. I find it unfortunate that pharmacologic protection is emphasized without a single comment concerning the most important aspect of aspiration prophylaxis, that of proper airway management.

There are also larger questions which could have been addressed. Should all patients be considered at risk for regurgitation and aspiration? If not, how do we identify those who satisfy the laboratory criteria of risk? Should all patients at risk receive pharmacologic protection (the

Meharry Medical College  
Nashville, Tennessee 37211

### REFERENCE

1. Manchikanti L, Colliver JA, Grow JB, Demeyer RG, Hadley CH, Roush JR: Dose-response effects of intravenous ranitidine on gastric pH and volume in outpatients. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 65: 180–185, 1986

(Accepted for publication November 6, 1986.)

as studying the patients with gastrointestinal disorders, it will require two separate studies, and we welcome other investigators to conduct such studies.

LAXMAIAH MANCHIKANTI, M.D.  
*Department of Anesthesiology  
Lourdes Hospital  
Paducah, Kentucky 42001*

(Accepted for publication November 6, 1986.)

authors do advocate this)? If it is not agreed that all patients at risk require pharmacologic protection, then should they all be intubated? If not, are we dealing with a laboratory definition of aspiration risk which is not accepted as a clinically significant definition of aspiration risk?

RAYMOND C. ROY, M.D.  
*Visiting Lecturer  
Department of Anaesthesia  
Royal Victoria Infirmary  
Newcastle upon Tyne University  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
United Kingdom*

### REFERENCE

1. Manchikanti L, Colliver JA, Grow JB, Demeyer RG, Hadley CH, Roush JR: Dose-response effects of intravenous ranitidine on gastric pH and volume in outpatients. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 65: 180–185, 1986

(Accepted for publication November 17, 1986.)