Anesthesiology
81:517, 1994
© 1994 American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc.
J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia

In Reply:—We agree with Block and Ghoneim that this phenomenon needs further investigation and that the dose-dependent effects of the commonly used anesthetics on implicit memory should be determined by future studies.

Dierk Schwender, M.D.
Associate Professor

Institute for Anesthesiology
Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munchen
Nußbaumstraße 20
D-8000 Munchen 2, Germany

(Accepted for publication April 22, 1994.)

Anesthesiology
81:517–518, 1994
© 1994 American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc.
J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia

Is Aprotinin Worth the Risk in Total Hip Replacement?

To the Editor:—We read with interest and some misgivings the report by Janssens *et al.*[1] on 40 patients undergoing total hip-replacement surgery who, in a randomized and double-blind study, intravenously received either aprotinin (2×10^6 KIU followed by an infusion of 5×10^5 KIU/h, n = 20) or placebo (normal saline, n = 20). Patients receiving aprotinin had a 26% decrease in perioperative blood loss and a 47% reduction in perioperative transfusion requirements compared to the placebo group ($P < 0.05$ and $P < 0.001$, respectively). The study suggests an expansion of the indications for aprotinin that is neither supported by the results presented nor can be accepted without reservations. We would like to make the following comments.

1. The perioperative blood loss associated with total hip arthroplasty is, among other factors, dependent on the experience of the surgeon, the surgical technique used (approach, osteotomy of the greater trochanter, the degree of surgical hemostasis), and the type of prosthesis used (cemented or cement-free prosthesis). Janssens *et al.* reported that all procedures were carried out by the same surgeon but did not state whether the groups were comparable with regard to the technical surgical factors mentioned above. Without this information, postulation of a causal relationship between the significant difference in perioperative total blood loss and the use of aprotinin must be regarded as pure speculation. A significant difference in perioperative total blood loss also has been found by other authors, including Wittig *et al.*[2] in a randomized study of 40 patients undergoing total hip arthroplasty (median 1,430 ml *vs.* 2,175 ml, representing a reduction of 34%; $P < 0.05$). Their patients differed only with regard to the modalities of preoperative autologous blood donation, and no patient had received aprotinin.
2. The lower perioperative total blood loss in Janssens *et al.'s* aprotinin group was due to a significantly lower *intraoperative* blood loss. In a study of similar design, Wollinsky *et al.*[3] found that the *postoperative* blood loss was significantly lower in the aprotinin than in the control group (difference in mean ca. 300 ml, $P < 0.01$). They suggested that aprotinin should be able to primarily reduce the *postoperative* blood loss, which would be more in keeping with the experience with aprotinin in cardiac surgical patients. The *postoperative* external blood loss, however, was not significantly different between the aprotinin and placebo groups in the study by Janssens *et al.* This finding also leads us to doubt whether the observed difference in the blood loss may be attributable to a specific pharmacologic action of aprotinin.
3. Janssens *et al.* reported a considerable perioperative blood loss in both the aprotinin and placebo groups (1,446 ± 514 ml and 1,943 ± 700 ml, respectively). A similar blood loss was observed in the study of Wollinsky *et al.* (mean 1,578 and 1,952 ml, respectively). In a series of 49 consecutive patients undergoing *cement-free* total hip arthroplasty *without aprotinin,* we found a perioperative total blood loss of 1,245 ± 412 ml, which was 14% less than in the aprotinin group of Janssens *et al.* This may be due to a much shorter surgical time (100 ± 33 min in our series *vs.* 169 ± 27 min in the study by Janssens *et al.*) and to the surgical technique used. We wonder whether the postulated reduction in bleeding after aprotinin could be demonstrated when perioperative blood losses *per se* are smaller.
4. Janssens *et al.* conclude from their study that the combination of high-dose intraoperative aprotinin and the preoperative donation of 3 units of autologous blood would allow 90% of patients undergoing total hip arthroplasty to avoid homologous blood transfusion. The perioperative transfusion requirements in the aprotinin group were 1.8 ± 1.2 units of blood per patient, which may be considered a typical amount for this procedure,[4] even without aprotinin. As already demonstrated by several authors,[2,5] these requirements may be covered solely by the preoperative donation of 3 units of autologous blood, thus avoiding any homologous blood transfusion in 90% of the patients without recourse to using aprotinin. When additional intraoperative blood salvage is used, up to 95% of patients may undergo surgery without receiving

Downloaded from http://pubs.asahq.org/anesthesiology/article-pdf/81/2/517/327701/0000542-199408000-00037.pdf by guest on 22 April 2021