


CORRESPONDENCE

HALOTHANE AND THE ROWBOTHAM’S BOTTLE

Sir,—A few weeks before publication of my paper “Halothane concentration from a Rowbotham’s bottle in a circle absorption system” (Brit. J. Anaesth., 1958, 30, 312) there appeared on the market a modified Rowbotham’s bottle produced by the British Oxygen Company; this version is wickless and has downward facing ports and a larger liquid container. The company claims that it delivers trichloroethylene vapour in similar concentrations to the old pattern (B.O.C. and M. & I. E makes); this may or may not be so, but when used in a circle absorber with halothane I find that concentrations in excess of the figures stated in my paper are obtainable. Actual readings cannot at the present time be given until further more accurate estimations have been made; however, as a rough and safe clinical guide, half to three-quarters “ON” with the new bottle is equivalent to “FULL ON” in the old, for vaporization of the first 10–15 ml of halothane, i.e. for the first hour.

A new vaporizer, offering minimal resistance to respiration, has been designed and is in the process of manufacture, testing and calibration, but this will not be available for purchase for some months, meanwhile it seems advisable to warn would-be users of the newly introduced B.O.C.’s Rowbotham’s bottle of the possibility of now producing concentrations of halothane in a circle system in excess of 3.5 per cent.

It was reassuring to see confirmatory clinical evidence by Brown and Woods (Brit. J. Anaesth., 1958, 30, 333 and 338) for a lack in build-up of concentration of halothane with a circle absorber but I feel it is a pity that they should advocate disembowelling and relining an otherwise satisfactory piece of apparatus when they already possess an adequate alternative.

P. J. C. BURTON
Southlands Hospital,
Shoreham-by-Sea

ERRATUM

The following correction should be made to the paper on “Halothane concentration from a Rowbotham’s bottle in a circle absorption system” by P. J. C. Burton in the July 1958 issue (Brit. J. Anaesth., 30, 312):

Page 312, column 2, line 21, should read:
“... Atropine 0.6 mg"