LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The British Heart Journal welcomes letters commenting on papers that it has published within the past six months.

All letters must be typed with double spacing and signed by all authors.

No letter should be more than 600 words.

In general, no letter should contain more than six references (also typed with double spacing).

Immunoglobulin response to intravenous streptokinase in acute myocardial infarction

Sir,—Lynch et al.'s study (British Heart Journal 1991;66:139-42) contributes to the growing body of information on the immune response after administration of intravenous streptokinase for acute myocardial infarction. The current focus has been on the length of the period during which important titres of antibodies to and neutralising capacity for streptokinase persist (these do not always correlate precisely). Studies by Lynch et al. and Jalilal and Morris showed that this period extends at least to 12 months, and further work is awaited to determine the outer limit of this period. During this period streptokinase should not be readministered because of fears of an anaphylactic reaction and also that the drug will be neutralised and hence ineffective.

The current recommendations of the 1990-91 Data Sheet Compendium are that a second dose of streptokinase should not be given within a period of five days to six months after the first. A recent Drug and Therapeutics Bulletin states that this will soon be amended to a 12 month interval. Recent authoritative papers have been broader in their recommendations, suggesting that streptokinase and anistreplase should not be readministered within a year, and the latter paper concluded with the assertion that tissue plasminogen activator (alteplase) should be used if repeat thrombolysis is required (no time limit was stated so it presumably extended indefinitely from day 0). A policy of not repeating streptokinase for a year from day 0 has been widely adopted. These conclusions are important because alteplase costs ten times as much as streptokinase.

This policy loses sight of the early window that exists before the development of a significant immune response to streptokinase. This is a worthwhile opportunity given that 9% of patients will reinfarct in the first year after thrombolysis. In a substantial number of these patients reinfarction requiring repeat thrombolysis occurs in the first few days after thrombolysis. In White et al.'s 1990 study of repeat thrombolysis after myocardial infarction 31 patients were treated for recurrent myocardial infarction after thrombolysis between 1 and 6 days after initial thrombolysis. The median interval was only five days and 10 of the 31 patients were treated in the first three days. Lynch et al.'s study shows that antibody titres to streptokinase (IgG) do not rise above baseline until day four, suggesting that an immune response (either anaphylactic or neutralising) is unlikely before this. The work of Masella et al. on neutralising antibody showed a neutralising capacity equivalent to 1×10⁶ units streptokinase between days 0 and 12 in 11 of their patients (this small study (11 patients) may not have adequately defined the normal range). This again suggests that there is an early opportunity for a second streptokinase therapy to be safe and effective. Indeed though White et al recommended that streptokinase should not be readministered within a year they did show that readministration within this period was effective (albeit with an increased incidence of minor side effects).

This evidence suggests that streptokinase can be readministered safely and effectively from 0 to 3 years after the initial event. A further large study of neutralising capacity would be helpful because the most recent study dealt only with antibody response and a previous study of neutralising capacity was small. If this policy is to be refined, the day 0 to 1 year policy, which seems to be emerging, is likely to have an impact on coronary care unit drug bills.

SDC GRANT Department of Cardiology, Wythenshawe Hospital, Green Lane, Manchester M23 9LT

3 Drug Ther Bull 1991;29:16.

This letter was shown to the authors and an advisor, who reply as follows:

Sir,—We are grateful to Dr Grant for his comments. We agree, as stated in our final paragraph, that it would be prudent to avoid repeating the dose between three days and at least one year after the initial treatment with streptokinase. After treatment with streptokinase, the antibody titre (IgG, subclass IgGl) virtually disappears, presumably because the antibody titres are with the antigen, streptokinase. Subsequently, there is a gradual rise in antibody titre, which does not become significantly higher than baseline titres until day 4. During this time window of 0-3 days, when there is no higher than pretreatment titres, it is probably as safe and effective to re-administer streptokinase in the event of a repeat infarction as in the case of the initial infarct.

We are continuing to monitor streptokinase administration antibody titres in this cohort of 20 patients, who have now reached the 18 month time point. Though they are gradually declining, the mean (SD) IgG titres to streptokinase are still significantly raised at two years (86±42) over baseline (0.029) (p < 0.025). Repeat infarction after 72 hours and until at least 18 months after the initial infarct should probably be managed with a non-streptokinase thrombolytic agent until the significance of these antibodies is known.

MARY LYNCH BL PENTECOST WL LITTLE RA STOCKLEY Lung Immunobiochemical Research Laboratory and Department of Cardiology, General Hospital, Steelhouse Lane, Birmingham B4 6NH

Lung Immunobiochemical Research Laboratory and Department of Cardiology, General Hospital, Steelhouse Lane, Birmingham B4 6NH


Myocardial ischaemia and ventricular arrhythmias after baseline by physiological concentrations of adrenaline in patients with coronary artery disease

Sir,—McCance and Forfar (British Heart Journal 1991;66:316-9) reported the effects of adrenaline on the development of ischaemia and arrhythmia in patients with ischaemic