About three quarters of patients who present with ST depression or T wave inversion on an admission ECG will have confirmed acute myocardial infarction on discharge. The patients with a discharge diagnosis of infarction are potentially those who would benefit from thrombolytic therapy. However, it has been shown in theory and practice that the use of early immunosassay of creatine kinase MB can achieve 94% sensitivity and specificity for prediction of the discharge diagnosis of infarction.

A subgroup analysis that might yield valuable information could be undertaken by the ISIS-3 coordinators. In ISIS-3, 9158 patients were enrolled as having an "uncertain" indication for thrombolytic therapy; 70% of these had an admission ECG criterion other than ST elevation. Fifty nine percent of the patients in the whole "uncertain" group and 11.4% in those with a discharge diagnosis of infarction. What was the mortality for thrombolytic treatment and what for placebo in this last group? As far as we are aware these figures have never been published.

IAN GUNN
DAVID MATTHEWS
IAN O'BRIEN
Late Hospital,
Cardups,
Lanarkshire,
ML8 5ER


6 LATI Study Group. Late Assessment of Thrombolytic Efficacy (LATI) study with alteplase 6-24 hours after onset of acute myocardial infarction. Lancet 1993;342:759-66.


These letters were shown to the author, who replies as follows:

Sir,—The concerns of Lee et al are certainly understandable. However, the recent history of cardiac therapeutics is littered with examples of different theoretical grounds should have been beneficial but which, when put to the test of a randomised trial, have proved unhelpful or harmful. Examples include isotopes in heart failure, calcium antagonists in unstable angina, and type 1 antiarrhythmic treatment in the post-infarction period.1,2 To this list should perhaps be added thrombolytic therapy in patients with unstable angina and non-Q wave myocardial infarction, following the report of the TIMI-IIIIB investigators which concluded that in this group thrombolytic therapy "is not beneficial and may be harmful." In this study presenting ECGs were non-diagnostic in 90% of cases, and in the remainder ST elevation was only transient.

Though I was careful to make implicit in my choice of words that the results of subgroup analyses of randomised trials can provide clues about the likely efficacy of treatment but non-randomisation et al accuse me of a misleading discussion of the evidence against the need for thrombolytic therapy when the presenting ECG is non-diagnostic. They then go on to request a further subgroup analysis from ISIS-3 that seems unlikely to yield much additional clarification. Nevertheless, they make the good point that a definitive answer will be obtained only from a randomised trial of treatment in patients who present with a non-diagnostic ECG and then go on to infarction. The TIMI-III trial, while not designed to provide answers definitively, certainly comes close to it. At present, therefore, there seems little justification for selecting patients who present with cardiac chest pain and a non-diagnostic ECG for thrombolytic therapy on the basis of rapid biochemical assays.

Finally, the assertion of Lee et al that rapid biochemical assays may increase "efficacy" by permitting early discharge of patients with negative results is potentially dangerous if it encourages premature discharge of patients with unstable angina whose need for coronary care is no less than that of patients with acute infarction.

ADAM D TIMMIS
London Chest Hospital,
Dover Road,
London E2 9JX


Haemodynamic deterioration after treatment with adenosine

Sir,—It is well known that non-dihydropy- ridine calcium antagonists, β blockers, and digitals can lead to an increase in the ven- tricular rate and haemodynamic deteriora- tion during pre-existed atrial fibrillation. This is because conduction through the acces- sory atrioventricular connection is facilitated, and the effect relates to sympathetic activation as well as to abolition of retrograde conduction into the accessory pathway. The case reported by Cowell et al illustrates that adenosine is no exception, especially if it is given repeatedly.

Although the very high rate during pre- existed atrial fibrillation may have been the primary cause for the haemodynamic deteri- oration, another possibility is that the patient's condition worsened after the repeat administration of adenosine for the wrong indication (that is, conversion of atrial fibrillation). In our opinion, Cowell et al should have stressed this fact more than anything else because it illustrates that too enthusiastic and indiscriminate use of adenosine can kill patients with the Wolff- Parkinson-White syndrome and that Williams class 1A agent such as pro- canaimide or a 1C agent, rather than adenosine, is indicated for safely terminating rapid pre-existed atrial fibrillation.

HARRY JIM CRINJS
KONG LIE
Department of Cardiology,
University Hospital Groningen,
PO Box 30001,
9700 RB Groningen,
The Netherlands


This letter was shown to the author, who replies as follows:

Sir,—We agree with Dr Crinjs and Dr LIE that repeat administration of adenosine once atrial fibrillation had been established was inappropriate. However, this patient deteriorated haemodynamically after adeno- sine because a narrow complex tachycar- dia converted to more rapid pre-existed atrial fibrillation. There was no evidence of a pro- gressive rate increase when administration of adenosine was repeated: the patient deteri- orated after the onset of atrial fibrillation. There was no further deterioration at the time of repeat adenosine administration.

We agree that the agents suggested could be used to convert pre-existed atrial fibrill- ation chemically but emphasise that electrical cardioversion should be used if there is any evidence of haemodynamic compromise.

RICHARD J. COWELL
Harefield Hospital,
Harfield, UB9 6HJ

Near miss paradoxical embolism

Sir,—In their timely reminder of the impor- tance of a patent foramen ovale as facilitator of paradoxical embolus Prakash et al state
that evidence for this mechanism remains circumstantial.¹ This may be so but it is also very strong. Thirty years ago, in the British Heart Journal, Corrin described two cases in which there was necropsy evidence of thrombus protruding through the patent foramen ovale.² Remarkably he was able to review a further 52 "verified cases" in which there was systemic embolisation, a source of thrombus in the veins, and a clot found in situ in a patent foramen ovale—surely the thrombotic equivalent of a smoking gun! He pointed out that the foramen ovale rather than a pathological shunt was the most commonly reported route for paradoxical embolism.

The sequence of events seems less unlikely if one considers that venous return from the inferior vena cava streams directly onto the fossa ovalis—the direction of the fetal circulation—so that thromboemboli arising in the lower half of the body bombard the valve of the foramen ovale while those that fly further to the pulmonary arteries transiently raise the right heart pressures, forcing the valve to open from right to left.

Thus any systemic embolism occurring around the time of a pulmonary infarction should alert us to the possibility of paradoxical embolism.

NOTICES

The 1995 Annual Meeting of the British Cardiac Society will take place at the Conference Centre, Harrogate, North Yorkshire from 23 to 25 May.

The first international meeting of the Working Group on Heart Failure (Heart Failure '95) will take place on 1–4 April 1995 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. It will be sponsored by the European Society of Cardiology. For further information, please contact: Holland Organising Centre, Parkstraat 29, 2514 JD The Hague, The Netherlands (tel +31 70 365 78 50; fax: +31 70 361 48 46).

A meeting on Neurohormones, Kinins and Endothelial Function in Ischaemia. Effects of ACE Inhibition, sponsored by the International Society of Cardiovascular Pharmacotherapy, will take place in Versailles, France on 19–20 May 1995. For further information, please contact: Dr Willem J Remme, Sticares, Cardiovascular Research Foundation, PO Box 52006, 3007 Rotterdam, The Netherlands (tel: +31 10 485 51 77; fax: +31 10 485 48 33).