



## Comments on an article published in EgJA in Oct. 2016



Raghuraman M.S.

Prof. & HOD, Department of Anesthesiology, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College & Research Institute, Ammapettai, Kancheepuram Dt, Chennai 603108, India

### Dear Editor of Egyptian Journal of Anaesthesia,

I found one article of EgJA, which was published in the October 2016 issue. This was a study on the effects of sugammadex in comparison to neostigmine [1]. The article was informative.

I have noted one typographical error in the discussion section of that article [1]. It is written that "**Plaud et al. [9] reported that sugammadex was 10 times faster in efficiency**". But, this is reference number 8 in the bibliography.

The dose of neostigmine is mentioned in mg, instead of microgram in reference 11 of that article [1].

Of course, these two are only typographical errors and can be ignored.

However, I have some comments about two sentences which were written with regard to reference number 11 in that article which I have quoted as reference number 2 here [2].

One sentence, written in the discussion section that,

**"Blobner et al. [11] reported that 11% of patients in the neostigmine group reached the 0.90 TOF ratio in 5 min and 98% of the patients in the sugammadex group using 2 mg/kg reached the 0.90 TOF ratio in 5 min"**.

is not mentioned anywhere in that article by Blobner et al., which was published in 2007 [2]. But, this result is mentioned in the other article [3], written by first three authors of the previous article [2], along with some additional authors. This article was published subsequently in the same journal in 2010 [3].

Of course, the last sentence of the introduction section, "**Compared with neostigmine administration (0.05 mg/kg),**

**sugammadex recovery time was approximately 13 times faster [11],"** correlates with the results of the both articles (median time to TOF ratio 0.9 being, 1.4 versus 17.6, 1.5 versus 18.6 min respectively) [2,3].

I think that the article published in 2007 [2] may be an abstract, presented in a conference/proceeding by the authors [Blobner et al.], before publishing the complete article with some additional authors in 2010 [3].

Hence, I feel that it would have been better if the complete article [3] had been cited as a reference rather than an abstract [2], especially for the sentence in the discussion section which is not at all found in that reference [2]. I also feel that it would have been better if the word "better" was added before the word "recovery" in the title of that article [1], because, this study had compared sugammadex with neostigmine.

### References

- [1] El sayed Mohamed, Hassan Shady. Does sugammadex facilitate recovery after outpatient tonsillectomy in children? *Eg J Anaesth* 2016;32:447–50.
- [2] Blobner M, Eriksson L, Scholz J, Hillebrand H, Pompei L. Sugammadex (2.0 mg/kg) significantly faster reverses shallow rocuronium induced neuromuscular blockade compared with neostigmine (50 microgram/kg). *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2007;24(Suppl. 39). 125 (A9AP7-10).
- [3] Blobner M, Eriksson L, Scholz J, Motsch J, Della Rocca G, Prins ME. Reversal of rocuronium-induced neuromuscular blockade with sugammadex compared with neostigmine during sevoflurane anaesthesia: results of a randomised, controlled trial. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2010;27(10):874–81.