

Chronology of separate techniques for endoscopic carpal tunnel release

To the Editor:

I read the article "Endoscopic Carpal Tunnel Release" (*JAOA* 1994;94:295-298) by Dr Payne and colleagues with interest. On page 295, the authors state that the "endoscopic management of carpal tunnel syndrome was first reported by Okutsu and coauthors in 1989. Refinement of the technique and development of specialized instruments was [sic] undertaken by Chow." This statement is incorrect. I think that Dr Payne and his coauthors need to understand that Dr Okutsu's technique differs completely from mine.

As noted in the reference section of this article, Dr Okutsu's article and my article were published in the same issue of *Arthroscopy*. In fact, our articles appear only 8 pages apart. Both of our techniques were developed at the same time, but using completely different instrumentation and different concepts. The aforementioned statement *should* read: "Endoscopic management of the carpal tunnel syndrome was first reported by Okutsu and Chow." Basically, we reported our results simultaneously.

James Chow, MD
Mt Vernon, Ill

Response

To the Editor:

My colleagues and I appreciate Dr Chow's writing to correct any misconceptions that may have been

inferred by reading our article on endoscopic carpal tunnel release. It was not our intent to imply that Dr Chow's technique was an extension of work initially done by Dr Okutsu. It is well recognized that the two-portal technique of endoscopic carpal tunnel release that Dr Chow originally described was developed independently from and is distinctly different from that described by Dr Okutsu.

We thank Dr Chow for this added historical perspective, and we regret any confusion that may have been created by our review of the history of his technique.

John C. Payne, DO
Sandusky, Ohio

Somatic dysfunction revisited

To the Editor:

Gregory A. Dott, DO, and his colleagues are to be commended on their research and discussion of the relationship between sacral base unlevelness and iliac crest measurements as they relate to radiographic screening of short leg syndrome and the prescription of lift therapy (*JAOA* 1994;94:383-390). Their conclusions correlate with my clinical experience and my thoughts concerning low-back dysfunction. The study demonstrates an unreliable correlation between these two measurements and reflects the independence of the ilium and the sacrum as each responds to acute and chronic stress.

Historically, researchers have searched for such a correlation; therefore, the current research is worthwhile. However, if *somatic*

dysfunction is defined as restriction of motion and *leg* (as it applies to short leg syndrome) is defined as everything from the calcaneus to the sacral base during a standing examination, why should we still try to define the motion restriction with a graphic of the hard structures in one plane? Furthermore, without defining the restriction, why would we add further restriction in the form of a heel lift? Too many joints and too many planes of soft tissue stress—including proprioceptor accommodation and fibrosis—are intervening for further motion restriction. Such a situation would leave too much for the operator to explore and to resolve manually.

Besides the multiple limb joints, which can confuse the diagnostic picture, the transverse planes of fascia are found above the femoral head. With their visceral contents, these planes have too many soft tissue stressors, including proprioceptive accommodation and fibrosis. As a result, the operator has too much to explore and to resolve manually.

Our credibility depends on our ability to describe what we do and to predict results. In our quest to do just that, we have, in the past, fallen into a reductionist approach. Such is the case in searching for radiographic definitions and evidence of dysfunction. Rather, I am convinced that we as osteopathic physicians need to proceed with the most sensitive "instrument" at our disposal—our hands, guided by our mind's comprehension of functional anatomy.

Dysfunction is more than the disruption of the relationship

(continued on page 630)

Esgic-plus[™] tablets

Butalbital 50mg (Warning: May be habit forming)
/Acetaminophen 500mg/Caffeine 40mg

References: 1. Benson GD. Hepatotoxicity following the therapeutic use of antipyretic analgesics. *Am J Med.* 1983;75(suppl 5A):85-93. 2. Jick H. Effects of aspirin and acetaminophen in gastro-intestinal hemorrhage. *Arch Intern Med.* 1981;141:316-321. 3. Mielke CH Jr. Comparative effects of aspirin and acetaminophen on hemostasis. *Arch Intern Med.* 1981;141:305-310. 4. Hansten PD. *Drug Interactions.* 5th ed. Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger; 1985. p. 95. 5. Insel PA. Analgesic-antipyretics and antiinflammatory agents; drugs employed in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and gout. In: Gilman AG, Rall TW, Nies AS, Taylor P, eds. *The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics.* 8th ed. New York, NY: Pergamon Press; 1990:638-681.

ESGIC-PLUS[™] Tablets

(Butalbital, Acetaminophen and Caffeine Tablets, USP)

50mg/500mg/40mg

Brief Prescribing Information: (Please see package insert for full prescribing information) Each Esgic-plus[™] Tablet contains: Butalbital, USP 50 mg. **WARNING:** May be habit forming. Acetaminophen, USP 500 mg, Caffeine, USP 40 mg. In addition each tablet contains the following inactive ingredients: microcrystalline cellulose, croscarmellose sodium, colloidal silicon dioxide and stearic acid.

CONTRAINDICATIONS: This product is contraindicated under the following conditions: • Hypersensitivity or intolerance to any component of this product. • Patients with porphyria. **WARNINGS:** Butalbital is habit-forming and potentially abusive. Consequently, the extended use of this product is not recommended.

PRECAUTIONS: **General:** Esgic-plus[™] Tablets should be prescribed with caution in certain special-risk patients, such as the elderly or debilitated, and those with severe impairment of renal or hepatic function, or acute abdominal conditions. **Information for Patients:** This product may impair mental and/or physical abilities required for the performance of potentially hazardous tasks such as driving a car or operating machinery. Such tasks should be avoided while taking this product. Alcohol and other CNS depressants may produce an additive CNS depression, when taken with this combination product, and should be avoided. Butalbital may be habit-forming. Patients should take the drug only for as long as it is prescribed, in the amounts prescribed, and no more frequently than prescribed. **Laboratory Tests:** In patients with severe hepatic or renal disease, effects of therapy should be monitored with serial liver and/or renal function tests. **Drug Interactions:** The CNS effects of butalbital may be enhanced by monoamine oxidase (MAO) inhibitors. Esgic-plus[™] Tablets may enhance the effects of: other narcotic analgesics, alcohol, general anesthetics, tranquilizers such as chlorthalidoxepoxide, sedative-hypnotics, or other CNS depressants, causing increased CNS depression. **Drug/Laboratory Test Interactions:** Acetaminophen may produce false-positive test results for urinary 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid. **Carcinogenesis, Mutagenesis, Impairment of Fertility:** No adequate studies have been conducted in animals to determine whether acetaminophen or butalbital have a potential for carcinogenesis, mutagenesis, or impairment of fertility. **Pregnancy:** **Teratogenic Effects:** Pregnancy Category C: Animal reproduction studies have not been conducted with this combination product. It is also not known whether Esgic-plus[™] Tablets can cause fetal harm when administered to a pregnant woman or can affect reproduction capacity. This product should be given to a pregnant woman only when clearly needed. **Nonteratogenic Effects:** Withdrawal seizures were reported in a two-day-old male infant whose mother had taken a butalbital-containing drug during the last two months of pregnancy. Butalbital was found in the infant's serum. The infant was given phenobarbital 5 mg/kg, which was tapered without further seizure or other withdrawal symptoms. **Nursing Mothers:** Caffeine, barbiturates and acetaminophen are excreted in breast milk in small amounts, but the significance of their effects on nursing infants is not known. Because of potential for serious adverse reactions in nursing infants from Esgic-plus[™] Tablets, a decision should be made whether to discontinue nursing or to discontinue the drug, taking into account the importance of the drug to the mother. **Pediatric Use:** Safety and effectiveness in children below the age of 12 have not been established.

ADVERSE REACTIONS: Frequently Observed: The most frequently reported adverse reactions are drowsiness, light-headedness, dizziness, sedation, shortness of breath, nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, and intoxicated feeling. **Infrequently Observed:** All adverse events tabulated below are classified as infrequent. **Central Nervous:** headache, shaky feeling, tingling, agitation, fainting, fatigue, heavy eyelids, high energy, hot spells, numbness, sluggishness, seizure. Mental confusion, excitement or depression can also occur due to intolerance, particularly in elderly or debilitated patients, or due to overdose of butalbital. **Autonomic Nervous:** dry mouth, hyperhidrosis. **Gastrointestinal:** difficulty swallowing, heartburn, flatulence, constipation. **Cardiovascular:** tachycardia. **Musculoskeletal:** leg pain, muscle fatigue. **Genitourinary:** diuresis. **Miscellaneous:** pruritus, fever, earache, nasal congestion, timidity, euphoria, allergic reactions. Several cases of dermatological reactions, including toxic epidermal necrolysis and erythema multiforme, have been reported. The following adverse drug events may be borne in mind as potential effects of the components of this product. Potential effects of high dosage are listed in the OVERDOSAGE section. **Acetaminophen:** allergic reactions, rash, thrombocytopenia, agranulocytosis. **Caffeine:** cardiac stimulation, irritability, tremor, dependence, nephrotoxicity, hyperglycemia.

DRUG ABUSE AND DEPENDENCE: Abuse and Dependence: Butalbital: Barbiturates may be habit-forming. Tolerance, psychological dependence, and physical dependence may occur especially following prolonged use of high doses of barbiturates. The average daily dose for the barbiturate addict is usually about 1500 mg. As tolerance to barbiturates develops, the amount needed to maintain the same level of intoxication increases; tolerance to a fatal dosage, however, does not increase more than two-fold. As this occurs, the margin between an intoxication dosage and fatal dosage becomes smaller. The lethal dose of a barbiturate is far less if alcohol is also ingested. Major withdrawal symptoms (convulsions and delirium) may occur within 16 hours and last up to 5 days after abrupt cessation of these drugs. Intensity of withdrawal symptoms gradually declines over a period of approximately 15 days. Treatment of barbiturate dependence consists of cautious and gradual withdrawal of the drug. Barbiturate-dependent patients can be withdrawn by using a number of different withdrawal regimens. One method involves initiating treatment at the patient's regular dosage level and gradually decreasing the daily dosage as tolerated by the patient.

OVERDOSAGE: Following an acute overdose of Esgic-plus[™] Tablets, toxicity may result from the barbiturate or the acetaminophen. Toxicity due to caffeine is less likely, due to the relatively small amounts in this formulation. **Signs and Symptoms:** Toxicity from barbiturate poisoning includes drowsiness, confusion, and coma; respiratory depression; hypotension; and hypovolemic shock. In acetaminophen overdose: dose-dependent, potentially fatal hepatic necrosis is the most serious adverse effect. Renal tubular necrosis, hypoglycemic coma and thrombocytopenia may also occur. Early symptoms following a potentially hepatotoxic overdose may include: nausea, vomiting, diaphoresis and general malaise. Clinical and laboratory evidence of hepatic toxicity may not be apparent until 48 to 72 hours post-ingestion. In adults, hepatic toxicity has rarely been reported with acute overdoses of less than 10 grams, or fatalities with less than 15 grams. Acute caffeine poisoning may cause insomnia, restlessness, tremor, and delirium, tachycardia and extrasystoles. **Treatment:** A single or multiple overdose with this combination product is a potentially lethal polydrug overdose, and consultation with a regional poison control center is recommended. Immediate treatment includes support of cardiorespiratory function and measures to reduce drug absorption. Vomiting should be induced mechanically, or with syrup of ipecac, if the patient is alert (adequate pharyngeal and laryngeal reflexes). Oral activated charcoal (1 g/kg) should follow gastric emptying. The first dose should be accompanied by an appropriate cathartic. If repeated doses are used, the cathartic might be included with alternate doses as required. Hypotension is usually hypovolemic and should respond to fluids. Pressors should be avoided. A cuffed endotracheal tube should be inserted before gastric lavage of the unconscious patient and, when necessary, to provide assisted respiration. If renal function is normal, forced diuresis may aid in the elimination of the barbiturate. Alkalinization of the urine increases renal excretion of some barbiturates, especially phenobarbital. Meticulous attention should be given to maintaining adequate pulmonary ventilation. In severe cases of intoxication, peritoneal dialysis, or preferably hemodialysis may be considered. If hypoprothrombinemia occurs due to acetaminophen overdose, vitamin K should be administered intravenously. If the dose of acetaminophen may have exceeded 140 mg/kg, acetylcysteine should be administered as early as possible. Serum acetaminophen levels should be obtained, since levels four or more hours following ingestion help predict acetaminophen toxicity. Do not await acetaminophen assay results before initiating treatment. Hepatic enzymes should be obtained initially, and repeated at 24-hour intervals. Methemoglobinemia over 30% should be treated with methylene blue by slow intravenous administration.

Toxic Doses (for adults): Butalbital: toxic dose 1g (20 tablets); Acetaminophen: toxic dose 10g (20 tablets); Caffeine: toxic dose 1g (25 tablets). CAUTION: Federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription.

Manufactured by: MIKART, INC., Atlanta, GA 30318

Distributed by: FOREST PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., Subsidiary of Forest Laboratories, Inc., St. Louis, MO 63045

Revised 3/94

Code 374A00

letters

(continued)

between solid structural components; it is a 360-degree alteration of freedom of motion around an anatomic locus. This point or portion of a fascial plane can be attributed first to a proprioceptor response to inflammation, which is the result of some injury. It can also be attributed to fibrosis due to stagnation of unresolvable tissue congestion. This congestion develops when free lymphatic and venous drainage is disrupted. In other words, motion restriction is a dynamic function of multiple physiologic responses to injury.

A summation of force vectors are translated along fascial planes and act on particular bony structures, such as the sacrum. However, this relationship fits into patterns and syndromes.

Regarding the question of functional short leg syndrome, clinically, I find a predominant pattern with a small variant in each dysfunctional leg, just as Dr Dott has documented. The dominant pattern is for the patient lying in a supine position to demonstrate iliac elevation and anterior superior iliac spine away from the short leg, with the sacrum following as a unit. In a small number of cases, an independent torsion or extension of the sacrum exists. The frequency of such varies, and the symptoms do not suggest the difference. It is only with a palpatory examination and by making a sequential assessment and treatment of the interrelating areas that the nature of the dysfunction is elucidated and the resolution is achieved.

If osteopathic manipulative treatment could be reduced to tests and simple algorithms, not only would osteopathic physicians be

(continued on page 684)

out of work, but osteopathy as a science and as an art would never have been established.

Zachary Comeaux, DO
Laurelville, Ohio

Response

To the Editor:

We appreciate Dr Comeaux's confidence in our work and findings. We are happy to see our findings correlate with his clinical observations. The purpose of our article was to identify potential problems with palpatory examinations for short leg syndrome. The stimulus came from the treatment of patients who had previously received inappropriate heel-lift therapy from paraprofessionals.

We documented in our article the inadequate method of using iliac crest heights (which are reportedly the best palpatory method of evaluating short leg syndrome) when defining and measuring anatomic short leg syndrome in patients with less than 0.5 inch of unlevelness. X-ray film evaluation has been pioneered to be a reliable measure of postural imbalance. Using this scientific method, we evaluated one aspect of a complex medical syndrome. Our study defines a method of reliable measurements for those physicians who wish to help their patients compensate for short leg syndrome through heel-lift prescription.

However, not all instances of leg length discrepancy produce somatic dysfunction, because the body can compensate. The definition of somatic dysfunction is not limited to restriction of motion.

Restriction of motion is but one of four characteristics of somatic dysfunction. The other three are tissue texture change; asymmetry of motion and relative position; and tenderness. *Somatic dysfunction* is defined as the impaired or altered function of related components of the somatic system, which are the skeletal, arthrodial, and myofascial structures, as well as the related vascular, lymphatic, and neural elements.

Our article does not address common compensatory patterns. However Gordon J. Zinc, DO, addressed these patterns in the 1960s.¹ Drs Irvin and Kuchera² have documented the need to consider the sagittal plane when treating postural problems. Our article in no way intentionally or unintentionally was meant to contradict these earlier findings. As we are asked to produce more data that support our way of examining our patients, we must balance our traditional way of reporting our findings with the currently accepted scientific methods of investigation.

Gregory A. Dott, DO, FAAO

Associate professor

Department of Manipulative
Medicine

University of North Texas Health
Science Center at
Fort Worth/Texas College
of Osteopathic Medicine
Fort Worth, Tex

References

1. Zinc GJ: Osteopathic holistic approach to homeostasis *American Academy of Osteopathy Yearbook*. Academy lecture; 1969:70:1
2. Kuchera ML, Irvin RE: Biomechanical considerations in postural realignment. *JAOA* 1987;87:781.

American Osteopathic Association

Advanced Registration Form, 637, 638

Hotel Registration Form, 641, 642

Capital Campaign, 645, 646

Proficiency Testing Program, 631

Deborah Heart and Lung Center, 682, Cover 3

Forest Laboratories

Esgic Plus, 629, 630

Lorcet 10/650, 643, 644

Glaxo Pharmaceuticals

Beclovent, 621, 622

Ohio University College of Osteopathic Medicine, 627

Pfizer Labs Division

Norvasc, 618

Sandoz Pharmaceuticals

Lescol, 633-636

G. D. Searle and Company

Calan, 625, 626

SmithKline Beecham Pharmaceuticals

Augmentin, Cover 4

Syntex Laboratories

Aleve, Cover 2, 617

University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey-School of Osteopathic Medicine, 683

University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth-Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine, 683

Whitehall Laboratories

Advil, 639