Why use Buscopan during diagnostic upper gastrointestinal endoscopy?

EDITOR,—In their audit of upper gastrointestinal endoscopy (Gut 1995; 36: 462–7), Quine et al considered the issues surrounding the use of anticholinergic agents during upper gastrointestinal endoscopy. They found that although most procedures were performed without the use of either hyoscine butylbromide (Buscopan, Boehringer Ingelheim) or atropine these agents were still in use in certain centres and their findings indicate that Buscopan (dose range 10–40 mg) was used in 29% of procedures in East Anglia compared with 20% in the North West region and atropine (0–6 mg intravenously) was used in 11.2% procedures in the North West region and only 0.3% in East Anglia.

Authors of this study report no clinical or smooth muscle relaxant drug with anticholinergic activity. Its anticholinergic activity lasts for about 15–20 minutes and infusion experiments suggest that it is rapidly inactivated or excreted. It also has a sympathetic ganglion blocking action but this effect is unimportant in humans at the conventional dose of 20 mg commonly used. Its actions on the gastrointestinal tract include inhibition of motility in the proximal part of the gut, reduction of gastric acid secretion, and slowing transit through the small bowel. It also causes transient pylorospasm. Some studies have shown that oesophageal peristalsis is reduced by Buscopan1 and that it relaxes the lower oesophageal sphincter.2

What is the rationale for the routine use of anticholinergic agents during diagnostic upper gastrointestinal endoscopy? The use of atropine to dry up sputum and for 'Cardiac protection'1 is a benefit postulated3 without there being any controlled data available. Reports have shown that anticholinergic premedication does not improve the quality of diagnostic endoscopy or reduce patient discomfort.4 These investigators found no differences between groups with respect to gastric motility function or endoscopic quality as judged by the endoscopist or discomfort.4 Though atropine decreased both the amplitude and frequency of gastric peristalsis this objective effect of atropine did not have any effect on the outcome of the endoscopy.5 Anticholinergic premedication does not have any effect in reducing the incidence of cardiac arrhythmias during upper gastrointestinal endoscopy.6 The audit by Quine et al reports on a total of 88 patients who experienced significant cardiac arrhythmias that required treatment, including five patients who arrested. Four of these had been given Buscopan (two had been given doses of 40 mg) in the preoperative study7 comparing the use of Buscopan and Glucagon it was found that with intravenous Buscopan 20 mg the heart rate increased from a baseline of 94±2±1 to 126±15 beats per minute and there was a fall in the mean systolic, diastolic, and mean arterial pressure by 20–50 mm Hg in the Buscopan group. Four patients (aged 76–80 years) had hypotensive episodes immediately after intravenous Buscopan that lasted one to seven minutes. Thus Buscopan can cause both hypotension and a tachycardia. Buscopan significantly reduces pressure in the lower oesophageal sphincter and in theory may facilitate gastro-oesophageal reflux.2 The effect of an intravenous injection of 20 mg Buscopan on gastro-oesophageal reflux was evaluated in 112 consecutive patients undergoing barium meal examination.8 This study concluded that the routine use of Buscopan was unlikely to spuriously increase the frequency or degree of gastro-oesophageal reflux seen during barium studies. However, radiological evaluation of an effective method of detecting gastro-oesophageal reflux and there are no data on oesophageal pH measurement after intravenous administration of Buscopan. Gastro-oesophageal reflux induced by Buscopan could predispose to the development of aspiration pneumonia. The audit by Quine et al reported 11 patients to have had pneumonia shortly after the procedure and 10 of these patients had received pharyngeal anaesthesia, which is a technique with the presence of the fibroptic endoscope interferes with glottic closure and swallowing and may cause pulmonary aspiration. We have no information about the use of anticholinergic agents in this group and wonder if these agents had any role in the development of pneumonia. Thus except for procedures such as injection of oesophageal varices and endoscopic retrograde cholangiography where the use of anticholinergic agents is clearly beneficial we would question their routine use during diagnostic upper gastrointestinal endoscopy.
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The nurse endoscopist

EDITOR,—As the advent of the nurse endoscopist seems even more certain, I wish to raise my concerns about the provision of clinical information to the histopathologist who reports on the biopsy specimens.

We are already in a situation where most liver and gut biopsy specimens are sent by endoscopists or radiologists who are not primarily involved in the clinical care of the patient, and whose knowledge of their clinical history and medical record is derived from a quick scan of the notes before appointments in a hecticly busy department. Most pathologists will already be familiar with the terse statement 'raised LFT's', which is totally inadequate for a clinically useful assessment of a liver biopsy specimen. Two recent confusing samples received in this department were returned interpretable only when histories of multiple myeloma and pelvic irradiation were eventually disclosed. Chasing clinicians and case notes is very time consuming and counterproductive.

Clearly the present situation, from the histopathologist's point of view, is not as good as it might be despite the fact that qualified medical practitioners are scanning the notes and entering clinical details on the request forms. But how will we fare when non-medical personnel are sending us specimens?

Who will ensure the flow of accurate and relevant clinical information? Their training may encompass aspects of anatomy and physiology (Gut 1995; 36: 795) but this is hardly sufficient training to rapidly assimilate and then distil the essence from a patient's medical case notes.
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Reply

EDITOR,—Dr Griffiths is understandably concerned about the provision of clinical information to the histopathologist by nurse endoscopists. Clinical information on histopathology forms is clearly of the greatest importance and this is one of many issues that will be covered in the training programme for nurse endoscopists. However, I do not think he need fear that pathologists are suddenly going to receive a lot of incompetently filled forms with the advent of nurse endoscopists. Often forms are poorly filled in because of the hectic nature of life that most medical endoscopists lead. It is also well recognised that doctors are frequently poor form fillers. By contrast it is my experience that nurses are very diligent in this respect. I am sure that with the increasing numbers of gastrointestinal nurse specialists, obtaining appropriate clinical information from the notes will be well within the nurses' ability. I actually foresee a higher standard of