**LETTERS TO THE EDITOR**

Percutaneous aspiration in the treatment of hydatid liver cysts

**EDITOR.—**During a survey of recent literature in preparation for the XVII International Congress on Hydatidology (held in Limassol, Cyprus, 6–10 November 1995) we have read with interest the article by Morris about liver echinococcosis (Gut 1994, 35: 1517–8). We have, however, been somewhat surprised by his misquoting of our paper.1 The two lines devoted to percutaneous aspiration ("The risks of fluid leakage are high and anaphylaxis has been well reported") are not representative of what we meant.

We suggested exactly the opposite—that is, the risks of fluid leakage and anaphylaxis, although real, seem rather overestimated. No such effect was reported—by the series, or series, nor by the authors who—invocately or not—had at that time aspirated a hydatid cyst.2,3 No major side effect was registered by the other groups who, at the time Morris wrote his paper, had diagnosed or treated by percutaneous aspiration more than 100 hydatid cysts and published the results of their work.4–11 We feel even more entitled to say this five years after, when our series has grown to 163 patients with 231 cysts treated this way12 and a growing number of colleagues’ reports of patients treated by this or similar methods.11–13

The reports quoted in those latest papers represent an overall population of more than 1000 patients treated with percutaneous puncture, and not in a single case anaphylactic shock or peritoneal dissemination have been reported. Both we and some of the mentioned authors reported only mild allergic reactions.

Indeed, the probability of major problems such as fluid leakage and anaphylaxis (obvi- ously when the procedure is performed by experienced personnel, and once the correct prophylaxis with mebendazole or albendazole has been set) is so low that the World Health Organisation recently recognised the procedure as a first choice method for treatment of hydatidosis especially in developing countries. As regards Western countries, we feel that PAIR (puncture, aspiration, injection, reaspiration) has gained a status such as to be proposed as an alternative treatment to surgery (when the patients cannot or do not want to undergo surgery). Its main advantages are greater safety, less expense, less distress for the patients.

We would therefore like to suggest that Dr Morris is more explicit in his next reviews concerning treatment of liver hydatidosis.

E BRUNETTI
C FILICE
Division of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, Ultrasound Unit, IRCCS ‘S Matteo’, University of Pavia, via Taramelli 8, 27100 Pavia, Italy


Reply

**EDITOR.—**Growing old can indeed be a painful business but let’s consider this carefully, our opinions clearly differ—I do think it matters! Can the facts help us? Brunetti and Filice acknowledge allergic reactions’ to what? If this is to parasite protein rather than the needle or the local anaesthetic, then spillage has occurred and it is (in my opinion) very likely that the other consequence of spillage—dissemination—will occur. The short-term, and often very poor quality, follow up offered by the current literature (of which I am well acquainted) does not reassure me. Recurrence is likely to take many years, and will probably be encountered in the perioumen, the needle track, and elsewhere. The ‘minor allergic’ reactions don’t reassure me much either—what determines the difference between the two? Major, and fatal allergic reaction to hydatid fluid spillage?—the evidence most certainly occur.

Hydatid cysts (E granulosus) if viable are often under considerable pressure and contain up to 10⁵ protoscoleces/ml each capable of forming a new cyst if spilled and contain large lumps of debris in the form of daughter cysts and collapsed laminar layer. Even at surgery using a large diameter suction device, blockage frequently occurs—the likelihood of spillage during percutaneous aspiration, even if done through liver, is in my view very high. Spillage has two risks: one immediate in the form of an anaphylactic reaction and the other long term in the form of dissemination. A large proportion (in my experience) of hepatic hydatid cysts communicate with the biliary tree—the injection of scolicid into the biliary tree can produce fatal sclerosing cholangitis. I certainly do not accept that it is established or likely that the safety of percutaneous aspiration is greater than medical or surgical treatment (I have not yet lost a patient with E granulosus treated by either medical or surgical means) whether it is less expensive and whether it causes more or less distress to patients will clearly depend again on longterm outcome.

If the WHO regards this technique as optimal I am surprised, and if it believes that it should be used as a first choice in developing countries, I am concerned and appointed—quality of follow up is likely to be in December 1984 when we published our faunistic and economical findings. We shall clearly demonstrate the safety of this technique, my view at present remains unchanged that this technique is most practical.

I challenge the writer to do some good and write with viva le vie and demonstrate clearly the safety of this technique, as I have at present remains unchanged that this technique is most practical.

DAVID L. MORRIS
Department of Surgery, The St George Hospital, Kogarah 2223, Australia

Ulcerative colitis and renal cell carcinoma

**EDITOR.—**In addition to the patients recently reported (Gut 1996; 38: 148–50) I would like to comment that I am also aware of a patient who developed both ulcerative colitis and renal cell carcinoma. We first saw this patient in December 1984 when we were concerned that a prophylactic nephrectomy because of multiple dysplastic polyps in a regularly exacerbating ulcerative colitis.

Ulcerative colitis was diagnosed in 1991 at the age of 61 and was treated with orally administered 5-aminosalicylic acid with good results for 12 months. Then, computed tomography was performed for increasing abdominal pain and showed a Grawitz tumour of the left kidney, which was subsequently treated with nephrectomy. Further history revealed nephrolithiasis (1976) and a low anterior resection because of a well differentiated ductus’s B, adenocarcinoma (1985). With regard to the risk factors faceted tumours of the kidney, the patient had hypertension since 1974, but was not obese and had given up smoking more than 10 years before the nephrectomy.

Unlike Dr Satcagni’s patients, our patient was not treated with corticosteroids or azathioprine before the diagnosis of the renal cell tumour was established. If it were true that 5-ASA derivatives do not participate in the pathogenesis of the neoplasms reported if there were any relation between ulcerative colitis and renal cell carcinoma, our case suggests that genetic factors are more important than the effects of drug. Although these four cases are merely anecdotal, and in no way definitive proof for a relation between (the treatment of) ulcerative colitis and renal cell carcinoma, I think they may be sufficient ground to start a case control study.

P W PLASIER
Department of Surgery,
University Hospital Dijkzigt,
NL-3015 GD Rotterdam,
The Netherlands.