institution, and the response to steroids. Not every case will be diagnosed antemortem, and not every pathology will respond favorably to steroids. Thus, treatment must take into consideration the possibility that bridge to recovery or bridge to transplant is conceivable. VAD support, therefore, is an excellent tool to accomplish the goal—particularly with a VAD that has features such as short- or long-term support, bridge to recovery or transplant, ambulation with possibility for home discharge, and so forth. In addition, a VAD that has left ventricular (LV) apical cannulation allows for optimal unloading of the LV while on support, antegrade flow pattern, and pulsatile flow. Although extracorporeal life support (ECLS) has been used extensively for acute circulatory decompensation, the femoral–femoral circulation is suboptimal in terms of resting the LV and counterproductive when the LV recovers and weaning is attempted—there is conflicting flow from the heart antegrade and femoral flow retrograde. Furthermore, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation introduces an oxygenator, which is appropriate when lung injury is associated with the heart condition but potentially detrimental when it is not. In addition, femoral cannulation is associated with the potential for vascular complications (both venous and arterial), prevents movement of the patient in the bed or at the bedside, and limits flow by the relatively small size of the cannulae. These views were shared by other surgeons in a discussion of acute heart failure with various types of mechanical circulatory assist technologies.⁴

We congratulate Dr Khabbaz and his team for their wonderful success and encourage others to think about mechanical circulatory support when confronted with a severe case of acute necrotizing eosinophilic myocarditis. The use of ECLS is not an unreasonable method to rapidly restore circulatory stability. However, in the event that ECLS is insufficient, then a more advanced form of mechanical circulatory support, such as a VAD, is appropriate.

Louis Samuels, MD, FACS
Surgical Director Cardiac Transplantation
Director Artificial Heart and VAD Program
Lankenau Hospital
Wynnewood, Pa

References

1. Kohout J, Ferdinand FD, Imaizumi S, Holmes EC, Samuels LE. A rare case of acute necrotizing eosinophilic myocarditis: bridge to recovery with ventricular assist device support. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2006;132:965-6.
2. Watanabe N, Nakagawa S, Fukunaga T, et al. Acute necrotizing eosinophilic myocarditis successfully treated by high dose methylprednisolone. *Jpn Circ J.* 2001;65:923-6.
3. Touze JE, Debonne JM, Scheiner C, et al. Acute necrotizing eosinophilic myocarditis. Favorable clinical course after heart transplantation. (In French.) *Presse Med.* 1992;21:565-8.
4. Discussion of acute heart failure. Moderator: D. Glenn Pennington. Panelists: Michael A. Acker, Jack J. Curtis, Francis D. Pagani, et al. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2001;71:S82-5.
doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2006.11.017

Modern drainage techniques include not only smaller drains for pain reduction

To the Editor:

In a prospective, randomized, controlled trial, Roberts and colleagues¹ recently demonstrated that the performance of small-bore Blake drains (19F) (Ethicon Inc, Somerville, NJ) is not inferior to that of standard Portex drains (28F) (Portex, Inc, Hythe, Kent, UK) after cardiac surgery. The study provides important evidence on the efficacy of modern drainage techniques. However, we have some comments.

The authors compared 199 patients undergoing first-time cardiac procedures; 90 patients received Blake drains, and 109 patients received standard Portex drains. We are not convinced that the influence of complex valve procedures, which are more frequent in the Blake group, is not statistically relevant. Furthermore, we believe that a homogenous patient group might demonstrate the advantage of silastic Blake drains and allow extrapolation to other patient groups.

Akokuwah and colleagues² demonstrated less pain with Blake drains, but, as mentioned by Roberts and colleagues,¹ with only a small patient group (70 patients with 35 in each group). Therefore, it is a pity that the authors did not assess pain with a visual analog scale score, which is easy to perform.

Finally, the authors somehow misquoted our correspondence on the article by Barnard and colleagues:³ We do not believe that “. . . the only way to reduce patient discomfort is to use smaller and softer drains.” In fact, we stated that a modern drainage technique is a

fundamental part in pain reduction while removing drains after thoracic and cardiac surgery. Of course, analgesia, special removal maneuvers, and so forth have value, as demonstrated in various studies.⁴ In our unit, 10F to 19F Blake drains are used in all patients (1800 patients/year). Our observations are consistent with the literature: The Blake drain system is as effective as conventional drains with no increased risk of retained blood in the chest or tamponade and significantly less pain for the patient. We therefore advocate the use of Blake drains in patients undergoing thoracic or cardiac surgery as well.

Helmut Mair, MD
Ingo Kaczmarek, MD
Sabine Daebritz, MD
Cardiac Surgery
University of Munich
Munich, Germany

References

1. Roberts N, Boehm M, Bates M, Braidley PC, Cooper GJ, Sply TJ. Two-center prospective randomized controlled trial of Blake versus Portex drains after cardiac surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2006;132:1042-6.
2. Akokuwah E, Ho E, George R, Brennan K, Tennant S, Braidley P, et al. Less pain with flexible fluted silicone chest drains than with conventional rigid chest tubes after cardiac surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2002;124:1027-8.
3. Barnard J, Thompson J, Dunning J. Can any intervention effectively reduce the pain associated with chest drain removal? *Interact CardioVasc Thorac Surg.* 2004;3:229-232.
4. Singh M, Gopinath R. Topical analgesia for chest tube removal in cardiac patients. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth.* 2005;19:719-22.
doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2006.11.039

Reply to the Editor

We thank Dr Mair and colleagues for their interest in our study¹ and for their comments to which we would like to reply.

First, we agree that homogenous patient groups avoid confounding variables; the influence of complex valve procedures is one that was mentioned. However, we do not agree that it was the heterogeneity of the patient groups that prevented us from demonstrating an advantage of the Blake system (Ethicon Inc, Somerville, NJ). Our study was powered on the statistical basis of testing noninferiority, which allows statistical comparison with a predefined level of difference between groups. Had the study hypothesis been that Blake drains