belief — whether the patient had told her that she had ingested MDMA, whether she felt the patient's behaviour was consistent with 'Ecstasy' use, or for some other reason. While the patient's inability to speak at the time of admission explains why no history could be obtained from her at that time, her speech did return after treatment. Yet the patient's belief as to what she ingested is not reported.

Even documentation of the presence of amphetamine is inadequate: we are told that 'drug analysis detected...amphetamine at a concentration of 0.07 mg L⁻¹', but are not told whether this was the concentration of drug as sold in solution or in the patient's plasma, urine or some other bodily fluid.

Table 2, 'Management of "Ecstasy" overdose', is of potential interest but raises a number of questions. Is this protocol meant for treatment of MDMA overdose, amphetamine overdose, or both? Where did this protocol come from? Has this protocol been applied to the treatment of MDMA overdoses? If yes, what was the outcome? The recommendation of phentolamine for the treatment of hypertension in amphetamine overdose is common, but other authors have noted that phentolamine has not been proven superior to sodium nitroprusside for this indication.² Continuous infusion of sodium nitroprusside permits more precise control of blood pressure than does bolus administration of phentolamine, and deserves consideration in the treatment of acute hypertension.

The report presented is both misleading and of unclear intent. If the point is to highlight the dangers of adulteration of illicit drugs then the title should reflect this and the inclusion of an MDMA overdose management protocol is of questionable relevance. Conversely, if the intent is to address the management of MDMA overdose, the inclusion of a case involving amphetamine is inappropriate. Certainly adulteration of illicit drugs presents a variety of hazards and the MDMA-associated deaths at British rave parties were tragic and alarming. However, these points cannot justify deficient history taking or inaccurately titled reports.

G. GALLOWAY,¹ A.T. SHULGIN,² H. KORNFELD³
& S.L. FREDERICK¹

¹Drug Detoxification, Rehabilitation, and Aftercare Project, Haight-Ashbury Free Clinics, San Francisco, ²Shulgin Road, Lafayette, and ³CPC Walnut Creek Hospital, Walnut Creek, California, USA

REFERENCES

1. Hughes J.C., McCabe M. & Evans R.J. (1993) Intracranial haemorrhage associated with ingestion of 'Ecstasy'. *Archives of Emergency Medicine* **10**, 372-374.
2. Ellenhorn M.J. & Barceloux, D.G. (1988) *Medical Toxicology: Diagnosis and Treatment of Human Poisoning*. Elsevier, New York.

Intracranial haemorrhage associated with ingestion of 'Ecstasy'? A response¹

We apologize for the omission of a question mark at the end of the title which would have avoided any confusion. The aim of this short report was to warn practitioners of the increasing adulteration of illicit drugs in the UK, the inherent dangers for diagnostic error and the need to rely on formal drug analysis.

Patients presenting with a history of ingestion of 'ecstasy' is on the increase in the UK and therefore the management of 'ecstasy' overdose was included and based on the Welsh National Poisons Unit's Database.

The 0.07 mg L⁻¹ refers to the level of amphetamine in the patient's plasma.

R. EVANS¹, & M. MCCABE²

¹ The Accident Unit, Cardiff Royal Infirmary and

² Accident and Emergency Department, Morriston Hospital, Swansea, Wales

REFERENCE

1. Hughes J.C., McCabe M. & Evans R.J. (1993) Intracranial haemorrhage associated with ingestion of 'Ecstasy'. *Archives of Emergency Medicine* **10**, 372-374.