Cidex OPA – Episodes of anaphylaxis

Sokel (2004) reported nine episodes of anaphylaxis in four patients receiving cystoscopy for the routine monitoring of bladder cancer in the same urology department. In this department Cidex OPA was used to sterilise the cystoscopes. The patients in this report had each undergone 4 or 5 previous cystoscopies and were presumably exposed to OPA residues during these procedures leading to the development of sensitisation. Upon re-exposure the patients developed severe anaphylactic reactions involving urticaria, laryngeal oedema and angioedema.

Initial assumptions that the cause of anaphylaxis was due to an antibiotic or local anaesthetic were dismissed following additional anaphylactic reactions after cystoscopy in the absence of these agents. Skin tests to identify potential allergens were performed on the four patients plus five ‘non-allergic’ volunteers. The results for lidocaine (anaesthetic), latex, latex specific IgE, and glutaraldehyde were negative. In contrast, Cidex OPA (0.55% ortho-phthalaldehyde) caused a significant allergic reaction in all four patients but not in the volunteers. Skin tests with histamine (positive control), saline, and glycerin (negative controls) produced the appropriate responses in both patients and volunteers.

Subsequent cystoscopy procedures in three of the four patients in which Cidex GTA (glutaraldehyde) was used instead of Cidex OPA were uneventful.

The author noted that the manufacturer of Cidex OPA had received reports of ‘allergic’ reactions to Cidex OPA in nine other urology patients.
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