

Letters

To the Editors:

Intra-amniotic injection or intrauterine injection of methylene blue? (2)

Ceylon Medical Journal, 2000; **45**: 92

I read with interest in your journal a letter written by Sirisena and Lanerolle (1) on the above subject. I wish to state that the title is misleading and needs correction. The letter describes a pregnant woman (diagnosed subsequently) undergoing laparoscopy and intrauterine injection of methylene blue to ascertain tubal patency on the 23rd day of the cycle. Subsequent ultrasound examination confirmed her dates.

The methylene blue injection was given about the ninth day after fertilisation (assuming ovulation on the fourteenth day of the cycle and fertilisation within a day of ovulation). The embryo and the amniotic cavity at nine days are still microscopic structures and embedded in the uterine decidua (2). Therefore intra-amniotic injection of 20 ml of dye is not possible at this stage of gestation and the dye would have been injected into the uterine cavity (ie intrauterine injection as mentioned in the text of the letter). The title should have been intra-uterine injection

and not intra-amniotic injection of methylene blue. The possible fetal effects from the two procedures are different (3,4).

References

1. Sirisena J, Lanerolle SD. A cautionary tale: intra-amniotic injection of methylene blue. *Ceylon Medical Journal* 2000; **45**: 44-5.
2. Early development of the embryo. In: Williams PL, Dyson M; eds. *Gray's Anatomy*. 37th ed. London: Churchill Livingstone; 1992: 124-41.
3. Inadvertent intrauterine injection of methylene blue in early pregnancy. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1981; **304**: 1427.
4. Cowelt RM. Untoward neonatal effect of intra-amniotic administration of methylene blue. *Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 1976; **48**: 74s.

P S Wijesinghe, Senior Lecturer, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Kelaniya.