To avoid the accusation that "eagerness to declare" my discovery might shamefully distort [my name]" I looked up Lister's original communication in which he stated that "in the course of the year 1864 I was much struck with the account of the remarkable effects produced by carbolic acid and the applicability of carbolic acid for the treatment of compound fractures naturally occurred to me." Six months later, in a leading article, the Lancet revealed that Dr. Lister of Paris had already published a book on the use of carbolic acid in medical and surgical diseases but credited Lister with having made the agent extensively known in this country. This provoked a spirited reply from Lister who, to quote Professor Hubble "introduced some explanation, which, in his own view at least, diminished the fault." He admitted that he did not claim the introduction of carbolic acid to surgery but claimed originality "for its employment with the view of protecting the reparatory processes from disturbance by external agency." A broadside was then delivered by Sir James Young Simpson in the form of an article giving very detailed evidence that a recent paper by Morton's [33] was in all his leading theories and uses in connexion with this subject." The earliest use of carbolic acid that he quoted was as a dressing to wounds by Cruveilhier, Follet, and Rigault in 1859, followed by the treatment of compound fractures by MM. Darricau and Petit in 1860. After this Lister retired as gracefully as possible "having already endeavoured to place the matter in its true light without doing injustice to anyone." 

The fact remains that Lister had claimed to have introduced carbolic acid to protect the reparatory processes from external agency" in 1864, while in 1863 Bert was of the opinion that acide phénique was essential to arrest putrid transformation. I think we may safely say with Sir Walter Langdon-Brown that "while there was no real claim to priority, there was no willful plagiarism with intent to deceive." I am, etc.,

David Perrins
Churchill Hospital, Oxford
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Sexual Dysfunction Due to Methyldopa
Sir,—It is now widely held that methyldopa is a drug which can control systemic hypertension with relatively few unwanted side effects. Disorders of sexual function are known to occur, but apart from reports saying that they are "rare" or met with "seldome" or "infrequently" their exact incidence has been poorly documented. Papers reporting a 2% incidence of methyldopa-induced impotence have been published1 as well as others which report no significant changes.2

We are of the opinion that disorders of sexual function occur in approximately one-third of males so treated and append the following information.

Twenty-seven male patients being treated with methyldopa for essential hypertension were seen in our medical outpatient clinic at the Veterans Administration Hospital, Northport, New York, in the month of July 1974. These patients were taking 500-2,000 mg a day in divided oral doses and were aged 43-64 years. Close interrogation revealed that seven were experiencing some disorder of sexual function which had started within a few days of commencing therapy. These included a decrease in libido, an inability to maintain an erection, and difficulty in ejaculating. Within two weeks of discontinuing the drug and instituting a regimen of propranolol and hydralazine these undesirable side effects had disappeared. Sexual dysfunction was not noted in a comparable group of 22 hypertensive males treated with a thiazide diuretic alone.

In view of the fact that aberrations of sexual function were not related to age or daily dose of the drug we would urge physicians to inquire specifically about the side effects experienced by patients being treated with methyldopa.—We are, etc.,

R. J. Newman
School of Medicine,
University of Leeds,
Leeds

Hugo R. Salerno
State University of New York at Stony Brook,
New York

Swelling of Arm in Patients with Arteriovenous Fistula
Sir,—We were most interested in the recent case report by Drs. J. Gothlin and E. Lindstedt (7 September, p. 629) and have recently completed formal studies of hand volume in patients on intermittent dialysis using an arteriovenous fistula. We found that the volume of the dominant hand was 5% greater than that of the non-dominant hand (P < 0-001) in 31 patients but that the volume of the non-dominant (fistula) hand was greater in age- and sex-matched male (18% ° n = 23, P < 0-001) and female (21% n = 5, P < 0-01) dialysis patients.

We found that 23 out of 36 patients developed pain, numbness, or paraesthesiae on dialysis, these symptoms being confined to the distribution of the median nerve in the fistula hand. At rest six patients with severe symptoms had an increase of the volume of the fistula hand increased by 15% on dialysis (P < 0-05), whereas the volume of the non-fistula hand increased by 4% (P < 0-10). Predialysis venous pressure in the dorsum of the fistula hand was 21 ± 4 mm Hg higher than in the non-fistula hand. Because of severe symptoms two patients have required carpal tunnel decompression.

We conclude that oedema of the fistula hand is common in dialysis patients, though it may be unpredictable on physical examination. The oedema is probably a consequence of high venous pressure and exacerbated by immobility during dialysis. Construction of an end-to-side anastomosis...