

On February 9, 1981, Lafayette's representative, Newton, wrote to a Dr. Gross, in response to queries raised in connection with a serious malpractice case Dr. Gross was involved in.

Gross had asked about the 'actual toxicity' of Pantopaque, the 'actual incidence' of arachnoiditis of post-myelographic arachnoiditis and the incidence of arachnoiditis when all or part of the contrast medium had been removed.

Newton's responses are stunning:

He replied that he was

*'not familiar with any article that provides clear information on Pantopaque causing arachnoiditis.'*

He went on to say that it is

*'not possible ...to determine the actual incidence of arachnoiditis associated with myelography.'*

Most amazingly, he remarked,

*'Pantopaque is regarded as safe.'*

It seems impossible for this man to plead ignorance of all the foregoing medical articles I have detailed, especially since knowledge of this literature must surely be a prerequisite of him being a viable 'expert' representative of the company on matters such as litigation.

In the same year, Barsoum and Canillo ( [\[1\]](#) ) wrote about thoracic constrictive arachnoiditis; two cases without history of operation, trauma or disc disease at these levels.

Worthington et al. ( [\[2\]](#) ) described bacterial meningitis after Pantopaque myelography.

---

[\[1\]](#) Barsoum AH, Cannillo KL. *Neurosurgery*. 1980 Mar; 6(3): 314-6. Thoracic constrictive arachnoiditis after Pantopaque myelography: report of two cases.

[\[2\]](#) Worthington M, Hills J, Tally F, Flynn R *Surg Neurol* 1980 Oct; 14(4): 318-20 Bacterial meningitis after myelography