ment of Bacterial Infection in Pregnancy[J]. Chin J Clin Pharmacol. 2004, 20(2): 83-87.

[5] Liu Guohui, Yao Ying, Xiong Shengdao, et al. Curative Effect Comparison of Cefotaxime Sodium in the treatment of Bacterial Infection[J]. Herald of Medicine, 2001, 20(11): 691-692.

[6] Zhang Ruixia, Cao Ehong, Xia Yirong, et al. The Comparative Research of Curative Effect of Domestic and Imported Cefotaxime Sodium in the treatment of RTI[J]. Journal of North China Coal Medical College. 1999, 1(6): 510-511.

[7] Chen Zhuochang, Deng Baojun. The Comparison of Cost and Effect of Domestic and Imported Cefotaxime Sodium in the Treatment of Acute Bacterial Infections[J]. Chin J Clin Pharmacol. 2004, 20(6): 465-467.

[8] Yang Qian, Zheng Jingchuan, He Jianqin, et al. The Clinical Curative Effect Observationof Domestic Cefotaxime Sodium for Injection in the Treatment of RTI[J]. Chinese Journal of Antibiotics, 2001, 26(5): 368-370.

[9] Hou Fang, Li Jiatai, Gao Lei, et al. The Clinical Assessment to Domestic and Imported Cefotaxime Sodium in the Randomized Comparative Treatment of Acute Bacterial Infections[J]. Chinese Journal of Antibiotics, 2002, 27(7): 413-418.

[10] Cai Yongning, Liang Derong, Xu Nan, et al. The Randomized Comparative Clinical Research with multi-center on Cefotaxime Sodium in the treatment of Acute Bacterial Infections [J]. Chinese Journal of Antibiotics, 2002, 27(5): 287-292.

[11] Li Jianguo, Chen Rui, Li Hongyu, et al. The Clinical Assessment of Domestic Cefotaxime Sodium in the treatment of Bacterial Lower Respiratory Infection[J]. J China Pharm, 2004, 15(12): 746-748.

[12] Liu Yuejian, Yu Yunzhi, Li Xiaohui, et al. The Clinical Research on Cefotaxime Sodium for Injection[J]. Chinese Journal of Antibiotics , 2002, 27(12): 734-737.

[13] Tang Chunying, Zhang Kouxing, Lou Tanqi, et al. Bioequivalence Study of Cefotaxime Sodium for Injection[J]. Chinese Journal of Nosocomiology, 2004, 18(4): 847-849.

[14] Chen Fei. The Analysis of Cost and Effect of Domestic and Imported Cefotaxime Sodium in the Treatment of Lower Respiratory Infection[J]. Modern Medicine and Health, 2007, 23(8): 1134-1135.

THE DISCUSSION ON ALLERGIC SHOCK DURING PERIOPERATIVE PERIOD CAUSED BY CEFUROXIME

Wang Haiyan, Wang Ying, Cheng Wei

Hei Longjiang University of Chinese Medicine, 24 He Ping Road, Xiang Fang District, Harbin, 150040, xiaohanyan@126.com

Hei Longjiang University of Chinese Medicine, 24 He Ping Road, Xiang Fang District, Harbin, 150040,wyviolin85@163.com

Harbin Commercial University, 1 Xue Hai Street, Song Bei District, Harbin, 150028, chw@hrbcu.edu.cn

The purpose of this paper is to probe into the characteristic and regularities of allergic shock caused by Cefuroxime and discuss the relativity between the drug and Patients under anaesthetic and anesthetics combination.

The method of this paper is to retrieve all the documents about Allergic shock caused by Cefuroxime from China National Academic Magazine Data-base (CNKI), Wan-fang database and Pubmed database. The matching degree is fuzzy with ‘cefuroxime’ and ‘allergic shock’ in Chinese as key words. Taking ‘cefuroxime’ and ‘allergic shock/anaphylactic shock/shock anaphylacticus’ in English as key words, there are 29 documents, including 25 in Chinese and 4 in English. With another 4 documents collected from clinic experience, there are totally 34 documents to be taken statistical analysis.

In total, there are 29 documents met the inclusion criteria. In 34 of the patients, 63.4% appeared the symptom in 30 minutes after medication. 6 of them are delayed type. 12 patients had the allergic shock during perioperative period, among them, 6 patients shocked after medical anesthesia, 10 patients got negative cefuroxime skin test.

In conclusion, it is difficult to prognosis the allergic shock caused by cefuroxime, which is apparently related with allergic physique. Side chain structure is the main antigenic determinant of allergic shock caused by cefuroxime. It will also increase the risk with the application of the combined anesthetics during perioperative period.

[Reference]

[1] Barry P. Adoption of intracameral antibiotic prophylaxis of endophthalmitis following cataract surgery: update on the ESCRS Endophthalmitis Study. J Cataract Refract Surg, 2014, 40(1):138-42.

[2] Abi Khalil M, Damak H, Déc osterd D. Anaphylaxis and anaphylactic shock. Rev Med Suisse, 2014, 10(438):1511-5.

[3] Elad Moisseiev, Eliya Levinger. Anaphylactic reaction following intracameral cefuroxime injection during cataract surgery. J Cataract Refract Surg, 2013, 39(9):1432-4.

[4] Dylan parry prosser, M ark gompels. Anaphylactic shock due to cefuroxime in a patient taking penicillin prophylaxis. Paediatr Anaesth, 2002, 12(1):73-5.

[5] Villada JR, Vicente U, Javaloy J, et al. Severe anaphylactic reaction after intracameral antibiotic administration during cataract surgery. J Cataract Refract Surg, 2005, 31(3):620-1.

[6] Sáenz de San Pedro B1, Mayorga C, Torres MJ, et al. Boosted IgE response after anaphylaxis reaction to cefuroxime with

cross-reactivity withcefotaxime. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 2002, 89(1):101-3.

[7] Frédéric Hasdenteufel, Samuel Luyasu, Jean-Marie Renaudin, et al. Anaphylactic Shock Associated with Cefuroxime Axetil:-Structure–Activity Relationships. Ann Pharmacother, 2007, 41:1069-72.

[8] Campagna JD, Bond MC, Schabelman E, Hayes BD. The use of cephalosporins in penicillin-allergic patients: a literature review. J Emerg Med, 2012, 42(5):612-20.

[9] Mertes PM, Laxenaire MC. Allergic reactions occurring during anaesthesia. Eur J Anaesthesiol, 2002, 19(4):240-62.

[10] Nabatame M, Mori M, Ikeda Y, Matsushita M, et al. Incidence and clinical features of anaphylaxis during general anesthesia. Masui, 2010, 59(2):252-6.

[11] Malinovsky JM , Decagny S, Wessel F, et al. Systematic follow-up increases incidence of anaphylaxis during adverse reactions in anesthetized patients. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand, 2008, 52(2):175-81.

[12] Freeman SG, Love NJ, Misbah SA, et al. Impact of national guidelines on reporting anaphylaxis during anaesthesia--an outcome audit. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand, 2013, 57(10):1287-92.

[13] Dewachter P, Mouton-Faivre C, Castells MC, et al. Anesthesia in the patient with multiple drug allergies: are all allergies the same?. Curr Opin Anaesthesiol. 2011 ,24(3):320-5.

[14] N. Belső, R. Kui, I. Szegesdi,et al. Propofol and fentanyl induced perioperative anaphylaxis. Br. J. Anaesth. 2011, 106 (2):283-4.

[15] Khalid Al-Dosary, Ahmad Al-Qahtani, Abdullah Alangari,et al. Anaphylaxis to lidocaine with tolerance to articaine in a 12 year old girl. Saudi Pharm J. 2014, 22(3):280-2.

MODELING COMPARISON OF ICR MICE AND BALC MICE MODEL OF GASTRIC CANCER

Wang Wei, Song Lei

HEILONGJIANG UNIVERSITY OF CHINESE MEDICINE

Abstract The incidence of gastric cancer is high, to better study the pathogenesis of it,developing new medicine, improve the effectiveness of the diagnosis, all need to apply gastric cancer model. Through heterotopic transplantation and think about immune system effect, how to build a better gastric cancer model, to make it more clinical.

Key words ICR mice; BALC mice; gastric cancer

Introduction Gastric cancer is one of the most common malignant tumors, and is the second leading cause of death,It is necessary to establish a reliable animal model of gastric cancer, in order to explore the etiology, pathogenesis and prevention and cure of gastric cancer.There are two kinds of modeling methods in the experimental animal model of gastric cancer, long-term induction and rapid transplantation.Long - term induction experiment has a long period of time, and now it is transplanted into less model,the problem of immune rejection should be paid attention to in the process of rapid transplantation into the model making method[1].Nowadays, most of the models of gastric cancer were made by mice, and the grafts were divided into two groups: human and mous. According to the different immunity of mic,such as the representative of immunodeficient nude mice,and immunocompetent mice, such as ICR mic, and also some inbred strains of mice.Nowadays, many Chinese herbal medicines have been put into effect in the immune syste,in this case, nude mouse model has some limitations. In this paper, ICR mice and inbred mice were used as recipients,heterotopic transplantation model was established by human and mouse cells,the comparison model is established to provide reference for related research.

Material and methods

1.Cancer cell:MFC rat gastric cancer cells and BGC-823 human gastric cancer cells buy from Boster Biological TechnologyCompany,MFC cell number:CX-211,BGC-823.No.CX0046.

2.Animals :20 ICR mice, 4-6 weeks old, weight 18-20g. 20 BALC/C mice, 4-6 weeks old, weight 14-16g. Both male and female.

3.Experimental method:After cell culture, the transplanted tumor was inoculated.The cell concentration was 2*106/ml. Mice axillary inoculation.Animal grouping: 20 ICR mice were divided into 2 groups, namely, MFC mouse gastric cancer cell line inoculation group and BGC-823 human gastric cancer cell line; 20 BALC mice were equally grouped. After 1 weeks, the mice were sacrificed after 2 weeks, and the changes of the naked eye and the microscope were observed.

Results The BALC mice inoculated with MFC cells had a better survival condition, a slight degree of activity, and no obvious inflammation and adverse reaction.1 weeks when the naked eye visible swelling of the armpit, palpation of the quality of hard, poor mobility, anatomy, only visible under the armpit 5 new creatures. Continued feeding for 1 weeks, we can see a new increase in the armpit of new organisms, hard texture, anatomy can be seen with the same new biological.The second remaining mice and found that the new biological anatomy, and the surrounding tissue tightly, without complete capsule, the mobility of small, nodular, infiltrative growth, invasion and muscle adjacent tissues, after 1 weeks the average diameter of 0.8cm, maximum diameter of 1.2cm; 2 weeks after the mean diameter of 1.0cm, the maximum diameter of 1.5cm. Light microscopy showed squamous cell carcinoma. After MFC inoculation, the BALC mice were visible at the same