

Letter to the Editor

Spinal Cord (2006) 44, 64. doi:10.1038/sj.sc.3101767; published online 19 July 2005

In reply to Dr S Vaidyanathan *et al*

We thank Vaidyanathan and colleagues for their interest.

Our article focused on the use of KUB radiographs for routine urinary tract surveillance after spinal injury. It showed the insensitivity of this examination for urinary tract calculi in spinal injury patients, partly due to obscuring bowel gas. Our conclusion was that the radiation exposure needed was not justified with the information obtained and that ultrasound of the urinary tract seemed a sufficient although imperfect tool for routine follow-up.

There is no question that other and in particular nonurinary information can be gleaned from radiographs that can be clinically valuable. We are, however, not aware of a peer-reviewed evidence-based article on

the potential benefit of routine abdominal radiographs in the follow-up of spinal injury patients and in particular in the view of prophylactic colectomy resulting from a radiographically detected abnormality.

Incidental relevant findings are well known in radiology but as such do not justify radiation exposure particularly in young patients with a good life expectancy. In the 100 patients in our study there was no other relevant radiographic finding.

However, if Vaidyanathan and colleagues have scientific data on this subject we look forward to its publication.

B Tins¹, V Cassar-Pullicino¹ and P Tyrrell¹
¹*Department of Radiology, RJA Orthopaedic Hospital,
Oswestry, UK*