Whilst I quoted the only two prospective, randomised trials concerning radical prostatectomy and watchful waiting, John Anderson, sensibly, confined himself to the Scandinavian study though both of us wrote our papers before the recent update of that study which appeared in the *New England Journal of Medicine* in 2005.

John Anderson, in order to buttress his case, used relative risk ratios which showed some difference. I had used absolute ratios which again, as I concede in my article, showed some difference although these are generally small. Whenever one sees relative risks and disease-specific mortality reductions, one has to look carefully at the overall outcome. Even the most ardent, radical prostatectomist much have a scintilla of doubt when at 10 years the progression curves for both the actively treated and the non-treated cases are still rising. One would have expected at some stage that all the patients who had been under-staged and under-graded would have been compensated for and a group identifiable as having been cured by surgery would be apparent; the graph, therefore, would go flat whilst the patients treated expectantly would continue to progress at a particular rate. At 10 years, the graphs of both groups are still going up. This re-emphasises that this study is yet to be completed in what is now the totemic trial but there remains lack of conclusive evidence to support the current practice of radical prostatectomy.

Indeed, such continuing sloppy thinking based on the tired and jaded mixture of grade 3 and 4 evidence, with the continual avoidance of treating patients with high-risk, poorly differentiated tumours is continuing. The result of this is that brachytherapy which is buttressed by equally flimsy grade 3 and grade 4 evidence is now supplanting radical prostatectomy as a procedure of choice for patients with good-risk, localised prostate cancer. Given the choice between a major operative procedure and one that can be

delivered as a day-case and, allegedly, has equal outcomes, we can perfectly understand why the patient would take such a decision.

My main and most aggressive point was that the UK had the opportunity to do a prospective trial in 1990 to answer these questions (by now, definitively, 15 years later), which was rejected although the PROTECH study in may ways resuscitated that earlier opportunity and will deliver results 10 years later than were necessary. By then, radical prostatectomy may well have fallen into obsolescence not because it has been shown to be either ineffective or effective but because people have not demonstrated a clear evidence-base by doing randomised prospective controlled trials. The latest gimmick will have overtaken it. Truly, it can be said: 'their own words will rise up to smote them'.

COMMENT ON

A Morritt. A simple method to prevent other people wearing your theatre shoes. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2005; **87**: 66

doi 10.1308/003588406X83177

Theatre shoes – taking them one day at a time

SPENCER HODGES

London, UK

CORRESPONDENCE TO

Mr S Hodges

E: spencerhodges@doctors.org.uk

Another way of encouraging people not to use your theatre shoes is to write the day you use the shoes on the front as well as your name, this being particularly useful in day surgery units where sessions are relatively fixed.