Correspondence

(The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for opinions expressed by correspondents)

Inaccuracy in geographic terms

The Editor – Sir,

I enjoyed reading the paper “Radiation dose and cancer risk in retrospectively and prospectively ECG-gated coronary angiography using 64-slice multi-detector CT” [1], published in the *British Journal of Radiology*.

However, I wondered how doses in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland differed from those in England. Is this just another case of poor editing with referees and editors being English and not realising the upset their carelessness causes in not correcting geographic terms?

I suggest more care is taken and that the correct name of our country, the United Kingdom, is always used.

Yours sincerely,

R H CORBETT, MBChB, DMRD, FRCR, FSRP, FRCP, FBIR

(Received 24 March 2010, Accepted 30 March 2010)

DOI: 10.1259/bjr/54925656

Reference

1. Huang R, Li J, Law MW-M, Zhang J, Shen Y, Khong PL. Radiation dose and cancer risk in retrospectively and prospectively ECG-gated coronary angiography using 64-slice multi-detector CT. *Br J Radiol* 2010;83:152–158.