Poisons Information Service is that the dose of methylene blue should not exceed 4mg/kg of body weight.^{6,7}

The algorithm presented by Wong *et al* needs further clarification. It seems to suggest that a decision to use IOPTH is made during surgery when a 'suspicious lesion' has been found. To use IOPTH in an appropriate and effective manner, a basal sample for PTH should be drawn before incision. Use of this modality during the operation (without a basal sample) may give erroneous and misleading results. Perhaps the authors can further explain their technique and whether this has been validated?

Finally, Wong *et al*'s argument that 'MIP has been shown to be the superior approach' is based on differences in outcomes shown in an observational study where MIP has only been used in 'selected' cases.⁸

References

1. Ozbas S, Pain S, Tang T, Wishart GC. Surgical management of primary hyperparathyroidism – results of a national survey. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2003; **85**: 236–241.
2. British Association of Endocrine and Thyroid Surgeons. *Third National Audit Report*. London: BAETS; 2009.
3. Mihai R, Simon D, Hellman P. Imaging for primary hyperparathyroidism – an evidence-based analysis. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 2009; **394**: 765–784.
4. Khan MA, North AP, Chadwick DR. Prolonged postoperative altered mental status after methylene blue infusion during parathyroidectomy: a case report and review of the literature. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2007; **89**: W9–W11.
5. Ahmed TS. Methylene blue toxicity following infusion to localize parathyroid adenoma. *J Laryngol Otol* 2006; **120**: 708.
6. Majithia A, Stearns MP. Methylene blue toxicity following infusion to localize parathyroid adenoma. *J Laryngol Otol* 2006; **120**: 138–140.
7. Martindale SJ, Stedeford JC. Neurological sequelae following methylene blue injection for parathyroidectomy. *Anaesthesia* 2003; **58**: 1,041–1,042.
8. Udelsman R. Six hundred fifty-six consecutive explorations for primary hyperparathyroidism. *Ann Surg* 2002; **235**: 665–670.

Hip resurfacing revision rates: radiological audit of risk factors

IS Grewal, HA Kazi, MR Cope

Southport and Ormskirk NHS Hospital Trust, UK
doi 10.1308/147870811X598579

CORRESPONDENCE TO

Ishvinder Grewal, E: ishi@doctors.org.uk

COMMENT ON

Ramisetty N, Krishnan KM, Partington PF. Hip resurfacing revision rates: radiological audit of risk factors. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2011; **93**: 314–316
doi 10.1308/003588411X571115

We read the article by Ramisetty *et al* with interest. Nevertheless, we have some concerns with the methodology. The study was retrospective and so there was no standardisation of the radiographs.

The authors' method of measuring the neck angle has been demonstrated to be inaccurate¹ in that as little as 7° of external rotation of the hip can result in more than 10° change in the apparent neck shaft angle (NSA) and up to 10° can be elicited by internal rotation. Wilson *et al* reported that when using a picture archiving and communication system

to measure the NSA of the proximal femur, the reliability of the measurement is only ±6° for different observers even under the best conditions.² In the study by Ramisetty *et al* the valgus angle of the hip resurfacings that were revised only varied from 4° to -6°. With an error of 6° in measurement alone, it is impossible to predict failure from this.

Murray described that the cup inclination angle (CIA) was better measured with computed tomography as opposed to a plain anteroposterior (AP) radiograph.³ This is in part due to the variation of angles from which AP radiographs are taken. The correct calculation is the angle between the major axis of the ellipse and the transverse body axis. If the cup is anteverted, then the apparent inclination is an overestimate of the radiographic inclination: $\text{Tan(RI)} = \text{Tan(CI)} / \text{Cos}^2(\text{OA})$. The greater the anteversion, the greater the overestimation.⁴

The topic of this paper is of interest but, unfortunately, due to the inherent errors highlighted above, the results do not translate into the ability to clinically predict failure.

References

1. Kay RM, Jaki KA, Skaggs DL. The effect of femoral rotation on the projected femoral neck-shaft angle. *J Pediatr Orthop* 2000; **20**: 736–739.
2. Wilson JD, Eardley W, Odak S, Jennings A. To what degree is digital imaging reliable? Validation of femoral neck shaft angle measurement in the era of picture archiving and communication systems. *Br J Radiol* 2011; **84**: 375–379.
3. Murray DW. The definition and measurement of acetabular orientation. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1993; **75**: 228–232.
4. Ackland MK, Bourne WB, Uhthoff HK. Anteversion of the acetabular cup: measurement of angle after total hip replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1986; **68**: 409–413.

Authors' response

N Ramisetty¹, KM Krishnan¹, PF Partington²

¹Northern Deanery, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

²Wansbeck General Hospital, Ashington, UK

doi 10.1308/147870811X598588

CORRESPONDENCE TO

Narendra Ramisetty, E: narenrami@yahoo.co.uk

We appreciate the interest of Grewal *et al* in our article. We would like to point out that in our study the revision rate was higher in a valgus than in a varus stem shaft angle, contrary to what one would expect, although this was not statistically significant. This part of our study is therefore not clinically relevant.

The revision rate was higher for patients with a cup inclination angle (CIA) of >60°. We agree that our method of measuring the CIA may not be highly accurate but this is the standard method in the day-to-day clinic setting. This was also the standard method of assessing the CIA in some other recently published studies.^{1–3} Tannast *et al* performed computed tomography of 37 total hip arthroplasties and compared them with standard pelvic radiographs.⁴ They concluded that the hip CIA could be measured reliably with standard pelvic radiographs. The aim of our study was not to predict risk factors for failure; this is already evident in the

literature.^{5,5} We appreciate Grewal *et al*'s comments about our methodology but this should not undermine the findings of our study, which are still clinically relevant.

References

1. De Haan R, Pattyn C, Gill HS *et al*. Correlation between inclination of the acetabular component and metal ion levels in metal-on-metal hip resurfacing replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2008; **90**: 1,291–1,297.
2. Hart AJ, Buddhdev P, Winship P *et al*. Cup inclination angle of greater than 50 degrees increases whole blood concentrations of cobalt and chromium ions after metal-on-metal hip resurfacing. *Hip Int* 2008; **18**: 212–219.
3. Langton DJ, Jameson SS, Joyce TJ *et al*. The effect of component size and orientation on the concentrations of metal ions after resurfacing arthroplasty of the hip. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2008; **90**: 1,143–1,151.
4. Tannast M, Langlotz U, Siebenrock KA *et al*. Anatomic referencing of cup orientation in total hip arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2005; **436**:144–150.
5. Beaulé PE, Lee JL, Le Duff MJ *et al*. Orientation of the femoral component in surface arthroplasty of the hip. *A biomechanical and clinical analysis. J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2004; **86**: 2,015–2,021.

Presumed consent for organ donation

M Rees

Royal Glamorgan Hospital, Llantrisant, UK
doi 10.1308/147870811X598597

CORRESPONDENCE TO

Michael Rees, E: michael.rees@talk21.com

COMMENT ON

Koffman G, Singh I, Bramhall S. Presumed consent for organ donation. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2011; **93**: 268–272
doi 10.1308/147870811X571136

After reading the two well written articles on organ donation in the May 2011 issue, I can appreciate the views of both Koffman and Singh, and Bramhall on what is most definitely a controversial topic. I myself am not only a current surgical trainee but also a recent lucky and grateful recipient of one of the relatively few but growing number of live donor renal transplants being performed in the UK today. Obviously, I have strong views on this particular issue albeit with some natural degree of bias. For this I make no apologies. Needless to say, I come out in favour of a change in law towards an approach of 'soft' presumed consent.

Although I do not necessarily expect such a change to bring about the immediate improvement in donor numbers that will make the UK in any way comparable with the majority of Europe, I do anticipate it prompting a change in attitude within the general public on the topic of organ donation. At present, despite several large-scale national campaigns targeted towards increasing awareness of organ transplantation, a large section of the public remains disengaged over the important issues at hand. Until there is a better way to encourage individuals to make an active decision over their position on organ donation, I would not expect current donor figures to change dramatically.

A move in changing the current law is still unlikely to engage today's population in the subject immediately. It would, however, have a greater effect and go some way towards encouraging future generations at least to consider

their own views and, ideally, make an early decision over their individual position on becoming an organ donor. In conjunction with future developments and improvements in communication, infrastructure and facilities, this should at least partially alleviate the current gap between the clinical requirement and donor numbers.

I reached my own personal decision on organ donation several years ago, prior to finding out how important an issue it would become later in my life. I took (and still take for that matter) the opinion that an individual who would be happy to accept an organ in the event that it became a necessity should also be of the view that he or she would act as a donor on death should that be an option. Subsequent to this, I would still be in favour today of a more aggressive 'happy to accept, happy to donate' policy. This opinion is likely to be regarded by many as jumping from the 'political frying pan' that currently surrounds presumed consent into the even more controversial 'ethical fire'.

Author's response

S Bramhall

Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Birmingham, UK
doi 10.1308/147870811X598687

CORRESPONDENCE TO

Simon Bramhall, E: simon.bramhall@uhb.nhs.uk

Many thanks for your interest in our article. I agree entirely that the UK population needs to engage in a debate about organ donation and organ transplantation. I am just not sure that presumed consent legislation is the best means to start that debate. There is a serious risk that if handled badly or even if the UK press takes a dislike to government meddling then we could make the situation a whole lot worse and it would have cost us a lot of money to achieve nothing.