

Pedro Paulo de Sá Earp

Letter to the Editor

Received: 9 November 2005 / Accepted: 6 December 2005 / Published online: 31 January 2006
© Springer-Verlag 2006

Sir,

I refer to the article entitled “Ex vivo model training for percutaneous surgery”, published in *Urological Research* (2005) 33:191–193.

It is my strong conviction that the same subject matter, with minimal technical changes, had already been disclosed in the article of my authorship published in the *Brazilian International Journal of Urology* (2003) 29:151–154 and readily accessible via Pub Med.

If we examine in detail the two articles it is clear that we are looking at identical rationales, same objectives and even extremely similar showings, leading to the conclusion that the ideas are fundamentally the same. I use pig kidneys (the same biological model), I preserve the ureters for contrast injection in the same way, I hide the kidneys with opaque (not transparent) medium in the same way and I reproduce all the steps of a conventional percutaneous surgical technique with the same intent to teach and train. The material chosen by the author to hide the kidney was silicone and mine was foam, but it could be any other material

that delivers the effect, this being a minor modification to the technique that does not change the basic concept.

I affirm that, conceptually, the idea and the technique are the same and only the material and the method of installation differ, these being minor variations and thus not sufficient to confer originality.

While the author disclosed his idea in 2005 and my article had been published in February of 2003, I accept from other correspondence that he only recently became aware of my article.

If, today, I were submitting to this respected journal an article on my idea, relating my experiences with this teaching method over these last years, it would probably not be accepted for the Original Articles section on the basis that an extremely similar article had already been published in this journal and it would therefore not be original.

Hence, in the interest of maintaining the respected reputation of *Urological Research* I request a correction as to the originality of the cited article.

Editorial comments on this letter can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00240-005-0011-7>.

P. P. de Sá Earp
FMP, Urologia, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil
E-mail: ppdesaearp@superig.com.br