LETTER TO THE EDITOR

In a recent defense of the “wick” method as a technique to measure tissue colloid osmotic pressure, Aukland et al imply (1) that the previous three citations attributed to him by me were either misleading or, even worse, fabricated. The three quotations were as follows:

1. “Insertion of the wick greatly increased the capillary protein permeability as determined by rapid transfer of label albumin from blood to wick fluid. The rapid blood-towick albumin transport almost ceased with 30 minutes.”
2. “Validation of the wick-method in subcutaneous tissue in rats does not guarantee a proper function in other species.”
3. “The true level of colloid-osmotic pressure of undisturbed subcutaneous tissue remains uncertain.”

Whereas the third citation was incorrectly given as Micorvas. Res. 14 (1977), 14-25, and should have been properly given as Miocoras. Res. 24 (1982), 104-113 (authors Noddeland, Hargens, Reed and Aukland), the statement, nonetheless, is accurately quoted and certainly was not contrived or foisted upon him. Moreover, based on our previous report (2) and the three accurate citations from Aukland’s own writings as given above, the wick method as a technique to measure tissue colloid-osmotic pressure should still remain suspect.
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CORRECTIONS

The following reference was inadvertently omitted from a recent article published in Lymphology 30 (1997), 49-62, authors C. Ketterings and S. Zeddeman.


On page 48, line 17, in the June Editorial by M. Földi [Lymphology 30, (1997), 46-48], the sentence should properly read:

“After 26±65 days of treatment (complex decongestive physiotherapy), 1 liter of edema fluid on the average could be removed from a swollen leg.”