Apparent Error in the Original Paper

R.N.

Sreenathan

Department of Anatomy, Al-Arab Medical University, Benghazi, Libya

R.N. Sreenathan, PhD, Department of Anatomy, Al-Arab Medical University, PO Box 17864, Benghazi (Libya)

Dear Sir

This letter has reference to the above mentioned original paper.

In this paper, midsagittal diameters of the lumbar spinal canals in Chinese and Indian adult skeletons are shown to vary from 4.54 ± 0.18 to 8.07 ± 0.19 mm (cephalad). This appears to be incorrect on the following grounds. The authors quote in the same paper that in 51 Dutch skeletons the lowest values ranged from 14 mm at L₁ to 11 mm at L₄ [Huizinga et al., 1952]. In South African skeletons the lowest normal limits of the midsagittal diameter of the canal in the two racial groups were 14 and 12 mm, respectively [Eisenstein, 1977].

In our survey in the Libyan population the lowest limit of midsagittal diameter is 10.5 mm.

The actual measurement in figures 1-3 on page 25 of the article shows the ratio of 2.2:1.3 between the midsagittal diameter of the body (A-P₁) and the midsagittal diameter of the canal (S₁). Apparently, when the midsagittal diameter of the body is 30.29 mm (table 3, p. 26), the midsagittal diameter of the canal should be 17.89 mm.

Based on these grounds, the measurements of the midsagittal diameter of the canal are improbable.

References

Wang, T.M., C. Shih (1992) Morphometric variations of the lumbar vertebrae between Chinese and Indian adults. *Acta Anat* 144: 23-29.

Eisenstein, S. (1977) The morphometry and pathological anatomy of the lumbar spine in South Africa Negroes and Caucasoids with specific reference to spinal stenosis. *J Bone Joint Surg* 59S:173-180.

Huizinga, J., et al. (1952) The human lumbar vertebral canal: A biometric study. *Proc K Ned Acad Van Wet Ser C* 55: 22-33.