Letters

Reply

Although Loizides et al. [1] read our article [2] with "great interest and surprise," we read their letter with shock. It appears that the writers have completely missed the objective of our article. Rather than create a laundry list of responses to the comments, we will address the two salient points that were obviously lost or overlooked.

The objective of our article [2] was to "better elucidate factors that may contribute to the success of CT-guided core needle biopsy." The Results section addresses this very clearly. The purpose was not to compare different guidance techniques to determine a "modality of choice."

This article was not designed to evaluate different imaging techniques for the diagnosis of bone and soft-tissue tumors. It addresses CT as a tool for guiding biopsy. Our patients generally present with multiple outside studies, including radiography, MRI, ultrasound, radionuclide, and even PET examinations. Such features as necrosis, aggressive-appearing bone destruction, and vascularity are noted on these outside studies, and localization is transferred to unenhanced CT to target the area for tissue sampling. Admittedly, the legend for Figure 1 is somewhat misleading in alluding that CT was the only imaging tool available.

We regret that our article [2] caused so much confusion for Loizides et al. [1].
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