

Letter to the editor

Ray Dyer , Pavani Thotakura

Department of Radiology, Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Medical Center Blvd., Winston-Salem, NC 27157, USA

To the Editor,

On behalf of myself and my coauthor, I would like to thank Drs. McCloskey and Sathyanarayana for their interest in the “signs” feature in *Abdominal Radiology* and for their bringing to our attention our editorial misstep [1].

My wife often points out that I cannot find ketchup in the refrigerator, and as the “senior author” of the manuscript on “the nubbin sign” [2], it was my responsibility to assure the correctness of the submission that, according to my notes, went through seven editorial iterations. Nevertheless, an “e” was somehow lost from “Meyer” in our discussion of the venerable “Weigert-Meyer Rule” [1, 3].

While most radiologists and radiology trainees are familiar with the basics of the rule that predicts the position of the two ureteral orifices in a completely duplicated collecting system, the fact that the ureteral orifice of the lower pole ureter may be prone to reflux

with parenchymal injury leading to a “nubbin” is often not emphasized [3]. Hopefully, our oversight will in no way be seen to diminish the importance of a rule that most would agree has stood the test of time [1].

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Research involving human and animal rights This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

References

1. McCloskey F, Sathyanarayana R (2016) Letter to the editor. *Abdom Radiol* 41:1439
2. Thotakura P, Dyer RB (2015) The “Nubbin” Sign. *Abdom Radiol* 41:340–341
3. Zagoria RJ, Dyer R, Brady C (2016) *Genitourinary imaging: the requisites*. Philadelphia: Elsevier Inc