able annotation to its proper place, namely, the correspondence column, where the writer would have been required to acknowledge his identity, and yet the responsibility has been laid upon you of making a personal attack upon a colleague whose work has been received with the highest appreciation both in Europe and the United States. The result can only be that an entirely false impression will be created among our foreign colleagues as to the position which Dr. Edridge Green holds as an authority upon colour vision among his colleagues in this country. It will be a poor day for science if so reprehensible a means, as here portrayed, for expressing a difference of personal opinion, were to become common.

I am, Sir, Yours truly,

PERCY DUNN.

WIMPOLE STREET, LONDON, W.
March 8, 1922.

[We refer our readers to the annotation in question and leave it to them to judge if the above censure is justified. In our opinion the comments are a fair scientific criticism.—EDITOR.]

---

COLLOSOL ARGENTUM (FOR THE MEDICAL PROFESSION ONLY)

To the Editor of The British Journal of Ophthalmology

Sir,—In your last issue a letter from Mr. R. R. James calls attention to and criticises a circular booming the above drug in the cure of ophthalmia neonatorum by dropping a solution of it into the conjunctival sac. He asks if it has been tried at St. Margaret's Hospital for ophthalmia neonatorum. In reply, I may say that it has been extensively tried and found to be of little or no value in weak solutions, and in strong solutions causes pain and irritation without any advantage over other silver preparations. It is also our experience that unless silver preparations are rubbed into the conjunctiva they do not produce the desired result.

Yours faithfully,

M. S. MAYOU.

HARLEY STREET, LONDON, W.

---

To the Editor of The British Journal of Ophthalmology

CORRESPONDENCE

issued by Crookes Laboratories, which I had not noticed. I have written to the Crookes Laboratories and have received a reply as follows:

LETTER TO CROOKES LABORATORIES.

43, PRYME STREET, HULL,

March 7, 1922.

Re Collosol Argentum.

Gentlemen,—My attention has been called to a brochure of yours on collosol argentum which I understand has been extensively circulated among medical men. You state that this is a plain statement of facts relating to the actions and uses of collosol argentum based entirely on the Published Reports of Medical Authorities in Standard Medical Journals. You quote from an article of mine in the British Medical Journal, 1915, Vol. I, p. 104.

Quoting me under gonorrhoeal ophthalmia, you say, "Patients treated with collosol argentum drops were cured in five days, and in severe cases which had failed to respond to silver nitrate and mercuric chloride, collosol argentum stopped the discharge in thirty-six hours and checked the ulceration, with the result that rapid recovery followed."

The natural inference from the above is that collosol argentum was substituted for the nitrate of silver and irrigations of mercury perchloride, whereas in the article it is definitely stated that the same treatment was continued, and, in addition, collosol argentum drops were introduced into the eye after each irrigation.

Again, quoting me in reference to purulent ophthalmia of infants, he states "that if collosol argentum drops were employed impaired vision or blindness from this cause would cease, and the drops being harmless to the conjunctiva the treatment of the case may be safely left to the friends."

Again, you make me say that the drops being harmless to the conjunctiva the treatment of the case may be safely left to the friends.

I said that "the drops being absolutely harmless may be safely trusted to the friends. The child is brought up once daily for the silver nitrate drops. The eyes are washed out every hour at home and the collosol drops put in." That is a totally different matter to saying that the treatment of the case may be safely left to the friends. As these quotations are so inaccurate and so grossly
misleading, in the public interest I must request you to stop the circulation of the brochure at once, and, in addition, to send to each person to whom you have sent the brochure, including myself, a full extract of that portion of my article referring to "Gonorrhoeal Ophthalmia and to Purulent Ophthalmia of Infants," with a suitable apology. I have only once trusted to collosol argentum entirely in the treatment of the above cases.

I enclose a reprint of my article as it appeared in the British Medical Journal.

I await your reply,

Yours faithfully,

A. Legge Roe.

Reply from the Crookes Laboratories.

22, Chenies Street,
Tottenham Court Road, London, W.C.1.

March 14, 1922.

A. Legge Roe, L.R.C.P., L.R.C.S.I.,
43, Pryme Street, Hull.

Dear Sir,—We learn with much concern and regret from your favour of the 7th instant, that a recently published brochure on collosol argentum has misquoted you in respect of your article of January 16, 1915. We would ask you primarily to acquit us of any intention to misrepresent or distort your views as expressed in the article above mentioned, and feel sure you will agree with us that there was not the slightest reason why such should have been made other than accidentally, as the addition of the omissions would hardly affect the value of your opinions.

Further, it would, we think, be taken for granted that practitioners who might be interested in cases similar to those mentioned in the brochure would, in the majority of instances, turn to the original article for explicit information, and for that reason care was taken that the authority for each statement should be quoted.

The Crookes Laboratories have issued to the medical profession an immense amount of literature from time to time, and this is the first occasion upon which, in spite of the many possibilities for error in the production of such material, that we have ever laid ourselves open to rebuke.

We hold ourselves to blame for not examining and comparing the manuscript of the brochure when returned to us by our printers, but you will appreciate that having regard to the care exercised in compiling from our available material it was assumed with certainty that all quotations were correct in every particular.
CORRESPONDENCE

It would, unfortunately, be extremely difficult to trace all the medical men to whom a copy of the brochure in question has been sent already, but we can certainly assure you that no other copies will be issued containing the quotation to which you refer.

If we have your permission we should be glad of the opportunity of reprinting the whole of your article and issuing it with the brochure, calling attention to the discrepancies so that those interested may ascertain for themselves your exact statement.

We have been the more sorry for this occurrence as in the past your article has been of much value in securing the extended use of collosol argentum, which is now almost universally employed by ophthalmic surgeons. You will doubtless remember that you were practically the pioneer in utilising and publishing the results of your investigations, and we should, indeed, hold ourselves in contempt if any intentional action on our part was likely to cause inconvenience or trouble to a member of the medical profession to whose kindly interest we owe much.

Yours faithfully,

FOR BRITISH COLLOIDS, LIMITED,

(Signed) E. H. BUCKMAN, General Manager.

Hull, March 15, 1922.

I am, Sir, Yours truly,

A. LEGGE ROE.

SCLEROCORNEAL TREPHTINING AND HOLTH'S EXTRALIMBAL TANGENTIAL SCLERECTOMY

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF OPHTHALMOLOGY

Sir,—Will you allow me some words in reply to Lieut.-Colonel R. H. Elliot’s letter in your March issue (p. 141). He qualifies as a "serious error" my quotation of Duane’s additional note in Fuchs’s Text-book of Ophthalmology, 6th American edition, 1919, p. 512. I admit that I ought to have quoted literally "according to some" instead of "according to American operators," though Duane’s additional notes generally concern experiences in America. I don’t know if some of European statistics have "about 7 per cent" of late infections after sclerectomies, though Professor J. Meller, in his "Manual of Ophthalmic Operations," 1921, p. 333, speaks of the "terrific frequency" of this calamity after sclero-corneal trephining.

When Mr. Elliot writes: "Duane makes it absolutely clear that he is speaking of sclerectomy as a whole, and not of any single