

Letter to the editor

Dear Sirs

We have recently published two manuscripts concerning penicillin allergy, one in *Allergy* (1) and the other in *Clinical and Experimental Allergy* (2). We are addressing this letter to the editors of both journals. These articles refer to different studies carried out on the same population. The group of patients in the first study was included in the larger group for the second study and no mention of this was made in

the second article. Although the data included in the first study refer mainly to the role of skin testing and the second to the role of controlled administration, both manuscripts gave details regarding the same population, which constitutes a partial duplication.

The authors recognize that it was an error of judgement not to inform you and the reviewers of the existence of the other manuscript. We have not intentionally set

out to duplicate any part of the study and regret any misunderstanding this may have led to. We would also like to apologize for the concern that this may cause to the high reputation of both journals.

M.J. Torres

M. Blanca

Research Unit for Allergic Diseases Carlos Haya Hospital, Málaga, Spain

References

1. TORRES MJ, ROMANO A, MAYORGA C, MOYA MC, GUZMAN AE, RECHE M, JUAREZ C, BLANCA M. Diagnostic evaluation of a large group of patients with immediate allergy to penicillins: the role of skin testing. *Allergy* 2001;**56**:850–856.
2. TORRES MJ, MAYORGA C, LEYVA L, GUZMAN A, CONEJO JA, JUÁREZ C, BLANCA M. Controlled administration of penicillin to patients with a positive history but negative skin test and in vitro test. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2002;**32**:270–276.