



## Editorial

Paul Eldridge

To cite this article: Paul Eldridge (2013) Editorial, British Journal of Neurosurgery, 27:3, 271-271, DOI: [10.3109/02688697.2013.785173](https://doi.org/10.3109/02688697.2013.785173)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.3109/02688697.2013.785173>



Published online: 02 May 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 341



View related articles [↗](#)

## EDITORIAL

This is the third edition of the year and contains the abstracts of the Spring 2013 SBNS meeting held in Sheffield in collaboration with the Hungarian Neurosurgical Society, whom we trust will be most welcome.

This means less than the usual number of articles, but I hope that those that are included are – as usual – of interest. There a number of articles – rather more than typical for an issue – on practical and operational issues of neurosurgery, and in particular the question of emergency workload, reflected in the often unrecognized burden of telephoned referrals. Of course, the telephone has been the medium of referral now for as long as all can remember; in addition many will remember the founder of the journal, Huw Griffith, pioneering one of the earliest examples of remote transfer of images, even to the extent of appearing in television adverts! As with many early technologies, this pioneering example now seems desperately primitive, and if the same quality of image was transmitted, taking an inordinate amount of time probably the registrar receiving the call would simply demand something better – always assuming that the whole enterprise wasn't completely aborted by some information governance apparachik! Of course this has now been superseded by the internet, and the increased data transfer rates allow not only for transfer of much larger data sets, but also live video conferencing, and even remote consultations. This capability does generate valid information governance concerns; however, it is important we do not let these prevent strategies that will benefit patients, especially when the patient risk is clear and tangible compared to a governance risk that is theoretical and highly unlikely. Failure to make this judgment

correctly will not enhance our reputation – our excuses will need to be phenomenally good.

I would also draw attention to the article from the British Neurosurgical Trainee research collaboration; I would like to offer the journal's support and encouragement to this endeavor.<sup>1</sup> I believe that the main motivation for this project genuinely does come from the members of this group themselves, which makes it even more creditable. The importance of research and a research culture is important for us all to support and encourage. Indeed, for those of us that work in the NHS there is an obligation placed on us on to commit to innovation, and to promote research, it being recognized that such a strategy should improve the current and future health care of the population. This commitment is to be found in the 201 version of the NHS constitution itself, being encompassed by the third of seven guiding principles by which the NHS should conduct itself. This (the third) principle is concerned with achieving the highest standards of excellence and professionalism.

I hope the issue is enjoyable for all; and that those of you receiving the journal as delegates at the SBNS meeting also enjoy the content.

PAUL ELDRIDGE  
*Editor-in-Chief*

## Reference

1. Kolas AG, Jones TL, Cowie CJ, *et al.* A report from the inaugural meeting of the British Neurosurgical Trainee Research Collaborative held in the Royal College of Surgeons of England, 19 October 2012. *Br J Neurosurg* 2013;27:307–10.