

magnetic resonance imaging revealed 2 infarctions in different coronary territories.

This case underscores the importance of implementing screening and diagnostic techniques suitable for detecting this type of patient, as well as asymptomatic carriers (in our patient 3 PCR tests were negative, but IgG was positive for COVID-19).

Iñigo Pereiro Lili,* Ainara Lozano Bahamonde,
and Nora García Ibarrondo

Servicio de Cardiología, Hospital Universitario Basurto, Bilbao, Spain

*Corresponding author:

E-mail address: inigopereiro@hotmail.com (I. Pereiro Lili).

Available online 29 September 2020

REFERENCES

1. Rey JR, Jiménez Valero S, Poveda Pinedo D, Merino JL, López-Sendón JL, Caro-Codón J. COVID-19 y trombosis simultánea en dos arterias coronarias. *Rev Esp Cardiol.* 2020;73:676–678.
2. Madjid M, Safavi-Naeini P, Solomon SD, Vardeny O. Potential effects of coronavirus on the cardiovascular system: a review. *JAMA Cardiol.* 2020. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamacardio.2020.1286>.
3. Levi M, Thachil J, Iba T, Levy JH. Coagulation abnormalities and thrombosis in patients with COVID-19. *Lancet Haematol.* 2020;7:e438–e440.



<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rec.2020.08.015>
1885-5857/

© 2020 Sociedad Española de Cardiología. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. All rights reserved.

New words, not always clearer

Palabras nuevas, no siempre más claras

To the Editor,

When health care professionals use certain technical terms not found in the *Diccionario de la Lengua Española* of the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) and raise questions about their meanings, it is appropriate to ask what is meant. Of course, there are words that are universally understood, such as pain, and others, such as the broad term *fatigue*, that may have different nuances for different people. The risk of confusion when imprecise terms are used—which the author and reader may interpret differently—is evident.¹

Accuracy is the main consideration in scientific texts and is sometimes achieved with more than one word. In fact, not every concept requires using a single word, particularly if no single word exists and the word must be invented, thus requiring the reader to ask what is meant by the term.

Do we need to use *vasculature* when the author himself² proposes alternatives with more than one word? He uses *vasculature* to refer to all the blood vessels of the body or to the vascular system of an organ or area of the body. Although brief wording is recommended, possibly justifying the use of a single word instead of several, content clarity is also an issue. When choosing words that are comprehensible for patients and their relatives, the word *vasculature* is not likely to be risk-free.³ Certainly, the term *musculature* is more easily recognized than



the neologism *vasculature*, which will require some passage of time before it is readily understood.

It is a concern that *vasculature*, a word used in information provided to patients or relatives in outpatient or hospital situations, is simply another word with an unclear meaning for most of the population.

Jordi Delás

Departamento de Medicina, Hospital Universitari Sagrat Cor,
Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

E-mail address: jdelas@ub.edu

Available online

REFERENCES

1. Navarro FA. La precisión del lenguaje en la redacción médica [Internet]. *Cuadernos de la Fundación Dr Antonio Esteve*. 2009. Available from: <https://estev.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/13567.pdf>. Accessed 30 Jul 2020.
2. Navarro F. *Vasculatura* *Rev Esp Cardiol.* 2020;73:604.
3. León-González R, García-Esquinas E, Paredes-Galán E, et al. Health literacy and health outcomes in very old patients with heart failure. *Rev Esp Cardiol.* 2018;71:178–184.



<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rec.2020.08.026>
1885-5857/

© 2020 Sociedad Española de Cardiología. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. All rights reserved.