

Throwaway nonpeer reviewed publications often receive high scores on these audits, frequently better than the scholarly journal in the field. Advertising buyers place great emphasis on these audits and the magazine with consistently low scores has little or no chance of survival.

Some firms use these audits as their sole basis for selecting the journals in which they advertise. It is obvious that doctors do read these publications. Throwaways have an advantage in those audits which measure coverage of a specific field of medicine, because they send their magazine free to all the doctors in that specific field who are known.

Society publications, because they are essentially paid for through society dues, seldom show up as well, because no society can claim as members all of the doctors in a given specialty. Thus, advertisers feel that controlled publications provide them with better coverage of their market.

In the scientific or diagnostic laboratory field there are no such audits. This is primarily because the total advertising dollars spent in these types of publications is much smaller and audit services do not find it lucrative enough to study them.

However, because the scientific and diagnostic laboratory constitutes the ultimate buyer of an advertiser's product, many advertisers evaluate these publications on the basis of their response to advertising.

The throwaways always are sent to laboratories, rather than homes, as are the society journals. Thus throwaways also claim more complete coverage of a specific field than a society journal because of their controlled free distribution.

Throwaway publications in the scientific and laboratory fields almost always draw more response for advertisers than do scholarly journals. They can also eliminate subscribers who advertisers feel are not likely to buy their products, such as students and nonmanagement personnel. It remains for the societies to educate these people.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the facts that I have presented here today will arouse some concern on the part of this committee for the plight of the scientific societies and their journals. If science is to survive, you must find some way to help.

Here are some ways that I feel this committee might be helpful.

One: I respectfully submit that the IRS regulation requiring scientific societies to pay taxes on their advertising revenues is contrary to the public interest and should be repealed.

Two: I suggest that this committee might meet with representatives from industry with the purpose of discussing ways in which a portion of the money now spent in advertising and throwaways might be rechanneled into peer review journals. I think it only fair to mention here that there are already many companies who recognize the importance of peer review journals and set aside a portion of their ad budgets to support them. Unfortunately, there are not enough.

If this committee should decide to propose legislation with respect to advertising in this field, I sincerely hope it will not be in the form of eliminating all advertising. To do so would injure the peer review