

Senator NELSON. So, of the 5,000 articles that are submitted, the editorial board advises as to what mix, what variety of scientific articles ought to be included?

Mr. ORMES. They would provide advice on that, yes.

Senator NELSON. The members of your peer review group are independent; they review independently of each other, is that correct?

Mr. ORMES. Yes, sir.

Senator NELSON. And what is the standard by which you measure their peer review? On what grounds? If they say it is mediocre, or not well done, or not soundly based, does the editor then automatically reject?

Mr. SCHERAGO. John?

Mr. RINGLE. That's right.

If both peer reviewers say this article is not up to acceptable scientific standards, we would reject it. If they were split in their opinion, we would seek another opinion, or try to decide on some basis. If the negative reviewer seemed to have very good reasons why he thought this was not up to standard, we would likely reject it, since we have to reject about 80 percent of all material we receive anyway.

Senator NELSON. Well, are most or all of the articles that appear endorsed by the two peer reviewers?

Mr. RINGLE. Yes, sir.

[Mr. Ormes nods affirmatively.]

Mr. RINGLE. Almost all of them.

Senator NELSON. Do you have any more questions, Mr. Gordon?

Mr. GORDON. No, sir.

Mr. SCHERAGO. Senator, just one other thing in that respect.

I really do not feel that, except for tabloids, there is a great deal of exchanging articles for advertising. I think that if there is any influence, it comes from the types of articles that a magazine accepts because obviously it has to publish the kind of editorial that will attract advertisers, that is, the direction that it takes and the fields that it covers. So, in that sense, I think there is more influence than there is in the actual trade, although that does happen.

Senator NELSON. I did not understand your point.

Mr. SCHERAGO. The point is, the direction of editorial content can also be influenced by advertisers as well as the content of a specific article.

Senator NELSON. In a nonpeer review?

Mr. SCHERAGO. In a nonpeer review.

Senator NELSON. Thank you very much, gentlemen. I appreciate your taking the time to come.

Our next witness is Dr. Jack Kelly, chairman of the board, and Dr. Leslie Huffman, Jr., speaker of the Congress of Delegates, American Academy of Family Physicians.

Senator Laxalt was here and intended to introduce Dr. Kelly, but had to leave prior to your appearance. I am sure you saw him this morning. He regrets he could not be here to introduce you.

Go ahead, please.

Would you identify your associates so that the record will be accurate?