

successes make more interesting reading than failures. Another common answer is that the journal sells space on the basis of reader interest and to sustain this interest the journal must contain objective articles. Usually, however, it is acknowledged that whenever material severely adverse to a sponsor is received, that sponsor is given the opportunity to rebut that material before it goes into the journal.

In any event, and for whatever reasons, the editorial content of these controlled circulation journals is overwhelmingly optimistic about drug therapy. A recent editorial appeared in the January 1976 issue of Current Prescribing. The article, entitled "The Undermedicated Society," laments that underprescribing and not overprescribing is a major problem in American medicine. The author states, "The family physician's alleged propensity to overprescribe has provoked well-publicized investigations, both Congressional and clinical."

"But what of the other side of the problem - underprescribing? Do doctors sometimes prescribe too little? In interviews with experts in several specialties, Current Prescribing found that the answer is yes. For many conditions, and with a number of drugs, M.D.'s may be giving their patients therapeutic short change." I am submitting a copy of this article for the record.

The editorial position is not without merit, but several questions arise. The editorial writer was not a physician and had to seek advice about matters like under- and overprescribing from physicians. In selecting his consultants could the support of his magazine have affected his choices? Is a journal wholly dependent upon the pharmaceutical industry