

teral injections of gold may add another. So that the cumulative benefit from small amounts of all of these drugs will give the patient a 70- or 80-percent total benefit.

Do you see? Did I answer that?

MR. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this correspondence as well as Part 2 of Dr. Rothermich's article which appeared in the March 28, 1966 issue of JAMA be placed in the record right after the testimony of Dr. Rothermich. The chart appearing on page 126 of the 1966 JAMA article indicates that most of the patients were on daily doses well above the permitted level.¹

Dr. ROTHERMICH. Senator Nelson, I am not objecting that it be put in there, but I believe that the date should certainly be emphasized; 1963 was a long time ago.

Senator NELSON. I don't know if it is particularly relevant at this stage, because that was before we had much clinical experience with it, right?

Dr. ROTHERMICH. Right.

Mr. GROSSMAN. Doctor, I would like to ask you one question. On page 6 of your testimony, concerning your report in modified form, you say, in the first full paragraph:

The fact is that Medical Journal editors are generally assuming more and more of an authoritarian position and demanding modification of practically every article or report submitted to them. These modifications are based on recommendations from editorial boards and reviewers who, no doubt, are themselves quite human and fallible.

How do you see your role? You talked before about doing things for the benefit of the profession. What do you see as your role in seeing to it that, for example, reports are not published in modified form? If they say they are only going to publish it in a modified form, why would you not say, then, do not publish it if you are going to leave out significant aspects of it? Do you not have some responsibility there?

Dr. ROTHERMICH. This is a question that I find difficult to answer. I cannot quite agree with the increasing authoritarian position assumed by medical journal editors, and I find that at times they are extremely arbitrary. But, you see, they have total power of veto; and if you want to get some information to the profession, you may find it necessary to modify to some extent.

Now, if you feel it is going to be modified substantially, then I think you are honorbound not to agree to its publication. But when I agreed to the publication by striking out the word "blind," I did go to great lengths to explain in the article for the benefit of the statistician-reviewer, that I was doing this, so I felt that my position was tenable.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. GROSSMAN. I think so. As far as you are concerned, there is no control over the various journals to see that this is not done, except for the particular physician who writes the article. Otherwise, nobody checks to see what he leaves out or what he does not?

Dr. ROTHERMICH. No, I think when the article is submitted to the medical journal, the editor submits it to several different reviewers. These reviewers may be all academicians, for example, who are not patient oriented and know little or nothing about the practice of

¹ See information beginning at p. 3282, *infra*.