I hope that this unfortunate incident is now closed and that you will consider any other papers submitted by me or the NAS–NRC according to your customary critical editorial review on the basis of their intrinsic merit.

Sincerely yours,

CALVIN M. KUNIN, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman.

Enclosure—Senate testimony.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., May 19, 1969.

CALVIN M. KUNIN, M.D.,
University of Virginia School of Medicine,
Charlottesville, Va.

DEAR DOCTOR KUNIN: I was somewhat surprised to discover that in the only communication that you have had with this office in recent months you refer to the belief that "this unfortunate incident is now closed."

The enclosed copy of my memo to my file as of May 8 refers to your statement published in the New York Times to the effect that I had rejected your manuscript. However, it is apparent that your remarks about the "rejection" in the question and answer period were based upon hearsay evidence—a very tricky business in a formal senate hearing.

Do you have any document that I had ever received a "publishable copy" or any document from my office that I had "rejected" such a copy?

Insofar as other manuscripts are concerned, submitted by you or the National Research Council, they will receive the customary editorial review only after the final publishable copy has been submitted, similar to the enclosed letter from Dr. Trexler. This accompanied the recent manuscript which was published in the May 16 issue of JAM.A

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. TALBOTT, M.D.

Enclosures: NYT's Report; Memo of 5/8/69; Dr. Trexler's correspondence.

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 209, No. 4, July 28, 1969, p. 552]

EDITORIALS—EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITIES—EDITORAL PROCEDURES

During the past ten years as Editor of this JOURNAL under authority from the Board of Trustees, I have assumed my responsibilities in keeping with current practices for many scientific publications, as well as other substantial periodicals. A statement of responsibilities and procedures such as this had scarcely seemed necessary until recent months. Two statements have appeared in the press raising certain questions, which, because of their repetition, demand a breach of the silence usually kept.

In carrying out the charge from the Board, a statement of the current procedure which has been in effect for a decade, and which has been reaffirmed in writing to anyone who has inquired, is as follows:

"No decision can be expected regarding acceptance, revision or rejection of a manuschipt until this office has had an opportunity to review critically the final draft submtited by the author(s) of a publishable copy. This review includes