

Editorial

Letters to the Editor: The Best Arthroscopy Research Ever!

In recent years, we have more (and more) frequently called (encouraged, exhorted, cajoled, and even begged) for your Letters to the Editor.¹⁻⁹ As evidenced by the Letters in this issue,¹⁰⁻¹⁷ you have responded. We very much appreciate this because we believe a lively, controversial dialogue will more quickly bring us to ultimate consensus on which treatments are best for our patients.

Beginning with this issue of *Arthroscopy*, we will further emphasize the importance we place on your opinions by moving the Letters to the Editor section to the front of our journal. We believe this makes journalistic sense not only because we feel your letters are of vital importance, but that it is logical for readers to begin by first reviewing a commentary on what has previously been published, and then moving on to our new articles.

We hope this prominent, primary position of our Letters to the Editor section will result in an even more robust reader response, so we hail you once again and say, please send us your letters!

In addition, we aspire to practice what we preach, and thus share some of our own correspondence immediately below.

JAMES H. LUBOWITZ, M.D.
Assistant Editor-in-Chief

GARY G. POEHLING, M.D.
Editor-in-Chief

A previously unpublicized and friendly academic dialogue between Dr. Lubowitz and Dr. Poehling is here revealed:

1 January 2009

Dear Dr. Poehling,

Thank you for your rapid review of and response to my article, "The Best Arthroscopy Research Ever!"

However, I believe you have made a small error because your letter suggests that the article was not accepted for publication. I await your immediate correction of this oversight.

Sincerely, James H. Lubowitz, M.D.

3 January 2009

Dear Jim,

I am sorry, but there was no error or oversight. We are unable to accept your article for publication.

Gary

4 January 2009

Dear Gary,

Perhaps you did not understand my article. Did you read the title? This is "The Best Arthroscopy Research Ever!"

With respect, Jim

12 January 2009

Jim,

Your article was subjected to our process of blinded, peer-review. The unanimous consensus of the two Reviewers, the Associate Editor, and your Editor-in-chief is that the article cannot be accepted for publication. This decision is based not only on the quality of your article, but in comparison to the many articles submitted to our journal.

Rejectfully, Dr. Poehling

13 January 2009

Dear Gary,

It seems very obvious that the Reviewers, Associate Editor, and you are confused. It is sad that you fail to appreciate that my article is "The Best Arthroscopy Research Ever!" I recommend that you reconsider your decision, pronto.

Jim

2 February 2009

Dear Jim,

To quote your quoting of J.J.P. Warner, quoting Christian Gerber: "Your research is interesting and original. Unfortunately, the interesting research isn't original, and the original research isn't interesting." Take a hint: you should change your title to "The Worst Arthroscopy Research Ever."

Most sincere regards, Gary G. Poehling, M.D., Editor-in-Chief and Your Boss

15 February 2009

Dear Boss,

First, I hope Sandy and you had a wonderful and romantic St. Valentine's day, and that you are both healthy and well. Second, you are totally round the

bend. However, I will revise my title as you suggest above; now, will you publish my paper?

Your friend, Jim

3 March 2009

Dear Former Friend Jim,

Sandy and I are just fine, thank you. However, your supercilious syntax, sibilant soliloquies, and senseless, sycophantic simpering are simply seditious. Please cease and desist from this dialogue lest I become annoyed! Send my very best to Gina, and I hope you have a delightful finish to your ski season.

Break a leg, Gary

21 March 2009

Dear Gary,

I can read between the lines. It is obvious that you are beginning to see the merit of my manuscript. I propose you publish "The Best Arthroscopy Research Ever!" as Level V evidence in the next issue.

My cast comes off this summer, Jim

1 April 2009

Dear Jim,

Excellent suggestion.

April Fools! Gary

2 April 2009

Dear Editor,

Me thinks thou dost protest too much. How about my idea of a Level V evidence publication?

Seriously, Jim

14 April 2009

Jim,

In all seriousness you make an excellent suggestion. However, a problem is that Level V evidence represents expert opinion. In this matter, you present amateur, inexperienced, unskilled, untrained, unknowledgeable, and decidedly inexpert opinion. Let us drop the matter. In addition, I am rewarding you with a permanent vacation from the position of Assistant Editor-in-chief without pay.

Enjoy your time off, GGP

4 June 2009

Dear Dr. Poehling,

Thank you for your response. Am I correct to assume that my article, "The Best Arthroscopy Research Ever!" will not be accepted for publication in Arthroscopy? I ask this question, because it seems like this might be what you are trying to say.

Enjoying the beach, JHL

28 June 2009

Jim,

You finally understand.

Gary

29 June 2009

Gary,

Will you reconsider?

Jim

30 June 2009

Jim,

No.

Deborah VanNoy for Dr. Poehling

1 September 2009

Dear Deborah,

With regret, I am writing to inform you that I am withdrawing my original scientific article, "The Best Arthroscopy Research Ever!" from submission to the Arthroscopy journal. However, I am pleased to share with you that the article has been accepted for publication! You may read my article in a forthcoming issue of the American version of the esteemed Journal of Bonny and Jovial Rejections.

Send my very best to Gary and Hank, and let them know that if they ever need a Letters-to-the-Editor Editor, I'm their man, Jim

REFERENCES

1. Lubowitz JH, Poehling GG. Clinical relevance: Eight shoulders and a knee. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:571-572.
2. Lubowitz JH, Poehling GG. Two on the fast track: Arthroscopic rotator cuff repair and subacromial decompression with coracoacromial ligament excision. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:2-3.
3. Lubowitz JH, Poehling GG. Mundo grande: Hip clinical diagnosis and journal translation. *Arthroscopy* 2008;24:1321-1322.
4. Lubowitz JH, Poehling GG. Keeping up with the literature: Knee ligament, wrist triangular fibrocartilage tear, and suture bridge rotator cuff technique questions. *Arthroscopy* 2008;24:1203-1204.
5. Lubowitz JH, Poehling GG. Diagnosis, safety, efficacy: hip and shoulder arthroscopy. *Arthroscopy* 2008;24:973.
6. Lubowitz JH, Poehling GG. Summertime blues: ACL rupture, rotator cuff tear, and meniscus tear seem epidemic. *Arthroscopy* 2008;24:741-742.
7. Lubowitz JH, Poehling GG. Do basic science articles have clinical relevance? *Arthroscopy* 2008;24:249-250.
8. Lubowitz JH, Poehling GG. A new year. *Arthroscopy* 2008;24:2-3.
9. Lubowitz JH, Poehling GG. Hip arthroscopy: An emerging gold standard. *Arthroscopy* 2006;22:1257-1259.
10. Vogrin M, Rozman P, Haspl M. Concerns about the effects of platelet concentrate. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:941-942.
11. Orrego M, Larrain C. Author's reply. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:942.
12. van Eck CF, Romanowski JR, Fu FH. Anatomic single-bundle anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:943-946.
13. Abdalla RJ, Forgas A. Author's reply. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:946-947.
14. Burks RT. Concerns about management of septic arthritis after acl reconstruction. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:947-948.
15. Ao Y, Wang C. Author's reply. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:948.
16. Lorenz S, Tashman S, Fu FH. Failed exploration of rotational instability in single- and double-bundle acl reconstruction. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:949.
17. Steiner ME, Ho JY-D. Author's reply. *Arthroscopy* 2009;25:949-950.