Julio de Pablos

Re: *International Orthopaedics*, vol 27, (Suppl 1) 2003

Accepted: 24 September 2003 / Published online: 5 February 2004
© Springer-Verlag 2004

Sir,

A few weeks ago I received Supplement 1 of volume 27, 2003 from your journal *International Orthopaedics*, which was entirely devoted to one particular model of hip endoprosthesis. In my opinion, this Supplement is clearly more an advertisement of that implant endorsed by an orthopaedic journal of international scientific reputation (SICOT) than any other thing. Were those articles peer reviewed? Have some of the authors received financial support from the company that produces the implants? Will the rest of implant makers have also the opportunity to publish the results obtained in similar supplements of *International Orthopaedics*?

I have no doubt that this group of articles, all dealing with the same prosthesis and showing its excellent results, is very profitable for the maker of the implant, but, on the contrary, I do not think this is the best way for us, orthopaedics surgeons, to study and learn from the experience of others.

In summary, Mr. Editor, I think this type of publication is, in my opinion, inappropriate for any scientific journal such as *International Orthopaedics* (SICOT), which by definition has to be completely independent from any commercial influences, and suggest that it should not be repeated again.

Sincerely yours,
Julio de Pablos

Response

Dear Dr. De Pablos,

Thank you for your interest in our journal. As you have noticed, the Supplement is a commercial publication on the basis of a commercial meeting held at the SICOT Congress in San Diego 2002. Due to the small number of subscribers, Springer has difficulties in attracting advertisements to the journal. The Editorial Board therefore decided to support Springer in this matter. Advertisements help keep the costs of the journal low. The journal costs less than \$10 Euro per year of your membership fee. Although the sum is small, the Editorial Board would like this sum to be nil. The Editorial Board thus favours Supplements, if they reduce our expenses.

I personally understand your disapproval—but you should understand that a non-commercial independent journal is far too expensive. The Supplement you received is only the second in the history of the journal. If we reject commercial Supplements, we will have to find many more non-member subscribers or use a greater percentage of the membership fee to cover the journal's expenses.

Yours sincerely
K. Skou Andersen
Editor