Editor-in-Chief's Response

Dear Dr Hill,

I am most grateful to you for taking time to transmit your concerns about aspects of the recent case report on the use of titanium mesh cages for surgical management of large segmental bone defects (1, 2). As a result of this interaction with the authors of this paper, our readers of the Journal have had the benefit of gaining a deeper and more detailed insight into certain aspects of the management of this case that might not have been otherwise apparent in the original report. Your contribution, as well as that of Dr. Segal and Dr. Shani, are much appreciated.

While it is apparent that readers of the Journal might reasonably have critiques to make about various imperfections in the surgical techniques employed in this case, one has to ask if this detracts significantly from the value of the report. I do not think so; the report has fulfilled a goal of making known a new technique that could be useful for managing large diaphyseal bone defects in dogs. Ideally the next step forward in the evaluation of this method would be to take the lessons learned in this single case, and to conduct a randomised controlled clinical trial. It is much more difficult to do, but it is the direction we should be going.

I must admit to feeling a little wounded after reading that you found my editing to be shameful, although I do acknowledge that mistakes and inconsistencies do ‘slip under the radar’. You are quite right in pointing out the redundant ‘the’ in the penultimate sentence of the case report. Fortunately it does not seem to have confused the meaning of this sentence.

Since becoming Editor-in-Chief of the Journal, it certainly has not been my experience that our referees are apathetic or lacking in expertise. I never cease to be impressed by their commitment to high standards, as well as the detailed and insightful manuscript reviews that
are produced by them. As you know from your own experience, being a referee for a scientific journal is a thankless job, but it is nevertheless essential to the process. However, we are certainly quite willing to consider recommendations for additional expert referees who would be keen to join our review board and contribute to the process.

Yours sincerely,

Kenneth A. Johnson
Editor-in-Chief

References