

FM REVIEW 2013 30 COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO EDITOR: I would recommend revision along the lines of reviewer 1. Reviewer 2 is obviously very smart and erudite, but he is also extremely harsh. My impression is that he just didn't like the whole tone of the essay. (I had to google ad misericordiam, but it means appealing to the emotions in a very negative way). I am not sure about his criticism regarding the inappropriate reference to Aristotle. I know that Aristotle was trained as a physician and possibly made anatomical studies (thank you again, google), but the author should be sure this is a correct allusion. Otherwise, I am supportive of the author reworking.

COMMENTS TO AUTHOR: This is a really intriguing and thoughtful article that has much potential. The concept of our ethical responsibility to the past in light of impossible-to-anticipate developments such as the internet is unique and powerful. Your awareness of the power of images, both historical and contemporary, is to be commended. However, the essay needs some revision, primarily because at times the writing is awkward and the diction confusing. Reviewer 1 has done you a great service by providing line-by-line revisions. Please consider these seriously. In addition, Reviewer 2 wrote that your reference to Aristotle is "inaccurate." I am not a medical historian, but I do know that Aristotle himself was trained as a physician. Did he actually make medical images? Or were medical images made in the time of Aristotle? Please make sure your language is clear and your facts are accurate on this point. Also please ensure that the manuscript is free of any inadvertent grammatical, typographical, or spelling errors.

COMMENTS TO EDITOR II: This is a much improved essay. It starts with the personal experience of the author contemplating a medical photograph, and expands to ethical questions regarding the use of such images. It is not an opinion piece (in my opinion!) because it does not take a position, but rather encourages the reader to consider the issues raised. The author has done a meticulous job of incorporating all of reviewer 1's suggestions, which have made it easier to read. The author has also provided a reference supporting her assertion re Aristotle (in response to reviewer 2's challenge). LeNeva also reviewed the essay with a favorable reaction. The topic is intriguing, the author uses her personal experience to good effect, and all in all I think the essay is well worth appearing in the pages of Family Medicine.

COMMENTS TO AUTHOR II: Thank you for your careful revisions and for referencing your Aristotle allusion. The article now reads much better and has a good flow. (Please review a final time for typos [second word, first sentence] and unnecessary commas). We like the fact that you are not arguing a particular position, but rather bring the reader along on a journey marked by questions and wondering. This is a unique subject and deserves the contemplation you bestow on it.