

FM REVIEW 2016 22 COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO EDITOR: This is a well-written essay that tells two contrasting stories, one of a "Marcus Welby Moment" and one of an MWM missed opportunity. Both reviewers liked the piece and felt it encouraged reflection on an important issue. Two issues need to be addressed: 1) the essay as written exceeds the column's limit by almost 200 words; 2) while the essay critiques the EMR as antithetical to MWM, it does not indicate how the author plans on pursuing her MWM encounters while still practicing in the 21st century. I anticipate that she will be able to correct both these concerns.

COMMENTS TO AUTHOR: Thank you for this well-written, moving essay that tells two contrasting stories, one of a "Marcus Welby Moment" and one of an MWM missed opportunity. The loss of human connection in medicine as a result of the EMR (as well as a host of other factors) is an important issue worth attention, and your essay does this very well.

We have a few relatively minor issues that we would like to see addressed. One is that the essay exceeds the column's limit by almost 200 words. We request that you shorten it to bring it closer to the 1000 word maximum (some areas for possible consolidation are indicated in the attached edited version). 2) The EMR is only one force among many contributing to the detachment of physician from patient, and it would be appropriate to acknowledge this (you do not need to discuss these factors, simply note their existence). 3) The EMR is here to stay. Your determination to continue to seek out MWM with your patients is admirable and inspiring. Can you say something about how you intend to balance this commitment with the demands of practicing EMR-based medicine?

COMMENTS TO EDITOR III: This essay discusses the loss of important relational moments between doctor and patient, symbolized by the efficiency and impersonality of the EMR. The author successfully made most changes recommended by reviewers and editor and reduced the word count considerably. Regarding the request to address ways of reconciling the EMR with the desire to preserve "Marcus Welby" moments, the author stated she could not do this because she herself has not yet found a solution. This response is honest and has integrity. I suggest a couple of small word changes (see below), but recommend accepting this piece.

COMMENTS TO AUTHOR III: Thank you for making edits and significantly reducing the word count of this essay. I respect that you cannot address the request to discuss ways of reconciling the EMR with your desire to preserve MWM because you are still looking for solutions. This is an honest response and one with integrity. Readers will just have to keep searching for themselves!

Please approve the following minor changes:

- 1) Pg 2, line 5 - substitute "persons with disabilities" for "the disabled"
- 2) Pg 2, line 41 - substitute "vacation" for "trip" (awful lot of "trips" in this section)
- 3) Pg 2, line 51 - I suggest going back to the original phrasing: "...saying the trip..." instead of "...saying that taking this trip..." (too many "taking/taken" in this sentence)

4) Pg 2, line 53 - substitute "filled" or some other word for "teeming" (this is not really the correct use of this term, unless it is a direct quotation from the patient, in which case it should be in quotes)

I very much like the sentence that pursuing MWMs "makes medicine joyful." Great insight! The sentence about "persisting" conveys that you have not solved the dilemma, but also underlines why the continued effort is so important.

COMMENTS TO EDITOR III: I am a little confused. The author's cover letter says that she has accepted the 4 minor suggestions I made, as follows:

1) Pg 2, line 5 - substitute "persons with disabilities" for "the disabled" (avoids totalizing of disability)

2) Pg 2, line 41 - substitute "vacation" for "trip" (awful lot of "trips" in this section)

3) Pg 2, line 51 - I suggest going back to the original phrasing: "...saying the trip..." instead of "...saying that taking this trip..." (too many "taking/taken" in this sentence)

4) Pg 2, line 53 - substitute "filled" or some other word for "teeming" (this is not really the correct use of this term, unless it is a direct quotation from the patient, in which case it should be in quotes)

However, on the pdf version as it appears on my computer, it looks as though only corrections #2 and #3 have been accepted. #1 and #4 are the more serious poor word choices, one because it is a potentially offensive term to persons with disabilities; and four because it is not a correct use of the term.

Can you please check the pdf and see if on your version all 4 changes have been made. Otherwise, I suppose it will have to be sent back to the author, unless we can accept her statement that she agrees with them and make the changes ourselves.

COMMENTS TO AUTHOR III: We want each essay to be as perfect as possible, including attention to word choice. These very minor changes nevertheless improve the flow of the manuscript. Thank you for accepting these minor suggested changes. The essay is really lovely and will remind our readers to work hard to build MWMs.

COMMENTS TO EDITOR IV: I am a little confused. In her cover note, the author writes that she approves the two small changes I suggested. However, on the revised pdf, it appears to me that only one of these changes has been made. The other - Pg 2, line 5 - substitute "persons with disabilities" for "the disabled"- really should be made because referring to "the disabled" is totalizing language that most disability rights advocates would recommend avoiding. I recommend accepting this essay, and perhaps given the author's letter we can make the change ourselves.

COMMENTS TO AUTHOR IV: Thank you for approving both the recommended changes. This article will make a lovely contribution to Family Medicine. Thank you for considering the journal as an outlet for your work.