
The *MJA* and Gawler: a case of self-censorship? Correction and clarification

COMMENT: In the 4 June issue of the Journal, I responded¹ to an enquiry from McBryde² as to why the *Medical Journal of Australia* decided not to publish an article by Haines and Lowenthal regarding the importance of a histological diagnosis when managing advanced cancer.

I would like to clarify that the prime reason for rejecting the manuscript was that the patient in the case it reported had not provided consent to have his clinical details published, and was not, as my letter stated, that the information in the manuscript was already publicly available. I also acknowledge that while the clinical facts were not new, the interpretation was novel, and it was for this reason that the manuscript was originally considered for publication. Unfortunately, we were unaware at the time of our decision to accept the manuscript that patient consent would not be forthcoming. The quality of the manuscript by Haines and Lowenthal was not in question. Finally, we received the original manuscript in October 2010, not in 2011 as was stated.

Annette G Katelaris Editor

Medical Journal of Australia, Sydney, NSW.
akatelaris@mja.com.au

Competing interests: No relevant disclosures.

doi: 10.5694/mja12.11051

1 Katelaris AG. The *MJA* and Gawler: a case of self-censorship [letter]? *Med J Aust* 2012; 196: 628. doi: 10.5694/mja12.10806.

2 McBryde ES. The *MJA* and Gawler: a case of self-censorship [letter]? *Med J Aust* 2012; 196: 628. doi: 10.5694/mja12.10684. □