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THIS OPEN-ACCESS CONTENT MADE POSSIBLE BY THESE GENEROUS SPONSORS
Editorial Controversy in the Journal and the Readers’ Response

Neurotherapy is a relatively young and sometimes disputed clinical field. Although this journal uses careful editorial and peer review processes, nothing that appears in the Journal of Neurotherapy is beyond dispute. The scientific articles published here, the clinical opinions advanced in “Clinical Corner,” the editorial opinions expressed are all open for commentary and reexamination. To continue a dialogue and reevaluation of any matter pertinent to the field of neurotherapy, we invite correspondence from our readers, particularly on articles that appear in this journal. These letters will be published, when suitable, in our “Correspondence” section.

Authors who are critiqued by correspondence will be allowed to answer their critics, in the spirit of promoting meaningful debate and correcting error. Letters to the journal (correspondence) are sought from our readers, with some simple ground rules in play. The letters must be brief, to the point, and collegial in tone. They may include limited references, tables, or an illustration. In addition to criticizing other published work or opinions, letters may also be used to briefly report new or unexpected results, or new methods. They also may be used to report untoward reactions to therapy. All letters must be signed and free of potentially libelous statements. Ad hominem attacks will not be published, nor will letters that are blatantly commercial in orientation. Claims of efficacy for any particular method, equipment or therapy not directly documented by data reported in the letter must be referenced to published studies.

New fields in behavioral health seem to me to develop almost cult-like followings of schools of thought about one particular model or another, with emotional reactions to anything that might be seen as a threat to their perceived orthodoxy. I hope that the correspondence section of the journal can serve as a platform for refereed and objective encounter for disputed facts and opinions in neurotherapy. To that end, your letters to the journal are sought. They will be reviewed and printed as edited (with the author’s permission) in the Correspondence section of the journal.
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