

Dialogue

Peter E Lipsky

As I am thinking about this Editorial, I am sitting in a darkened room at a scientific symposium listening to the marvelous developments in our understanding of microRNAs. I am always amazed to learn about a field that did not even exist when I was undergoing training, or even when the Yankees last won the World Series, and that seems to have developed overnight from a few seminal observations. The speed with which modern technology allows investigators to develop an initial observation into an entire discipline is astounding and creates a real communication challenge.

How can physicians remain informed about the progress in a dynamic new field of investigation that has obvious translational potential? This is a central problem that needs to be addressed so that physicians do not become scientifically marginalized and, therefore, unable to understand the basis of new therapies or laboratory investigations, or to contribute to their eventual application. Failure to involve physicians in a discussion about the potential clinical application of new scientific advances creates the real possibility that these discoveries might be applied in an ineffective or inappropriate manner. The challenge, then, is to create a working dialogue between laboratory and clinical investigators that will enable the appropriate focusing of novel basic discoveries into meaningful clinical applications.

This challenge was one of the important motivating factors in the development of *Nature Clinical Practice Rheumatology*. The goal of *Nature Clinical Practice Rheumatology* was not only to create a means of informing the practicing rheumatologist about new scientific developments, but also to translate primary scientific advances into effective clinical

How can physicians remain informed about the progress in a dynamic new field of investigation that has obvious translational potential?

PE Lipsky is the Editor-in-Chief of Nature Clinical Practice Rheumatology.

Competing interests

The author declared he has no competing interests.

www.nature.com/clinicalpractice
doi:10.1038/ncprheum0043

applications. Since the development of the concept, the Nature Publishing Group has been extremely busy nurturing the idea into reality. An excellent Editorial Staff has been identified and an internationally recognized Advisory Board established. Through interactions between myself, the journal staff, Board members and many members of the rheumatology community, an editorial philosophy has been developed and content commissioned. Now, many months later, we have a nascent journal. Is it a success? It is too soon to know for sure, but the signs are very encouraging. The response to the content of the first issue has been gratifyingly positive. The combination of Reviews, Viewpoints, Practice Points, Case Studies and updates on what's new in rheumatology seems appropriate, as does the list of subjects covered. We cautiously believe that we are off to a good start. The only way we will know for sure, however, is to hear from the readers. We welcome your comments on how *Nature Clinical Practice Rheumatology* is doing and what could be done to make *Nature Clinical Practice Rheumatology* even more useful for you. We strongly believe that dialogue is the best form of communication and we encourage the readership to participate actively. Only in that way can *Nature Clinical Practice Rheumatology* meet its goals and develop into an important forum for communication about topical issues in the science and practice of rheumatology. Together, we can learn and discuss novel developments in basic science, such as the evolving awareness of the critical regulatory role of microRNAs, and actively contribute to the appropriate application of that information to the care of patients with rheumatic diseases.