## On the same page

As most of you know, *Modern Drug Discovery* recently completed a readership survey. In these days of e-mail overload and spam aggravation, I'd like to personally thank those of you who opened and then took the time to respond to our electronic survey. The feedback you've provided is already proving extremely useful. Based on the survey, I know at least half of *MDD*'s readers find my editorials somewhat interesting and useful!

But what exactly have we learned? First, I'd like to convey my appreciation to the majority of you who expressed your support for the magazine and for your steady readership. It's good to hear that you look to *MDD* as a leading source to learn more about discovery and development approaches, industry trends, the drug R&D business, clinical and regulatory updates, and new technologies, products, and services.

To those of you who may have been less enthusiastic or more critical, be assured that we hear you. We will work to address the issues you've raised. As we cull through the responses— including several hundred written comments on how we can serve our readers' professional needs—I've already begun collecting ideas for upcoming articles, looking for ways to improve our content, and most importantly, learning what it really is that you want and don't want to see.

I'm very pleased about the positive reaction toward many *MDD* departments, such as the expanded Diseases and Disorders, the new People and Perspectives, and the insightful Clinical Trials Track and Rules and Regulators. This month's issue will not disappoint. For example, Diseases and Disorders focuses on the pipeline for osteoporosis drugs, a rapidly growing market expected to exceed $11 billion by 2006, while Rules and Regulators looks at recent conflict-of-interest issues involving NIH scientists.

Our clinical trials story this month was so compelling that we offer it as a full-fledged feature (see page 41). Few aspects of the current 'omics revolutions have generated as much buzz as pharmacogenomics. However, the prospects for diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers in clinical development are uncertain, as is how these markers are to be considered in drug approvals. As these issues continue to challenge drug developers and regulators, so too does the field of metabolic profiling, which is the subject of our feature on page 34.

Another key aspect of the 'omic sciences is information flow—from experimental data gathering, and among researchers and across organizations. Information handling can be so daunting that the topic arises repeatedly in this issue—in an exclusive interview with the head of IBM's healthcare and life sciences unit, in perspectives from drug company R&D leaders on "decommissioning knowledge silos," and in a discussion of critical informatics technologies.

And in this month's New and Noteworthy section—the largest among competing drug R&D publications—*MDD* covers a breadth of topics you said you want to read about: scientific advances, product developments, government funding initiatives, alliances between big and small drug firms, clinical updates, and even nanotechnology.

Obviously, what everyone wants is a publication that is well written, accurate, reliable, balanced, and relevant. And *MDD* thanks you for giving us high marks across the board. For the rest of this year you'll see that *MDD* continues to be on the same page as its readers, with stories touching on pharmacology, medicinal chemistry, biochemistry, molecular biology, proteomics, and genomics as part of our overall coverage of the science and business of drug R&D.