several weeks ago, I toured our brand-new opera house here in Seattle, and all the buzz was about resonance. The singers and the orchestra sound better if their music bounces around in the rafters as it makes its way to the ears of the audience. I got to thinking that ideas often have the same characteristic as they bounce around in the rafters of my mind before reaching my consciousness. Some of them don’t do much for me, but others seem to resonate.

We ophthalmologists are a unique group; we share a common resonant frequency. It’s one of those intangibles we picked up during residency that differentiates us from our medical colleagues, and from others who have an interest in the eye. It’s why we enjoy attending meetings rather than listening to rebroadcasts on the Internet. On the Internet, you can’t look your colleagues in the eye, renew old friendships and resonate with each other. The Academy has always known that, and it’s the reason the Annual Meeting is still so successful.

Resonating is something we try to do at EyeNet Magazine. Sure, we try to print the information you can trust to take better care of your patients, in an easily readable format. And yes, we cover the news at the Academy, in industry and in Washington, D.C. But always we are looking for ways to connect with our audience of practicing ophthalmologists in resonant ways, as only ophthalmologists can do with each other.

These Opinion columns are no exception. After nearly two years on the job as Chief Medical Editor at EyeNet, I look forward each month to sounding off about issues confronting all of us. I try to do so in a way that rings true, that resonates with thoughts you may have been thinking. I don’t expect that my views will agree with yours all of the time (God forbid!), but at least I’d like to think that you pay them more than fleeting attention because they have resonated a bit under your rafters.

Apparently, our efforts are succeeding. Join us at EyeNet in celebrating a milestone that you helped us achieve. High readership. Each year, an independent "PERQ/HCI" survey asks ophthalmologists how much of each publication they read, and how frequently they read it. The PERQ/HCI data are accorded reverence in the publishing community akin to results from randomized clinical trials in ophthalmology. Historically, EyeNet’s readership has trailed behind that of some non-peer-reviewed magazines we consider our closest competition. (Last year, we came in fifth of 19 publications surveyed.) But in 2003, we surpassed our rivals. The good news is that only two publications rank above EyeNet in high readership, both of which are peer-reviewed, including Ophthalmology (ophthalmologists really do care about the science), but the better news is that you value what we are trying to produce each month. I’m delighted, of course, but not surprised at our scores. I’ve always felt that if we resonate with you, our readers, we win, you win, and your patients win.

Whether we resonate positively or negatively, we’d love to hear from you. If you’d rather not make your views public, we will respect your wishes, but we’d like to hear in any event.