

# Review of: "Changing chiropractic's subluxation rhetoric: Moving on from 'deniers', 'vitalists', and 'unorthodox', to realists, post-realists, and absurdists"

Michael Schneider<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Pittsburgh

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article is very lengthy and difficult to read. The author uses many terms that will not be recognized by people outside of the chiropractic profession. Frankly, I would have stopped reading this article at about the 2nd page if I had not committed to review it for the editor. It is essentially a 12-page diatribe against what the author considers the 'chiropractic scientific elite'.

The author clearly has the strong opinion that these elitists have disrespected the concept of spinal subluxation, and that they should....and this is where the author lost me.... do what? This manuscript rambles on in an almost incoherent manner. I really don't understand what actual action steps the author is suggesting other than what he proposes in the abstract: 1) that an active discussion/debate about subluxation occur and 2) that a summary be published in an open-access manner in a peer-reviewed journal.

My suggestion is that the author conduct a systematic rewrite of this entire manuscript and focus on the following improvements:

1. Cut the total length of the manuscript down to about pages maximum (from current 12 pages)
2. Provide definitions for these terms within the first 1-2 pages:
  1. Subluxation
  2. Realist
  3. Post-realist
  4. Absurdist
3. Provide a summary 1-2 paragraphs for the positions about subluxation taken by b, c, and d above. These summaries should each have subheadings.
4. Provide a subheading/summary about the key points of debate between b,c,and d.
5. Avoid ad hominem attacks against the evidence-based post-realists.
6. The conclusion is somewhat circuitous. If there is not much scientific evidence characterizing the nature of spinal subluxation as the post-realists suggest...why should they be expected to produce evidence that doesn't exist. Shouldn't the onus be on those who suggest there is evidence about spinal subluxations as a clinical entity?

7. Other than an internal squabble amongst the various chiropractic factions that might be of interest to chiropractors, what is the public health urgency to the issues posed in this manuscript? The primary purpose of this manuscript seems to be related to the author who feels a need to vent his frustrations on paper. Therefore, I do not consider this manuscript to be an example of scientific writing...rather constitutes a verbose piece of opinion/prose that is not well-aligned with the goals of a peer-reviewed scientific journal.