



CUSTOMARY CONTROVERSY

Debate has played a role in the scientific process for centuries. Although some notable disputes have formed around scientific and nonscientific beliefs, true scientific controversies exist solely within the realm of science. From heliocentrism versus geocentrism to nature versus nurture, opposing theories have long been presented, debated, and defended.

Although debates are often influenced by the innate human desire to be deemed “right” by others, scientific debates are not about achieving consensus but about shedding light on the issues that must be clarified to determine an answer. As author Michael Crichton once said, “In science, consensus is irrelevant. What is relevant are reproducible results.”

For this issue, *GT* asked contributors to take a specific stance on a topic and discuss their assigned positions. The objective was not to identify a winning take but to present the strengths and weaknesses of each and, most importantly, to illuminate the unanswered questions that exist on both sides. Individuals also commented on the dogmas they feel are most worth challenging in the pursuit of advanced glaucoma care.

In the spirit of provoking thought and facilitating discourse, we invite you to share your position on any of the topics discussed in this issue by writing to us or tweeting us @glaucomatoday. ■



CALLAN NAVITSKY
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF