



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SciVerse ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/jbmt



EDITORIAL

Recognising reviewers

In this first editorial of JBMTs Volume 16 I wish to give credit to the unsung heroes of each issue – the reviewers.

Reviewers receive minimal reward for their efforts which can be extremely time consuming, requiring as it does, dedicated focus. Reviewers are unpaid apart from a gratis subscription, and all too often go unrecognised, despite being a key part of a system that ultimately depends on their diligent work.

Having deliberately chosen to avoid Elsevier's automated review process the complexity of managing JBMTs review process has necessitated my asking for additional support from two of my associate editors, Glenn Hymel EdD LMT and Geoff Bove DC PhD. These two colleagues supervise the reviews that involve methodological and statistical accuracy, with their own dedicated teams of reviewers. To all of those involved in this essential underpinning of the accuracy of JBMTs content, my profound thanks.

More general reviews are managed by myself, with the reviews being carried out by appropriately selected reviewers (based on topic, or professional background) derived from a pool of invited and volunteer professionals – to whom I also offer my thanks. There have been many instances in which reviews have been far more interesting and enlightening than the papers to which they relate – but sadly these are read only by the authors and the editors!

What do reviewers look for in the papers they are scrutinising?

- Above all, the relevance of the paper to JBMTs readership
- Whether the paper is well organized, logical, clear, easy to follow – and, critically, whether or not it adds something new to our knowledge of the topic?
- The accuracy of statements made relative to the evidence and information provided – and crucially the appropriateness of citations used to support what is being said: Whether or not references are from primary sources or are derived from secondary source (i.e. book)? And, does each citation actually validate the

text it is being used to support, as well as being adequate and appropriate?

- The appropriate use of language – spelling, grammar, punctuation. As JBMTs attraction as a venue for publication has grown, more and more submissions are being received from authors whose first language is not English, with inevitable problems arising. It is always the authors responsibility to provide manuscripts in a form that complies with JBMTs style requirements (as set out in our *Guide for Authors*) one of which is that correct use of the English language is a necessity. I urge all prospective authors to pay attention to this requirement, as well as the style (especially relative to citations) rules, in order to save a great deal of time and effort.

This issue (JBMT16(1)) sees the launch of our new fascia section: *Fascia Science and Clinical Applications*, in which a range of new papers are presented. This section has a specialized Advisory Board, and will periodically carry invited editorials, as does the first, from Thomas Findley MD PhD.

There is also a slight change to the *Prevention & Rehabilitation* section which has been modified to include both an editorial, as well as a practical, clinically relevant article, compiled by the section's editor (either Matt Walden DO or Warrick McNeill PT), together with the regular feature by Craig Liebenson DC, on patient self-management. To these Associate Editors and also to those who play less specific, but important roles in JBMTs progress, John Hannon DC and Dimitrios Kostopoulos PhD DSc – my continued grateful thanks.

And to all members of the Editorial Advisory Board, JBMTs Associate Editors, the Production staff at Elsevier, and above all, you the reader – a happy, healthy and safe 2012

Leon Chaitow, ND DO
PO Box 41, 49100 Corfu, Greece
E-mail address: leonchaitow1@mac.com