

The *European Spine Journal* ‘Reviewer Award’

C. Lamartina¹

Received: 4 July 2015 / Revised: 4 July 2015 / Accepted: 4 July 2015 / Published online: 3 September 2015
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2015

The *European Spine Journal* is an International peer-reviewed journal with increasing visibility worldwide. Thanks to this, the number of manuscripts submitted to our Journal grows yearly. In 2014 our Editorial Office received 1589 papers, approximately 200 manuscripts more than those submitted in 2013 (an average increase of about 13 %). Table 1 reports the countries of the authors of the papers accepted for publication in 2014. The growing number of papers submitted by authors worldwide is the direct consequence of the rising acknowledgment of *European Spine Journal*. Of this huge number of papers only 32 % were published, while the remaining were rejected. Each paper undergoes a complex process of peer-reviewed evaluation that considers each aspect of the manuscript, from the formal presentation to bibliographic data, passing obviously through the deep analysis of the contents. Frequently papers return to the authors to improve the quality of the study after a thorough revision process. When the revised manuscripts are re-submitted, new revisions are made to check the appropriateness of author’s responses. All this is possible only thanks to our excellent team of Reviewers who work hard everyday to offer their best services to the Journal and its Editorial team. Without their help, none of these papers could have been published. Their reviews help authors improving the quality of their manuscripts, and they also help the Editor making a final decision.

In order to recognize the fundamental value of Reviewers’ work and to underline their importance to the

Table 1 Number of papers accepted for publication in 2014, divided per Country of origin

Number of papers	Country
85	China
45	United Kingdom
45	United States
37	Italy
37	France
33	Japan
30	Germany
21	Switzerland
21	Republic of Korea
15	Netherlands
12	Canada
11	India
8	Spain
7	Turkey
6	Australia
6	Austria
6	Poland
5	Denmark
5	Taiwan
3	Brazil
3	Ireland
3	Norway
3	Thailand
2	Belgium
2	Czech Republic
2	Egypt
2	Hungary
2	Islamic Republic of Iran
2	New Zealand
2	Singapore

✉ C. Lamartina
c.lamartina@chirurgiavertebrale.net

¹ II Spine Surgery Division, IRCSS Istituto Ortopedico Galeazzi, Via Riccardo Galeazzi, 4, 20161 Milan, Italy

Table 1 continued

Number of papers	Country
2	Sweden
1	Chile
1	Finland
1	Hong Kong
1	Israel
1	Mexico
1	Portugal
1	Romania
1	South Africa

Journal, the Editorial Board is glad to announce two new Reviewer Awards, a way to thank all *European Spine Journal* Reviewers worldwide.

The work made by each Reviewer will be evaluated monthly and the Best Reviewer of the Month will be chosen depending on the following parameters: number of revisions made per month; average number of days to answer and complete a revision request; percentage of accepted revision on the total requests; quality of the reviews. Among the best reviewers of the month, with the same evaluation parameters, the Best Reviewer of the Year

will be chosen. All the Best Reviewers of the month will receive a certificate and a full-page mention in the following issue of *European Spine Journal*. The Best Reviewer of the year will receive the same awards and will be officially invited to the subsequent yearly Editorial Board Spring Meeting of the *European Spine Journal*. This is a Friday to Sunday event held in Europe in varying locations. 2016 meeting will be held in Antwerp, Belgium, 10–12 June. We hope this could be a way to encourage reviewers in their work, to strengthen the relation between Editors and Reviewers, and to bring to the Editorial Board Meeting direct experiences and suggestions from a Reviewer's point of view.

We think that this new Reviewer Award is an excellent way to gratify Reviewers' hard work and to increase relations among all the players involved in *European Spine Journal*, ultimately leading to an improved Journal.

Obviously, all we do is directed towards the final receiver for whom all of our work is daily (and frequently nightly) made: the reader, and through the reader ultimately our patients.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest None.