Editorial

Editorial: Thanks to Our Peer Reviewers

Seth S. Leopold MD

Peer reviewers are essential to the quality of our Journal. In a year that saw considerable media coverage on journals that got it wrong [1–3], we would like to thank the people who make it possible for us to do a good job on behalf of patients with musculoskeletal illnesses and injuries around the world: Our reviewers.

In 2014, we asked a great deal of our reviewers. As of this writing, manuscript submissions at *CORR*® are up more than 14% compared to the same period in 2013. This statistic is

even more impressive given that 2013 was our previous high-water mark, a year that saw a 30% increase in manuscript submissions compared to the year prior. Clearly, *CORR*® is a journal on the rise, but all this good news results in our reviewers working overtime. This year, 1659 reviewers helped us evaluate the work, performing an average of more than two reviews each, with some of our most-stalwart performers reviewing dozens of papers. Although our Editorial Board is composed of extremely talented, accomplished men and women who practice every subspecialty of orthopaedics, and who come from all corners of the globe, our core subject-specific knowledge comes principally from our peer reviewers. Without them, realizing the quality that we have achieved simply would not be possible. Each review takes hours of time, research, and effort. Reviewers donate their time for this important task – a remarkable gift, considering the time constraints of these surgeons and scientists.

In large measure because of the hard work of our reviewers, Editorial Board, and staff, 2014 also was a great year to write for *CORR*®. Our average time from submission to acceptance was about 3½ months,

with authors receiving the initial editorial decision at an average of only 34 days from submission. More importantly, I am proud to say that the work of *CORR*® authors influences the world of science and clinical practice to a larger degree every year: Our Impact Factor increased again, for a sixth consecutive year, and our Article Influence Score ranked first among general-interest orthopaedic journals. And when I say the “world” of science, I mean exactly that: Last year, authors from 47 countries submitted manuscripts to *CORR*®, our journal serves as the official or affiliate publication to 13 societies including five international associations, *CORR*® is available to surgeons and researchers in some 11,000 institutions around the globe, and recommendations from our editorial page [4] recently were proposed as guidelines at this year’s United Nations Commission on the Status of Women [5].

Because, again, it is the hard work of our reviewers that makes all this possible, I would like to extend my personal gratitude to each referee who reviewed for *CORR*® in the last year; their names are listed in this Acknowledgement (DOI [10.1007/s11999-014-4006-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-014-4006-y)).

The author certifies that he, or any members of his immediate family, has no commercial associations (eg, consultancies, stock ownership, equity interest, patent/licensing arrangements, etc) that might pose a conflict of interest in connection with the submitted article.

All ICMJE Conflict of Interest Forms for authors and *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*® editors and board members are on file with the publication and can be viewed on request.

The opinions expressed are those of the writers, and do not reflect the opinion or policy of *CORR*® or the Association of Bone and Joint Surgeons®.

S. S. Leopold MD (✉)
Clinical Orthopaedics and Related
Research, Philadelphia, PA 19103, USA
e-mail: sleopold@clinorthop.org

Editorial

I also would like to call attention to a smaller, but very important part of our roster: Our “Top Reviewer” lineup, which you will find at the top of the Acknowledgement. These reviewers both are committed and particularly good at what they do. To make this list, a reviewer needed to complete four or more reviews between September 2013 and August 2014, and to receive an average review score in the “excellent” range. This list represents fewer than 3% of the referees who reviewed for *CORR*® last year. We thank and congratulate this special group for their contributions to orthopaedic research and to *CORR*®.

References

1. Barbash F. Scholarly journal retracts 60 articles, smashes ‘Peer Review Ring.’ *The Washington Post*. July 10, 2013. Available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2014/07/10/scholarly-journal-retracts-60-articles-smashes-peer-review-ring/>. Accessed September 23, 2014.
2. Bohannon J. Who’s afraid of peer review? *Science*. 2013;342:60–65.
3. Campbell H. The corruption of peer review is harming scientific credibility. *The Wall Street Journal*. July 13, 2014. Available at: <http://online.wsj.com/articles/hank-campbell-the-corruption-of-peer-review-is-harming-scientific-credibility-1405290747>. Accessed September 23, 2014.
4. Leopold SS, Beadling L, Dobbs MB, Gebhardt MC, Lotke PA, Manner PA, Rimnac CM, Wongworawat MD. Fairness to all: gender and sex in scientific reporting. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2014;472:391–392.
5. Schiebinger L. Gendered innovations: Making science and technology responsive to women’s needs. Paper presented at: The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, 58th Session, Interactive Expert Panel. March 18, 2014; New York, NY. Available at: <http://www.unwomen.org/~media/Headquarters/Attachments/Sections/CSW/58/CSW58-panel5-londaschiebinger%20pdf.pdf>. Accessed October 2, 2014.