

EDITOR'S CORNER

Those of you who have acted as referees for the journal will have noted an innovation in that process in the past year. Manuscripts being sent to reviewers now contain two forms instead of one. In addition to the traditional Reviewer Comment Form, which remains unchanged, there is a new Reviewer Checklist. Many of you will recognize the format of this form, which was plagiarized shamelessly from existing forms, but which was modified, after a trial period, to its present form. This checklist asks readers to evaluate specific characteristics for each manuscript they read. If the reader feels compelled to respond negatively to any of the questions on the list, he/she is asked to elaborate on the reasons for doing so, and to offer any suggestions for improving the manuscript on the traditional Reviewer Comment Form.

Although a few readers have expressed dissatisfaction with the checklist, it is a valuable adjunct to the traditional form, which was an invitation to free-associate on the merits or demerits of the manuscript. Few people would comment, for example, on inappropriate or misleading titles, bad abstracts, and whether or not all of the illustrations were relevant and necessary. If you don't like the form, please include the relevant information from it on the traditional form. A moment of reflection will, I hope, illustrate the value of the checklist to the editorial staff in weighing the merits of a given paper. And thank you for your cooperation.

We continue to experience problems with delinquent reviewers. It is a depressing and frustrating problem—depressing for our office, and frustrating for authors who are awaiting a decision on their papers. Although late reviews do not necessarily delay the publication of a paper that is accepted for publication (since we make every effort to publish papers in the order in which they are submitted), it does, however, delay the resubmission of that paper to another journal in the event it is not accepted. So, for God's sake, respond as promptly to a review as you would wish to be treated.

W. Raymond Wood
Editor