EDITORIAL

To our reviewers

2009 and 2010 were the launch years for OTSR-RCOT, with all the enthusiasm that entails. 2011 is going to be our make-it-or-break-it year: the year in which the foundations have to be made stable; and in which the earliest objective criteria of success are going to be disclosed: our first impact factor (by definition made public in the third year of a journal’s publication), and the evolution of our readership following or despite the end of the free on-line access period (although subscribers, of course, will still have this).

There are certain signs, however, which justify confidence: a 60% rise in submissions in 2 years, a 2-fold rise in the immediacy index, a regular increase in visits to the journal on the ScienceDirect site and in the number of articles downloaded—and, perhaps most important of all, a parallel increase in the formal quality of the articles we publish, closing in on the standards of those international journals in whose company we intend to be seen. More updates, original articles that are more succinct and well structured, and fewer case reports: that is the recipe we are seeking to develop, along with the special flavor brought by our associated societies and SoFCOT partners.

The groundwork to this lies in promoting the basic art of medical writing and in the critical review of the articles that are submitted. Medical writing is a skill with a learning curve, just like any other technique in surgery. The OTSR-RCOT editorial board is therefore working alongside the SoFCOT (French Orthopaedic and Traumatology Society), the CFCOT (French Orthopaedic and Traumatology College), the SFA (French Arthroscopy Society) and others to develop a training course, open to all, in the key points of how to write scientific articles.

The acuteness of our reviewers’ critical analysis is the guarantor of the journal’s quality. To put it mildly, we have been putting them under pressure, with the rise in submissions, even if their number has also increased. This backroom work of analysis takes time. It is unpaid, but vital. The reviewers’ analyses are a major factor in the final editorial decision: rejection, revision, or acceptance. They are the basis on which a scientific study can be said to have or to lack the quality required in terms of form and of content to be validated and “officially” drawn to the attention of the worldwide scientific community. They are also a powerful teaching aid. On behalf of the editorial board as a whole, may I take this opportunity to express our warmest thanks to our reviewers. The list of those who contributed during 2010 is being published in the current issue—the first of many lists to come, acknowledging our debt of gratitude.

Long life to OTSR-RCOT!

P. Beaufils
Editor in Chief, OTSR-RCOT