

Editor-in-chief's voice

Reviewer is a supporter of a scientific author

Nowadays, almost all scientific journals publish articles based on their educational merit and overall quality, as determined by invited reviewers; including here in the Central European Journal of Urology. Articles are evaluated by at least two reviewers, using the so-called peer-review system. In principle, reviews are anonymous: the reviewer does not know who he or she assesses and the authors do not know who is reviewing them. This system is not perfect because, as we know, no perfect system exists. It has its advantages and disadvantages, but it certainly is used in the assessment of the majority of scientific publications appearing in the world. Therefore, for the authors and reviewers, there is nothing left to do but learn how to use this system. Understanding the rules of operation of the peer-review system will make scientific publishing easier and more enjoyable.

The key to publishing is the understanding of the function that a reviewer has in a scientific journal. The reviewer is asked to review an article by the editor-in-chief or section editor. Often the reviewer is selected amongst the first authors of recent publications on the subject of the submitted paper. It may happen that the person reviewing our work is a colleague with whom we compete against in our given research field. Conversely, we may be asked to review their work at some point in time. It is extremely important to promptly respond to the request and to prepare a review as soon as possible. Please note that preparing a review, quickly expedites the publication of the evaluated work. Additionally, please do not forget that thanks to the selfless work of our fellow reviewers we are able to publish your reports in a short amount of time. No response to the request for a review of a piece of work is a sign of arrogance and lack of manners. If one cannot take on the task, one should immediately notify the editor. This provides editors enough time to find another reviewer.

The journal invites the reviewer to perform two essential tasks. Firstly, to assess the value of the work, and secondly to prepare its content to be suitable for publication in the journal. It should, however, be noted that the final decision to publish or not to publish an article is always made by the editor-in-chief. The reviewer should be treated as a person who is sympathetic to the authors and who contributes significantly to increase the value of the publication.

The finding of weak points of a scientific work and indicating their possible corrections contributes to an improved quality of scientific publications. Significant is the fact that even if the work is rejected by one journal, the reviews that the author received can help him or her to improve the manuscript before it is sent to another journal. Therefore, after careful analysis of the reviewer's comments, most of these observations should be included in the next version of the work. To all the reviewer's suggestions we should respond in turn, explaining which of them we have taken into account, which we rejected, and why. It is only fair to give the real reasons for our choices. Most reviewers respect authors who seriously take into consideration their recommendations and comments. The reply to the suggestions and comments of reviewers should always be exhaustive.

Dear Authors, please remember that the reviewer devotes his or her time in order to make sure your articles are of the highest quality. The editor-in-chief of the Central European Journal of Urology appreciates the efforts of reviewers and from 2013 has printed a list of reviewers working for the journal.

Dear Reviewers, thank you for your devoted time.



Tomasz Drewa,
Editor-in-chief