HONORING PESQUISA OPERACIONAL REVIEWERS

Annibal Parracho Sant'Anna

The work of the reviewers is of the utmost relevance for both the journals' representativeness and the research advancement that the publication of high-quality papers entails. More than assisting the editor in screening articles according to the journal's standards, the reviewer helps the authors in enhancing their research and the presentation of their findings.

At the same time, speed of publication is essential for attracting quality articles. Publication delays interrupt the natural progression of research. Authors themselves stop citing the article if they publish subsequent developments before the article is accepted in our journal.

Pesquisa Operacional has always expressed its appreciation to reviewers by strictly respecting a stipulated three-month deadline for reviewing in each evaluation round and always extending it while the reviewer's feedback had not yet been received. Considering the importance of the review work and the fact that good reviewers have numerous other responsibilities, many reviewers who accept the invitation to review treat the given deadline as a lower limit for submitting their reviews and do not mobilize to complete the evaluation until they receive the deadline reminders. The second round is especially more costly due to the reviewer's increased sense of accountability for final approval.

As an editor beginning in 2022, I have substantially lowered these deadlines. And I eliminated submitting to the reviewers for the second round whenever the response of the authors to their recommendations was quite clear, assuming this task myself. The outcome was satisfactory. For articles accepted in 2020 and 2021, at the median, the first round took more than four months, the median time between submission of the second version and final acceptance was three months, and the overall period from submission to final approval was about ten months. In 2022, so far, these median timescales have been approximately halved, with the first round having a median of two months, the second round having a median of one and a half months, and the overall period being five months.

It remains for me to find a way to note that, like the previous editors, I also place a high value on the reviewers' contributions. I had the idea to publish a list of the finest reviewers as a way of expressing the journal's appreciation to the reviewers when I came across excellent reviews when

Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil – E-mail: aparracho@id.uff.br – http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6336-1688

analyzing assessments from the past few years to inform future appointments. This is a practice of renowned journals (Abbara, 2022; Anzai, 2022). Following it, I announce here six reviewers who offered outstanding reviews during 2020 and 2021:

Ana Paula Iannoni

Danielle Costa Morais

Edilson Fernandes de Arruda

José Gilberto Spasiani Rinaldi

Maristela Oliveira dos Santos

Silvio Alexandre de Araújo

References

ABBARA S. 2022. Editor's Recognition Awards to Reviewers. *Radiology: Cardiothoracic Imaging*, **4**(1): ce220027. https://doi.org/10.1148/ryct.220027

ANZAI T. 2022. Editorial Statistics and Best Reviewers Award for 2021. *Circulation Journal*, **86**(2): 173-175. https://doi.org/10.1253/circj.CJ-66-0200

How to cite