FROM THE EDITOR

The Role of Peer Review in FPM

The FPM editorial team includes dozens of family physicians and other subject matter experts.

November seems like a particularly appropriate time to thank the many individuals who contribute to FPM’s peer review process, but they really deserve our gratitude year round for the important role they play in ensuring the quality of the articles we publish. Those who have reviewed at least one FPM article since January 2011 are listed on our website at http://www.aafp.org/fpm/reviewers.

If you haven’t experienced it, you may wonder what peer review means for a journal like FPM. Our reviewers evaluate articles using criteria similar to what traditional medical journals require: relevance, interest, accuracy, authoritativeness, and clarity. We also ask our reviewers to evaluate usefulness, a critically important criterion for a journal like FPM, which exists to give readers tools and information they can put to immediate use in building a rewarding practice and improving patient care. Our manuscript rejection rate is currently 42 percent. All feature articles as well as editorials are evaluated by at least four reviewers, including members of FPM’s Editorial Advisory Board, and soon we’ll be adding a medical editor to the process. We also invite reviews from subject matter experts such as health care attorneys, professional coders, and practice management consultants, as needed. The answers that appear in our Coding & Documentation department are reviewed for accuracy by a panel of eight experts that includes several professional coders.

You play an important role as well when you provide feedback on our articles. To make it easier for you to do this, we recently implemented a commenting feature on our website. It appears on articles published beginning in January 2012. AAFP members and FPM subscribers can access this feature at the end of each online article. As always, we also welcome your comments at fpmedit@aafp.org. Please take a few minutes to tell us what you think of the articles you read in this issue. And if you’re interested in being considered for our peer review panel, send us a note and a copy of your CV. At this time, we are especially interested in adding reviewers to our panel who are in full-time, private practice.

No matter what your relationship is to FPM – reviewer, reader, or author – we thank you for your contributions this year and look forward to new beginnings in 2013.
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