

Journal Status Report 1986–1993

The Journal of Orofacial Pain was conceived at a satellite meeting of the American Academy of Orofacial Pain that was held at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota, on 10–11 October 1986. It was hosted by Dr. Joseph Gibilisco, the current Publications Chairman, who had long believed that the Academy should have a journal of its own in which to publish deserving papers related to our field of orofacial pain.

The excellence of the material presented at the Mayo meeting stimulated the officers and attending members to strongly endorse and promote the journal concept. It was wisely suggested that the papers presented at that meeting would provide ideal material for the initial issue.

Negotiations were conducted and an understanding was reached with Quintessence Publishing Co, Inc to publish the journal. Academy members Tore Hansson, Joe Gibilisco, Stu Davidson, and I were involved in achieving the original agreement in talks held in Chicago. The generous support and encouragement of Quintessence greatly assisted the efforts of the Academy in publishing the journal.

The first issue, Volume 1, Number 1, appeared in the spring of 1987. Since that time, quarterly issues have been published every January, April, July, and October and have been mailed to European, American, and Asian Academy members, as well as other subscribers. This issue is the last quarterly publication of Volume 7.

To give our readers an appreciation of the Journal's evolution, I am using this editorial to describe some past, present, and hoped-for future matters related to its publication.

All manuscripts are first received by the Editorial Manager at Quintessence, where they are copied, recorded, and forwarded to the Editorial Chairman. He cursorily reviews the paper and, if he judges it to be of value to our readership, sends "blind" copies of the paper to at least three outside referees. In many instances, the manuscripts are sent directly to Dr Antoon De Laat, the European Editor, for him to distribute to referees.


The Editors endeavor to select reliable and knowledgeable referees who have expertise in a given paper's topic. Specific and concise instructions are mailed with the papers to each referee. Referees are drawn from the memberships of the Academy, IADR, Neuroscience Group, and various medical and dental specialties, as well as personal faculty acquaintances of the Editors.

All three chosen referees will usually respond with comments and suggested dispositions of the papers. If the referee does not respond within a suitable length of time, the paper is sent to another referee. The referees assign each paper to one of four general categories: "Publish with minor revisions as noted," "Revise—manuscript potential warrants request to author for major revision," "Reject—quality or importance of manuscript does not warrant revision," or "Recommend publication in more appropriate journal." Of those manuscripts that pass the initial review, well over 95% of the papers are returned for some revisions. A total of 53 papers were received during 1992, 21 of which were rejected. In 1991, 62 manuscripts were received and 26 were rejected.

Another indicator of the Journal's development is the gradual increase in pages in each volume; the number of pages has expanded from 300 pages in 1991 to 364 pages in 1992 to 416 pages in this year's volume.

All indications point toward a healthy and growing publication. True, some problems still exist and occur. We have published articles that, according to the purists among us, belong in the *National Enquirer*, and we have rejected articles that some authors believe are of Pulitzer or Nobel quality. In the future, we hope to diminish our errors. To achieve this goal, there are several matters under consideration. The more important ones relate to a more stringent referee selection and review format, a possible restriction on manuscript length, and, finally, the development of a truly international and respected core of referees.

Since the Journal does not publish "Letters to the Editor," I would be most appreciative of personal notes, suggestions, or criticism related to this editorial.



Harold T. Perry
Editorial Chairman