Epidemiol. Infect. (2014), **142**, 895.
doi:10.1017/S0950268814000326

OUR REVIEWERS

Reviewing a paper for a journal is an exercise that generally benefits both the authors of the paper and the reviewers. For the reviewers themselves it can bring into focus important points for their own use in compiling their own papers; for the authors, insight and not infrequently, revelation. My Associate Editors and I are fully appreciative that so many of our reviewers go to great lengths in reviewing a paper, invariably making positive comments for improvement. Their reviews often cover a spectrum from major points to minutest details. Reviewing a paper must surely be of mutual educational value, and we are indebted not only to our reviewers, but also to our authors who follow the advice given. We ask authors to "detail how [they] have dealt with each point made by our reviewers, justifying any with which [they] may disagree", and this gives an opportunity for dialogue. As Editors we are sometimes a little perplexed, but rarely confounded, by reviews of the same paper ranging from 'accept', *via* 'major revision' and 'minor revision', to 'reject', but invariably come to an acceptable (and hopefully fair!) decision in the end.

We at *Epidemiology and Infection* are greatly indebted to all our reviewers for upholding the standards of the Journal, and thank them unreservedly for the time and trouble they take in ensuring these standards.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

To view supplementary material for this article, please visit http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0950268814000326.

Norman Noah
Editor-in-Chief