B
cause of the dynamic events occurring in health
care, medical education, and biomedical re-
search, it seems that we are destined to cross a
threshold that will greatly change the health care and
biomedical research enterprise. On the one hand, we
perceive an atmosphere of uncertainty about the future
and how we will fare. Physician-investigators are being
confronted with greater pressures that will influence
how they allocate their efforts and how much time they
will have for research. All investigators will continue to
compete for the limited resources that are available. On
the more positive side, the scope of basic research that
is relevant to the hypertension field has grown greatly,
and there are more opportunities for interacting multi-
disciplinary avenues of investigation.

Through this wave of change, however, there will be
the continuing need to communicate with our col-
leagues. Where is there such a thirst and need to
communicate if not in science? We attend meetings at
great expense to exchange our thoughts and feelings
with those who will listen and share our interests. We
work with great vigor and enthusiasm to have our
papers accepted in the best peer-reviewed journals so
that our results are available for posterity. That drive
to communicate with colleagues who share common inter-
ests is the raison d'être for Hypertension.

Hypertension has undergone many changes since it
first appeared in 1979. Each group of editors has left its
lasting imprint, contributing greatly to the enduring
success of the journal. It is important, however, to
emphasize the sage advice provided by Dr Harriet
Dustan and her associate editors in the 1979 inaugural
issue: "The field of hypertension is multidisciplinary
and the journal will serve a purpose only if it provides
bridges among the many disciplines. It must stimulate
thought and air scientific controversies. It must be a
forum not only for results of laboratory but also of
clinical research. It must inform its readers of events
happening outside the sphere of the laboratory and the
medical center that may impinge upon our ability to do
research or on the care of hypertensive patients. It must
serve the science of hypertension and promote the
better care of hypertensive patients." How well have
we achieved these requirements up to now? Most of us
would say that the journal has met them admirably and
with excellence. As the new editors, we will strive to
build on that record of success. Changes will be care-
fully considered so that they truly provide a net gain and
improve the journal further. Nevertheless, we must
recognize and respond to the changing times and grow-
ing pressures. Many of these responses will involve
practical considerations that will facilitate and improve
communication.

All changes to the journal will be based on the simple
but most important premise that we exist to serve
you—you, collectively, as a group dedicated to the
understanding and control of arterial pressure and
cardiovascular function in normal and pathologic states.
You also exist as an association dedicated to reducing
morbidity and mortality from cardiovascular disease; as
clinicians and clinician-scientists who treat patients with
hypertension and other cardiovascular diseases; and as
investigators who strive to understand the fundamental
pathophysiological, cellular, membrane, and molecular
derangements responsible for cardiovascular dysfunc-
tion. We also understand the importance of serving you,
individually, as a reader and, hopefully, as a contributor
to Hypertension. As a reader, you want to learn more
about the newest and most exciting findings in areas of
critical interest. You also want to know more about the
developments in areas outside your major interests. As
a contributor, you want efficient, timely, and fair treat-
ment of your treasured manuscripts, and you want rapid
publication of your findings. Sometimes, however, our
responsibility to you, collectively, may unfortunately
have priority over our desire to serve you, individually,
as we strive to publish the very best papers in the
hypertension literature. However, whenever unfavor-
able decisions occur, we will do our best to provide you
with explicit reasons as to why a manuscript was found
unacceptable for publication. You should also realize
that you have the prerogative to write us with your
comments, concerns, and ideas about the peer review
process. In particular, it is important that we remain
vigilant in protecting the right to discuss conflicting
views and controversial theories. The peer review pro-
cess depends strongly on a mutual respect for opposing
opinions and interpretations, and all reviewers must
continuously guard against any conflicting interests that
would influence their ability to provide an objective and
fair review.

As a contributor, you can do much to minimize the
likelihood of unfavorable decisions. Often, the major
problems are related to inadequate communication and
preparation. A little extra time spent in carefully review-
ing the manuscript and getting all authors to consider
means to optimize effective and efficient communica-
tion will pay great dividends by improving the likelihood
of success. Another helpful strategy is to get an in-
fomed but uninvolved colleague to critique the paper
before you formally submit it. Most importantly, send us
your best work in a succinct and well-organized manner.
Complete studies that allow firm conclusions will have
the greatest probability of acceptance. If you are not
very excited about the work, the reviewers will probably
have similar reactions. Try to be as objective as possible
in interpreting your results. We should also recognize
that the demands on our time continue to increase so 
that anything you do to deliver your message succinctly 
will contribute to an increased readership.

In an effort to avoid redundancies, we ask that 
introduction and methods sections be concise and brief. 
Take advantage of previously published descriptions 
and refer to routine methodology briefly without re-
peating all the details. If the current study strongly 
depends on detailed methodology previously published, 
it is acceptable to reference the method and enclose the 
relevant paper (in duplicate) for the reviewers rather 
than detailing a lengthy, “in brief” section. Avoid use of 
outmoded terms that are no longer valid or have been 
supplanted by more modern descriptors. Presentation 
of results should avoid redundancies in tables, figures, 
and text as much as possible but without compromising 
this most important section. Finally, the discussion 
allows you to interpret your results and place your data 
in perspective. However, the discussion is not the place 
for a long, tedious, detailed literature review of the 
field. Throughout the manuscript, statements about 
primacy (ie, “we show for the first time”) are inapprop-
riate and should be avoided. References should be 
carefully screened and primarily should include original 
peer reviewed investigations rather than reviews or 
chapters.

If all of us put extra effort into achieving some of 
these goals, the overall quality of all manuscripts will be 
improved, and the collective effort to reduce the length 
of the papers may make it possible to increase the 
number of papers per issue within the available space 
alotted. The new editorial office is committed to serv-
ing you using the most modern techniques available. We 
will strive to be creative, innovative, and efficient. Your 
papers will be assigned quickly, the reviewers will be 
asked to respond promptly, and decisions will be ren-
dered within the shortest time possible. We ask you to 
remain vigilant and provide us with feedback and cre-
ative suggestions on any issues that you feel need 
attention. In particular, we want your ideas about how 
best to present the various sections. For example, does 
“Original Contributions” suggest that the others are not 
original? Should we retain “Brief or Rapid Communica-
tions” or should we strive to make them all as rapid as 
possible? What topics do you want to see covered as 
reviews, tutorials, or special articles? This is your jour-
nal and we are eager and committed to maintaining the 
excellent record that it has already established and to 
positioning it to continue in its leadership role during 
these exciting years ahead.

L. Gabriel Navar, PhD
Associate Editor
Edward D. Frohlich, MD
Editor-in-Chief
Richard N. Re, MD
Associate Editor

Reference
Toward a more effective and efficient communication process.
L G Navar, E D Frohlich and R N Ré

Hypertension. 1994;23:143-144
doi: 10.1161/01.HYP.23.2.143
Hypertension is published by the American Heart Association, 7272 Greenville Avenue, Dallas, TX 75231
Copyright © 1994 American Heart Association, Inc. All rights reserved.
Print ISSN: 0194-911X. Online ISSN: 1524-4563

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is located on the World Wide Web at:
http://hyper.ahajournals.org/content/23/2/143.citation

Permissions: Requests for permissions to reproduce figures, tables, or portions of articles originally published in Hypertension can be obtained via RightsLink, a service of the Copyright Clearance Center, not the Editorial Office. Once the online version of the published article for which permission is being requested is located, click Request Permissions in the middle column of the Web page under Services. Further information about this process is available in the Permissions and Rights Question and Answer document.

Reprints: Information about reprints can be found online at:
http://www.lww.com/reprints

Subscriptions: Information about subscribing to Hypertension is online at:
http://hyper.ahajournals.org//subscriptions/