Reviewers are the unsung heroes of scientific publishing. They are unpaid and rarely acknowledged, yet they work hard reading initial drafts of papers, many of which will not appear in *TODS*. I want to highlight their contributions and to publicly thank them for their time and effort.

As discussed in previous columns, *TODS* goes to great lengths to ensure that reviewers (a) remain anonymous, (b) are sent only submissions that meet submission guidelines and are relevant to their area of expertise, (c) are provided clear guidelines on the review itself and on potential conflicts of interest, (d) are not overloaded with reviews of *TODS* submissions, (e) are provided a reasonable time (at least two months) to do a review, and (f) are informed of the editorial decision, including the author-visible portion of reviews. *TODS* has the notable policy of not expecting more than one formal review in any twelve-month period, though reviewers can elect to do more reviews if they wish (and many in fact do so).

*TODS* reviewers are the principal guarantors of the high quality and technical correctness that readers demand of this scientific journal. Most papers that referees review are rejected by *TODS*, though a modified version may appear in another venue. Those that appear in *TODS* are often reviewed two or three times before they are accepted. In both cases, the reviewers markedly improve the paper, though a close, though anonymous to the authors, dialog.

For some of the papers I’ve personally handled, and for some papers that Associate Editors have told me about, the reviews and the responses to the referees from the authors have been truly inspiring, with all parties obviously dedicated to configuring a paper that most effectively conveys its insights to its readers. When that happens, it is a joy to be part of this process. And perhaps more surprisingly, some authors of papers that are rejected convey their appreciation for the constructive comments of the reviewers.

The community owes the following people a debt of gratitude for their responsive and generally quite detailed reviews. These reviewers (for papers whose editorial decisions were made between July 2001 through March 2003, almost 200 reviewers in all) are true professionals, participating in a meaningful way in the scholarly process.

To each, please accept my personal and heartfelt thanks.
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