With this issue, I am beginning my last year as editor of *JNMT*. In some ways it is difficult to believe that I have actually been working on this for almost six years. My tenure as editor has been for two, three-year terms. But the process of being editor starts long before the first issue. As I write this editorial, the Publications Committee of the SNM Technologist Section has not selected the next editor. By the time you read this editorial, we will know who that individual is. They started the application process last summer. All said, it takes about 10 months to select a new editor. This is a heavy responsibility for all involved. A good editor will produce a *JNMT* that is relevant, interesting, and on-time. With a poor editor, JNMT could have none of these characteristics.

One of the greatest challenges to editors of scientific journals is the selection of reviewers for papers submitted for publication. In an ideal world, an editor will just *know* who would be a good reviewer for a given paper. In the real world, a number of papers are submitted each year in content areas where even the most well-connected editor has limited expertise. In these cases, the editor will consult with their associate and consulting editors. Through this process, journal editors receive reviews that help them decide whether or not each paper should be accepted, and authors receive valuable feedback on how improve their papers.

The *American Journal of Roentgenology* has graciously allowed *JNMT* to reprint two recently published articles on the process of writing and reviewing scientific papers. The first article, which we present in this issue, will take you step-by-step through the process of producing a paper that contains all the elements of a true scientific journal article. It is an excellent guide for both first-time and seasoned authors. It could also be used as a guide for reviewers in that it details exactly what they should be looking for in each section of a paper. This article presents extremely useful information to everyone who would like to participate in the process of sharing their research or clinical experience with the scientific community. The second paper is a detailed description of the duties of a reviewer and the content of a good scientific review. Both of these articles will be particularly useful to those of you who have had an abstract accepted for this year's SNM Annual Meeting.

As usual, I encourage each person who has had an abstract accepted to write a paper and submit it to *JNMT*. Whether you are new to this process or a seasoned publishing veteran, this article can guide you through the process of producing a well-written scientific article.

While I am encouraging submission of scientific papers to *JNMT*, let me remind you that each year at the SNM Annual Meeting, *JNMT* presents two awards: one for the best scientific paper and one for the best case study where the first author is a technologist. The best scientific paper is awarded a plaque and a cash award of $500; the best case report is awarded $100. Remember, a case report must have a strong technical component to be considered for publication in *JNMT*.

I will sign off for now, but I hope you find this issue of *JNMT* useful. We are happy to present two continuing education articles in this issue that can be used to obtain some (now mandatory!) credits toward maintaining your nuclear medicine certification. In addition, we have several excellent scientific articles and a book review. As usual, I hope this issue expands your understanding of the field of nuclear medicine technology.