Editorial

Our readers will have noticed that during the past 2 years the journal has published articles prepared by the Clinical Practice Committee (CPC), chaired by Stefano Cianfarani. *Hormone Research in Paediatrics* has published 6 papers per year and will continue to do so during the year to come. Not surprisingly, the development of our journal follows the evolution of our society. At the beginning, the ESPE was essentially involved in the progress of science and new insights into the mechanism of diseases and their treatment. Gradually, professional development has emerged as an important task, and the success of summer or winter schools demonstrates how valuable these initiatives are for both experienced and less experienced colleagues who wish to strengthen and expand their knowledge or add to their expertise in paediatric endocrinology. Similarly, the Meet the Professor section of our annual ESPE meeting is now extremely popular.

Hormone Research in Paediatrics has also experienced comparable developments: almost exclusively original papers and clinical observations were published about 10 years ago. Currently, several sections of our journal are dedicated to postdoctoral teaching. The Mini Review section is certainly a success and a point of reference. The publication by the CPC is also useful and I believe an important source of information for those who wish to know the opinions of experts in a specific field of paediatric endocrinology.

However, these publications by the CPC are not consensus papers. They do not represent a collective opinion or a general agreement. Therefore, they could and should be discussed. I would, for that reason, be happy to accept letters which express a range of different opinions. Having a constructive dialogue with the authors of published papers is an uneasy undertaking for a journal. There are probably different ways to open a dialogue between the readers and our journal. I believe that, on this specific point, having an open discussion on our clinical practice focused on the papers published by the CPC would certainly be fertile and could make any recommendations even more valuable. I hope that our colleagues will take this opportunity to exchange with others and contribute their own experience on the different subjects covered by the CPC recommendations. These letters should be short (max. 1,200 words) with no more than 8–10 references. In this January issue, you find the first letter challenging the statement by the CPC on sex hormone priming prior to the growth hormone stimulation test. I hope that this letter will be the first of many!

This time of year also gives me the opportunity to wish a happy new year to the members of the ESPE and SLEP, and to all our readers, for both their personal and professional life.

Paul Czernichow, Editor-in-Chief