



JBP and bibliometric indices

Rogério Souza^{1,2}

The process of publishing a scientific journal has complexities that go well beyond the choice of manuscripts, although this process alone has intrinsic peculiarities. Initially, it is necessary to consider the context surrounding the journal.⁽¹⁾ The JBP is the leading journal in the field of respiratory medicine in Latin America, a fact that has recently been confirmed with the release of the 2016 bibliometric indices. We achieved an impact factor of 1.496, according to the Thomson Reuters index, and, according to the Scopus database, which uses the same methodology, we achieved an index of 1.609. These are the highest values ever achieved by our Journal and place us in the second quartile of the respiratory medicine journals. In addition, if we observe other indicators, we can infer that the trend is toward growth. For instance, international collaboration has grown consistently in recent years, increasing from 8.5% in 2013 to 16.9% in 2016, which demonstrates the improved representativeness of the JBP.

It is important to emphasize the concept that the indices used for the evaluation of the various scientific publications are not the sole determinant of the relevance of such publications and, sometimes, even create additional complicating factors.⁽²⁾ We need to maintain our commitment to increasing our visibility without losing focus on the formative character that our Journal has, particularly in Brazil. However, the metric by which the national publications are evaluated in the Brazilian graduate system does not take that into account, giving importance only to the impact factor and making large research groups less interested in the national publications. This is a problem that needs to be addressed directly if we want to further increase the editorial relevance of the JBP.

Over the past two years, we have been able to balance all that. The profile of the most often cited articles includes review of topics that are most prevalent^(3,4) and original articles addressing prevalent topics or rarer conditions.^(5,6) However, it should also be considered that the JBP is the official organ of the Brazilian Thoracic Association, and, therefore, all related fields should be covered, regardless of the citation potential of each one of them, since it is well known that smaller or still incipient fields are less likely to be cited over the time period used in the bibliometric indices. All of these aspects should be considered together in analyzing the relevance of the JBP in the respiratory medicine setting.

For such discussions to become increasingly present in the JBP, the participation of the associate editors in

editorial decisions has been most relevant. They are the ones mainly responsible for the growth of the Journal and the consolidation of our indices. For this to be even more long-lasting, the position of Vice Editor of the JBP was created. It is the Vice Editor's responsibility to participate in the most significant editorial decisions, together with the Editor-in-Chief, for a period of two years, after which he will take on the editorial leadership for the customary period of four years. The creation of this new position was aimed at enabling smoother transitions, allowing changes in editorial policies in a context known to all parties involved. The Vice Editor selection process was disseminated through our media and will be completed in July of 2017, and the results should be known by the time the September/October issue of the JBP comes out.

While on one hand the decentralization of editorial policies is underway, several barriers have yet to be overcome. As a result of the increased visibility of the JBP, there has been a significant increase in the number of submissions. While such an increase is desirable, because it reflects our representativeness, it carries with it an even greater demand for reviewers. We have had the unequivocal collaboration of a large number of colleagues, who, almost anonymously, have contributed significantly with their critical and analytical thinking and their insight. There is a need for greater recognition to be given to these colleagues, to whom the entire editorial board expresses its eternal gratitude. The Brazilian Thoracic Association has studied alternatives for achieving this objective. This is not a characteristic of ours alone; the major international journals are discussing how to give better recognition to their reviewers and, at the same time, attract more people to this position, a position that is key to the routine of any journal known for excellence, such as ours is. Critical analysis of scientific studies needs to be made part of the daily life of pulmonologists in training. In the long term, the result of this process will be better education of researchers and faculty. An increased critical mass of reviewers and potential editors will be a very beneficial secondary effect of this process.

All in all, we have much to celebrate from the growth of the JBP, but we still have numerous challenges ahead, both known and unknown. To overcome all of them, the participation of the JBP's readership is essential. Therefore, here is an invitation: give your opinions, ideas, criticisms, and suggestions! This will allow the JBP to reflect the concerns of those for whom it is intended.

1. Disciplina de Pneumologia, Instituto do Coração, Hospital das Clínicas, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo (SP) Brasil.
2. Editor-Chefe do JBP - Jornal Brasileiro de Pneumologia, Brasília (DF) Brasil.

REFERENCES

1. Souza R. 2015—another step along the road in a 40-year journey. *J Bras Pneumol*. 2015;41(1):1-2. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1806-37132015000100001>
2. Souza R. Consolidating in the present, with an eye to the future. *J Bras Pneumol*. 2016;42(6):399-400. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1806-37562016000600002>
3. Torres-Sánchez I, Rodríguez-Alzueta E, Cabrera-Martos I, López-Torres I, Moreno-Ramírez MP, Valenza MC. Cognitive impairment in COPD: a systematic review. *J Bras Pneumol*. 2015;41(2):182-90. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1806-37132015000004424>
4. Caruso P, Albuquerque AL, Santana PV, Cardenas LZ, Ferreira JG, Prina E, et al. Diagnostic methods to assess inspiratory and expiratory muscle strength. *J Bras Pneumol*. 2015;41(2):110-23. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1806-37132015000004474>
5. Freitas CS, Baldi BG, Araújo MS, Heiden GI, Kairalla RA, Carvalho CR. Use of sirolimus in the treatment of lymphangioleiomyomatosis: favorable responses in patients with different extrapulmonary manifestations. *J Bras Pneumol*. 2015;41(3):275-80. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1806-37132015000004553>
6. Stelmach R, Fernandes FL, Carvalho-Pinto RM, Athanzio RA, Rached SZ, Prado GF, et al. Comparison between objective measures of smoking and self-reported smoking status in patients with asthma or COPD: are our patients telling us the truth? *J Bras Pneumol*. 2015;41(2):124-32. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1806-37132015000004526>