

## Editorial

*Diabetologia* has now been in Pisa for one year. The transfer of the journal's editorial office from Uppsala was swift and essentially without problems, thanks to Claes Hellerström's support and Sarah Hills' organised cooperation. The present editorial staff includes Sarah Hills (as the managing editor), Alison Frank (editorial assistant), and Pauline Jackson (secretary). *In situ*, the Assistant Editors (C Catalano, A Natali, and R Saracci) have kept busy reading and reporting; just beyond the Alps, the Deputy Editors (P Halban and H Häring) have intelligently helped with the editorial decisions. The relationship with our publisher, Springer-Verlag, has been smooth and pleasant.

The following members of the Editorial Board (H Beck-Nielsen, DJ Ewing, Å Lernmark, GJ Bruining, and J Tuomilehto, Associate Editors: M Berger, Y Kanazwa, EM Kohner, RG Larkins, Members of the Advisory Board), whose terms of office expired in 1994, have been replaced by K Borch-Johnsen, NE Cameron, G Dahlquist, T Mandrup-Poulsen, and S O'Rahilly as Associate Editors, B Kahn, D McGarry, M Kasuga, and E Van Obberghen for the Advisory Board.

With regard to editorial statistics, the total number of manuscripts (including originals and rapid communications) received in 1993 was 631, a 22 % increase over the preceding 4 years. The rate of manuscript submission in 1994 has been quite stable at 1.9 papers per day, or about 700 manuscripts at the end of the year, which represents a further 10 % increase over 1993. An analysis of the geographical origin of the manuscripts submitted to *Diabetologia* during 1993 shows that, while the UK and USA are still the two most abundant sources, Japan has been steadily increasing over the last 4 years, and now occupies the third position. Of the countries contributing more than 10 manuscripts per year, Germany, Denmark, Finland and Sweden have remained stable, while Italy, France and Spain have risen sharply.

The inevitable consequence of the larger inflow of manuscripts was that the acceptance rate fell from 36 % in 1992 to 29 % in 1993. The (projected) figure for 1994 is 24 %. This means that three out of four papers were returned to the authors with a tearful letter of rejection. With an average of four to five authors on each manuscript, over a year about 2,500 colleagues, who had entrusted a slice of their future (curriculum, grants, glory) to the written testimony of their work, were disappointed by those letters. Indeed, as I was wandering around the (beautiful) convention center in Düsseldorf during the (wonderful) EASD Annual Meeting in September, I steered clear of dark corners and studied the faces of passers-by, on guard for ambush by some fuming colleague with hopes of squaring accounts with me. To reduce such chances in the future, I proposed to the EASD Council, and the Council gracefully approved, to increase the size

of *Diabetologia* in 1995 by 300 pages, to a total of 1,500 per year. This increase is expected to raise the acceptance rate back to 34 %, which is a more humane performance (and a less risky operation). Thus, the January 1995 issue of *Diabetologia* will be richer, without, we hope, sacrifice of quality or speed. We will continue to welcome review articles, of which we published eight in 1993, and five in 1994, as well as for debate papers, which have been successful with six published in 1993 and seven in 1994.

In terms of circulation and recognition, more than 5,500 copies of *Diabetologia* now reach individual subscribers and libraries the world over, twice as many as those of only 2 years ago. The impact factor – an index of the citation rate of articles published in *Diabetologia* – has been going up steadily. Its last quote (in 1992) is above 5, which places our journal in the fifth position of all the periodicals in the endocrinology/metabolism field.

In summary, *Diabetologia* is in excellent health, both physical (size, circulation) and mental (the science). This state of things makes me nervous. It is notoriously more demanding to maintain a high than a low standard: if you succeed, it was good luck (victory has many fathers), if you fail it is positively your fault. On the other hand, for all the hard work and beyond the effort, there is an element of *divertissement*. Each new manuscript that lands on my desk is a *bona fide* revelation of a small bit of truth before anyone else knows, and an act of entrustment for that matter. The place of origin of the paper brings me the flavour of that part of the world. The diligently assembled submission package – signature sheet, five copies, reference list, and the rest of the ritual – disguises the expectation, the anxiety. Reading the authors' prose I think I almost can tell the person behind the pen, the experienced investigator and the newcomer, the verbose enthusiast and the dry skeptic. When I turn to the referees' reports, it is yet another range of styles and reactions. Whether through brilliant speculations or pedantic analyses, the dialogue unfolds surprisingly fair despite the shield of anonymity. Dispute tends not to decay into wrestle, and overall the degree of concordance is unexpectedly high. As the months pass by, I end up in the middle of a permanent conference, faceless but no less lively. Most often, I feel gratified to be the guardian of this special traffic. A few times, I have been overwhelmed.

Such has been my first-year experience, facts and feelings. At this righteous and pious time of the year, I should like to thank all, authors, referees, and co-editors, on behalf of them all, for contributing to a good thing. To the readers of their journal, my warmest wishes for a happy Christmas.

Ele Ferrannini  
Editor-in-Chief  
December 1994