

Bibliometric performance of Acta Physiologica

One step up in the ranking of Acta Physiologica, that is the result of the 2013 impact factor. We now rank ninth out of 81 journals the field of physiology. If only those publication organs are considered that are not completely focused on reviews or on specialized fields, Acta Physiologica ranks number four. *Physiology*, *The Journal of General Physiology* and *the Journal of Physiology (London)* are the leading three.

Submissions surged last year (Persson 2014). Within a short time span, we have increased submissions over twofold. What is more, the proportion of submissions by regions has dramatically changed. Scandinavian authors are now around several times more likely to submit their work to Acta Physiologica compared to the last years (Persson 2013). What has particularly pleased all of us involved in publishing Acta Physiologica is that the quality of our submissions is improving by the month.

New challenges appear as the impact factor is now in its second year well above four. Becoming an online-only-journal meant that we can publish more pages without inflicting a much greater financial burden on the Scandinavian Physiological Society. Nevertheless, we have decreased the acceptance rate of manuscripts.

Attempts are made in several countries to quantify performance of research by bibliometric means. The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) has taken a closer look at this and makes recommendations for institutions, publishers and researchers (The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment [http: and am.ascb.org/dora/](http://am.ascb.org/dora/) 2014). Certainly, most of us will agree to the following statements made by DORA:

- When involved in committees making decisions about funding, hiring, tenure, or promotion, make assessments based on scientific content rather than publication metrics.
- Use a range of article metrics and indicators on personal/supporting statements, as evidence of the impact of individual published articles and other research outputs.
- Challenge research assessment practices that rely inappropriately on Journal Impact Factors and promote and teach best practice that focuses on the value and influence of specific research outputs.

References

Persson, P.B. 2013. Who are our readers? *Acta Physiol (Oxf)*., 208, (2) 137

Persson, P.B. 2014. Submissions bode well for 2014. *Acta Physiol (Oxf)*., 210, (1) 1

The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment [http: and am.ascb.org/dora/](http://am.ascb.org/dora/). (2014).

Figure 1. Regional distribution of submissions to Acta Physiologica