

Editorial

This issues inaugurates our tenth year. I may be pardoned for wishing to celebrate our decade of successful history up to this issue.

During these almost ten years, we have received a little over 300 papers to evaluate. Of these, little over 100 were accepted and published, resulting in an acceptance rate of around 35%. This demonstrates that there has been no compromise of scientific rigor in order to achieve a higher throughput, even at the risk of publishing only a small number of papers in each issue.

The papers themselves, using the metrics of reads and downloads, have attracted attention: 10% of our papers have been downloaded more than 1.000 times, while 50% of our papers have been download more than 100 times, post installation of counters in each download page. It is safe to conclude that our journal has achieved a good level of visibility.

Furthermore, these downloads of our papers have led to citations. According to Google Scholar, close to 10% of our papers are referenced 5 times or more and more than 60% of our papers are referenced at least once (excluding self-references). This is a gratifying statistic since peer citations are the most reliable indicator of scientific quality of published papers. Hence, we can say that we are making our small part in putting other researchers "on the shoulders of giants".

On a personal note, I am proud to report that my own paper on clustering published in 2009, which I chose to submit to our journal (and which, I hasten to add, went through the standard reviewing procedure, with no intervention by me), has achieved the respectable number of 40 citations, making it my second most cited paper. So I certainly have no regrets about having submitted my manuscript to our journal, instead of some traditional high impact factor journal.

I took the liberty of including this personal anecdote in order to emphasize that even small journals can, under appropriate circumstances, advance your work and improve its visibility.

The "appropriate circumstances" just referred to are, in the case of our journal, speed of publication and a rigorous double-blinded review process, with all reviewers being PhDs. Our recent statistics indicate an average of 2.9 reviewers per manuscript; first review within 60 days (53, on the average) and the accepted paper that was the longest time under review, took eight months from initial submission to publishing.

Given all that, one can easily come to the conclusion that we are a top-notch journal and publishing with us will further your quality and career.

As I have pointed out many times in previous editorials, the kind of success described above makes no difference to the national QUALIS system, which is based on journal impact factors (a Thomson Reuters commercial product), with no attempt to carry out an independent investigation on the actual review processes and editorial rigor used by the journal.

Had we accepted more papers in our journal, perhaps we would have improved our rating. Nevertheless, I said it once and I will repeat it as many times as necessary: we are not compromising our quality, not matter what comes.

Paraphrasing Henley, it matters not to us how strait the gate and how filled with numbers the QUALIS' scroll. As the masters of our fate, we will keep our proud and scientific sound soul.

Despite this, let me close with the following hope: may the next decade be as fruitful as the one that just got over and may the force (of science) be with all of us.


Editor in chief