



FIGURE 1. Computed tomography images showing a) the classical multiple “star burst” appearance due to multiple shot pellets, and b) evidence of embolisation of multiple shots into the lung.

shotgun fired at close quarters during military duty into the anterior lower thorax. The lower chest wall, liver, pericardium, base of right lung and heart were impregnated with shot pellets, giving the classical multiple “star burst” appearance. (fig. 1a). Extensive debridement of the chest wall wound was performed, with the removal of numerous lead shots. Intracardiac and intrapulmonary shots were left *in situ* and successfully managed conservatively [5]. He remained asymptomatic. Injuries were monitored by serial CT scans and echocardiograms, which later showed evidence of embolisation of multiple shots into the lung (fig. 1b).

C.S.H. Ng, M.W.T. Kwok and R.H.L. Wong
Dept of Surgery, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China.

Correspondence: C.S.H. Ng, Dept of Surgery, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China. E-mail: cshng@netvigator.com

Statement of Interest: None declared

REFERENCES

- 1 Jorens PG, Van Marck E, Snoeckx A, *et al.* Nonthrombotic pulmonary embolism. *Eur Respir J* 2009; 34: 452–474.
- 2 Ng CSH, Lee TW, Yim APC. Iatrogenic causes of hilar radiopaque densities. *Eur Respir J* 2005; 26: 358.
- 3 Rickman OB, Utz JP, Aughenbaugh GL, *et al.* Pulmonary embolization of 2-octyl cyanoacrylate after endoscopic injection therapy for gastric variceal bleeding. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2004; 79: 1455–1458.
- 4 Goldman RL, Carmody RF. Foreign body pulmonary embolism originating from a gunshot wound to the head. *J Trauma* 1984; 24: 277–279.
- 5 Nagy KK, Massad M, Fildes J, *et al.* Missile embolization revisited: a rationale for selective management. *Am Surg* 1994; 60: 975–979.

DOI: 10.1183/09031936.00126709

Impact factor and its role in academic promotion

To the Editors:

The following statement was adopted unanimously at the May 17, 2009, meeting of the International Respiratory Journal Editors Roundtable.

In our collective experience as editors of international peer-reviewed journals, we propose that the impact factor calculated for individual journals should not be used as a basis for evaluating the significance of an individual scientist's past performance or scientific potential. There are several reasons not to equate the impact factor of a journal in which the scientist publishes with the quality of the scientist's research. For example, as revealed by several recently published analyses of the impact factor [1–6]:

- 1) A journal's impact factor is determined by a decided minority of its published manuscripts. Thus the impact factor correlates poorly with the citations of an individual manuscript.
- 2) The impact factor does not consider the number of scientists actively producing research in a given specialty field. Indeed, some journals feel the need to serve constituencies with relatively small numbers of participants who continue to address important questions even though the number of scientists available for citations is limited.
- 3) A journal's impact factor can be inflated by certain journal practices, such as publication of many review articles.

- 4) Impact factor measures only the frequency of citations which cannot be assumed to always equate with quality.

There are alternative and we believe more valid measures of the quality and impact of an individual scientist's published contributions. First, a citation record for the individual candidate is readily available *via* several types of Internet search engines. Second, the time-honoured practice of soliciting evaluations concerning the significance of a candidate's work from scientific peers who are carefully selected to be both highly qualified as well as clearly “arms-length” from the candidate should be rigorously applied.

V. Brusasco*, **A.T. Dinh-Xuan***, **A.R. Leff[#]**, **K.B. Adler[¶]**, **R.W. Glenny⁺**, **J.A. Dempsey⁺**, **M.L. Levy[§]**, **R. Panettieri[†]**, **H.K. Reddel^{**}**, **D. Singh^{###}** and **J.C. Virchow^{¶¶}**

European Respiratory Journal*, [#]*Proceedings of the American Thoracic Society*, [¶]*American Journal of Respiratory Cell and Molecular Biology*, ⁺*Journal of Applied Physiology*, [§]*Primary Care Respiratory Journal*, [†]*Respiratory Research*, ^{}*Respirology*, ^{###}*International Journal of COPD*, and ^{¶¶}*Respiratory Medicine*.

Correspondence: V. Brusasco, Internal Medicine, University of Genoa, largo R. Benzi 10, Genova, Italy. E-mail: vito.brusasco@unige.it

Statement of Interest: Statements of interest for V. Brusasco, A.T. Dinh-Xuan and K.B. Adler can be found at www.erj.ersjournals.com/misc/statements.dtl

Acknowledgements: The International Respiratory Journal Editors Roundtable thank J.A. Dempsey, Editor of the *Journal of Applied Physiology*, for preparing the original draft of this statement, which was reviewed, altered, and edited by the Roundtable members.

REFERENCES

- 1 Chew M, Villanueva EV, Van Der Weyden MB. Life and times of the impact factor: Retrospective analysis of trends for seven medical journals (1994–2005) and their Editors' views. *J Roy Soc Med* 2007; 100: 142–150.
- 2 Ketcham CM, Crawford JM. The impact of review articles. *Lab Investig* 2007; 87: 1174–1185.
- 3 Ogden TL, Bartley DL. The ups and downs of journal impact factors. *Ann Occup Hyg* 2008; 52: 73–82.
- 4 Smith R. Beware the tyranny of impact factors. *J Bone Joint Surg (Br)* 2008; 90-B: 125–126.
- 5 Szklo M. Impact factor: Good reasons for concern. *Epidemiol* 2008; 19: 369.
- 6 Wilcox AJ. Rise and fall of the Thomson impact factor. *Epidemiol* 2008; 19: 373.

DOI: 10.1183/09031936.00094109