The editorial board for *Public Health Nutrition* has seen another year pass, with an ever increasing number of submitted papers, larger volumes and an increased number of pages over the year.

**Impact factor**

The increased number of pages that we have had over the last few years has now taken its toll: in the latest ‘verdict’ from ISI Journal Citation Reports (JCR), our impact factor decreased from 2·79 to 2·09 in June this year. This reduction makes us all who put a substantial amount of work into the journal disappointed, wondering what we did wrong. It is good to know that we are not alone – the same drop happened to our big sister journal, *British Journal of Nutrition*(1), which experienced an impact factor drop from 3·45 to 3·07. These drops are, for both journals, probably due to an increased number of papers being published in the years 2008 and 2009, the years that the 2010 impact factor is based on. Just to remind our readers: the impact factor is based upon the number of citations of papers published in the last two years, divided by the number of papers. For 2008 plus 2009, we published 456 papers, while the corresponding figure for 2007 plus 2008 was only 343 papers. We are now ranked as number 39 out of 70 nutrition journals.

Our 5-year impact factor, which may be more interesting than the 1-year version, is higher, 2·817, and moves the journal up to number 25 out of the 70 nutrition journals. Our 5-year impact factor, which may be more interesting than the 1-year version, is higher, 2·817, and moves the journal up to number 25 out of the 70 nutrition journals. The Article Influence score that is also published by JCR calculates the relative importance of the journal per paper. When this score is more than 1, it indicates that the journal has above-average influence. Our journal ranked relatively high here: at 0·819, *Public Health Nutrition* was ranked as number 22 out of the 70 listed nutrition journals in JCR.

**What renders many citations?**

Table 1 shows papers published in *Public Health Nutrition* in 2008 and 2009 that were the most highly cited in 2010 (data from ISI Web of Science in October 2011).

Reviews generally get many citations. For our journal, we can see that papers in novel areas such as local community interventions, methodology papers and large cohort studies are also highly cited.

In the broader scope of all scientific journals, papers in research areas that are moving quickly and/or have a clear market value, such as pharmaceutics and molecular biology, get many citations; as do papers in clinical journals. An example of a high-ranking journal is *Nature* with an impact factor of 36·1 according to JCR. Among journals in paediatrics, the highest ranking is *Pediatrics*, with an impact factor of 5·39. The highest ranking of the nutrition journals, if we do not count those devoted merely to publishing reviews, is *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, with an impact factor of 6·61.

**Health impact factor**

We might be accused of discussing ‘sour grapes’ here, but again, pointing to our earlier editorial about the nude emperor(12), is it not time to start discussing a ‘health impact factor’ as a supplement to the above-mentioned impact factor for journals related to human health? It seems evident that papers published in the area of paediatrics as well as in nutrition can have a profound effect on human health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of paper</th>
<th>Citations in 2010</th>
<th>Total citations to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodor et al.(^{(2)})</td>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno et al.(^{(3)})</td>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean et al.(^{(4)})</td>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinburn et al.(^{(5)})</td>
<td>Policy paper</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen et al.(^{(6)})</td>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al.(^{(7)})</td>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psaltopoulou et al.(^{(8)})</td>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson et al.(^{(9)})</td>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson et al.(^{(10)})</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvez et al.(^{(11)})</td>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
health, which is not reflected in the journal impact factor or in the currently existing systems for assessing quality of research.

**Thank you to all for a good year**

This journal is the result of efforts from administrative as well as editing staff at the Nutrition Society and Cambridge University Press. Additionally, a large number of volunteer scientists devote their time and effort into making the journal interesting and in developing the content in regard to editorial material as well as paper review. And finally, we have a tremendous amount of papers from eager authors submitted every year. The number of papers has steadily increased during the 14 years that the journal has existed. Clearly the journal is generating a lot of interest, and the field of public health nutrition is expanding. Thank you to you all, the readers, authors and 'citers', for another great year – we hope to welcome you back in 2012.
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