60th anniversary of *Thorax*

Thorax 1991–1996

S G Spiro

The only bound volumes that I have of *Thorax* (five in all) were the annual collations of published papers during my tenure as Editor. I noted with some satisfaction that the pagination had risen from 939 pages in 1991 to 1328 pages by 1995.

For me, my short editorial announcing that we had agreed to publish Supplements to be produced with—but not integral to—*Thorax* was a huge leap forward. No, we may not have been

pioneers here, but it represented a broadening of the content and it became a vehicle for Society guidelines, symposia summaries, and topical reviews.

The first supplement was the Guidelines for the Management of Asthma (1993;48:S1–24). Not only was this publication a great success, reaching a world audience and excellent for the journal's impact factor, it was also a considerable financial success as the pharmaceutical industry bought thousands of copies. These

profits were in part transformed into more pages as I adopted a policy of expanding *Thorax* with papers of general interest, perhaps at the expense of the impact factor—always a controversial issue.

I think that, overall, the supplements raised the journal's profile. Other guideline supplements followed, some more successful than others. They have always been independently produced without sponsorship, although industry has often bought copies after publication. While they remain individual gambles, I was pleased to have added supplements to the content of *Thorax*.

Editor, 1991–1996

Thorax 2006;61:1020.

doi: 10.1136/thx.2006.072694

Correspondence to: Professor S G Spiro, Department of Thoracic Medicine, University College Hospital, London WC1E 6AU, UK; stephen.spiro@uclh.org

60th anniversary of *Thorax*

Thorax 1996–2002

A Knox, J Britton

The year 1996 was a strange one. Dolly the sheep was cloned and Britain was embroiled in an epidemic of mad cow disease. Nottingham Forest football team were in the premier league. Amid this confusion, two different beasts were appointed to the editorship of *Thorax*, one a cell biologist and the other an epidemiologist. This was the first time *Thorax* had joint editors rather than a dictatorial structure. Would it work? How would we run the journal?

The main indicator of scientific quality of a journal then, as now, was the impact factor and, for all its failings, it at least provided something objective which was measurable against comparator journals. At that time the impact factor of *Thorax* was rather low and we were concerned that, as competitor journals expanded, we might be left in their wake. We decided that lean and mean was best. We would concentrate on quality at the expense of quantity and hope that by publishing only the best papers we would improve the impact factor. Hopefully this would then make the journal more appealing to contributors for their better papers, and there would be a positive spiral with this

policy increasing the number of good manuscripts received. Interestingly, not all within the publishing house were convinced about this. The spectre was raised of an anorexic journal getting thinner and thinner and then imploding without trace. Another major change we made was to improve the turnaround time on decisions. As investigators ourselves, we had experience of papers being in review for inordinate lengths of time before being rejected. We hoped that a quick decision—especially if it was negative—would allow the authors to send their work elsewhere with speed.

At first life was difficult. Irrate authors who were used to getting their work published in the journal were horrified that their papers would have to find a different home. There were protests that papers had been rejected so speedily that we could only have given them a cursory glance. Unfortunately, if the message is not compelling, then no amount of reviewing is likely to turn a paper into something which will have a major impact in the field. We may have made some mistakes, but authors could always turn to other journals. We also suffered from the assumption by the

British Thoracic Society that guidelines written by them would automatically be published in the journal, irrespective of quality. These were interesting times.

Initially our policy resulted in a few lean issues of the journal but—lo and behold—as the impact factor of the journal rose, its perception did also and submissions increased steadily. Our ideas had been vindicated. Like Clinton in 1996, we stayed on for an extended term but all good things eventually come to a natural conclusion.

There were the issues of potential scientific misconduct, duplicate publications, ghost writing, etc. The former were often spotted by sharp eyed reviewers. These were inevitably a source of embarrassment to those involved and unnecessary hassle for us.

We were able to publish a number of papers which took respiratory medicine forward in new directions (and probably some which set it back!). Some examples of the former in common respiratory conditions were landmark papers highlighting the relationship between exacerbations and decline in lung function in COPD¹ and papers characterising new phenotypes in asthma.² There were also clinical papers with therapeutic implications in a diverse range of therapeutic areas such as a study defining the role of CPAP in mild sleep apnoea,³ a paper on bisphosphonates in treating osteoporosis in cystic fibrosis,⁴ and the occasional interesting anecdotal report such as a paper suggesting that GM-CSF was a novel treatment for alveolar proteinosis.⁵ On a more experimental note, laboratory studies suggested a potential for anti-TGFβ strategies in pulmonary fibrosis.⁶ These

give just a flavour. In epidemiology and public health we published an excellent series of review articles on the health effects of passive smoke exposure,^{7–16} all of which have been extensively cited and used since. We published the UK smoking cessation guidelines and a subsequent update,^{17–19} which have had a major impact on clinical practice and health service development in this area. We published a wide range of respiratory epidemiology and, in particular, *Thorax* took a lead in reporting work on the relation between asthma, obesity, and body mass index during this period.^{20–26}

At a management level we enjoyed the challenge of the emergence of online publishing during our period as Editors, and are pleased to see how these opportunities have since transformed the ways that journals operate and have increased their accessibility. We were proud to see the impact factor of *Thorax* improve from 1.96 to 4.08 in the year we finished. We did this without requesting contributors to cite past papers from the journal or from publishing multiple reviews quoting only work published in the same journal—the editorial equivalent of Selfcite²⁷ that does wonders for the impact factor but is of minimal value to readers.

Editing *Thorax* was immensely enjoyable. We were supported superbly by our editorial assistants Hilary Hughes and Rachel Orme. Liz Stockman did an excellent job tidying up the errors in the papers we accepted, with unfailing discretion and tact. Alex Williamson and Richard Smith tried their best to make us toe the then BMJ Publishing Group line into education and what they referred to as “added value”, but never seemed to mind us ignoring them. However, after seven years we were more than happy, when the time came, to pass responsibility on to the current team. Their record more than justifies

that change. It was very satisfying to look through issues of *Thorax* we edited when they were delivered to us as the finished product; it is even more so now that someone else is responsible for it. *Thorax* continues to go from strength to strength. It's a shame the same can't be said for Nottingham Forest.

Editors, 1996–2002

Thorax 2006;**61**:1020–1021.

doi: 10.1136/thx.2006.072819

.....

Authors' affiliations

A Knox, J Britton, Division of Respiratory Medicine, Clinical Sciences Building, Nottingham University Hospital, City Hospital Campus, Nottingham NG5 1PB, UK

Correspondence to: Professor J Britton, Division of Respiratory Medicine, Clinical Sciences Building, Nottingham University Hospital, City Hospital Campus, Nottingham NG5 1PB, UK; j.britton@virgin.net

REFERENCES

- 1 Donaldson GC, Seemungal TAR, Bhowmik A, et al. Relationship between exacerbation frequency and lung function decline in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Thorax* 2002;**57**:847–52.
- 2 Green RH, Brightling CE, Woltmann G, et al. Analysis of induced sputum in adults with asthma: identification of subgroup with isolated sputum neutrophilia and poor response to inhaled corticosteroids. *Thorax* 2002;**57**:875–9.
- 3 Engleman HM, Martin SE, Deary IJ, et al. Effect of CPAP therapy on daytime function in patients with mild sleep apnoea/hypopnoea syndrome. *Thorax* 2001;**56**:114–9.
- 4 Haworth CS, Selby PL, Adams JE, et al. Effect of intravenous pamidronate on bone mineral density in adults with cystic fibrosis. *Thorax* 2001;**56**:314–6.
- 5 Barracough RM, Gillies AJ. Pulmonary alveolar proteinosis: a complete response to GM-CSF therapy. *Thorax* 2001;**56**:664–5.
- 6 Wang Q, Wang Y, Hyde DM, et al. Reduction of bleomycin induced lung fibrosis by transforming growth factor β soluble receptor in hamsters. *Thorax* 1999;**54**:805–12.
- 7 Cook DG, Strachan DP. Parental smoking and prevalence of respiratory symptoms and asthma in school age children. *Thorax* 1997;**52**:1081–94.
- 8 Cook DG, Strachan DP, Carey IM. Parental smoking and spirometric indices in children. *Thorax* 1998;**53**:884–93.
- 9 Cook DG, Strachan DP. Parental smoking, bronchial reactivity and peak flow variability in children. *Thorax* 1998;**53**:295–301.
- 10 Cook DG, Strachan DP. Summary of effects of parental smoking on the respiratory health of children and implications for research. *Thorax* 1999;**54**:357–65.
- 11 Strachan DP, Cook DG. Health effects of passive smoking: 1. Parental smoking and lower respiratory illness in infancy and early childhood. *Thorax* 1997;**52**:905–14.
- 12 Strachan DP, Cook DG. Parental smoking and allergic sensitisation in children. *Thorax* 1998;**53**:117–23.
- 13 Strachan DP, Cook DG. Parental smoking and childhood asthma: longitudinal and case-control studies. *Thorax* 1998;**53**:204–12.
- 14 Strachan DP, Cook DG. Parental smoking, middle ear disease and adenotonsillectomy in children. *Thorax* 1998;**53**:50–6.
- 15 Coultas DB. Passive smoking and risk of adult asthma and COPD: an update. *Thorax* 1998;**53**:381–7.
- 16 Anderson HR, Cook DG. Passive smoking and sudden infant death syndrome: review of the epidemiological evidence. *Thorax* 1997;**52**:1003–9.
- 17 Parrott S, Godfrey C, Raw M, et al. Guidance for commissioners on the cost-effectiveness of smoking cessation interventions. *Thorax* 1998;**53**(Suppl 5, Part 2):S1–8.
- 18 West R, McNeill A, Raw M, et al. Smokeless tobacco cessation guidelines for health professionals in England. *Br Dent J* 2004;**196**:611–8.
- 19 West R, McNeill A, Raw M. Smoking cessation guidelines for health professionals: an update. *Thorax* 2000;**55**:987–99.
- 20 Chinn S, Rona RJ. Can the increase in body mass index explain the rising trend in asthma in children? *Thorax* 2001;**56**:845–50.
- 21 Chinn S, Jarvis D, Burney P. Relation of bronchial responsiveness to body mass index in the ECRHS. *Thorax* 2002;**57**:1028–33.
- 22 Figueroa-Munoz JI, Chinn S, Rona RJ. Association between obesity and asthma in 4–11 year old children in the UK. *Thorax* 2001;**56**:133–7.
- 23 Gibson GJ. Obesity, respiratory function and breathlessness. *Thorax* 2000;**55**(Suppl 1):S41–4.
- 24 Litonjua AA, Sparrow D, Celedon JC, et al. Association of body mass index with the development of methacholine airway hyperresponsiveness in men: the Normative Aging Study. *Thorax* 2002;**57**:581–5.
- 25 Schachter LM, Salome CM, Peat JK, et al. Obesity is a risk for asthma and wheeze but not airway hyperresponsiveness. *Thorax* 2001;**56**:4–8.
- 26 von Mutius E, Schwartz J, Neas LM, et al. Relation of body mass index to asthma and atopy in children: the National Health and Nutrition Examination Study III. *Thorax* 2001;**56**:835–8.
- 27 Craddock N, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ. Introducing Selfcite 2.0—Career enhancing software. *BMJ* 1996;**313**:1659–60.

Dr A J Robertson: an appreciation

Dr A John Robertson (1919–2006): an appreciation

A Seaton

John Robertson was the second medical editor of *Thorax*, succeeding Guy Scadding in 1960 and serving in this

role until 1970. It was my good fortune to learn clinical medicine on his firm at Liverpool Royal Infirmary in 1959/60

and later to work as his house physician and registrar. In those days, when many consultants still regarded themselves as “honorary” and attended their NHS sessions only occasionally, he was a beacon of conscientiousness both in his clinical work and his teaching, and was a role model for generations of students and junior colleagues.

After graduation from Liverpool and wartime service in the RAMC, he spent time at Ann Arbor where he demonstrated the efficacy of the medical management of bronchiectasis, exciting controversy with some distinguished thoracic surgeons. An early example of