EDITORIAL

Editorial: Incoming Editor-in-Chief

To cite this article: Richard H Bayford 2008 Physiol. Meas. 29

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

Related content
- Editorial: Incoming Honorary Editor
  Michael R Neuman
- Incoming Editor-in-Chief
  Steve Webb
- Incoming Editor-in-Chief
  Simon Cherry
Editorial: Incoming Editor-in-Chief

The quality of a scientific journal relies on many factors, not least of which is its ability to attract authors who consider the journal a worthy place to present their research findings. Under the stewardship of past editors and with the considerable help of the expertise of its busy international referees and Board members this journal has continued to grow in stature. As I assume the position of Editor-in-Chief of *Physiological Measurement*, I realize how important such a role is in the success of a journal and the great responsibility that the editor and the publisher have in guiding the publication to fulfil its aims. It is an honour and a challenge to take on this responsibility. I am pleased to follow the excellent example set by my predecessor, Michael Neuman, to work with the publishers, and the rest of the staff at IOP Publishing (IOP), and to receive advice and assistance from an outstanding international Editorial Board. I have placed my own research material in *Physiological Measurement* and encourage my colleagues to do likewise, acknowledging the prestige of this journal. The quality of the journal is clearly evident from the continued growth of its impact factor. The international referees, Editorial Board and the publishing team are to be congratulated for achieving this outstanding recognition.

As the incoming Editor I hope my role will be to maintain and enhance quality. The Editor-in-Chief is primarily a guardian of the journal and should change nothing that does not need changing but aim to improve standards. It is no different from taking on any other leadership role such as in a team or department. One has to lead by consensus and with respect for the position. Conversely there are things I would like to see improved and I commit to attempting these but in a spirit of cooperation with the Board, the publisher (IOP), IPEM and the readership. Any other approach would be doomed. So, what would I like to see changed?

I would like us to engage more with the clinical community; *Physiological Measurement* is a journal that should showcase new ideas. Research that has the potential to have a major impact on and greatly improve the accuracy of diagnosis or the monitoring of clinical conditions is always in need. However, it is a long road from initial research to having it accepted as a routine clinical tool. I believe that we need to address this issue by encouraging clinicians to see the journal as a place to find new ideas and identify research areas that need to be addressed. I would hope that we are able to find *Physiological Measurement* ranking alongside clinicians’ own journals as required reading. *Physiological Measurement* has begun this process and it is always open to debate as the best approach for achieving this but I believe this is an achievable goal. What else would I like to see changed? Modelling is a key process in the understanding of physiological function; however, all models need validating and hence modelling and measurement should not be considered as separate operations. Although the journal has already embraced this there is still room to encourage further development; this is particularly important as development in the human physiome project continues to gain pace.

The future of *Physiological Measurement* looks healthy as it continues to provide researchers with an ideal showcase for high quality research and a proven forum for new research challenges.
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