

## EuroIntervention: moving forward

Davide Capodanno, *Editor-in-Chief*

Let's begin by turning the clock back a number of years. At a conference in the USA, the organisers had designed a session with stars from the field of interventional cardiology, mixed with abstract presentations by outsiders like me. Among those legendary names I had no place, which does not mean that I left things to chance: as a diligent fellow, I started working on the flow and graphics of my slides several weeks earlier than necessary, because "this is a train that passes only once". After the talk, in a room crowded with people who were there to listen to the others, I felt quite gratified. Born in a city of about 300,000 inhabitants in southern Italy, interacting with colleagues in a room on the other side of the ocean was quite a big leap. Later during the day, without any other particular commitment, I was sitting in an almost empty hall waiting in the audience for another session full of cardiology icons to begin in twenty minutes' time. I was consulting the conference programme, when Patrick Serruys entered the room and spoke to me for the very first time.

With his famous Belgian accent that does not seem to allow replies, he said something kind about my presentation earlier that day. It sounds incredible to say, considering that my background was very limited while his background was endless, but we had some common scientific interests in the area of risk stratification for coronary interventions. So there we were: the teacher and the student, the legend and his fan. I think I was not able to articulate long sentences during that episode and, in retrospect, it was probably the right thing to have done. Even during the many EuroIntervention meetings that I attended years later as a Deputy Editor, I always spoke little to Patrick Serruys. When you have the privilege of sitting next to such a giant of cardiology, the wisest thing to do is to listen.

Now, in the particular situation in which I find myself writing this Editorial – namely that of a transition in the Editorship of this Journal – there is nothing I can say about the former Editor that will not sound like an obligation. And so I will not say anything that is not already obvious to the dozens of collaborators who know him and have taken turns over the years, except that the merits of Patrick Serruys in founding and running EuroIntervention for 15 years, raising it to its current standard and bringing it to the attention of the interventional community, are here for all to see. He passed on to me a product in a healthy condition, with an impact factor of 4.018, an editorial board of motivated and enthusiastic people, and an editorial office that translates ambitions into reality with professional ease. "When Prof. Serruys decides to devote himself to other challenges in his bright career, only a madman could accept the assignment of succeeding him", I thought some time ago. Now that I'm the madman, apparently, it's all about deciding what to do: to copy him, resulting in a pale imitation, or to do something different, following the vision I have been developing for some years.

Towards the end of 2019, when PCR, EAPCI and Europa Publishing informed me that I had been chosen for the position of Editor-in-Chief, I reflected on the formula of the impact factor. This was a somewhat arid and mathematical exercise when dealing with such a big new responsibility, but it helped me to stay focused and rank my ideas and priorities. Kindly follow this reasoning. The useful window for citations to articles from 2018 and 2017 (i.e., the numerator of the impact factor ratio) ended on 31 December 2019. So, in 2020 we will have the impact factor for 2019, and whatever the new Board has been able and will be able to do starting from January 2020 will be fully acknowledged by an

impact factor released in 2023 (citations in 2022 of articles published in 2020 and 2021 divided by the number of citable material in 2020 and 2021). I know, it's weird. Increasing the impact factor of a journal means acting in two directions: the numerator (citations) and the denominator (articles) of the ratio. Publishing fewer articles does not increase the impact factor if this results in fewer citations. Increasing citations does not increase the impact factor if in doing so you end up with publishing a greater number of articles. There is only one way to act simultaneously on both the numerator and the denominator, and it is as simple as three words. Publishing. Good. Articles. If the recipe is so easy, when accepting the position I thought that there was no need to focus on mathematical formulas: let's forget the impact factor, and think about making a good journal.

In a variety of roles I have been a loyal EuroIntervention collaborator for the past ten years – as an author, a reviewer, an International Board member, and as a Deputy Editor. Each of these roles involves a peculiar challenge, and a different perspective that drives my wishes and concept for the future of this Journal. As an author, in the Journal I would like, I see the idea of respect at all stages of the editorial process. Quick and motivated decisions, for better or for worse, and a process of rapid and efficient submission. We will only be able to publish about 10% of what we receive, which is why we are asking for the authors' understanding right now. For reasons of space or editorial priority, we are already forced to reject a considerable number of manuscripts of undoubted value. As a reviewer or as an Associate Editor, I would like to be selected and stimulated based on my interest and expertise, and actively contribute to the mission of the Journal. I would like to be able to influence the selection of the articles, and be acknowledged for my efforts. EuroIntervention is already ahead in many of these aspects, but this community follows the principle of

continuous improvement. In the coming weeks and months, you will begin to notice something new; the email address [editor@eurointervention.com](mailto:editor@eurointervention.com) is ready to welcome your suggestions and feedback.

Finally, I would like to reflect with you on aspects that characterise EuroIntervention. It is the Journal of PCR: we cannot escape the “by and for” principle. It is one of the founding pillars of EAPCI: we will foster this synergy of strength. It is the Journal of the worldwide interventional community: there will be “academic” articles but also “technical” articles connected with daily practice. Technical articles are a pleasant read and ... a threat to the impact factor: heavily downloaded but rarely cited. However, they represent the value we want to provide to each reader and member of our community. Finding the right balance between practice and academia is at the heart of our reflection and efforts during these first few weeks. EuroIntervention will have to face the challenges and opportunities of the decade that has just begun, evolving in form, style and language, integrating its two souls, paper and digital. The Journal experience will continue online in many ways, and articles and columns will serve as a discussion and sharing platform, as has already been happening for years in the colourful universe of social media. We hope for the renewed enthusiasm of the authors to submit the product of their intellect and research: we will treat it well. We hope for the renewed involvement of our best reviewers in helping us to maintain the Journal's scope: your opinion will be held in high regard. We hope that readers will be increasingly aware of EuroIntervention as “their” Journal and empathise with the effort it takes to do a good job. My most heartfelt thanks go to Patrick Serruys for his legacy and for all the things he has taught me in working with him: EuroIntervention is one of his brightest gems. I, the Deputy Editors and all those who are involved with building this Journal will look after it well.