

The need to locate, analyze and assess scientific study was initially proposed by Bush (1945), and culminated in the organization of the National Library of Medicine, the Impact Factor and also the Journal Citation Reports of the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), with participation of Eugene Garfield (1955) [2,3].

The calculation for the IF of a journal in a given year (X) is performed as follows:

IF of year X = No. of journal citations obtained in the two previous years ÷ No. of articles published in the two previous years [2].

In addition to IF, there are over 30 levels of measurements. In the words of Garfield (2006). *"Impact Factor is not a perfect tool to measure the quality of articles but there is nothing better and it has the advantage of already being in existence and is, therefore, a good technique for scientific evaluation"* [4].

But we must always improve, but how? In "The Secret of visibility", Maurício da Rocha e Silva, editor of Clinics, highlights important points for IF increase: the language of science is English, publishing good articles with high impact (from the editorial board members), publication of specific supplements of a particular subject and maintaining the journal with snapshot open access (allowing greater visibility of articles published) [5].

An interesting analysis published in the European Heart Journal (2012) sought to relate factors that may predict publications and citations (from abstracts submitted to scientific conferences). Using data from the 2006 European Congress of Cardiology, in which 10,020 abstracts of scientific studies were sent, the average of published studies subsequently was 38%. We identified prospective, randomized and controlled studies and inclusion of a number of patients  $\geq 100$  as independent factors of acceptance for publication [6].

We reached and outscored 1.0. Quo Vadis?

**Helcio Giffhorn - Cardiovascular surgeon, Member of BSCVS- Curitiba/PR**

## REFERENCES

1. Gomes WJ. Elevação do fator do impacto. Available from URL: [http://www.sbccc.org.br/medica/exibeConteudoMultiplo.asp?cod\\_Conteudo=660](http://www.sbccc.org.br/medica/exibeConteudoMultiplo.asp?cod_Conteudo=660)
2. Ruiz MA, Greco OT, Braile DM. Fator de impacto: importância e influência no meio editorial, acadêmico e científico. Rev Bras Hematol Hemoter. 2009;31(5):355-60.
3. Garfield E. Citation indexes for science: a new dimension in documentation through association of ideas. Science. 1955;122(3159):108-11.
4. Garfield E. The history and meaning of the journal impact factor. JAMA. 2006;295(1):90-3.
5. Marcolin N, Zorzetto R. O segredo da visibilidade. Pesquisa FAPESP. 2012;191:28-33.
6. Winnik S, Raptis DA, Walker JH, Hassun M, Speer T, Clavier PA, et al. From abstract to impact in cardiovascular research: factors predicting publication and citation. Eur Heart J 2012 Jun 5 [Epub ahead of print].

## Cone Technique - José Pedro da Silva

Another technique developed by a Brazilian Cardiac Surgeon: Dr. José Pedro da Silva, discloses his technique abroad, showing the potential for development of cardiovascular surgery in our country. It is the "Cone" technique for correction of Ebstein's anomaly. The recognition was already patent by adopting the procedure at centers in the United States and Europe. The concept now crystallizes, with the invitation to Dr. José Pedro da Silva, by American Heart Association, to present the details of the surgery and its long-term results, at the Annual Congress of the entity to be held between 3-7 November in Los Angeles, California.