Table 2 Ranking of the 10 journals publishing the most injury/accident prevention papers, 1945–2005

Rank	Journal	TGCS*	Publications
1	<i>Pediatrics</i>	1155	93
2	<i>Accident Analysis and Prevention</i>	282	54
3	<i>Journal of Trauma</i>	460	46
4	<i>Injury Prevention</i>	78	41
5	<i>Public Health Reports</i>	150	41
6	<i>Safety Science</i>	135	36
7	<i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i>	185	27
8	<i>Academic Emergency Medicine</i>	200	26
9	<i>Journal of Safety Research</i>	52	26
10	<i>British Journal of Sports Medicine</i>	193	25

*Total Global Citation Score—the citation frequency based on the total count in the Web of Science.

B Barlow, C Finch, F Rivara, L Schelp, J Langley, D Chalmers, and G Smith, head the list. Each of these top 10 have between 11 and 15 publications in this database. (Note that eight of these are, or have been, members of the editorial board of *Injury Prevention*!)

MOST CITED JOURNALS

Although this has been noted previously in another context,⁴ I was curious to learn in which journals these papers most often appeared and how often papers in those journals are cited. The Global Citation

Score shown in the table 2 indicates that *Pediatrics* followed by *Journal of Trauma* are the most cited. However, the list is sorted by number of publications meeting the search criteria published in each journal over the period since 1945. Although it appears that *Pediatrics*, *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, and the *Journal of Trauma* come ahead of *Injury Prevention*, this is an artifact. It stems from the fact that papers in *Injury Prevention* have only been archived in the Web of Science for the past four years. If we add all the other papers we have published since the

journal began in 1995, our total of peer reviewed original articles would be over 500, putting us well in the lead.

Calling attention to the pace setting role of *Injury Prevention* is, of course, one of the purposes of this editorial. Another purpose is to express my gratitude. As we embark on our second decade of publication, there is much reason for satisfaction from the data uncovered by this exercise. Everyone—our authors, reviewers, editorial board and, above all, Alex Williamson and the BMJ Publishing Group—once again deserve our thanks and that of others in this field.

Injury Prevention 2006;12:65–66.
doi: 10.1136/ip.2006.011817

Correspondence to: Professor I B Pless, Editor; barry.pless@mcgill.ca

REFERENCES

- 1 **Armstrong DB**, Cole. Accident Prevention. *Am J Public Health* 1946;36:869–74.
- 2 **Garfield E**, Pudovkin AI, Istomin VI. Mapping the output of topical searches in the Web of Knowledge and the case of Watson-Crick. *Information Technology and Libraries* 2003;22:183–7.
- 3 Available at <http://www.histcite.com/> (accessed February 2006).
- 4 **Pless IB**. Do scientific publications change anything? *Inj Prev* 2005;11:193–4.

Reed Elsevier

For the record: journal publishers and the arms trade

I B Pless

Promoting the international arms trade is incompatible with medical publishing's values

Of all journals that should not conceivably have any sort of formal or informal association with the facilitation of violence, especially violence involving civilians, *Injury Prevention* must head the list. In light of revelations regarding the involvement of the giant publisher Reed Elsevier with the arms industry, we want to assure our readers and contributors that our publishers, the BMJ Publishing Group, have no such links.

Reed Elsevier owns the *Lancet* along with hundreds of other medical journals. Last September, it staged what has been described as “the world’s largest arms fair”—Defence Systems and Equipment International (DSEi). A letter to the *Lancet* notes that “Military buyers are from some of the world’s most serious human-rights-abusing regimes”. And that “there is a demonstrable lack of effective regulation at these events”.^{1,2} We concur with the proposition “Professionals and practi-

tioners who use Reed Elsevier’s numerous medical and biomedical publications hold to principles that include, at their most basic, the maxim to ‘do no harm’.”

This relationship might be of less concern if arms sales only involved the military, or if only “conventional” weapons were being sold—although in the end, all weapons in any hands are designed for no other reason than to kill or maim. They have resulted in countless deaths and immense disability in the name of justice. In the case of cluster bombs, their legacy can be horrendous; the victims are all too often civilians, not soldiers. Further, it would be naïve to assume none of what is sold ever finds its way into the hands of terrorists.

Journals that espouse the prevention of injuries and violence have a moral obligation to take a stand on issues such as this. Hence, I fully concur with the conclusion of the letter “As researchers, scientists, medical professionals, and campaigners

concerned about the damaging effects of the arms trade on the health and well-being of many populations, we call on Reed Elsevier to end its international promotion of the arms trade.” The *Lancet* also agrees: “On behalf of our readers and contributors, we respectfully ask Reed Elsevier to divest itself of all business interests that threaten human, and especially civilian, health and well-being ... Values of harm reduction and science-based decision making are the core of public-health practice. Certain military technologies that Reed Elsevier has allowed to be showcased at DSEi are contrary to these values.”³

Issues such as this are rarely clear cut and there may well be situations that warrant the use of arms to fight oppression. The purpose of this commentary, however, is not to debate what those situations might be, but to call attention to the unacceptable relationship between a publisher of medical journals and the promotion of arms sales.

Injury Prevention 2006;12:66.
doi: 10.1136/ip.2006.011908

Correspondence to: Professor I B Pless, Editor; barry.pless@mcgill.ca

REFERENCES

- 1 **Parkinson S**. Letter to the *Lancet* re Reed Elsevier (published on behalf of Scientists for Global Responsibility) (web version). Available at http://www.sgr.org.uk/ArmsControl/letter_Lancet_10sep05.htm (accessed February 2006).
- 2 **Feder G**, Rohde JE, San Sebastian M, et al. Reed Elsevier and the international arms trade. *Lancet* 2005;366:889.
- 3 **Lancet’s International Advisory Board**. Reed Elsevier and the arms trade. *Lancet* 2005;366:868.