
EDITOR'S PAGE



During an informal luncheon at the American Heart Association (AHA) meetings in Dallas, Texas, the Editors-in-Chief of *JACC*, *Circulation*, *Circulation Research*, *Hypertension*, *American Journal of Cardiology* and *American Heart Journal* met to discuss common goals and concerns. There was a collegial spirit of cooperation and sharing, and an open discussion on a wide variety of topics. It was clear that we all face similar challenges, such as duplicate publication, obtaining timely, high quality peer reviews, quality control of statistics, decline in advertising revenue, uniform abbreviations, and standardization of units. As we discussed these issues, it became readily apparent that we could go a long way toward solving some of these issues if we adopted similar practices. Certainly, one of the best examples of the value of this cooperation has been the American College of Cardiology (ACC)/AHA Practice Guidelines for the evaluation and management of different subsets of cardiac patients. Indeed, the semiannual meetings of the officers of the AHA and ACC have helped greatly to unify the two organizations. With this example in mind, all of the editors agreed that periodic meetings would be helpful in resolving common issues. Accordingly, the editors of the journals listed above agreed to meet at the ACC meetings to continue the

Address for correspondence: William W. Parmley, MD, Editor-in-Chief, *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 415 Judah Street, San Francisco, California 94122.

**The Editors Meet—
A New Alliance**

William W. Parmley, MD, FACC

Editor-in-Chief

Journal of the American College of Cardiology

dialogue. Other editors will be invited to broaden the groups represented.

By consensus, the main topic of discussion at the next meeting will be the issue of duplicate publication. This proved to be a surprisingly common problem, as each of the editors had a chance to review his own experience. Several issues will be discussed regarding duplicate publication:

1. Defining what duplicate publication is.
2. Sharing information on articles and authors in an attempt to prevent it.
3. Using the forum of editors to discuss specific occurrences.
4. Using the forum of editors to assess any penalties.

It is anticipated that it would be worthwhile to adopt common guidelines and review processes so that duplicate publication can be dealt with objectively and equitably. Such processes would be set in motion prospectively in all participating journals, with appropriate written announcements.

Besides dealing with duplicate publication, the group of editors can usefully discuss a wide variety of issues regarding the peer review process and scientific publication in general. This cooperation should be helpful in enhancing the value and integrity of the cardiovascular literature. The editors would welcome your comments and suggestions regarding this new alliance, and the issues it should address.