Moving away from IFs and looking at other measures of attention, impact and influence. The Funding Councils in the UK have already realised that telling a good ‘impact story’ is an important marker of research quality, and this is reflected in the funding formulae for the Research Excellence Framework.

Many journals, including the BJGP, use alternative metrics; we publish Altmetric donuts for our papers, indicating the various press, social and other media sites where they have been picked up. It is still difficult to search the ‘grey literature’ to discover where publications have been used to develop local, regional or national clinical or policy guidance, but this is a further important dimension of impact. Conversely, we do our best to promote important papers by sending out press summaries to draw wider attention to the research so that public interest and societal impact begin to compete with ‘citeability’ as editorial acceptance criteria.

Finally, the impending revolution in biomedical publication mandated by Plan S (https://www.coalition-s.org) brings with it further pressures to move away from the sole use of IFs towards other, more meaningful measures of the true impact of research publications. More on this soon.

I hope you enjoy reading this issue of the BJGP as much as we have enjoyed putting it together. There are some excellent research papers on aspects of new technologies in general practice, with linked editorials on artificial intelligence and digitally enabled primary care. The director of the National School for Primary Care Research, Richard Hobbs, analyses the place of primary care research in today’s health system. Towards the end of the Journal there are two must-read articles by Roger Neighbour and Chris Salisbury which, between them, contain more wisdom than you can shake a stick at.

And, talking of wisdom, we say a fond farewell to Marshall Marinker, one of the founding fathers of 20th century general practice.

Roger Jones, Editor
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Editor’s Briefing
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