

## Report of the editor

The initiative to erect Gerontechnology journal was taken at the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference in Munich (1999). Nine years later the journal has seen 6½ completed volumes. Three issues concerned mainly conference abstracts from Miami (2002), Nagoya (2005) and Pisa (2008) respectively; the other 23 issues were filled with reviews, long and short original contributions, best practices, editorials, book reviews, correspondence and some news. Also included were small bio's of all ISG officers and volunteers of the journal. All continents are represented.

Since Nagoya the journal has welcomed 4 new associate editors (Anna Dickinson, James L. Fozard, Willam D. Kearns, Gari Lesnoff-Caravaglia) and 2 assistant editors (Joost van Hoof and Claudia Oppenauer). The editorial board lost one member (James L. Fozard) because of his 'promotion' to associate editor, and was strengthened with representatives from Argentine (Ramón M. Guttman), Denmark (Birgit Jæger), the Netherlands (Helianthe S.M. Kort) and the USA (R. Darin Ellis), while its Finnish member, Vappu T. Taipale was succeeded (on her request) by Mauno Konttinen. Candidates from other regions are most welcome to further strengthen the editorial board.

Since May 2005, the acceptance rate of manuscripts is slowly increasing: 43% (volume 4), 46% (volume 5), and 48% (volume 6). Leaving out the instructions for contributors, slowly reducing the news sections and introducing the Optima™ font led to more space for scientific contributions, for instance, volume 5 originates from a stock of 49 manuscripts, while volume 6 with only a slightly higher acceptance rate has been based on 60 submitted manuscripts. The quality of the submitted manuscripts is improving, although it apparently remains difficult to write good interdisciplinary manuscripts that honour both technology and gerontology. In addition, design manuscripts featuring both good functionality and an effective user interface, are still underrepresented in Gerontechnology journal, as are contributions including the effects of focus groups of actual users.

Of most issues, 450 hardcopies were printed. The conference issues have a larger circulation. In addition to the distributed hardcopies, members and subscribers have access to the digital version of the journal.

The readership of the e-version of the journal falls in three categories. The first category is formed by the members of the International Society for Gerontechnology. A larger readership is presumably attracted by the libraries that carry a subscription. At the Nagoya conference (May 2005) the number of subscribing libraries was 22 (13 in Europe, 5 in the Americas, 2 in Asia, and 2 in Australia). Currently (April 2008), this number has increased to 29, with 17 in Europe, 9 in the Americas, 1 in Asia and 2 in Australia). Interlibrary loans of individual articles increase the readership further. However, the increase in library coverage is still too slow to cover in the near future scientists, engineers, designers, professionals and policymakers that work on the interface of technology and gerontology.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> category of our readers concerns the community of interested persons that use internet as a source of information. For those without membership or access to a library subscription, the older volumes may be viewed free of charge.

*Table 1: March 2008 distribution of page views with known geographical distribution (Taken from One Stat.com)*

Continent	% Page views
Europe	67
Africa	0
Asia	9
Australia & Oceania	2
North America	23
South America	<1

Geographically speaking, the readership of the e-mail version is mainly located in Europe and North-America (*Table 1*). Africa had no readers in March 2008, but Africans were incidentally seen in other months. If we compare these percentages with the origin of the abstracts for the Pisa conferences as included in this issue, we find some concordance: 60% European contributions, and 30% from Asia, especially Japan. Africa is also represented, but the Americas are underrepresented in Pisa, probably because of the relative value changes of US\$ and €. We may conclude that the journal has reached all continents, but should grow further, especially in Africa, South-America, Australia and the Pacific.

The increase in readership was facilitated by the acceptance of Gerontechnology journal by the abstracting or indexing services of ASSIA, Inspec, PsycInfo, Social Services Abstracts, and Sociological Abstracts Database. Gerontechnology Journal is also listed in Genamics JournalSeek. Our inclusion in Medline was denied, but PubMedCentral did accept us. Due to a lack of finances of the society, we were not able to supply an XML-version of the contributions in the journal and this meant that our inclusion in PubMedCentral could not be implemented. Our request to be included in Science Citation Index and Social Sciences Citation Index is pending. However, in case we are accepted, extra finances will still be needed to supply the required XML-text.

With the help of our layout officer, volunteering associate and assistant editors, members of the editorial board and other peer reviewers, improvements have been implemented since the Nagoya conference. From May 1, 2006 on, peer reviewing is performed anonymously. Starting volume 6, we are using a new, better readable and more compact font: Optima™. Starting volume 7, most of the professional news has been taken over by the website of the ISG. A new website design is underway that should, among other things, make us better visible for Google Scholar, a free indexing service, much in use by the younger generation of scientists, engineers and designers.

Further improvements, such as XML-versions for websites, and growth are hardly possible with the existing budget. In fact, even the continuation of current procedures for peer reviewing and publication is no option due to time limitations of the editor. The society will need to choose between setting-up an editorial office with paid personnel or take a subscription to an e-service to manage manuscripts and publication. If an extension of the budget is not possible, the option remains to transform Gerontechnology Journal to a less costly and less time-consuming e-journal. But even then, an editorial office or manuscript management service is needed for sustainability and keeping up quality standards.

*J.E.M.H. van Bronswijk, editor of Gerontechnology journal*  
E: [j.e.m.h.v.bronswijk@gerontechnology.info](mailto:j.e.m.h.v.bronswijk@gerontechnology.info)