Let's Move On!

In the first issue of 1998, Chris T. Bolliger published his editorial 'A Wind of Change' in *Respiration*. Therein he described how he had taken over from Prof. Herzog after a year of joint editorship of the journal. For an incoming Editor in Chief this was an ideal situation. Over the years Chris developed *Respiration* into one of the leading journals for the respiratory community. He introduced several very successful series and sections, such as the Thematic Review Series, the Interventional Pulmonology section, Technical Notes, Eye Catcher and Guidelines. In 2002 *Respiration* became the Official Journal of the European Association for Bronchology and Interventional Pulmonology. The number of issues grew from 6 to 8 per year in 2008 and again from 8 to 12 issues per year in 2010. Furthermore, the impact factor of the journal rose from 0.36 to 2.543 in 2012.

Unfortunately, and much too early, Chris T. Bolliger died last autumn.

And for the future? When Karger approached me about taking on the editorship of *Respiration* I felt honored and accepted after only a short period of reflection. Why did I decide to do it? Firstly, is the journal's preeminence in respiration, as already outlined, and, secondly, is the fact that over the years Chris has established Associate Editors as well as an Editorial Board of such capability that the journal has now one of the shortest turnover times in its field. Without them and their tremendous work the success of *Respiration* would not have been possible.

Does something need to be changed?

Conclusions from forecasts of global mortality trends indicate that 4 of the 10 most common diseases leading to death affect the lungs. The importance of the role of individual respiratory diseases in future global health care is particularly clear from the projected percentage increase of lung diseases by 2050. For these reasons, there is also growing research activity, basic and clinical, hopefully leading to an increase in publications in the pulmonary field. Through entering keywords such as pulmonary medicine

or lung diseases into search engines like PubMed, it can be seen that the number of references cited has been increasing weekly to a nearly 3-digit scale. Therefore, the need for a journal with up-to-date peer-reviewed research is clear.

The structure, including classic features such as editorials, original articles in clinical and basic science research, reviews and letters to the editor as well as technical notes, the 'Eye Catcher' and so on, has shown the attractiveness of the journal to readers, which is reflected in its growing impact factor.

What is going to be the biggest challenge for us?

In the age of tablet computers and apps, and also increasing numbers of open-access journals, is there still a need for 'classical' journals? For example, in 2000 the number of open-access journals was around 740, which, by 2009, had risen to nearly 5,000. We all believe that there is a strong need for a journal like *Respiration*. Also, due to the flood of available information, the pulmonary community needs the security that the published data have been assessed and reviewed independently. Confidence and credibility: that is what *Respiration* stands for.

We will all work hard at continuing Chris' great work.

Felix J.F. Herth, Heidelberg