

# Let's analyze the year passed

While we move ahead with the year 2009, let's devote some time analyzing the year ended. This stock-taking is prudent to all the stakeholders of AJP, particularly, as AJP still does not enjoy impact factor ratings.

The year of AJP's inception – 2007 – was full of teething troubles, and it's in the year of 2008 that the journal entered into systematic growth phase. I am delighted to share the success of AJP with all its stakeholders, most importantly, the readers, the authors, and the reviewers. As 'editorial board' we find our role that of facilitator between 'authors' and 'reviewers', between whom, the

actual transaction takes place.

## TOP 10 TALLY

Table 1 provides the top 10 tally for the year 2008 with Bhandari *et al's* review article on orodispersible tablets occupying the first place followed by Wagh *et al's* review on polymers for ocular preparations. Subsequent to these two reviews the remaining tally is dominated by research articles fiercely leveraging their positions. Presence of large number of research articles in the top 10 tally is an indicator of the quality and utility of the researches published by the journal.

**Table 1: Top 10 tally for the year: 2008**

Rank	Article particulars	Access statistics
1.	<b><i>Orodispersible tablets: An overview</i></b> Bandari Suresh, Mittapalli Rajendar Kumar, Gannu Ramesh, Rao Yamsani Madhusudan Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 1   First Page: 2	11361
2.	<b><i>Polymers used in ocular dosage form and drug delivery systems</i></b> Wagh Vijay D, Inamdar Beena, Samanta MK Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 1   First Page: 12	6602
3.	<b><i>Design and in vitro evaluation of haloperidol lactate transdermal patches containing ethyl cellulose-povidone as film formers</i></b> Sadashivaiah R, Dinesh BM, Patil Uma A, Desai BG, Raghu KS Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 1   First Page: 43	3751
4.	<b><i>Development of trilayered mucoadhesive tablet of itraconazole with zero-order release</i></b> Madgulkar Ashwini, Kadam Shivajirao, Pokharkar Varsha Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 1   First Page: 57	3556
5.	<b><i>Preparation and evaluation of hand rub disinfectant</i></b> Padsalgi Amol, Jain Devendra, Bidkar Sanjay, Harinarayana Dommati, Jadhav Vijay Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 1   First Page: 18	3431
6.	<b><i>Tailoring of ketoprofen particle morphology via novel crystallocoagglomeration technique to obtain a directly compressible material</i></b> Chavda Vikash, Maheshwari Rajesh Kumar Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 1   First Page: 61	3207
7.	<b><i>Formulation and characterization of fast-dissolving tablet of promethazine theoclate</i></b> Sharma Shailesh, Gupta GD Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 1   First Page: 70	2933
8.	<b><i>Preungual drug delivery systems of Terbinafine Hydrochloride Nail Lacquer</i></b> Jan Sabreen, Bora Divyakumar, Bhise Kiran Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 1   First Page: 53	2877
9.	<b><i>Sustained release tablet of theophylline by hot melt wax coating technology</i></b> Padsalgi Amol, Bidkar Sanjay, Jadhav Vijay, Sheladiya Deepak Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 1   First Page: 26	2838
10.	<b><i>Preparation and characterization of aceclofenac microspheres</i></b> Trivedi Parul, Verma AML, Garud N Year: 2008   Volume: 2   Issue: 2   First Page: 110	2709

Address for correspondence:

Dr. V B Gupta,

E-mail: vipin@vipingupta.org

DOI: 10.4103/0973-8398.49165

**Table 2: AJP acceptance rate: 2008**

Article type	Submitted	Accepted (%)	Rejected (%)	Under review (%)
Case Report	14	2 (14)	8 (57)	4 (29)
Editorial Commentary	1	0 (0)	1 (100)	0 (0)
Letter To Editor	7	1 (14)	6 (86)	0 (0)
Original Article	172	29 (17)	118 (69)	25 (15)
Total decisions	170	32 (19)	138 (81)	-
Total articles	199	32 (16)	138 (69)	29 (15)

## ACCEPTANCE/REJECTION RATE

Rejection rate of any journal indicates its popularity. While in 2007 most of the articles were invited, 2008 had high submissions of 199 articles leading to the rejection rate of 81% [Table 2]. Although we could have been more generous by accepting a few more articles, constraints of time and money compelled us to decide otherwise. Let the rising rejections make published researchers feel distinct, without disheartening young researchers submitting the research for the first time.

**Table 3: Journal performance: 2008**

Submitted to first decision for the year: 2008	
Number of articles submitted	199
Days to suggest reviewers	22.58 (0, 99)
Days taken by reviewers	18.13 (1, 28)
Days taken by editor for decision	15.69 (0, 97)
Days until paper is under review	56.40
Revisions for the year: 2008	
Days from first decision until revision arrives	14.43 (0, 125)
Days for editor to take decision	28.90 (0, 81)
Articles rereviewed	10
Days for rereview by reviewers	1.00 (0, 1)
Days to send revision decision by editors	28.90 (0, 81)
Days from revision receipt to revision decision	58.8
Accepted papers for the year: 2008	
Days from first submission to acceptance	157.22 (3, 282)
Days from acceptance to publication	85.82 (67, 161)

**Table 4: Author registration**

Total number of authors registered with the site	494
Number of authors who have submitted manuscripts	165
Number of authors who have submitted more than one manuscripts	6
Number of manuscripts from abroad	12 (6%)

**Table 5: Reviewer performance**

Total referees	473
Number of reviewers used (/article)	301 (3)
Number of reviewers responded (/article)	170 (1)
Reviewers on time (%)	51
Returned late (%)	22
Never returned (%)	27

## JOURNAL PERFORMANCE

It's every researcher's desire to get published as early as possible, which is in the interest of other stakeholders too, as due to rapid knowledge explosion the researches start diminishing their value with time. We, at the editorial office, try to reduce the cycle time as much as possible; still the peer-reviewing process takes its own time. How did we measure in 2008 on this aspect, is shown in Table 3. The time taken from 'first submission' to 'acceptance' is still very high. Our onus in 2009 would be to reduce this time.

## AUTHORS

AJP succeeded in attracting a large number of authors in 2008

**Table 6: Country wise referees**

Country	Manuscripts reviewed	Country	Manuscripts reviewed
Algeria	2	Italy	21
Argentina	4	Japan	7
Australia	3	Jordan	3
Austria	2	Korea	2
Bangladesh	8	Macedonia	1
Belgium	1	Malaysia	3
Brazil	5	Mexico	1
Bulgaria	1	Netherlands	2
Canada	8	New Zealand	1
China	3	Nigeria	10
Croatia (Hrvatska)	4	Norway	1
Cuba	1	Pakistan	7
Czech Republic	1	Poland	2
Denmark	1	Portugal	4
Egypt	14	Saudi Arabia	2
Finland	9	Singapore	1
France	2	Slovenia	2
Georgia	1	South Africa	2
Germany	10	Spain	3
Greece	3	Thailand	9
Hungary	1	Turkey	10
Iceland	1	Ukraine	1
India	209	UAE	1
Iran	9	UK	6
Ireland	2	USA	65
Israel	1	-	-

[Table 4]. Although most of the contributions are still from India, the journal is spreading its wings in other countries and has started attracting overseas contributions.

Amidst the global recession, hoping that the AJP will not require any contraction.

## REVIEWERS

This is the front where the journal succeeded the most, 473 referees from 49 countries generously contributed in peer reviewing. Because of this rigorous involvement of reviewers, it's almost certain that whatever AJP published, carried high quality; and hence, the authors should feel pride in having passed this test. Table 5 represents the reviewers' performance and Table 6 represents country-wise distribution of the manuscript review.



**Dr. V B Gupta,**  
Editor-in-Chief