

## A note from the publisher and editor-in-chief to JOT readers



Bertrand Meyer,  
Publisher



Richard Wiener,  
Editor-in-Chief

Dear JOT readers:

The Journal of Object Technology has now existed for more than five years. It is clearly playing a major role in the development of modern software technology.

The community recognizes this, as attested by the comments that we regularly receive and the growing number of citations. The next step is to achieve academic recognition. Prompted by many readers and authors we requested indexing in the ISI Web of science. After a tedious process JOT was rejected without any explanation; all that numerous requests for clarification ever produced was that impact was not strong enough.

This would be laughable if ISI indexing were not used blindly by too many institutions as a basis for ranking publications. Even a cursory look at ISI indexing of publications and individual researchers shows that the organization is biased towards the traditional natural sciences and has a very poor grasp of information technology and computer science. Actually this is putting it mildly. As noted (in 2005) by Friedemann Mattern of ETH, the 250 mostly cited computer science researchers, from <http://www.isihighlycited.com>, do not contain a SINGLE person who received the Turing award in the last ten years. ISI once published the "scientist rankings in computer science". The first 5 read HIGGINS, DG; FUCHS, R; BLEASBY, AJ; BILLETER, M; KORADI, R. One of those highly cited CS papers by Rainer Fuchs (rank 2) is "Predicting protein function: a versatile tool for the Apple Macintosh". The top 10 list does include one ETH person, but if you guessed e.g. "Niklaus Wirth" you are completely off. Do you know the name Kurt Wüthrich? A brilliant scientist indeed: 2002 Nobel prize -- in chemistry!

The underlying question is who ranks the rankers. The process is opaque, the criteria unknown, the appeal procedures absent. As scientists we are used to evaluating each other's result thoroughly and openly. Assessment mechanisms should be bound by similar standards. Otherwise it is unconscionable for university management to use them for policy decisions and researcher evaluation.

