

In this issue of CJNS there are several contributions for readers to contemplate. Dr. Sarnat provides some sobering insights to those contemplating a move of their neuroscience practice to the United States. I highlight this piece for two reasons. The first is that it is critical reading for our trainees considering future practice locations. Secondly, I think it challenges a Canadian "mindset" that assumes approaches developed elsewhere are better and should be adopted in this country. In his editorial, Dr. Sarnat reinforces the idea that when it comes to health care delivery, the reverse may hold. We have significant challenges to improve what we do in this country, particularly in connecting those "in the trenches" with decision makers. These challenges do not diminish the message that we think other societies, even powerful ones, should do better and that they should be reminded to do better. We share the mission to improve health care in both countries in order to do better for all of our sick. Let us engage the debate and not hesitate to offer advice to decision makers in both countries indicating that they can get it wrong.

At the CCNS meeting in June several important issues were discussed and some new CJNS directions were decided upon. We have had a vigorous debate about the feasibility and importance of expanding CJNS publication from quarterly to bimonthly issues. For several years, I have proposed this change in CJNS and have had encouragement and support from prior editors. More timely publication could improve our impact factor, and raise our profile.

While considering these issues, we have had the opportunity to consider what impact the more frequent publication of other neurological journals has had. In my case, these extra issues seem to accumulate on a "to read" pile, with less items of interest per issue. Meanwhile, innovations in online access have provided rapid "pre-print" electronic publication allowing authors to get out their message very quickly. There are also

significant cost issues involved in publishing more issues without guarantees of added value. At CJNS, we have decided to remain a quarterly publication while increasing the number of papers published in each issue. You will notice that CJNS has increased in girth to accommodate the doubling in our submission rate. We are actively exploring selected immediate online publication for articles and hope to have some news about this for you soon. We have decided to remove barriers at this time to all for full online access to all issues of CJNS. By being completely available full text online, those searching for high quality neuroscience work worldwide will find it easier to read what we have to say first.

My goal is to convince CJNS readers in Canada and worldwide that this is an excellent venue in which to publish your work. Our peer review program is vigorous, routinely requiring authors to satisfy not two (the usual referee number for other journals), but three external referees. Our supplements are peer reviewed yet a financial bargain for those interested in putting them together from symposia, meetings etc. While a number of our review articles are specifically invited, many are not and arise because an author had important information and messages to relate. I would really like to encourage more submissions of review articles, original articles, clinicopathological conferences and basic neuroscience articles. Finally, when referencing a topic, whether for our journal, another journal or a grant, take advantage of our free full text access and cite important work we have published. Perhaps it is time for Canadian neurosciences to highlight what we already suspect – very high quality and striking work comes from this country and thrives in the context of our own health care system.

Douglas Zochodne
Editor-in-Chief
Calgary, Alberta