

## *From the editors*

---

### News and comments

Robert H. Anderson and Giancarlo Crupi

**T**HIS ISSUE SEES A FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE IN THE direction of *Cardiology in the Young*. Coincidental with his impending retirement as Head of the Department of Cardiac Surgery at Ospedale Riuniti, Bergamo our Editor-in-Chief, Lucio Parenzan, has announced that he is relinquishing his editorial chair. Lucio has been instrumental in building several highly significant areas. From virtually nothing, he established Bergamo as an internationally recognized center of neonatal, infant and pediatric cardiac surgery. He, together with the sadly missed Vincenzo Gallucci, trained the majority of the Italian cardiac surgeons who rightly take their place in the present-day pantheon of world experts. Perhaps the cusp of his achievement was the First World Congress of Paediatric Cardiac Surgery, held in Bergamo in 1988, which brought together all the foremost practitioners in the fields of both pediatric cardiac surgery and pediatric cardiology, and paved the way for the combined congress introduced last year in Paris. It was, indeed, at the Bergamo congress that the seeds were sown for the establishment of the World Forum for Pediatric Cardiology, and the initial steps taken for the production of *Cardiology in the Young*. We are indebted to Lucio for the encouragement and support he has given us during his tenure as Editor-in-Chief. From now, the Executive Editors will jointly assume the editorial responsibilities for production of the volumes, coordinated by the production office in Chapel Hill. Lucio himself will concentrate his efforts on the School of Pediatric Cardiology which was announced at the Paris congress. Half way through its initial season, this educational initiative is already providing important training resources for 12 young pediatric cardiac surgeons, cardiologists and anesthesiologists, drawn mainly from the developing world, and is offering them opportunities which would not otherwise be available to them. We wish Lucio every success as he continues to develop this exciting venture.

In our last issue, we commented upon our commitment to present our papers in uniform style, and emphasized our attention to grammatical and stylistic proprieties.

One of our readers, and member of the board, Per G. Bjornstad from the University Hospital of Oslo, Norway, has drawn our attention to another solecism inadvertently committed. Commenting on the "elfin face syndrome," which he frequently observed at close quarters in Beuren's clinic at Gottingen, he rightly castigates us for referring to the syndrome throughout a recent article as "William syndrome." If described nowadays, it should, of course, be given the title "Williams' syndrome," reflecting the description of Dr. Williams, from Auckland, New Zealand. The inappropriate deletion of the apostrophe is also seen now with some frequency when accounts are given for trisomy 21. First described by Dr. Down, an English pediatrician, this syndrome should properly be cited as Down's syndrome. We have always attempted to observe, in our editorializing, the preservation of Dr. Down's apostrophe. In the future, prompted by Per Bjornstad, we will attempt to do the same for Dr. Williams!

This issue of *Cardiology in the Young* concludes with an extensive section of abstracts. Should they count as an index of performance, and should journals encourage such practices by publishing the abstracts from symposium presentations? Not all of the material presented in the form of abstracts is subsequently recycled as original articles, and many of the abstracts themselves enjoy several outings. Those who themselves submit the abstracts are aware of the extent of this practice, and it is very difficult for those who select abstracts to exclude some on the basis of multiple submissions. Citation of abstracts is now accepted as one criterion of excellence, and, while this continues, we will continue to publish suitable examples.

What, then of book reviews and their place in journals such as ours? We are firmly in favor of reviews from the stance of our roles as editors, readers and authors. We find the content of reviews invaluable in judging our success as authors. We find the information contained equally valuable in guiding us as potential readers and purchasers. And we hope that the content of our own reviews satisfies these needs for our subscribers.

The opinions expressed in our reviews are hopefully constructive. We reiterate once more that the correspondence columns are always open to any who hold contrary views, including authors (or readers) of books reviewed who may feel themselves unduly wronged by the editorial pen. It remains our firm conviction that the best way forward is to offer a forum for constructive and stimulating debate. We have enjoyed vigorous debates

by telephone but we would like to share these thoughts with all readers. This remains the watchword of our editorial policy.

*National Heart & Lung Institute  
London, United Kingdom*

*Ospedali Riuniti  
Bergamo, Italy*