Following up on our more comprehensive message on the occasion of this journal’s 25th anniversary, this short editorial was prompted by some responses to what we had written in our “quarter-century update” (Pöchhacker & Liu 2021). Here we briefly summarize these and offer clarification where needed, and then take this opportunity to comment on some current developments.

We are aware that our editorial in *Interpreting* 23:1 (2021) raised some delicate issues and exposed some individuals and institutions, especially universities and publishers, to serious criticism. Our motivation and aim was to draw attention to some problematic practices that threaten to undermine the integrity and quality of publications in interpreting studies. Most of the readers who took the trouble to send us a response felt that our text was an “eye-opener” that had made them aware of issues to which they had not previously given much attention. Aside from the problem of plagiarism, these mainly concerned predatory publishing practices. Several colleagues felt that “this type of exposure” was “critically needed” and considered our editorial “a must-read, especially for PhD students and younger researchers.” Others shared experiences of their own with dubious practices in certain contexts, about which they had chosen to remain silent in public. (One case involved a publisher suggesting changes in content to suit their ideological orientation.) One colleague characterized our message as “clear-cut and courageous” and expressed the hope that it would “spread like wildfire among community members and raise awareness in the field.” We are therefore happy to see our goal achieved, at least as far as awareness-raising is concerned. The issue of quality, to which we devoted considerable attention in our text, remains on the agenda, of course, as does the critical role of expert peer reviewing as the most powerful tool for safeguarding and raising the standards of academic publishing in our field.

As one might expect, our editorial paper also drew some defensive comments and even a furious attack by a publisher whose practices we had criticized. We will not use this space to discuss the lengthy piece published on the website of IGI Global; suffice it to say that the accusatory tone and lack of any substantial argument of that bloated text written in poor English can serve as a test case of a publisher’s integrity and quality, or the lack of it, in our field.

While we see no need or space for further argument in this brief editorial, we would like to take this opportunity to make two points of clarification. The first...
concerns our assertion in the editorial paper that the plagiarist we had exposed “continued in her position as Associate Professor in BFSU’s GSTI until 2020” (Pöchhacker & Liu 2021:13). This was based on the Graduate School’s staff directory on Beijing Foreign Studies University’s website, which gave the impression that the punitive measures communicated to us by the Graduate School’s Dean in June 2019 might not have been implemented after all. Admittedly, it would have been safer not to trust the information on the website and rely on the Dean’s candid email message, which informed us that the plagiarist had been demoted and transferred – close on one-and-a-half years after we had brought the case to the university authorities’ attention.

The second point also involves an email message, this time one that was actually cited. In a passage about questionable practices by the editors of an IGI Global journal on translation and interpreting, we quoted from an email message that had been sent on 15 September 2018 to editors of translation studies journals, including *Interpreting*. Since the only name in the address field of that message, which was apparently sent to an undisclosed list, was that of Loredana Polezzi, co-editor of *The Translator*, we provided this information in indicating our source. Although we stated clearly that the IGI Global journal’s editors “wrote to journal editors in translation and interpreting studies” (Pöchhacker & Liu 2021:14), it has been pointed out to us that the citation may have given readers the impression that the message was a personal email shared with us by its recipient. We are happy to clarify that this was not the case and that Loredana Polezzi was not in any way a contributor to our editorial.

Having thus dealt with the responses to our previous editorial, we would like to conclude the present one with some observations on recent and future developments. Most gratifying among these are the latest citation metrics for our journal. The Impact Factor (JCR) of *Interpreting* has more than tripled and now stands at 1.864. An even greater jump was recorded for the SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) in the Scopus database. Following an unexplained dip in our metrics for 2019, *Interpreting* is back in the top quartile (Q1) with a vengeance: with an SJR of 1.47, our journal ranks highest among all translation and interpreting studies journals in the list, and its CiteScore stands at 2.100 (up from 1.200). We are also pleased to see the $h$-index of *Interpreting* continue to climb, from 26 to 29.

While we view these significant gains in our journal’s citation metrics as well-deserved recognition of our authors, reviewers and the extended editorial team, we need to reaffirm our cautious attitude towards numerical indicators of a journal’s standing. As a leading member of our research community has pointed out to us, quite a few papers of poor quality are still being published in established (high-ranking) journals, just as quality work by serious authors may appear in journals and books by publishers of doubtful repute. We gladly take this as encouragement
to continue our striving towards the highest possible quality in research on interpreting published in *Interpreting* and beyond.

Aside from continuing our collaboration and exchange with fellow editors in translation studies, we are looking forward to an opportunity for a broader debate on publishing in translation studies on the occasion of the 10th Congress of the European Society for Translation Studies (EST) in Oslo in June 2022. The event’s organizers have agreed to schedule a panel discussion on “Advancing Publishing in Translation Studies.” We would be more than happy to see many of our readers participating in that much-needed exchange of views.

Franz Pöchhacker and Minhua Liu
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