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Impact factor
In the article, which first introduced the word combination “impact factor” (Garfield, 1955), “impact factor” was still a full synonym of the word “impact”, and it did not relate to journal evaluation, as it happened much later (Bensman, 2007, p. 111): “Garfield <...> was to change this meaning when he created a measure he called the “impact factor” to determine which journals should be covered by the SCI. This term came to be defined as the average number of citations to the papers of a given journal”. According to E. Garfield’s definition, “this impact factor is the mean number of citations to a journal’s articles by papers subsequently published. It is determined by dividing the number of times a journal is cited (R) by the number of source articles (S) it has published” (Garfield, 1970, p. 5).

Discipline impact factor
The classical Garfield impact factor reflects the level of the use of an average paper of a certain journal by all the journals representing technical and natural sciences (being indexed by the Science Citation Index; later–Web of Science). However, I believe that in order to organize a sufficient information service, it is much more important to know the level of use of an average paper of a certain journal (or of other serial) not by all the journals representing technical and natural sciences in toto (as reflected in the classical impact factor), but by the ones specialized in that concrete discipline or a field of research which is going to receive information services. After all, the provision of information services to specialists in a particular field of research is the task of a larger portion of journals that are being included in the list of necessary periodicals. The example is the paper by Jan and Zhu (2015). Our experience of DIF application for serials evaluation of selections (Lazarev and Nikolaichik, 1979; Gould, 1981; Black, 1983; Lazarev, 1983; Kushkowski et al. 1998; Lazarev et al., 2017 etc.). There are also some papers in which just some minor elements of the Hirst’s methodology were used relating to the restricted number of “core journals” selection, but not to the application of DIF itself for determining extensive lists of necessary periodicals. The example is the paper by Jan and Zhu (2015). Our experience of DIF application for serials evaluation of selections (Lazarev, 1983; Lazarev and Skalaban 2016; Lazarev et al., 2017; Lazarev et al., 2019 etc.) demonstrated that quite a substantial portion of journals that are being included in the list of serials to be determined in order to organize or amend information services of the specialists in a certain discipline or research field is being selected exclusively by means of DIF computation.

Do we still need it?
One of my papers was rejected by a reputed journal, whose editor wrote me that nowadays libraries buy access to huge databases (packages) and do not bother to determine the “best” journals, while it is much cheaper to buy the whole package than to buy separate journals. Nowadays libraries really mostly buy access to huge databases (packages) and do not bother to
determine the concrete necessary journals and other serials. And as bibliometric evaluation and selection of non-profile serials to be used by researchers in a specific discipline were usually performed exactly in order to select serials for the specialized library stock, there seemed to be no more need in bibliometric evaluation of the non-profile serials value for researchers in a specific discipline (Lazarev 1998).

However, the following question still arises: “Which databases (packages) ought to be purchased? The answer might seem easy to a librarian who lives in a country where a regular sufficient financial support of university and research libraries is practiced. But in case of restricted, meager financing for database subscriptions, we are to spend our small money for sure. The point is we need to choose exactly the databases (“subscription packages”) with the best coverage of the relevant serials, the databases (packages) that optimally meet both the requirements of containing more useful periodicals and of being cheapest to be purchased. As many as possible relevant periodicals ought to be accessed via these databases (packages) at the lowest financial cost. In order to arrange this, one is to check each “subscription package” for the presence of maximum number of necessary serials. In its turn, in order to fulfill the latter, one is to know concretely which periodicals are needed! And therefore, one is to start the procedure that is very much similar to the one that was practiced in the past for the selection periodicals immediately for acquisition to the library stock! (As for the Open Access journals, thought they are available, they ought to be identified as well!) So, we, librarians from the countries that cannot afford sufficient financial support of academic, university and research libraries, still do need in determining “best” journals and in good instruments for it. One of such efficient tools is the discipline impact factor.
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