

7 Should the Quality of the Journal Determine the Quality of the Research?

Ahmet Yüksek

Although there are many different ways to explain the results of scientific research, the most important and effective way is still publication in scientific journals. Academic journal publishers or scientific organizations publish these research results that have been reviewed and verified by experts in the field. It is essential to understand and measure the importance, quality and impact of these publications, whether for scientists or for organizations that hire or provide financial support. For an academic researcher, problems begin here.

Even if a researcher has done a very successful academic study without financial support, it is problematic as science needs serious financial support to announce it and even if this study is published in a journal, it will be considered as good or poor according to previous articles in that journal because of the impact factor.

After this point, the evaluation of the publication is according to the citation rate received. Still no assessment is made by experts in the field. Even if this assessment is made, objectivity will be discussed. It is also a distressing fact that readers have to pay for some journals, no matter how high quality your research is in the field of academic publishing, which has become a market.

A widely used criterion in the evaluation of scientific publications is the Journal Impact factor [1]. As the impact factor increases, the concept that the journal is read more and, therefore, higher “quality” is established. The impact factor is a criterion regarding the citation rate of articles in the journal. However, it is controversial that many attributed publications contribute more to science. It is also not possible to measure unnecessary references to each other’s articles. There may be publications with more or less citations in a journal, or publications with very few citations in a journal with a high impact factor. In this highly inconsistent environment, it does not seem meaningful to argue that all publications in journals with high impact factors are of high quality.

In 2012, the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) was published in San Francisco [2].

The purpose of the DORA is to improve the ways in which the outputs of scholarly research are evaluated. This declaration emphasizes the following; do not use journal-based criteria in any assignment, promotion and funding process, and conduct research evaluations only on the work or results, not on the journal.

Indeed, it is difficult to evaluate researchers on a publication basis. The H index has been developed for this purpose [3]. J.E Hirsh emphasized that the h index is superior to the impact factor of publications in the evaluation of researchers [4]. For this research, he examined the h index values of the researchers who have received a Nobel prize in the last 20 years. He also emphasized that researchers with a high h index should be closer to the Nobel Prize, as the Nobel award was given to the inventor who made a difference as a result of years of productivity. However, in the last 20 years, researchers found that the majority of the h index values of the Nobel field researchers were between 35 and 39. According to this result, the h index is not sufficient to measure how much the researcher contributes to science.

A successful researcher near the end of his career, in the last 5 years, may have an h index value that is lower than a young researcher. This result should not conclude that the experienced researcher is less successful. Albert Einstein's h index is 115 by Google scholar, while his h index in the last 5 years is 65. Therefore, long-term and continuous success of a researcher should be considered as a criterion. The long-term h index can be used in this field. However, increasing the h index with inappropriate citations cannot be avoided [5].

It is not appropriate to use the number of citations in the evaluation unless the quality of the cited study is measured and, in this way, this process becomes increasingly complex.

There is more than one academic journal in one discipline in medicine. Most of them are published by big publishing houses. The most valuable articles for that discipline can be shared by the valuable referees of these journals on another platform. In today's world where printed journals are replaced by e-journals, large publishing houses can publish the 100 most valuable works of each year on their websites. In addition to the number of citations received by the manuscript in the evaluation, the submission by the referees to an open platform for other researchers and listing it there may provide a solution. Further announcement also positively affects the index h of the manuscript.

However, the process of evaluating academic publications is complex and neutrality is difficult to maintain due to many factors.

References

1. Clarivate analytics Impact Factor. Available online: <https://clarivate.com/essays/impact-factor/> (accessed on 21 July 2019).
2. San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA). San Francisco, USA, 2012. Available online: <https://sfdora.org/read/> (accessed on 21 July 2019).

3. van Haselen, R. The h-index: A new way of assessing the scientific impact of individual CAM authors. *Complementary Ther. Med.* **2007**, *15*, 225–227. doi:10.1016/j.ctim.2007.10.004.
4. Hirsh, J.E. An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2005**, *102*, 16569–16572. Available online: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0507655102>.
5. Available online: <https://scholar.google.com.tr/citations?user=qc6CJjYAAAAJ&hl=tr&oi=ao> (accessed on 20 July 2019).



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).