

EDITORIAL**WHY DO I PRODUCE AND DO NOT PUBLISH? PART I**Eneida Rejane RABELO^a

Scientific literature has been experiencing an eruption of quantity and quality, provoking a raise in the number of publications that reach reviewers of the main periodicals. Both knowledge production and dissemination of what is being produced are obligations of a researcher committed to the evolution of science and, particularly, to the growth of his field of specificity.

Conversely, the publication of research results still falls far short of what is actually produced. Surely, the amount of production is much larger than the amount of publication. But why do we research and do not publish? The answer to this question may be the following: it depends. It depends on us, researchers; it depends on the periodicals' refusal to publish our papers - although I have a strong tendency to believe that it actually depends much more on us!

Among the reasons why we do not write about what we produce, I wish to highlight writing difficulties, negative results, and findings that do not add anything new or relevant to the current knowledge about that theme. In addition, included in the personal category, the reasons pointed out are usually lack of time, organization, discipline and, particularly, experience.

Researchers should write in accordance with patterns required by science; yet, not all researchers master scientific language. Many editors point out the lack of style as the main reason for rejecting articles submitted by scientists from developing countries⁽¹⁾. The main Brazilian nursing periodicals, all with international insertion, registered rates of article rejection that range from 35% to 76% in 2009. The interpretation of these rates confirms that many researchers demonstrate deficiencies in using scientific language.

Literature poses a basic rule which recommends that one should never sit down to write a paper only after having finished a study⁽²⁾. Although it seems paradoxical, it may be really important to write down an article while you are still developing the research, in order to keep the enthusiasm and avoid contamination with a possible negative result at the end of the study.

A physicist named Faraday once said: "Work; finish; publish"⁽³⁾. If you started a work and did not finish it, why did you even start it?

Well, you should start by understanding that it is fundamental to be attracted and interested in the theme of your research. Be attentive to the issue of the study: it should be feasible, interesting, new (or questioning what exists or is already known), ethical and relevant (to knowledge and science)⁽⁴⁾. Recently authors identified that reviewers use three criteria to evaluate a paper submitted to publication: relevance, originality, and scientific validity. Also, the paper should be clear and well written⁽⁵⁾.

Ally yourself with a productive group that demands production e subsequent publication from its members. Invest in yourself: master the literature and English; have discipline as a daily goal; be organized and define a priority for all your duty assignments; be persistent, ambitious and curious, three desired qualities in every good researcher.

When writing a text, it is worth remembering that both form and content are important. It is impossible to pass on relevant and pertinent information if that is not well presented. Yet, an excellent presentation does not substitute for poorly planned experiments, questionable results or weak argumentation⁽⁶⁾.

In the second part of this editorial, you will find some important suggestions to improve your writing skills. The reading of the references that support this and the next editorial will bring more details about scientific writing. I recommend that you read them.

The reading of this edition's articles - which address many areas of knowledge such as child's, teenager's, woman's, adult's and elder's health, mental health and management - should also serve as an incentive for and a model of scientific writing appropriate to the studied theme.

REFERENCES

- 1 Valenti WC. Cientistas também precisam ter estilo. J Cons Reg Biol. 1998;49:7.
- 2 Van Way III CW. Writing a scientific paper. Nutr Clin Pract. 2007;22(6):636-40.
- 3 Michael Faraday [Internet]. [S.l.]: Wikipedia; 2010 [citado 2010 set 06]. Disponível em: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Faraday.
- 4 Huley S, Cummings S. Delineando a pesquisa clínica. 3ª ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed; 2008.
- 5 Davidson AJ, Carlin JB. What a reviewer wants. Paediatr Anaesth. 2008;18(12):1149-56.
- 6 Abrahamsohn PA. Redação científica. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara Koogan; 2004.

^a Adjunct Professor of the Nursing School and the Graduate Programs at Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (Nursing School and Cardiovascular Sciences: Section of Cardiology at College of Medicine). Coordinator of the Cardiac Insufficiency Clinic of Hospital de Clínicas of Porto Alegre.