

## The researchers and the scientific production in Pediatrics: what is its value?

*Os pesquisadores e a produção científica em pediatria: quanto valem?*

*Los investigadores y la producción científica en Pediatría: ¿cuánto valen?*

Marcelo Zubaran Goldani

The article by Oliveira *et al* proposes an assessment of the profile of researchers in the field of Pediatrics through a bibliometric analysis of their scientific output. Outcome: there are few of us and we have been producing substantially; however, our production needs qualitative improvement<sup>(1)</sup>.

This conclusion arises as a consequence of an analysis and an adequate evaluation of the data and achieved results. However, it may certainly give occasion for a brief discussion on the model of scientific knowledge production in which we, researchers, currently operate.

The postmodern university enters the world of consumption, in which knowledge becomes a product, students are treated as equivalent to commodities, and the evaluation criteria must comply with the metrics of the market. Simultaneously, there is a process of classifying researchers in productive (1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 2) and unproductive (3?), which has gripped the imagination of the university community, influencing personal decisions and policies in the sector. This scenario suggests that universities and researchers from developing countries must necessarily align with external criteria, supposedly global, which may not be the most suitable for Brazil or the world<sup>(2)</sup>.

The main question is: is Brazilian science the best possible for Brazil and for the world? Can we provide an overcoming alternative, capable of modifying the central hegemonic model of knowledge production, to then resubmit it to international forums, plus a local relevance bias and with universally recognized quality?

Yes, I believe that peripheral countries that hold scientific development projects can articulate, within the

hegemonic field of science, the cracks needed to present the contradictory process of globalization: centrally recognized quality and local relevance. However, in this dispute, the leading countries will not abandon the criteria for evaluating scientific production beyond any relevance<sup>(3)</sup>. Therefore, an alternative should also promote the reviewing of scientific assessment criteria, placing them in the space of actions and needs. In the study by Oliveira *et al*, full adherence to the “universal” bibliometric parameters is observed, which are certainly the possible parameters, but not necessarily the best.

A second point worth mentioning is the networking of ideas and processes, aiming at the contamination of adjacent areas, both from the geographical and the sociocultural point of view. The new role as an emerging global pivot allows Brazil to be a disseminator agent of this ideology of scientific market. With such premises, the country may serve as a protagonist in the review of this single thought, offering a remodeled version of the global scientific agenda, now added by our native trinkets. Thus, the expansion process of the production model of national science acquires significant strategic relevance.

Holder of high quality human resources, Brazil can overthrow, through science, the last barriers to social and political emancipation of the continent<sup>(4)</sup>. Brazilian science, particularly in the field of Pediatrics, could propose a renewed pact by means of a local agenda, with objectives, theoretical marks, and a scientific method attentive to our needs and peculiarities, retaining, however, its universal character.

---

Instituição: Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil  
Professor-Titular do Departamento de Pediatria da Faculdade de Medicina da UFRGS, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

Endereço para correspondência:  
Marcelo Zubaran Goldani  
Rua Andre Puente, 200  
CEP 90035-150 – Porto Alegre/RS  
E-mail: mgoldani@hcpa.ufrgs.br

Conflito de interesse: nada a declarar

Recebido em: 27/5/2013

In this sense, I disagree with Oliveira *et al*, because I believe that it is not possible to assess the quality of scientific production in the area of Pediatrics with the data and indexes exposed. However, the great merit of these authors lies in having indicated the critical need for electing criteria that allow the

assessment of the degree of proximity between knowledge and action in the field of Pediatrics. In summary, knowledge that significantly qualifies the health of children and adolescents in the world and even in Brazil is the best science to ultimately overcome the final weariness of humanity.

## References

1. Oliveira MC, Martelli DR, Pinheiro SV, Miranda DM, Quirino IG, Leite BG *et al*. Profile and scientific production of National Counsel of Technological and Scientific Development (CNPq) researchers in Pediatrics. *Rev Paul Pediatr* 2013;31:279-85.
2. ASCB [homepage on the Internet]. San Francisco declaration on research assessment: putting science into the assessment of research [cited 2013 Dec 16]. Available from: <http://am.ascb.org/dora/files/SFDeclarationFINAL.pdf>
3. Rochon PA, Mashari A, Cohen A, Misra A, Laxer D, Streiner DL *et al*. Relation between randomized controlled trials published in leading general medical journals and the global burden of disease. *CMAJ* 2004;170:1673-7.
4. Glänzel W, Leta J, Thijs B. Science in Brazil. Part 1: a macro-level comparative study. *Scientometrics* 2006;67:67-86.