

---

## EDITORIAL

Nowadays, it is common for our scientific creations to be strictly linked to the post-graduate programs, not just because they bring together the results of the academic work of the most significant pieces of our resources and emerging researchers (due to the required performance of a post-graduate program for a research grant), but also because many of our journals have been linked to the emergence and sustainability of these programs.

When we arrive at the end of the cycle of validation for the Brazilian post-graduate program, that is, after the three-year evaluation (2010-2012) of the programs by CAPES, it is natural that more than just the concepts that were attributed to programs to be put at stake. The year 2013 began with the "climate" of which ends the three year period, and through reports, criteria and metrics which were placed under examination, faculty, students, academic, scientific and technological programs were produced. They were not just exposed to the actors and productions of the academic life, but also to the successes and failures of the institutional policies and their own areas of knowledge.

Visibility is the keyword, since it is the essential condition for consistent evaluation. In that, despite the tribulations and limitations of a process of this magnitude, the importance of this moment is undeniable for a fundamental exercise of self-reflection. Using the terminology described by the sociologist Giddens, to think in today's society, this reflection is aimed at viewing this situation as a problem for one's self. This he describes to be self-problematize. To be "problematic" is something that is inherent to the valid and helpful knowledge provided by the researchers involved as well as our journals and programmes.<sup>1</sup>

We raise some questions that remain challenging, despite the ongoing progress. When we are evaluating each program and course, we are also evaluating the scientific magazines and research that was produced. Such criteria allows for metrics, with the objective of converting into measurable data or comparable measures, the results of which are not always as comparable. For example, the number of publications alone was an insufficient metric when it was necessary to classify the quality of these products through a classification of the vehicles of publications, especially in scientific journals. For this, it was necessary to establish quality requirements, after which we needed to rank them based on the impact of the journals and articles produced.

By impact, we mean, the number of citations, and therefore the visibility of these products in the global language of science, English. In fact, when comparable data is attained, what is the impact that is measured? It would be possible to compare two hypothetical researchers, assuming that researcher #1 achieved an important H index in the *Web of Science* and *Scopus* (used in this triennium as sources for measuring its impact) and researcher #2 obtained a low expressive score? This is an element that can discriminate between quantitatively similar products. However, what does this interpretation actually say and what does it not say? It says that the articles of researcher #1 were most cited by the journals indexed in these databases (*Web of Science* and *Scopus*). Therefore, there is evidence of the contributions of these products, which is without a doubt, commendable. But, this interpretation does not say if the articles produced by researcher #2 also represent an equal or greater contribution, simply because they are cited in other journals or in a lesser number. This interpretation does not say if the citation score refers to different researchers, journals and countries, if it is focused on a few researchers of the same journal, if they belong to the journal published by the institution where he/she works, or even if it belongs to the authors of the same research program (self-citation). This interpretation does not express if the majority of journals indexed in those databases are highly permeable to research results in order to study researcher #1 and low permeability (or even refractory) in order to study researcher #2. A clinical study, for example, finds a much larger number of journals whose Scope is relevant, that is, an expressive availability of accessible journals (that publishes the study topic). Now, on the other hand, a study that addresses items related to health and nursing education in national contexts or Brazilian public policy, for example, have been reduced due to the availability of permeable journals related to those topics. The very fact of choosing a national scenario or a regional/national problem proves that many authors submit their items as national journals and do not publish them into the international context.

Of course this is not a rule or an impenetrable barrier, but it still represents a major restriction. In addition, the restrictions placed are the identifiable interest of the author in the Scope of Brazilian journals. This shows that researcher #2 is more focus on the opportunity to be published in journals that do not belong to the databases that relate to this impact. This does not mean it is less important, however, as some people think it is the measure/interpretation that is available at the current moment.

Many items could be discussed to problematize the discriminatory capacity of the index H, however it cannot be done in this space. Many criticisms are directed at the capacities and disabilities of this "data," especially when it is applied as a decisive criterion in this evaluation processes. By "decisive" we mean "with greater weight." If this is not an exclusive indicator, it could be the most unquestionable and risky indicator. For example, when a program reaches all metrics of excellence, but most of their teachings do

not reach the H index, the program does not satisfy one of the 13 indicators or metrics used to evaluate the international circulation of the scientific production. So far, nothing seems wrong - in fact, it looks like it was only the metric that was not reached, but the problem occurs when you realize that this single indicator will impact on a dimension that represents 45% of the total weight of what is considered "excellent." In another perspective, if this program reaches this metric, but does not reach other indicators/metrics such as solidarity, nucleation and leadership, this does not mean there is such a huge prejudice in the evaluation, since these three dimensions have weights of 10%, 10% and 15% respectively.

Finally, it seems that valid to say that our researchers and programs: "focus on the most decisive, index H, if the other indicators were not reached. Also, it still demonstrates excellence, but if this is not achieved it was not worthy to show excellence in all other indicators and dimensions". Perhaps this scenario is not concretized in all basic medical science cases, although we need to be aware.

Despite this reflection, some risks of our decisions can be highlighted. Its main objective is to recognize that the moment we refer to (the end of the evaluation cycle) has been shown to serve an important, rich and productive purpose. We need to unveil the criterion of this process to those who produce and consume the results of Brazilian nursing research, to all the participants of our post-graduation programs that do not participate in the forums, where all programs are represented. It is evident that the maturity of this area, is shown in the relations of cooperation and solidarity, in the quality of the discussions and conceptions of the trials by all local and national leaders and representatives.

So, what to say about the challenge of increasing the number and quality of our journals? Schools and other institutions have shared this challenge and the results are visible in the recent years. There are considerably new magazines, the qualifications of which are in accordance with international standards, but such growth is still too low when we look at the demand fueled by the increasing post-graduate courses, and as a result, the emergence of new researchers. Also, the visible Editorial rating does not mean quick results in terms of indexing in the most recognized databases, this vicious cycle requires constant effort and often deferred expectations.

For those four Brazilian journals that are already indexed in these databases, including Text & Context Nursing, there is a challenge of following the evolution over the editorial profiles and avoiding endogeneity and self-citation. Those who seek the highest level of evaluation must attain visibility by researchers and consumers to know that this represents an excellent opportunity for divulging, which is also required for Nursing. There are no immediate effects, however, as there is sufficient time to prepare, submit and publish a manuscript, as well as time for them to be read and cited. If these times were added to the time when our magazines are made available in a second language, therefore read and cited internationally, at that point we could recognize significant advances. Observing the results achieved by some pioneered journal that reached these initiatives which already had improvements in their impact factors, we can say that it is undeniable to think that we are on the right track. Even so, new magazines are incorporating these teachings at a faster rate which are conquering important quality indicators.

To congratulate the nursing area is mandatory. Perhaps that is why we cannot forget the first task we need to do - to problematize the place where we are and where we want to be, our comfort situation and also our discomfort situation - and we must not forget what we already achieved and the effort we put in while stepping through this path.

Flávia Regina Souza Ramos

*PhD in Nursing. Associate Professor of the Nursing Department and Coordinator of the Graduate Nursing Program at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (PEN/UFSC). CNPq Researcher. Santa Catarina, Brazil.*

Vânia Marli Schubert Backes

*PhD in Nursing. Associate Professor of the Nursing Department and PEN/UFSC. Leader of the Research Group Education in Nursing. CNPq Researcher. Santa Catarina, Brazil.*

## REFERENCE

1. Giddens A, Beck U, Lach S. Modernização reflexiva: política, tradição e estética na ordem social moderna. São Paulo (SP): Editora da Universidade Estadual Paulista; 1997.