

### **It is not just a question of internationalization...**

The debate on the internationalization of scientific production gained momentum when the Coordination of Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (Capes) recently released, at a meeting with representatives of international publishers and journals, strategies for journal internationalization. The SciELO collection, which for more than 15 years has materialized an open access policy and has played an important role in disseminating scientific production, features, as one of the references for the next revision of its indexing criteria, the purpose of promoting the internationalization of the journals that are part of its base.

The assumptions that support this movement are hard to challenge because they rest on the broader international dissemination of Brazilian research and its products, among which scientific articles.

However, this is only one side of this process which, in theory, would be connected with strengthening research. We chose to use a cautious 'in theory' because we understand that qualifying research in Brazil requires following several routes, among which enhancing the value of producing knowledge that can contribute to progress towards relevant issues in the country. Therefore, this qualification requires taking on research subjects the justification for which is not in the same context as the validation criteria concerning the type of research that gets the support needed to become 'internationally recognized' is in.

It must be stated that this internationalization of scientific knowledge is guided by the pursuit of recognition and prestige among individual researchers, groups, institutions, and Brazilian journals by other prestigious foreign researchers in scientific realms of the major capitalist countries, whose research topic agenda does not take the particularities of the peripheral countries into account. Consequently, it is not a two-way route or even one of interaction with nations that share common issues. One must wonder, therefore, if, in adopting this internationalization format, we would not be taking a step backwards in a process of subordination, of uncertain benefits, one that would divert us from building autonomy and from deepening the social meaning of our scientific production.

In the case of *Trabalho, Educação e Saúde*, such intent could lead to very worrisome developments such as, for example, not prioritizing manuscripts the research for which contributed to the understanding of local issues, including work done concerning SUS, training mid-level workers, or even the implementation of specific policies for public health or education. Reflecting on this makes us wonder to what extent a shift of this order, on a larger scale, could discourage groups and research dedicated to these topics.

This consideration leads us to reflect on the reader we want to reach. If, in idealized terms, we are thinking about a researcher to whom reading

a scientific paper can represent a significant addition to his or her research in a given research project, we must *assume* that the value of scientific knowledge and of the article also lies in its appropriation by professionals in their updating and training processes at various levels. Thus, the production and dissemination of science have a social value that must be defended by boosting critical thinking, advances, and changes in social practices.

Procedures that have been pointed to as quality criteria, such as the internationalization of the body of reviewers, can be beneficial if indeed it is possible to find researchers whose study track record allows for manuscript analyses that are both profound and renewed. In addition to simply judging the text, the reviewers have the opportunity to qualify the discussions that take place, and this is the fundamental criterion for the selection of a reviewer, instead of their geographical location. In the case of journals whose editorial line incorporates studies that investigate, in an interdisciplinary way, the peculiarities of our social reality, it can be foreseen that major difficulties will be faced to ensure both international reviewer diversification and consistent study analyses.

We also believe that this scenario could worsen competition which, at times more insidiously and at others more aggressively, surrounds scientific journals whose funding is increasingly restricted and researchers who have their work recognized largely due to the prestige of the journals they get published in. Such elements may have more potential to weaken than to strengthen national research and must also be on the agenda for discussion.

International projection is certainly not a purpose to be disregarded, but its means and effects need to be problematized, especially in a context where visibility and the number of citations have been matched to the quality of research, and yet, does not exclude the international publishers' market interests.

Thus, we believe it is fundamental to guide a discussion on the policies towards a true internationalization of knowledge in a way that is not subject to the mentioned market logic. This - initial - step assumes, in turn, in our view, a double movement: Firstly, deepening the national and collective sense of scientific research in relation to the singularities of the areas of knowledge and local needs; and, secondly, promoting critical studies, including in collaboration with researchers in various countries on the role science plays in the new determinations of globalized capitalist sociability, with a view to the transformation of this reality, the creation of international partnerships, and forming a truly global, emancipatory science.

*Angélica Ferreira Fonseca*

*Carla Macedo Martins*

*Marcela Alejandra Pronko*