



## EDITORIAL

DOI: 10.17126/joralres.2016.029

Transparency is one of the guiding principles of editorial practice in our journal, in the same way transparency guides scientific work and any kind of activity deemed relevant and far-reaching. In the last issue we proudly informed our readers about the entry of the *Journal of Oral Research* into the renowned and prestigious Scopus database, recognition not only for our editorial team, but also for our readers, reviewers, authors and contributors<sup>1</sup>.

Now transparency also moves us to report that our journal has not been accepted in the SciELO-Chile Collection. We believe the best way to share this information with our readers is publishing the report sent by SciELO-Chile last May 26 and commenting on some points that seem relevant to us:

1. *Quality of the editorial board: The editorial board shows a balance between active members and others with experience in their area of specialization. However, its members should have more experience as authors in indexed journals. (Score: 4.2)*

2. *Coverage of the journal from the point of view of the published articles: It was observed that two of the revised issues (vo.4, No. 2/2015 and vol.4, No. 4/2015) contain less than 50% of original articles. Most of them comprise case studies, which belong to the category of case report. While the journal is relatively new, efforts should be made to publish more original studies, mainly from funded research, providing information about the project such as its name or registration number, funding institution and date of award. (Score: 3.8)*

3. *Coverage of the journal from the point of view of the discipline: The content of the articles is too broad in scope and lacks a clear profile. While this is declared in the mission of the journal, the lack of definition affects its scientific character, resulting in miscellaneous topics where most of the articles offer no novelty regarding the subjects under discussion. (Score: 4.2)*

4. *Quality of the authors: In relation to the authors, different weaknesses were identified. It was observed that only few authors have a Master's or PhD's degree. While it is interesting to give young authors (who are just starting and do not have a strong record of publications) the opportunity to publish, the number of authors acknowledged as researchers with publications in indexed journals is very low. Several authors of reviewed articles are part of the list of reviewers participating in the journal. Some of them are: Alfredo Esguep; Israel Juárez;*

## There will be no SciELO for the *Journal of Oral Research*, here are the reasons.

*Pedro Aravena; Sergio Uribe; Patricio Rubio; Miguel Simancas. It should be noted that this kind of endogamy negatively affects the overall quality of the journal. (Score: 3.7)*

5. *Quality of peer-review process: The procedure and evaluation guideline of the articles is appropriate. In spite of the above, it is recommended to improve the quality of articles and the criteria used by reviewers. (Score: 4.5)*

6. *Quality of the reviewers: The journal requires increasing the number and quality of original publications, mainly through the selection of expert evaluators. Therefore, it is essential to favor the participation of reviewers with PhDs, specialists with experience in research and with current scientific productivity (last 5 years). One of the advantages of the journal is that it is published in English; this should allow the participation of a large number of ad-hoc reviewers. (Score: 3.8)*

7. *Flow of articles: The flow of articles is adequate, and so is the proportion of rejection and acceptance. The early publication of articles (Advance Online Publication - AOP) is also a positive aspect. However, the weakness lies in the process of selection of articles, as stated in previous evaluation criteria. (Score: 4.5)*

8. *Writing quality and presentation: While in some cases, greater scientific rigor in the presentation of the research methodology and results is desirable, the structure and presentation of the articles is adequate, with a friendly format and good readability. Illustrations are relevant with good visual quality (photographs /figures/graphs). (Score: 4.3)*

9. *Literature review: The literature review of the articles is relevant and plentiful, and most of it is sufficiently updated. (Score: 4.2)*

10. *Scientific quality of articles: Articles are of interest to research in dentistry; however, many of them lack depth and scientific support or just report clinical cases. In short, this journal is in a good path, but needs to publish studies with greater scientific impact, preferably funded research. (Score: 3.7)*

As Editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Oral Research* I must say that I strongly disagree with many of the observations made by the reviewers. I am also worried about the arbitrary way in which scores were assigned to different items. In some cases there is a clear contradiction with SciELO's own guidelines,



considering that the minimum score to be accepted (with observations) is 4.5 points.

Among other things, it is important to emphasize that our journal in its Print and Online versions meets all the criteria established by Latindex and follows the guidelines proposed by Equator-Network. Hence, it is surprising that in "writing quality and presentation" we have received a score of only 4.5 points. Moreover, in "literature reviews" a positive comment is made, but then again we are assigned a score under 4.5 points. Something similar happens with the "quality of the peer-review process" and the "flow of articles", where despite the positive comments, the score does not exceed 4.5 points.

In relation to "coverage of the journal from the point of view of the published articles", the reviewers of SciELO-Chile said "*Most of the articles comprise case studies, which belong to the category of case report*", but in issues 4(2), 4(3) and 4(4), those evaluated by the reviewers, only 4 case reports were published<sup>2-5</sup>, this from a total of 35 documents (editorials, letters, original articles, reviews and case reports). Apparently, for SciELO-Chile, 11.4% (4/35) is greater than 88.6% (31/35).

However, there are other reviewers' observations that, from my perspective, seem even more worrying and disconcerting. For example, in "coverage of the journal from the point of view of the discipline," they indicate "*The content of the articles is too broad in scope and lacks a clear profile. While this is declared in the mission of the journal, the lack of definition affects its scientific character, resulting in miscellaneous topics...*", this seems inconsistent and fallacious, as it would imply that multidisciplinary journals will never have any chance of being accepted in SciELO-Chile. We are in fact a journal covering oral and craniofacial sciences, which is not by any means a lack of definition; it is, instead, a

really well-defined scope. Moreover, in "quality of the authors" they point out that "*Several authors of reviewed articles are part of the list of reviewers participating in the journal*" and "*It should be noted that this kind of endogamy negatively affects the overall quality of the journal*". This is curious to say the least because anyone with experience as an author and reviewer knows that this is the way how "peer-review" works, otherwise it would have a different name. It is also worrying to note that SciELO-Chile's reviewers biased their assessment affected by the well-known "Horn effect", that is, scores assigned to items 2, 3, 5 and 7 were based on their evaluation of item 10.

Despite the above objections, it is clear that some observations of the reviewers are true, ours is not yet a journal publishing exclusively internationally funded multicenter clinical trials written by world-renowned researchers, we are referring those to *Science, Nature, NEJM, The Lancet, JAMA*, and to a lesser extent to *PLOS One* and *Scientific Reports*.

Finally, I would like to emphasize two ideas. First, the evaluation made by SciELO-Chile does not seem consistent with its own guidelines and does not reflect the actual operation of our journal, much less the effort of its reviewers, authors and editorial team. Second, as noted in the last editorial, "*We continue working hard to be indexed in PubMed and Web of Science in the medium term, to increase our frequency of publication, internationalize our audience and remain a contribution to the development of oral and craniofacial sciences*"<sup>1</sup>.

**RICARDO CARTES-VELASQUEZ.**

**DDS BPsych MPH PhD.**

Editor-in-Chief

Journal of Oral Research

## REFERENCES.

1. Cartes-Velásquez R. Expanding the Journal of Oral Research to craniofacial sciences and Scopus. *J Oral Res.* 2016;5(3):95-6.
2. Ribadeneira J, Muñoz E. Vertical root fracture associated with prolonged use of calcium hydroxide during apexificación. A case report. *J Oral Res.* 2015;4(2):124-8.
3. Rosales D, Castillo B, Rodríguez J. Gland excision in submandibular sialolithiasis: A case report. *J Oral Res.* 2015;4(4):270-4.
4. Maldonado A, Muñoz E. Management of an internal root resorption on a permanent tooth. A case report. *J Oral Res.* 2015;4(4):275-81.
5. Reyes E, Ayala C, Ríos L. Parry-Romberg syndrome in a pediatric patient. A case report. *J Oral Res.* 2015;4(4):282-6.