



EDITORIAL



Dilemma: Quality or Quantity in Scientific Periodical Publishing



Melnyk Yu. B.^{1,2} , Pypenko I. S.^{1,2,3,4} 

¹ Kharkiv Regional Public Organization "Culture of Health" (KRPOCH), Ukraine

² Scientific Research Institute KRPOCH, Ukraine

³ Educational Center KRPOCH, Ukraine

⁴ Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, Ukraine

Received: 09.12.2021; **Accepted:** 23.12.2021; **Published:** 25.12.2021

Keywords: scientific periodical, quality, quantity, International Journal of Science Annals

Copyright: © 2021 Melnyk Yu. B., Pypenko I. S. Published by Archives of International Journal of Science Annals

DOI <https://doi.org/10.26697/ijisa.2021.2.1>

Conflict of interests: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests

Source of support: This research did not receive any outside funding or support

Information about the authors: **Melnyk Yuriy Borysovyeh** (Corresponding Author) – <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8527-4638>; YBM.office@gmail.com; Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogy, Associate Professor; Kharkiv Regional Public Organization "Culture of Health" (KRPOCH); Scientific Research Institute KRPOCH, Kharkiv, Ukraine.
Pypenko Iryna Sergiivna – <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5083-540X>; Doctor of Philosophy in Economics, Associate Professor, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, Kharkiv Regional Public Organization "Culture of Health" (KRPOCH); Scientific Research Institute KRPOCH; Educational Center KRPOCH, Kharkiv, Ukraine.

Dear Readers, Authors, and Publishers,

The eternal dilemma of quality or quantity affects many areas of human life. One of these areas is the publishing industry. This issue is particularly acute for scientific periodicals (Michalska-Smith & Allesina, 2017; Peng, 2011).

The aim of the study. To analyze the dilemma of the quality or quantity of papers in the publication of a scientific periodical Journal, and to share the four-year experience of publishing the International Journal of Science Annals (IJSA) with publishers, editors, reviewers, and authors.

Undoubtedly, it is important to develop both quality and quantity for any periodical Journal.

However, for scientific periodicals, the dilemma of quality or quantity should be decided definitely in favor of quality.

This is important both for the development of one or another scientific direction, and for a particular person, especially when it comes to influencing him (medicine, biology, ecology, etc.).

The most reputable leaders who have developed their own quality standards are Web of Science and Scopus.

The selection process in Scopus describes the procedure of their strict standards quite responsibly and transparently.

"The Content Selection and Advisory Board continually review titles using both quantitative and qualitative measures. Every year, approximately 3,500 new titles are suggested for inclusion in Scopus, but only 33% of those titles meet the technical criteria. And of those roughly 1,200 titles, only 50% are accepted after CSAB review" (Elsevier, 2021b).

The Scopus ranking of Journals clearly characterizes the priority of quality over quantity.

For example, Ca-A Cancer Journal for Clinicians is ranked number one in Scopus indexed Journals (Elsevier, 2021a). CiteScore Tracker 2021 is 670.3. CiteScore Tracker counts the citations to date (for the current year), and divides this by the number of documents to date. CiteScore Tracker 2021 calculated by Scopus on December 2021 is 71722/107=670.3.

In IJSA, the problem of the quality of papers published in the Journal is clearly regulated by the peer review procedure.



All manuscripts submitted for publication the IJSA are peer reviewed. Manuscripts of the IJSA Editorial Board Member are submitted to the review process on general terms. Each participant in the review process – author, reviewer or editor – is required to declare a possible conflict of interest so that the publisher anticipates the possibility of such influence. The Editorial Office strives to exclude conflicts of interest between authors and reviewers.

The average number of rejected manuscripts is 85%, of which: 40% are rejected during the preliminary evaluation process; 45% are rejected during the peer review process.

At the first stage, the reasons for rejection are: the guidelines of the study have not been followed, the manuscript title is out of scope of the journal, manuscript requirements have not been followed, the manuscript contains stylistic, spelling and syntax errors, plagiarism, etc.

At the second stage, the reasons for rejection are: scientific relevance and practical importance are absent, methodological errors, there is no logic between the sections of the manuscript, etc.

All authors complete the conflict of interest declaration. Authors should disclose at the time of submission any financial arrangement they may have. Such information will be held in confidence while the manuscript is under review and will not influence the editorial decision, but if the manuscript is accepted for publication, the editors will usually discuss with the authors the manner in which such information is to be communicated to the reader. Because the essence of reviews and editorials is selection and interpretation of the literature, journal expects that authors of such manuscripts will not have any financial interest in a company (or its competitor) that makes a product discussed in the manuscript. Journal policy requires that reviewers, associate editors, editors reveal in a letter to the Editor-in-Chief any relationships that they have that could be construed as causing a conflict of interest with regard to a manuscript under review. The letter should include a statement of any financial relationships with commercial companies involved with a product under study.

We welcome genuine appeals to the editor's and the reviewers' decisions. However, authors will need to provide strong evidence or new data in response to the editor's and reviewers' comments. The Journal has developed a template for the replies to reviewers' comments.

Ethical behavior is very important. No author should insist on the publication of his/her manuscript. Respect the opinion of the reviewers and the editor. Rejecting a manuscript can be an important step in improving the quality of your manuscript. The Editorial Board members or the editor may not treat any manuscript or author as biased or favorable.

IJSA is committed to a high standard of editorial ethics. IJSA is the Committee of Publication Ethics (COPE) Member.

The Editorial Office of the Journal denounces plagiarism. KRPOCH Publishing uses the CrossCheck service from Crossref to initially detect possible plagiarism. If plagiarism is detected in the paper, it is completely removed at any stage.

The IJSA Editorial Office has developed a procedure for removing published papers in case of detection of plagiarism in them after their publication, which is described on the Journal's website.

The Journal Editorial Office denounces the following types of authorship: "Ghost" author, "Guest" author, and "Gift" author. Therefore, the Editorial Office strictly monitors the awareness of the authors about their submission of the manuscript to the Journal, the presence of the contribution of all authors to the manuscript, signed supplemental documents, etc.

Perhaps some Journals have a policy of refusing authors to publish a manuscript based on the authors' low H-index or even their residence in developing countries.

We strongly believe that such a position is not only unacceptable, but also erroneous.

For example, George Huntington only published two medical papers, of which one, produced at the age of 22 describing his eponymous chorea (Huntingdon, 1872) was subsequently eulogized by Osler et al. (1950) who said there are "few instances in which a disease has been more accurately, more graphically or more briefly described".

So, George Huntington's H-index couldn't be higher than 2 in principle. Journals, guided by the selection of articles according to the author's citation index, would not give this author any chance of publishing his work.

IJSA provides immediate open access. All texts are free for all users and (or) institutions they represent. This can greatly increase the likelihood of citations.

The confidence that academics and the public have in the research published in the IJSA relies on the diligence of our peer review process as well as the Editorial Office commitment to ensuring objectivity and high-quality publication.

All manuscripts that have been submitted to the Editorial Board go through a peer review procedure. The reviewers fill out the reviewer evaluation form, which they submit to the IJSA Editorial Review Board.

Reviewers could submit their reviews via the IJSA profile on Publons (International Journal of Science Annals, n.d.).

The Journal Editorial Office is grateful to all editors. IJSA Editorial Board includes the most authoritative scientists from 17 countries, 5 continents in the fields of Education, Psychology, Medicine. We guarantee compliance the proper level of publication ethics, copyright protection at all stages of material review.

We are extremely grateful to our editors and reviewers for their expertise, time, and willingness to provide essential feedback.

The Editorial Office is proud to have been able to provide the required quality of publications in our Journal, as well as funding for all published papers by 2022.



IJSA publishes manuscripts not only of reputable scientists, but also of those who are just starting their scientific career.

In 2021, the Journal initiated, co-organized, and sponsored the international competition “Blockchain in the Digital Society” (ICBDS-2021) (Kharkiv Regional Public Organization “Culture of Health”, 2021a).

This competition was held among masters, graduate students, and young scientists.

In 2022, the Journal will initiate the international competition “Mental Health in the Digital Society” (ICMHDS-2022) (Kharkiv Regional Public Organization “Culture of Health”, 2021b).

All winners of the ICMHDS-2022 competition will be able to publish their papers in the next issues of IJSA. There is no fee for entering the competition or for publishing the manuscript for participants.

Conclusions

Scientific periodicals should solve the dilemma of quality and quantity of papers definitely in favor of quality.

Journals should be committed to a high standard of editorial ethics.

Journals should have a clear and precise procedure for reviewing and selecting papers for publication.

Journals should necessarily consider the possible conflict of interest in research between authors, editors, reviewers, funders, etc.

Journals should motivate young talented scientists to publish their manuscripts by providing them with editorial support in the preparation of the manuscript and funding for its publication.

The implementation of these key principles will contribute both to the development of science in general and the Journal in particular.

References

- Elsevier. (2021a). *Ca-A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*. <https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/28773>
- Elsevier. (2021b). *How Scopus works – Content*. <https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/scopus/how-scopus->

works/content?dgcid=RN_AGCM_Sourced_300005030

Huntingdon, G. (1872, April 13). On chorea. *The Medical and Surgical Reporter of Philadelphia*, 26(15), 317–321.

<https://archive.org/details/b29349023>

International Journal of Science Annals. (n.d.). *Home – Journals and Conferences – Journal/Conference Details* [Publons page]. Publons. Retrieved November 17, 2021, from <https://publons.com/journal/105740/international-journal-of-science-annals/>

Kharkiv Regional Public Organization “Culture of Health”. (2021a). *International competition “Blockchain in the Digital Society” (ICBDS-2021)*.

<https://competitions.culturehealth.org/index.php/competitions/icbds>

Kharkiv Regional Public Organization “Culture of Health”. (2021b). *International competition “Mental Health in the Digital Society” (ICMHDS-2022)*.

<https://competitions.culturehealth.org/index.php/competitions/icmhds>

Michalska-Smith, M. J., & Allesina, S. (2017). And, not or: Quality, quantity in scientific publishing. *PloS One*, 12(6), e0178074.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178074>

Osler, W., Bean, R. B., & Bean, W. B. (1950). *Osler aphorisms: From his bedside teachings and writings*. Henry Schuman.

<https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.63933>

Peng, C. (2011). Focus on quality, not just quantity. *Nature*, 475, Article 267.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/475267a>

Dr. Yuriy Melnyk,
Director of KRPOCH Publishing,
Editor-in-Chief of the IJSA

Dr. Iryna Pypenko,
Technical Editor of the IJSA

Cite this article as:

Melnyk, Yu. B., & Pypenko, I. S. (2021). Dilemma: Quality or quantity in scientific periodical publishing. *International Journal of Science Annals*, 4(2), 5–7. <https://doi.org/10.26697/ijsa.2021.2.1>

The electronic version of this article is complete. It can be found online in the IJSA Archive <https://ijsa.culturehealth.org/en/arhiv>



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>).