



LETTER TO THE EDITOR

DOI: 10.17126/joralres.2016.049

Immediately after its publication, we set out to read "Bibliometric analysis of the *Journal of Oral Research*. Period 2012-2015" by Corrales *et al.*¹ First of all, we acknowledge the great importance of bibliometrics in the process of evaluating the quality of scientific journals, especially in Health Sciences.² However, we also think it is necessary to make some considerations about the aforementioned study.

In our opinion declaring that the country of origin of the article was the country of the main author was a mistake. It has been shown that multicenter studies have a greater impact, so they have to be analyzed as international studies. Then comes the need for analyzing the international collaboration index, which plays a significant role in the quality of the articles and therefore in the quality of the journal.

The "most popular" articles, which could be better called "most viewed" should receive greater attention. The number of views is an altmetric and not a bibliometric index, and they should not be confused. If an article is more frequently consulted, it is more likely to be cited. Although, it should be borne in mind that the number of views is not directly proportional to the validity or quality of the article. An attractive title or a well-written abstract, although desirable, do not necessarily mean that the article is equally good.

The reasons why there was an increase in the number of documents published in the *Journal of Oral Research* in 2015 should be clarified to avoid misleading the readers. Some of them, particularly those unfamiliar with the history of the journal, may think that the increase was due to irregularities in the issues published in previous years, when it is actually not the case. The journal planned and published two issues in 2012, three in 2013, four in 2014, and six in 2015.

A positive aspect of the study is that more than half of the articles are original, in agreement with Cartes-Velásquez³

Comment on "Bibliometric analysis of the *Journal of Oral Research*. Period 2012-2015".

commenting on the results of the evaluation of the journal performed by SciELO-Chile. Original articles are generally the most cited, increasing the chances for the journal being cited in other papers, and directly affecting its impact factor.⁴

The study suggests that original articles involve a higher level of knowledge and skills than other types of publications. We think this statement is incorrect. Critical analysis of scientific work, expressed through letters to the editor/publisher, is a reflection of the state of science. They are publications that demand a strong methodological expertise and solid knowledge of the subject matter. Therefore, the previous suggestion regarding original articles contradicts the idea that: "*Letters to the Editor/Publisher are a very important part of journals, as they reflect the way in which biomedical publications began, when doctors and scientists published their experiences and experiments in them*".¹

It is well known that the value of an article depends on the prestige of the journal where it is published. This involves two main factors: the quality of the article and the visibility of the journal, that is, its indexation. A journal indexed in various databases, especially open-access databases, is more likely to be cited.

While international collaboration is an important bibliometric index in any study, there are other equally important indicators not addressed by Corrales *et al.* in their study.

Bibliometric indices are ways of evaluating a journal and comparing it with similar publications. Taking Google Scholar database as a reference, current indicators of the *Journal of Oral Research* are: h-index: 5 (coverage h: 21), g-index: 6 (coverage g: 25), total citations: 151, citations per year: 37.75.

It should be noted that despite its recent indexing in Scopus database,⁵ the journal still does not appear in the list of SCImago Journal Rank (www.scimagojr.com). It must be indexed at least one year until its records are processed.

Finally, we appreciate that Corrales *et al.* suggest that scientometric studies allow the assessment and design of



policies. However, they do not make any recommendations to the journal, which would be certainly of interest for the editorial team. Consequently, we would like to make the following recommendations with the aim of improving the quality and visibility of the journal:

1. Strengthen international authorship and multicenter studies, thus reducing endogamy.
2. Use of social networks, especially scientific networks such as ResearchGate, Academia.edu, LinkedIn, BiomedExperts, Facebook, Twitter and others. This will facilitate the diffusion of publications and increase their visibility.
3. Encourage the publication of articles in institutional repositories and social networks to increase visibility.
4. Stimulate self-citations, suggesting cites from the journal's own articles.
5. Indexation in other databases such as Redalyc, Index

Copernicus and others in the field of dentistry.

6. Use the resources of the Open Journal System platform more efficiently for the dissemination of each issue to the readers, and for improving the management of the editorial process.

There remains the challenge of constantly moving forward, with hard work and perseverance, ensuring scientific quality, which will undoubtedly improve the quality and visibility of the *Journal of Oral Research*.

JAVIER GONZALEZ-ARGOTE. MD student.

Facultad de Ciencias Médicas Miguel Enríquez.

Universidad de Ciencias Médicas de La Habana, Cuba.

ALEXIS GARCIA-RIVERO. MD student.

Instituto de Ciencias Básicas y Preclínicas Victoria de Girón.

Universidad de Ciencias Médicas de La Habana, Cuba.

REFERENCES.

1. Corrales IE, Reyes JJ & Fornaris Y. Bibliometric analysis of the Journal of Oral Research. Period 2012-2015. J Oral Res 2016; 5(5): 188-193.
2. Gonzalez-Argote J, Garcia-Rivero AA, Dorta-Contreras AJ. Producción científica estudiantil en revistas médicas cubanas 1995-2014. Primera etapa. Inv Ed Med. 2016;5(19):155-163.
3. Cartes-Velasquez R. There will be no SciELO for the Journal of Oral Research, here are the reasons. J Oral Res. 2016;5(4):138-139. DOI: 10.17126/joralres.2016.029.
4. Garcia-Rivero AA, Gonzalez-Argote J, Dorta-Contreras AA. Indicadores científicos de la Revista 16 de Abril. Rev 16 de Abril. 2015;54(260):25-30.
5. Cartes-Velásquez R. Expanding the Journal of Oral Research to craniofacial sciences and Scopus. J Oral Res. 2016;5(3):95-6.