



LETTER TO THE EDITOR

DOI: 10.17126/joralres.2016.050

The readers of a journal have the right to show their discrepancies with the views or opinions expressed in any given paper.¹ In view of that, we really appreciate the interest and scientific rigor shown by doctors Gonzalez-Argote and Garcia-Rivero by reading and discussing our research thoroughly and from a scientific standpoint. Considerations and suggestions emerging from their critical reading are equally interesting. However, although we agree with many of their conclusions, we think it is also relevant to make some clarifications about them.

We agree that multicenter studies have a greater impact and that the analysis of the international collaboration index is an indicator of the quality of the articles and, therefore, of the journal. However, we do not think it is a "mistake" to declare the country of origin of the paper was the country of the main author. It was done in this way for methodological reasons, as well as to operationalize this variable in a simpler way. It is the responsibility of the writer of a scientific article to communicate the content so that it reaches its recipients with the minimum of disruption².

They also suggest that the more frequently viewed an article is, the more likely to be cited. We think that if an article is more frequently viewed and cited, it is just evidence of its overall quality. They suggest that, though beneficial, an attractive title or a well-written abstract are not predictors of a good paper. But we believe that the title and the abstract are the "cover letters" of the article, and that they both play a role in impacting the readers positively. The title and the abstract must allow a clear understanding of the problem addressed by the study, reducing the need of reading the introduction. In this sense, we think titles should be good and well written, combining scientific rigor and interest.³

The use of the term "most popular" to refer to the "most viewed" articles on the journal website can be analyzed from different points of view, and should not be considered

Response to comment on "Bibliometric analysis of the *Journal of Oral Research*. Period 2012-2015".

inaccurate. The number of visits an article gets is certainly an indicator used as Altmetrics at the author level.

Traditional metrics based on the impact factor and citations continue to have a strong influence on the academic community. However, there have been created new social and academic platforms such as Altmetric.com, Plum Analytics, ImpactStory.org, ResearchGate.net, Academia.edu and GetCited.org. These platforms include publications that do not appear in traditional citation indexes as Web of Science (ISI) and Scopus, so they allow the use of alternative ways to measure the impact of a paper.⁴

Regarding the increase in the number of annual issues of the journal (two in 2012, three in 2013, four in 2014, and six in 2015⁵), we must remember that in the *J Oral Res* 2012;1(2) a contractual relationship ("*Contrato divulgativo*"⁶) was established. Alongside the printed edition, the journal publishes an electronic version available at www.joralres.com. This latter is managed by the Open Journal Systems software, which facilitates the presentation and indexing of articles in different databases, achieving greater visibility at international level. The journal is open-access, giving an immediate and unrestricted access to all its articles. That said, the journal is indexed in different databases and catalogs of international prestige, such as Latindex, IMBIOMED, DIALNET, DOAJ, LILACS, Scopus and Google Scholar. Consequently, when thousands of researchers from Latin American and other parts of the world look for information on dental research, they find direct access to full-text articles. Hundreds of these researchers consider the *Journal of Oral Research* as a real option to disseminate the results of their studies and for that reason they send manuscripts for publication.⁷

"Publishing an article is very rewarding, and it is even more so in the case of an original article, as this shows the skills of the research team from problem detection to the preparation of the manuscript for publication. All other forms



of publication also require knowledge and skills, but they are always somehow less relevant than an original article".⁸ By suggesting that, we recognize that the use of the expression "less relevant" may be provocative and controversial, and that there should be a broader and deeper discussion on the subject.

We really want to thank doctors Gonzalez-Argote and Garcia-Rivero for suggesting other scientometric indicators of the *Journal of Oral Research* not addressed in our research and that would undoubtedly enhance it. Namely:

h-index: 5 (h coverage: 21), g-index: 6 (coverage g: 25), total citations: 151 citations per year: 37.75; all obtained from the Google Scholar database. We further agree with the recommendations made by these doctors and urge the Editorial Committee of the *Journal of Oral Research* to continue working hard to make their journal more authoritative, updated and visible.

IBRAÍN CORRALES REYES. DDS.

Universidad de Ciencias Médicas de Granma, Cuba.

REFERENCES.

1. Iraola Ferrer MD, Luques Hernández L. Producción científica de la Revista Cubana de Medicina Intensiva y Emergencias. Análisis bibliométrico descriptivo. Rev Cub Med Int Emerg. 2008; 7(3):1172-81.
2. Corrales IE, Reyes JJ, García M. Artículos científicos en las ciencias médicas: ¿una necesidad o un eslogan?. Rev 16 de Abril. 2014; 53(256):128-35.
3. González de Dios J, González-Muñoz M, Alonso-Arroyo A, Aleixandre-Benavent R. Comunicación científica (XV). Conocimientos básicos para leer (y escribir) un artículo científico (2): título, resumen e introducción. Acta Pediatr Esp. 2014; 72(8):169-75.
4. Alonso J, Cerdón-García JA, Maltrás B. Altmetrics: medición de la influencia de los medios en el impacto social de la investigación. Cuadernos de Documentación Multimedia. 2016; 27(1):75-101.
5. Corrales Reyes IE, Reyes Pérez JJ, Fornaris Cedeño Y. Análisis bibliométrico del Journal of Oral Research. Período 2012-2015. J Oral Res. 2016. [Ahead of Print].
6. Cartes-Velásquez R. El contrato divulgativo. J Oral Res. 2012; 1(2): 65.
7. Cartes-Velásquez R. Ingreso a LILACS, seguimos avanzando. J Oral Res. 2014; 3(1):7-8.
8. Miró O, Burillo-Putze G, Tomás Vecina S, Pacheco A, Sánchez M. Estimación del impacto bibliométrico de EMERGENCIAS durante los últimos 10 años (1997-2006). Emergencias. 2007; 19(187):94.