doi: 10.2478/v10221-011-0024-1

Kot strela z jasnega

V začetku julija 2012 je na uredništvo kot strela z jasnega prispela novica Javne agencije za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije, da so Bilten uvrstili na seznam revij, ki sicer niso vključene v mednarodne bibliografske baze podatkov, se pa upoštevajo pri kategorizaciji znanstvenih publikacij. Za raziskovalce, ki objavljajo, to pomeni, da se njihovi objavljeni znanstveni članki točkujejo po metodologiji ARRS (1D – znanstveni članki v drugih znanstvenih revijah s seznama agencije), pri čemer vsaka objava prinese 10 točk.

Ker naša revija pod okriljem Fakultete za matematiko, naravoslovje in informacijske tehnologije Univerze na Primorskem (UP FAMNIT) izhaja šele dve leti, je to velikanski uspeh. Zahvala gre avtorjem in recenzentom, ki so vsak zase odgovorno odigrali svojo vlogo. No, vsaj v večini primerov je bilo tako.

V zadnjem uvodniku pisanje namenjam aktualni problematiki o avtorstvu in plagiatstvu pri pisanju znanstvenih člankov (1). Tokrat ga namenjam recenzentom in njihovi vlogi v uredniškem postopku.

V uredništvo svoje prispevke pošiljajo tudi mladi avtorji, ki bi svoja opažanja in prispevke radi prvič objavili v znanstveni reviji; enkrat in neke pač morajo začeti svojo publicistično znanstveno pot. Predvsem zanje so nasveti še posebej dobrodošli, še posebej, če prispevek le formalno ne ustreza zahtevanim merilom, vsebuje pa pomembna opažanja in sporočilnost. Prav temu sta namenjena delo in ocenjevanje recenzentov. Z recenzentovo oceno avtor dobi uvid v kakovost svojega prispevka, avtorja pa tudi spodbudi, da oblikuje bolj kakovosten končni izdelek, kar konec koncev koristi tudi ugledu revije.

V uredništvu se trudimo in izbiramo recenzente po najboljšem védenju. Pričakujemo, da se bo recenzent poglobil v bistveno sporočilo prispevka ter ocenil, ali zaključki in sklepi dejansko izhajajo iz rezultatov raziskave (2). Recenzent ima pravzaprav vlogo učitelja: njegove pripombe in komentarji obogatijo avtorjevo znanje in prispevajo k boljši predstavitvi raziskave in poročanju o rezultatih. K dobri recenziji pripomore več dejavnikov, kot so odgovornost, poznavanje literature, čas in poznavanje revije. Dober recenzent mora imeti občutek odgovornosti do svojih kolegov in tudi do mladih, še neuveljavljenih avtorjev, zato naj recenzijo oblikuje in posreduje pravočasno. Kakovost recenzije znanstvenega članka je določena s splošno recenzentovo odgovornostjo do dela, ki ga opravlja (3).

Recenzije znanstvenih člankov so pomemben sestavni del znanstvenega udejstvovanja, tako kot to velja za branje znanstvene literature ali raziskovanje pri znanstvenem delu. Nenazadnje obstajajo tudi pravila, ki jih mora recenzent vsaj okvirno upoštevati. (3)

Zakaj sploh recenzirati?

Zaradi obveze (ocenjevanje je del objavljanja – kdor želi objavljati, mora tudi sam ocenjevati), zaradi koristnosti (bogatenje znanja in informiranosti, povečevanje

ugleda) in zaradi zadovoljstva (znanstveno razpravljanje, izmenjava informacij, izpolnjevanje odgovornosti) (3).

Uredništvo samo, tj. brez sodelovanja med avtorji in recenzenti, nikoli ne bi zmoglo zagotoviti boljše kakovosti svoje revije. Znanstveno publiciranje je enakostranični trikotnik, v katerem stranice predstavljajo avtor – recenzent – urednik. Vsaka stranica nosi enakovreden del odgovornosti. Brez pravilne oblike tudi ni dobrega vzorca, ki bi reviji, urednikom, recenzentom in avtorjem prinesel kakovost in odmevnost. Vrstni red omenjenih je naključen.

Tudi tokrat uvodnik zaključujem s citatom, to pot z mislijo Gerarda Piela: »Neobjavljena znanost je mrtva znanost.«

Petruša Miholič
izvršna urednica

Literatura

1. Miholič P. Tanka črta med avtorstvom in plagiatorstvom. Bilt – Ekon Organ Inform Zdrav 2012; 28(1): 3-4.
2. Drinovec J, Ahčan U. Standardi za medicinsko pisanje in urejanje. Zdrav Vestn 2006; 75 (2): 105-9.
3. Marušić M, Sambunjak D, Marušić A. Guide for peer reviewers of scientific articles in the Croatian Medical Journal. Croat Med J 2005; 46(2): 326–32.

doi: 10.2478/v10221-011-0024-1

Like a bolt from the blue

In early July 2012, like lightning from a clear blue sky, we received news at the editorial board, from the Slovenian Research Agency (ARRS), concerning the inclusion of the Bulletin on the list of journals that are not included in the international bibliographic databases, but are considered in the categorisation of scientific publications. For researchers that publish, this means that published scientific papers are assessed according to the ARRS methodology (1D - scientific articles published in other scientific journals included on the agency's list) and each publication brings 10 points.

For a magazine that is under the auspices of the Faculty of Mathematics, Natural Sciences and Information Technologies, University of Primorska (UP FAMNIT) and is in its second year of publication, this is a great success. Commendations for this go to the authors and reviewers, who have each in their own way played their role responsibly. Well, at least in most cases, this was so.

In the last editorial I dedicated my writing to the current issues of authorship and plagiarism when writing scientific articles (1). This time I am dedicating it to reviewers and their role in the editorial process.

Our editorial board also receives contributions from young authors who want their observations and contributions published for the first time in a scientific journal. Sometime and somewhere, one must start down the road of scientific publishing. Helpful counsel is particularly welcome if a contribution contains important observations and information, but does not conform formally. This is what the work and evaluation of a peer reviewer is intended for. Reviewers can help authors by motivating them in a suitable manner and finalising the article together, which would both benefit the journal and raise its quality.

The editorial board endeavours and selects reviewers to the best of their knowledge. The reviewer is expected to delve into the essential message of the contribution, and assess whether its conclusions and deductions are truly gained from the research results. (2) The peer reviewer has the role of a teacher: his remarks and comments enrich the author's knowledge, better showcase the research and improve reporting on the research results. Responsibility, knowledge of the pertinent literature, time and knowledge of the journal for which a work is reviewed are all necessary to accomplish a good review. A good peer reviewer must have a sense of responsibility to their colleagues, the young yet to be established authors, and will finish their review in good time. The review quality of a scientific article is determined by the peer reviewers overall responsibility to the work they do. (3)

Reviews of scientific articles are in fact part of scientific work, the same as reading scientific literature or researching a scientific work. When reviewing, there are

rules that a peer reviewer must generally follow. (3)

Why even review?

Due to commitment (evaluation is part of publishing - anyone who wants to publish must also evaluate), because of the benefits (enrichment of knowledge and information, enhancing your reputation) and for the satisfaction (scientific debate, information exchange, fulfilling your responsibilities). (3)

The editorial board (editors) alone, without the cooperation of authors and reviewers, cannot achieve and will never be able to achieve an increase in the quality of the journal.

Scientific publishing is an equilateral triangle (author - reviewer - editor). Each side bears an equal share of responsibility. Without following the correct form, a good pattern cannot be achieved that will bring quality and visibility to the journal, the editors, the reviewers and the authors. The order of the latter is written randomly. I shall again conclude with a quote, this time by Gerard Piel: 'Without publication, science is dead'.

Petruša Miholič
Executive editor

References

1. Miholič P. Tanka črta med avtorstvom in plagiatorstvom. Bilt – Ekon Organ Inform Zdrav 2012; 28(1): 3-4.
2. Drinovec J, Ahčan U. Standardi za medicinsko pisanje in urejanje. Zdrav Vestn 2006; 75 (2): 105-9.
3. Marušić M, Sambunjak D, Marušić A. Guide for peer reviewers of scientific articles in the Croatian Medical Journal. Croat Med J 2005; 46(2): 326–32.