

## Editorial

Our journal arrives at its 15th issue, once again fulfilling its compromise of never publishing a single issue after the proposed deadline.

In this issue, we received 16 papers and accepted only 5 of them (close to 30% acceptance rate, which is quite typical for our journal). Besides, every one of the accepted papers underwent at least two rounds of revisions by our reviewers, besides being analyzed by our editorial staff. This is characteristic of our daily strife for quality – we have the lofty goal of improving science, both for Brazil and the whole world.

We had 54 reviewers for this issue, all of them PhDs. We had at least one reviewer from each of the CAPES class 7 postgraduate programs and one from most of the CAPES class 6 postgraduate.

The papers submitted to our journal were reviewed in the first round in an average of 53 days (standard deviation of 21 days). This means that all papers submitted are reviewed quickly. Adding this to the quality of our reviewers and the fact that no review is acceptable without a detailed explanation, our journal can pride itself of a quality review system.

All this information is being shared with our esteemed readers in order to stress the point that we aim to become a beared for the standard of scientific quality. As we have already said in our previous editorial, our policy is to behave as if we were a world class journal.

We know that we are still far away from becoming a reference in our field, specially due to our short life span. After all, eight years is nothing comparable to the duration of some of the most important journals in our field. Nevertheless, we believe that there is still an unfair characterization of our journal (and others in the predicament as we are) by some of the major bodies that influence science nowadays.

In spite of those quality issues, which can be verified if you contact our authors (both accepted and rejected), we were not accepted into Web of Science and were rated at B5 at the QUALIS system. In both cases, the answer was the same: **we do not have the numbers to qualify.**

In order to qualify for the Web of Science, we worked for two years. We filled all the forms, offered all the testimony, published our issues in a timely fashion and in the end, we received the answer: “you do not have enough papers and citations to qualify”.

In the case of QUALIS, the assignment is done exclusively by numbers. The responsible parties published their criteria: they included all journals in a bell curve according to their citation count and simply verified where a journal landed.

Both venues are promoting a numbers game. They are not fostering quality or even sound editorial principles. They are just measuring up the number of citations.

We know that good papers tend to be cited more, but this criterion could be complemented by a process evaluation or

even by other easily attainable metrics, such as number of downloads.

Besides, this number is not as nearly flawless as its importance suggests. For instance, if we published one or two reviews at each number, we would probably have a higher citation count, for reviews tend to get a broader readership and citation network.

By keeping themselves focused solely on the numbers, these important classification agencies are doing science a disservice. Remember the quantum physics motto: observation changes the observed party. Hence, focusing on the numbers game will make researches more prone to play it. Hence, this important agencies are actually working hard to kill the small publications, which will be suffocated by the lack of major articles (for most senior researchers are pressed into publishing in journals belonging to B1 or above strata).

We need an evaluation system that truly understand what each journal is doing. We want to be scrutinized. We want to be audited. We want to be able to offer our contribution to the scientific world and not be massacred by a numbers game that is not the real measurement of science.

Hence, this editorial is published as a plea to both Thomson Reuters and CAPES: stop killing the smaller venues. We contribute to science and we are as important as the major journals. If we remain serious, we can be an entry point for new scientists and a way for scientific knowledge to spread. Hence, acknowledge our seriousness and our importance. If you do, you get as a return a better scientific world.