

## Editorial

A recent opinion in the Washington Post<sup>1</sup> showed some disturbing statistics: 98% of papers in the arts and humanities are never cited by another researcher. Even in the hard sciences, the area in which this journal is included, shows a level of 25% of the papers never cited. This means that these papers did not reach any goal other than fuel the academic structure itself, never producing any results that may help other scientists, or society as a whole, progress.

Hence it could be argued that we have enough journals and we do not need another one, especially one that is published by a very small college located in a medium sized Brazilian inner city.

This is the logical conclusion: if many papers are “useless”, we could get rid of them, restructure the existing journals, making them even more prestigious and get rid of the “excess publications”

Obviously, we believe that this does not apply to our case (otherwise, we would not have published this issue!), and in the rest of this editorial, I will state our case.

First of all, the citation metric is not a very accurate metric to the paper relevance. We publish papers that describe practical applications (for a practical example, you can check the *OntoDDS* paper in this issue, which is an excellent application of ontologies to a very hard software project management problem). These papers tend to be less cited, but they solve a problem and may be useful to engineers and professionals worldwide. Hence, we can say that they are relevant, even though they may not have a nice impact in an index calculated with a very complex formula.

We encourage papers on practical applications, because we believe in improving the world through science. Here, professionals, professors, undergraduate and graduate students that are solving real problems with their research will find a safe harbor, a journal willing to receive their papers and discuss their applicability in a deep and meaningful way.

Second, even if we ignore the previous paragraphs, we can say that we are close to the average. Since we became an open journal (our first four issues were devoted to the internal public of our institution), we published 74 papers. A cursory search in Google Scholar informed us that 41 of them were cited (approximately 56%). This is not 75%, but we are a backwater journal, remember?

It is important to notice that one paper received 25 citations, and at least three received more than 10. Hence, even by this incomplete criterion, we can assert our importance as a scientific channel.

Last, but not least, the opinion piece does not take into consideration the important service rendered by reviewers, which analyze the paper and offer lengthy recommendations.

Journals as ours serve as an important communication channel between younger scientists (or maybe those who publish less in more famous venues) and the more established ones. We are proud of our rejection rate (a little above 70%) and of the fact that most of our published papers passed through several iterations before being considered journal-ready. These facts are indicative of the high level of demand that we impose on the quality of the submitted papers and even those authors who were rejected receive an important boost for the improvement of their next work. This is not measurable, but is a service that is provided free of charge (and we thank our reviewers a lot for it).

This is not a happy circumstance, but the consequence of a well devised policy. When the new editorial board assumed in 2010, we decided to follow the same principles and guidelines of the world top journals, both in terms of academic rigor and of process efficiency.

Therefore, we should be considered by all parties as an important (or at least acceptable) scientific venue, shouldn't we? Unfortunately, that is not entirely true. We are submitted to the fell clutch of circumstance, and we have decided to wince and cry aloud.

The most important Brazilian index is the one kept by CAPES. Even if not intentionally, it serves as a guideline for those professors in graduate programs who intend to publish their research.

Given the fact that programs are evaluated according to the journals in which they publish and points are awarded for researchers for the main reason in important areas such as scholarships awards and public competitions for tenured positions, researchers analyze with attention the possible venues and choose those in the higher possible stratum.

This should not be a problem for us, because from 2010 on we followed all the CAPES guidelines and in 2012 we were included in that list, as a B5 level journal. It is not as good as we deserve, but it is a start.

In the next years, we continued to keep pace with the official recommendations and many of our papers were included in the Sucupira database, the one CAPES uses to manage QUALIS and which stores information on journals and graduate programs.

Unfortunately, last July, when rolling in the new Sucupira system, CAPES left out dozens of journals, because of clerical errors in the programming or in the load process (it was never clear to outsiders). When pressured by publishers, CAPES, in what amounts to an incredible level of negligence and arrogance, simply stated that it will not correct their database this year and all offended parties must wait until the next roll-in of the database (which will happen in April/2016) to see if their issue was solved.

It should be clear that this will cause damage to the journals' reputation. We have received four e-mails from prospective authors who wanted to know whether or not we were classified in the QUALIS system, because they could not find us in the

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/four-tough-things-universities-should-do-to-rein-in-costs/2015/11/25/64fed3de-92c0-11e5-a2d6-f57908580b1f\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/four-tough-things-universities-should-do-to-rein-in-costs/2015/11/25/64fed3de-92c0-11e5-a2d6-f57908580b1f_story.html)

CAPES website. It comes without saying that we cannot accurately measure how many prospective authors decided not to submit to our journal because our disappearance from the Sucupira database.

We are sure that we have followed the rules, as defined by the regulating authorities. We also believe that we have shown our value as a scientific venue. Now, we need to be reciprocated. Paraphrasing Abraham Lincoln, we do not think CAPES is bound to win, succeed and be true (that is, have a perfect database), but to live up to what light it has. Until they do, Brazilian science will be terribly maculated.