



Online Brazilian Journal of Nursing

E-ISSN: 1676-4285

objn@enf.uff.br

Universidade Federal Fluminense
Brasil

Machado de Lima, Dalmo Valério
Adtendite a falsis prophetis qui veniunt ad vos
Online Brazilian Journal of Nursing, vol. 12, núm. 1, 2013, pp. 1-4
Universidade Federal Fluminense
Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=361433915001>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's homepage in redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System
Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal
Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative

**OBJN**
Online Brazilian Journal of Nursing

ENGLISH

Federal Fluminense University

AURORA DE AFONSO COSTA
NURSING SCHOOL


Editorial



Adtendite a falsis prophetis qui veniunt ad vos

Dalmo Valério Machado de Lima¹

¹Fuminense Federal University

ABSTRACT

Each segment of a society is guided by parameters established by regulatory bodies instituted by the society itself. In this sense, laws, codes, norms and monitoring indicators of such a society are established. It is legitimate to say that laws should follow the will of the people and not the opposite. It is also legitimate to question certain indicators in terms of their real benefits, as well as the context in which they were conceived and, above all, operationalized. Roughly speaking, it would be reasonable to assume that most indicators are created with good intentions, although often, in reality, the theory is different. In the field of publishing and editing within the health sector, the logic of indicators is no different. Ultimately, the inclusion of a journal in an internationally recognized database, implies recognizing that it has incorporated certain quality parameters that include the preservation of ethics in research and publications, the intrinsic quality of the construct and the external validity of its results.

Keywords: Access to Information; Evidence-Based Nursing; Bibliometric Indicators; Bibliometrics; Scientific Misconduct.

Each segment of a society is guided by parameters established by regulatory bodies instituted by the society itself. In this sense, laws, codes, norms and monitoring indicators of such a society are established. It is legitimate to say that laws should follow the will of the people and not the opposite. It is also legitimate to question certain indicators in terms of their real benefits, as well as the context in which they were conceived and, above all, operationalized. Roughly speaking, it would be reasonable to assume that most indicators are created with good intentions, although often, in reality, the theory is different.

In the field of publishing and editing within the health sector, the logic of indicators is no different. Ultimately, the inclusion of a journal in an internationally recognized database, implies recognizing that it has incorporated certain quality parameters that include the preservation of ethics in research and publications, the intrinsic quality of the construct and the external validity of its results.

On the other hand, the use of certain indicators in an inappropriate manner may result from redundant information, which is considered a lesser evil to broadcasting news about the provision of a service that is not effectively carried out. As a consequence of this second condition, at a minimum, three movements arise: the exposition of the journal to the scientific community; the weakening of the group of journals that try, with great difficulty, to achieve the necessary steps for the judicious use of this indicator and; the provision of a disservice to the reader, as they violate their good faith, reducing the barriers between the ethical, antithetical and unethical, ultimately banalizing the usefulness of the indicator itself.

As background to the matter mentioned in this editorial, we may take, as an example, the Digital Object Identifier (DOI). The DOI system was developed and is being implemented in a variety of desktop publishing applications since the 2000s. By April 2011, more than 50 million DOI numbers had been assigned by nearly 4,000 organizations⁽¹⁾. Notwithstanding the various DOI assigned numbers, the most commonly used system applications today include citations in academic materials through CrossRef, a consortium of nearly 3,000 publishers. CrossRef interconnects millions of items from a variety of content types, including journals, books, conference proceedings, working

papers, technical reports and data sets. Its mission is to enable easy identification and use of trustworthy electronic content, promoting the cooperative development and application of a sustainable infrastructure⁽²⁾. Among the CrossRef services there is the CrossCheck, which consists of a database of academic literature that compares the contents of its database against current submissions, linking previously registered authors and titles with new ones⁽³⁻⁴⁾.

Thus, the reason for the existence of a DOI number that has been assigned to a scientific article, is to safeguard the legitimacy of the authors who have claimed authorship of the manuscript, and protecting authors, publishers and readers. Moreover, it allows the indexing of information retrieved based on a unique number that is inter-connectable with other databases, such as the Lattes Platform⁽⁵⁾ in Brazil. However, there is no restriction concerning the use of the DOI in a journal, although the process of recovering will be focused on the journal, not the article. Therefore, taking into account the indexation of the journal, the *International Standard Serial Number* (ISSN) has perfectly met the demands since 1971⁽⁶⁾.

The ISSN is a numeric code that consists of a unique identifier for each title of a serial publication, whose attribution is a condition prior to the existence of the journal itself. Therefore, unlike the ISSN that is obligatory for the journal, the DOI, when properly employed, proves to be a DIFFERENTIATED quality resource, of optional use and intended to allow the indexation of each article.

The separation of the wheat from the chaff, as suggested by the Hebrew culture, does not need to be effective in early growing stages, but only in the harvest season. This is because when you remove the chaff you can also reap the wheat⁽⁷⁾. When you reap the wheat you also remove the chaff. However, according to the warning contained in this parable, none of this happens without the plain knowledge of our Lord.

When transporting the referred enactors through this biblical passage, the Lord is materialized in the image of the readers to whom the existence of the wheat and chaff are targeted. It was up to them to have the foresight to watch two representatives of the same realm grow together, even though they come from different families.

On the other hand, the recurrence of the difficulties associated with the sale of facilities has accompanied Man since ancient times, and will not cease, at least not in the near future. In this sense, the Christian Bible illustrates a situation in which Jesus Christ was travelling through Galilee, teaching and preaching the gospel of His kingdom. When he saw the large crowd waiting for him, he went up a nearby mountain where he sat down, and his disciples came to him. He said to them *Adtendite the falsis Prophetis qui adveniunt you in vestimentis ovium intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapacious* – Beware, however, of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves⁽⁸⁾.

In spite of the religious beliefs of each reader, the context of the Hebrew literature mentioned here can be seamlessly transported to the daily life of each one of us. It is the responsibility of the consumers of research and the scientific community to arm themselves with what is considered one of the cornerstones of the Evidence-Based Practice, that is, access to information.

REFERÊNCIAS

1. DOI [homepage on internet]. DOI News. April 2011 [cited 2013 Apr 17]. Available from: <http://www.doi.org/news/DOINewsApr11.html#1>
2. Crossreforg [homepage on internet]. History/mission [cited 2013 Apr 17]. Available from: <http://www.crossref.org/01company/02history.html>
3. Crossreforg [homepage on internet]. Crosscheck [cited 2013 Apr 17]. Available from: <http://www.crossref.org/crosscheck/index.html>
4. Ithenticate [homepage on internet]. [cited 2013 Apr 17] Available from: <http://www.ithenticate.com/>
5. Conselho nacional de desenvolvimento científico e tecnológico [homepage on internet]. Plataforma Lattes [cited 2013 Apr 17]. Available from: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/>
6. Instituto Brasileiro de Informação em ciência e tecnologia [homepage on internet]. Centro Brasileiro do ISSN. Sobre o ISSN [cited 2013 Apr 17]. Available from: <http://www.ibict.br/informacao-para-ciencia-tecnologia-e-inovacao%20/centro-brasileiro-do-issn>
7. The Holy Bible. King James version. Grand Rapids (MI): Zondervan Publishing House; 1995. Matthew 13: 24-30.
8. The Holy Bible. King James version. Grand Rapids (MI): Zondervan Publishing House; 1995. Matthew 7:15.

Received: 17/04/2013

Approved: 17/04/2013