

Commentary to the Evaluation of Journals

Joseph J. Smulsky

06.10.2017.

1. Introduction

In mid-September of 2017, I was invited by the working group on the expert assessment of the quality of Russian journals to take part in assessing the quality of these journals. The evaluation is carried out with the aim of identifying the best journals in the Russian Scientific Citation Index (RINC – in Russian) and placing them in the form of the Russian Science Citation Index (RSCI – in English) database. At the first stage, 652 journals were selected. They entered in the RSCI and in the core of the RINC. I was invited to take part in the second stage to correct and replenish this list. In addition, it could be suggested to include additional journals in the list of journals under consideration.

I took part in the evaluation of journals and added my "Commentary to the Evaluation of Journals" which follows.

2. My evaluation of journals

To a number of journals I put a low rating based on the following considerations.

The journal is a tribune of a narrow circle of people for the manifestation of their agreements in the field of science. It rejects articles with research results that refute the hypotheses of those close to the journal.

The journal publishes low-quality articles of authors who receive government grants, for example the RFBR, and rejects high-quality papers of the authors, which are non-recipients of grants. In Future, the author with publications in this journal is awarded grants. These actions create a corrupt system of financing unscientific activities in the scientific community.

The journal is not interested in developing research in the cognition of the surrounding world. He stands guard over the dominant falsified theories, for example, the Theory of Relativity.

By these actions, the journal hinders the development of science and the progress of human society. Therefore, I give him the lowest score.

3. Some suggestions

3.1. New principles of publication

For the successful development of science, in particular for the elimination of the modern scientific understanding of micro - and macrocosm, unreal and false, it is necessary to go to other principles for selecting papers for publication [1]. In particular, the reviewer's status and responsibility should be upgraded: the reviewer's surname should be published in the editor's notes to the paper, and his performance should be in fractions of the scientific work of the author, for example, in the form of 0.05 - 0.2 share, depending on the amount of reviewer labour. Additionally, the author's arguments should be equal in rights with the arguments of the reviewer: in cases when the author reasonably refutes the arguments of the reviewer, the paper is published with the arguments of the reviewer and the refutations of the author.

After moving the journal to new principles of publishing papers, it is possible returning to the problem of the status of the journal.

3.2. Evaluation of the paper on the quality of its content, and not on the quality of the place of its publication.

Assessment of the effectiveness of the scientist by the availability of his publications in the core of the RINC or of the Web of Science, depends on the quality of these journals. Now this quality is such that it hinders the development of science.

This assessment system can not hamper the progress of science if all the existing journals in the core are deleted and start incorporating them into the core, based on the new above-mentioned principles for selecting papers for publication.

A more reliable system for assessing the effectiveness of a scientist may not be by the quality of the place of publication of his work, but by the quality of their content. This system is proposed in many details by Dr. Phis.-Math. Sc. V.G. Polnikov [2] and supported by me [3].

3.3. Journal "*The Way of Science*"

I propose to include the journal "The Way of Science" (Russia, Volgograd, <http://scienceway.ru>.) in the list of multidisciplinary Journals of a broad profile. The Journal publishes articles on the most pressing issues that face human society. Giving this status to the journal will contribute to the progress of science and our country.

What determines the progress of the state?

All modern progress: computers, mobile phones, GPS, etc. is created not by the high-ranking science of the Mainstream, but in spite of it. The principles of operation of new devices very often refute the provisions of academic science. The creators of these devices do not have academic ranks, and sometimes, as the founder of "Apple" even do not have higher education. However, their intellect is superior to the intellect of any representative of the Mainstream, if the intellect is meant the ability to solve previously unresolved problems. The creators of everything new themselves do their scientific research to know the unknown, and with their help they find solutions to the problems that arise before them.

Now the resolution on the funding of applied scientific research is determined by rating publications. This will provide funding for individuals from the Mainstream, but not those who really can make technical progress. Therefore, the success of development of our state depends directly on the quality assessment of scientific papers.

References.

1. Smulsky J.J. On the improvement of the scientific press. 12.02.07. (In Russian) <http://www.ikz.ru/~smulski/smul1/Russian1/FounPhysics/Itogiht.htm>.
2. Polnikov V.G. On the qualification ranking of research workers. *The Way of Science. International scientific journal*. 2015, No. 10 (20), pp. 144-148. (In Russian). <http://scienceway.ru/arhiv>.
3. Smulsky J.J. On performance indicator of scientist's scientific work. *The Way of Science. International scientific journal*, No. 10 (32), 2016, pp. 8-16. (In Russian). <http://www.ikz.ru/~smulski/Papers/PokRezNauchD4.pdf>, <http://scienceway.ru/arhiv>.