than 30 medical journals in various fields, special issues and translated journals. Turkey Citation Index is a large database built on Türkçe Kılklıleri periodicals, designed to improve the quality and visibility of local publications. Since 2008, the archived issues of these periodicals feature 146 indexed medical journals.

Indicators such as “national impact factor” and “contribution value” are currently available. National impact factor reflects the impact factor of indexed journals. Contribution value evaluates citations of an indexed article to other indexed articles. To join the Turkey Citation Index, journals must be published regularly, i.e. at least twice a year. In addition, the references must be formatted according to the standard regulations. Turkey Citation Index also conducts studies on standardisation; e.g., Turkey Scientific Terms aims to develop a nomenclature of keywords based on Medical Subject Headings vocabulary of the US National Library of Medicine. Medical journals indexed by Turkey Citation Index each published, on average, 44 articles (range 5-350) in 2010. Nearly half of these were research articles (range 15-100).

Hayrettin Bulletin of Social Sciences and Humanity was the first journal indexed by the Institute for Scientific Information back in 1970.1 but it lasted only two years. Twelve years later, the Turkish Journal of Pediatrics was accepted for indexing by SCI-E, and remained the only Turkish journal listed in SCI-E until 1994. From 2006 - 2009, the number of journals indexed by this prestigious database rose from 69 to 125. Currently, 75 Turkish journals are listed in Thomson Scientific databases,2 with Energy Education Science and Technology having the highest 2-year JIF (8.333). SCI-I lists 56 medical journals, of which 34 are published in English. Journal Citation Report (JCR) 2010 listed 49 Turkish journals, of which 23 are medical journals, with Experimental and Clinical Transplantation having the highest 2-year JIF (0.873).

The SCOPUS database includes 27 Turkish publishers.3 The number of Turkish medical journals in SCImago Journal and Country Rank database is 74; the leading ones are shown in the Table. The majority of these journals are published in English.

English is the predominant language in scientific publishing.4 Current trends of publishing high-quality and well-edited articles in international journals may adversely affect the prestige and productivity of local journals. At the same time, publishing local journals in Turkish may decrease the chances of their being indexed in international databases and attracting citations. In order to increase a journal’s quality, it is recommended to publish in English or in Turkish and English simultaneously. In any case, editors should encourage more submission of articles in either language to local journals.

In Turkey unfortunately, it has a devastating impact on local publications. It is hoped that national indexing services will increase the visibility and prestige of Turkish journals. More extensive journal indexing in both national and international databases should be encouraged.

An important factor influencing the rank and quality of local journals is the credentials of the Editors, who are mainly from universities. Strengthening ties with international publishers and professional associations, as well as regularly organising training seminars, may become a powerful tool for improving a journal’s quality.

To increase the number and quality of research articles, local learned societies and science editors should cooperate and adopt international standards of scientific writing. More incentives should be offered to Turkish researchers to publish their best articles in local journals. Editors and publishers should also arrange more training. Editors should improve the design and readability of journals. English language editing should be done by native English-speaking experts. Internationalisation of authors, reviewers and editors pool should also be encouraged. Finally, the academic promotion need to be revised to credit publications in local journals.
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Impact factors of the Web of Science-indexed Turkish medical journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>2-year</th>
<th>SJR</th>
<th>B-index</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental and Clinical Transplantation</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Sports Science and Medicine</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Journal of Gastroenterology</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Journal of Neurosurgery</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalus Journal of Dentistry</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkan Pathology</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliyet: Doutches</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Journal of Pediatrics</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalus Pathology: Dentistry</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuous professional development of researchers and those involved in science writing and editing is of importance, especially for non-anglophone communities striving to advance in medical journals. Though countries of mainstream research offer numerous academic courses and degree programmes on biomedical writing and editing, these are still not accessible for most novice researchers and editors from developing countries. Besides, there is still lack of scholarly communication between experts in science editing from developed and developing countries. Information on current standards on biomedical writing and successful editing is scarce and is not properly distributed and interpreted. With that in mind, a group of medical editors, supported by Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, arranged a seminar on hot topics in medical journalism.

The seminar took place in the University Education Development Centre on 25 June 2011. It was well attended by academicians, researchers from Haematology and Cardiovascular Research Centres, Publication Centre of the University, editors of the Iranian Cardiovascular Research Journal, Iranian Journal of Radiology, Archives of Iranian Medicine, Journal of Dentistry of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, International Journal of Organ Transplantation Medicine, and The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine.

Editors of The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, European Science Editing and Iranian Cardiovascular Research Journal at the Shiraz seminar (from left: A. Simi, M. Yadollahi, F. Habibzadeh, A. Y. Gasparay, M. Ghods)

One of the invited lecturers, Prof. Arman Yurgi Gasparay, member of editorial boards of several high-rank Iranian journals and the chief editor of European Science Editing, gave a talk “Current Principles of High Impact Science Editing and Indexing Biomedical Journals”, outlining the issues of funding, improving the qualifications of editors, networking with colleagues from the European Association of Science Editors and other professional associations, and widening visibility of journals. The indexing criteria of different databases and their relevance to the local community of editors were also highlighted. Most issues touched on during the talk were of interest to the editors of small journals, struggling to get indexed by prestigious databases and listed in different categories examples from the lecturer’s own editorial practice. Many points of the talk are elegantly presented in the recently published essay on journal editing.5 Dr. Karim Vessal, one of the eminent radiologists, founder of medical journalism in Iran, Editor-in-Chief of Iranian Journal of Radiation and member of the Iranian Academy of Medical Sciences, presented a history of medical journalism in Iran and challenges with establishing and indexing journals in the Middle East. He was fascinated by the growth of science publishing and digitization in Iran and quite optimistic over the fate of local journals, some of which were indexed and succeeded under his guidance. Main points of his talk were discussed in an essay in European Science Editing.6

Dr. Farrokh Habibzadeh, Vice-President of the World Association of Medical Editors and founding editor of The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, delivered highly educational lectures on peer review, plagiarism and impact factors. A large part of his lectures was based on his own publications.7, 8 He described in detail the main steps in reviewing manuscripts, elements of success in the peer review and reporting the review results. The issue of plagiarism of words and ideas was also thoroughly discussed, and options to avoid this type of scientific misconduct, particularly by improving English language skills, were touched upon. In his final presentation Dr. Habibzadeh explained his experience with Shiraz University of Medical Sciences (the former Pahlavi University School of Medicine, a sister association to the University of Pennsylvania, USA) is one
of the leading academic centres in the Eastern Mediterranean region. For decades, the University used English as its institutional language and accepted numerous visiting professors from top world universities. Most of its current faculty members are world-renowned specialists, who contributed to medical education and science growth in Iran and in the region.1 2

The University is also famous for its high standards in education and journal publishing. One of the oldest English-language publications, Journal of Medical Sciences (formerly Pahlavi Medical Journal) was launched by the University, edited by Dr. Karim Vessal and was indexed on MedLine.2

Vessal presented several newly launched Iranian journals, where Dr. Habibzadeh and Dr. Karim Vessal and was indexed on MedLine.2

One of the oldest English-language publications, Journal of Medical Sciences (formerly Pahlavi Medical Journal) was launched by the University, edited by Dr. Karim Vessal and was indexed on MedLine.2

The University of Split, Croatia

When I started editing a small journal in a small country 20 years ago, I soon realized that our authors often had good data but little knowledge and few skills in presenting and writing about them.3 Our work with authors naturally developed into teaching critical reading and science communication to medical students in a mandatory second year course.4

Working with students proved to be the most effective way of creating a critical mass of (future) successful researchers and research-minded physicians.5

The next move was rather obvious – outside medicine and teach research methods and writing to a multidisciplinary group, where research is usually performed in contemporary science.

The Croatian National Science Foundation recognized the importance of such training and has so far funded three Summer Schools of Scientific Communication at the University of Split in Croatia. Our main argument for getting the funding, despite comments that scientific writing is a part of every doctoral programme in Croatia, was the finding from a study of our colleagues from the Faculty of Humanities, University of Split, that 50% of all masters theses and 15% of all doctoral theses produced at medical schools in Croatia ended up as publications in journals indexed in PubMed.6

The Summer School of Scientific Communication in Split has developed over the years into an international and multidisciplinary forum for young researchers – not only to improve their writing and publication skills but to understand the specificities of other disciplines and experience collaboration across research fields. We started with an initial teaching team of experienced editors and methodologists and invited colleagues from other research areas to join us.7

Two outstanding participants joined Professor Elizabeth Wager of SideView, the chair of COPE, UK; Professor Christopher Vinković described his experience as an astrophysicist from the Faculty of Physics, University of Split, and me. They were Professor Les Olson, moving out of British Columbia, Professor Les Olson, moving out of British Columbia, Professors Fredian Raffaelli, editor in chief of Contemporary Linguistics and professor of Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Contemporary Linguistics and professor of Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Contemporary Linguistics and professor of Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Contemporary Linguistics and professor of Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Contemporary Linguistics and professor of Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Contemporary Linguistics and professor of Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Contemporary Linguistics and professor of Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Contemporary Linguistics and professor of Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Contemporary Linguistics and professor of Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Professor Dejan Vinković, astrophysicist from the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics at the University of Split.

We worked with 20 exceptional students from all over Europe—from the Czech Republic, Montenegro, and, of course, Croatia. Their range of research disciplines was even greater: clinical medicine and public health, psychology, mathematical modelling of chemical reactions, law, phonetics, information sciences, philosophy, medical publishing, kinesiology, medieval glass archaeology, and pre-Romanesque sculptures. Indeed, Anglo-Saxon colleagues might be surprised by the inclusion of humanities in our science school, but we believe that knowledge of the European tradition of not distinguishing between research and science.

The focus of the summer school was learning about writing in your own discipline by exploring the differences and similarities with other research fields. Although we might find great differences in the content and form of research presentation between clinical medicine and the history of art, the rigour of scientific thinking, exploration, and presentation of ideas and findings is similar. When we explored the basic structure of the scientific article and data presentation, we also constantly challenged the differences across the disciplines and tried to understand why they were necessary and how they enriched research communication. We learned from our colleagues from the humanities and social sciences about the special way they structured the introduction section (much longer than in biomedicine), how they differentiated between the abstract and the summary, and why their manuscripts were often longer than ours in biomedicine and natural sciences. Professor Vinković described his experience as an astrophysicist collaborating with social science researchers – sharing with us some of his frustrations but also the many benefits in novel research and great publications.

Perhaps the best evidence for the success of the summer school’s interdisciplinary approach comes from a comment by one of the participants in the evaluation questionnaire: “The main benefit of the workshop for me was new knowledge about the publication process. The second great benefit was making contacts with other young scientists from different areas. I have made a deal with four participants for future collaboration”7

Participants and teachers at the 2011 Summer School of Scientific Communication.

Writing in an interdisciplinary team

After morning sessions, which covered the theoretical and practical aspects of manuscript writing and data presentation, afternoons were reserved for the “paper clinic” – work on manuscripts that participants had been asked to bring to the summer school. Each lecturer had or his or her own team of students with manuscripts covering the topics of their expertise. Here was the opportunity for students to focus on the specific requirements in their research field as they worked individually and in small groups on revising their manuscripts. They also read their colleagues’ manuscripts and made comments—similar to journal peer review.

The participants appreciated learning details about peer review and editorial process in journals: knowing what happened to their manuscripts gave them greater confidence in the publication process and increased their hopes for future publication. Liz Wager introduced them to research integrity issues in publishing. Real cases of publication and research misconduct and not so clear-cut misbehaviour in research and publishing stimulated a very heated discussion, in which the participants shared their own experiences and appreciated expert advice.

Last, but not least, we all had great fun, not only because of the warm Adriatic (for a morning dip before classes) but because of the discussions and activities related to publishing and understanding the processes and continued after formal class work. Topics ranged from open access to the treasures of the Diocletian palace and the city of Split. There was an amusing raffle (with quite different entry tests) of writing apps such as superglue to keep IMRAD in order, and a magic ball with ready answers to all questions about publishing.

We hope you will join us next summer. The Croatian Science Foundation has discontinued its programme of summer schools for doctoral fellows, but we hope to find (multidisciplinary) funding for the next year – your help is greatly appreciated.

Ana Marušić
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Earlier in 2011 the Royal Society established a working group on the use of scientific information in ways that reflect public values. Some members of the working group discussed some of the issues behind this policy study in a Lancet article published in May and others were among the speakers at “An Open Meeting on Open Science” organized by the Royal Society’s Science Policy Centre on 8 June. After the meeting had been opened by Sir Paul Nurse, Secretary of the Royal Society, Mark Walport, Director of the Wellcome Trust, addressed the question “Why should science be open?” He noted that it is a characteristic of a free and enlightened society that knowledge should be available to all. He drew a parallel between campaigns to translate the bible from Latin into vernacular languages and some of the reactions from a powerful church that these provoked, with promotion of open access publishing and the reaction of a bible from Latin into vernacular languages and some of the themes that were key features of science, so openness was essential for science to function efficiently.

Philip Campbell, Editor of Nature, suggested that action to promote greater openness needs to come from the funders of research. He noted that people should not be under any illusion that one big fat open was good enough, and it would be possible to control the way that they were used. In a final session chaired by Professor Charlotte Waelde (Professor of Intellectual Property Law at the University of Exeter, Camden Neylon (Science and Technology Facilities Council), and Timo Hannay (Digital Science) spoke about the challenges in sharing data.

The outcomes of open research are maximized by allowing everyone access to the data. He thought that many arguments against greater openness. He viewed some arguments as having little merit - for example, that researchers should be allowed to hang on to data for their own benefit that making data available would add huge opportunity and financial costs, and that allowing the “unqualified” access to it would sow confusion. However, Sir Mark recognized that other arguments did have some merit - namely, that there were some results from the effort needed to make data publicly accessible.

(ii) In the developed world extraparrot data could be generated by researchers in the developing world.
(iii) The confidentiality of participants may be compromised.
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Acknowledgements in PhD theses

The literature provides plenty of advice on how to structure a PhD thesis but John Taylor had not been able to find anything on what was expected when you didn’t acknowledge anything! The acknowledgements in a thesis he was editing were long and amounted to a hyperbolic eulogy of the student’s professors and lecturers. He wanted to know if there was anything he could do about this. It was made clear from the forum that it made clear that such acknowledgements are common in theses world-wide and the general feeling was that editors should only correct obvious language errors. Mary Ellen Kerans pointed to research in applied linguistics (e.g. by Ken Hyland) which showed that students followed their own whims when writing acknowledgements as well as local departmental ‘rules’. Franscèse Saltzer-Meyer added that Mohammed Nahar Al-Ali (University of Jordan) had written a paper on acknowledgements in PhD dissertations written in English by Arab writers where she commented, ‘Allah was frequently acknowledged as well’.

Academic and socio-cultural identities in English dissertations acknowledged of Arab writers


Sylvia Ualnaka had also recently edited a paper (written by a Polish author) where about 30 people were mentioned in the acknowledgements, many she thought were without good reason. She had explained to the author that when publishing results in English they would need to follow English rules of science writing and advised them to correct this section in accordance with the http://www.ease.org.uk/guidelines/index.shtml. As a result the authors had greatly reduced the acknowledgements. Mary Ellen thought that while those guidelines worked for articles, acknowledgements in PhD theses typically had personal touches and a sincere, not-very-academic tone to them. Although Sylvia agreed that some flowery thanks may be acceptable, she considered a whole page unacceptable. Students should confine their thanks to those for which there was a good reason. However, from Carol Norris’ experience, which she illustrated with a photo of one of the stacks of those that had been edited from students in Finland, one to four pages of detailed and personal acknowledgements are normal. She commented that many people contribute much during one’s half a dozen years of research.

Joy Burrow, who edits theses by Dutch students, fervently defended long and emotional acknowledgements as a venue for young scientists to speak in their own words. She found the acknowledgements were often very personal. God may be mentioned and thanked, but also supervisors who have provided hospitality to foreign PhD students far from home, friends and colleagues who had been encouraging, or had contributed to data collection which had gone on long walks during which the problems of research/ the world etc. had been discussed.

James Hartley agreed with Mary Ellen that there is a problem with some acknowledgements in theses and acknowledged in papers. He commented that the inclusion of an acknowledgement section in scientific articles has increased from about 60% in the 1960s until it is now almost 100%. There were also disciplinary differences between papers in the arts, social sciences and sciences in the kinds of things acknowledged — funding, technical support, conceptual ideas, and editorial help. Blaise Cronin had researched the topic and more details could be read in pages 53-55 of Hartley, J. (2008) Academic Writing and Publishing published by Routledge.

Placement of table and figure captions

“Does anyone know why the captions for tables appear above the tables and the captions for figures below the figures?” James Hartley asked. Timo Hannay explained that in ESP the guideline was that tables (including figures) should be read. “At the top of a paper you cannot have a figure and a table,” said Tom Lang that William Playfair, who had created the concept of graphs, put the captions above the figures but he suspected that the location of captions had been determined by some aspect of early typesetting. Mary Ellen found that positioning varied depending on a journal’s house style. The British Journal of Anaesthesia, for example, puts what other journals would call ‘foot’ notes up at the bottom immediately after the table. She had been waiting for some time to be able to use the term immediately after the table and some IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers) journals put table ‘titles’ at the bottom.

Yateen had explored the topic some years previously and suggested that Laurence Penney had provided the answer to Tom’s questions in the quote “In general, it is good practice and polite to introduce things before showing them in the reader’s face. Tables, like sections in a book, particularly need an introduction since they are syntactic language and numbers abstracted away from their subject. A glance through a table is even less profitable than a glance through a block of text of that size. So tables need an introduction, hence a caption above them. By contrast pictures and figures usually serve as their own introduction. They are analogous to what they represent, there’s no change of mode. So it might be a bit disrespectful to use a caption below, which does not demand to be read.” Yateen added that what applies to the entire table (i.e. introduces it) goes into the headache and what is specific to particular cells goes into the footnote.

Placement of table and figure captions

As a result the authors had greatly reduced the acknowledgements. Mary Ellen thought that while those guidelines worked for articles, acknowledgements in PhD theses typically had personal touches and a sincere, not-very-academic tone to them. Although Sylvia agreed that some flowery thanks may be acceptable, she considered a whole page unacceptable. Students should confine their thanks to those for which there was a good reason. However, from Carol Norris’ experience, which she illustrated with a photo of one of the stacks of those that had been edited from students in Finland, one to four pages of detailed and personal acknowledgements are normal. She commented that many people contribute much during one’s half a dozen years of research.

Joy Burrow, who edits theses by Dutch students, fervently defended long and emotional acknowledgements as a venue for young scientists to speak in their own words. She found the acknowledgements were often very personal. God may be mentioned and thanked, but also supervisors who have provided hospitality to foreign PhD students far from home, friends and colleagues who had been encouraging, or had contributed to data collection which had gone on long walks during which the problems of research/ the world etc. had been discussed.

James Hartley agreed with Mary Ellen that there is a problem with some acknowledgements in theses and acknowledged in papers. He commented that the inclusion of an acknowledgement section in scientific articles has increased from about 60% in the 1960s until it is now almost 100%. There were also disciplinary differences between papers in the arts, social sciences and sciences in the kinds of things acknowledged — funding, technical support, conceptual ideas, and editorial help. Blaise Cronin had researched the topic and more details could be read in pages 53-55 of Hartley, J. (2008) Academic Writing and Publishing published by Routledge.

Placement of table and figure captions

“Does anyone know why the captions for tables appear above the tables and the captions for figures below the figures?” James Hartley asked. Timo Hannay explained that in ESP the guideline was that tables (including figures) should be read. “At the top of a paper you cannot have a figure and a table,” said Tom Lang that William Playfair, who had created the concept of graphs, put the captions above the figures but he suspected that the location of captions had been determined by some aspect of early typesetting. Mary Ellen found that positioning varied depending on a journal’s house style. The British Journal of Anaesthesia, for example, puts what other journals would call ‘foot’ notes up at the bottom immediately after the table. She had been waiting for some time to be able to use the term immediately after the table and some IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers) journals put table ‘titles’ at the bottom.

Yateen had explored the topic some years previously and suggested that Laurence Penney had provided the answer to Tom’s questions in the quote “In general, it is good practice and polite to introduce things before showing them in the reader’s face. Tables, like sections in a book, particularly need an introduction since they are syntactic language and numbers abstracted away from their subject. A glance through a table is even less profitable than a glance through a block of text of that size. So tables need an introduction, hence a caption above them. By contrast pictures and figures usually serve as their own introduction. They are analogous to what they represent, there’s no change of mode. So it might be a bit disrespectful to use a caption below, which does not demand to be read.” Yateen added that what applies to the entire table (i.e. introduces it) goes into the headache and what is specific to particular cells goes into the footnote.