

Volume 11, n 3, 2023

Editorial

On Originality and Advancement of Publishing in the Clinical Psychological Field

Emanuele Maria Merlo ¹

¹ Department of Biomedical and Dental Sciences and Morphofunctional Imaging, University of Messina, Messina, Italy

E-mail corresponding author: emerlo@unime.it



Keywords:

Clinical Psychology; Editing; Originality; Psychological Field; Scientific advancement.

Citation: Merlo E.M. (2023). On Originality and Advancement of Publishing in the Clinical Psychological Field. *Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology* 11(3).

<https://doi.org/10.13129/2282-1619/mjcp-3952>

The commitment and role of clinical psychology refers to various fields of scientific interest. There is a growing interest in clinical psychology in the field of patient care, with particular reference to those domains where the aetiology is partly or entirely of a psychological nature (Baker et al., 2008; Barchetta et al., 2021; Caputo et al., 2022; Christensen & Ehlers, 2002; Conversano, 2019; Hajcak & Klawohn, 2019; Levine et al., 2021; Ricciardi et al., 2023; Silvestro et al., 2023; Vita et al., 2020). In this sense, it is possible to observe how the advancement of diagnostic techniques and the irreplaceable clinical relationship constitute strong points, for example referring to recent pandemic experience (Bochicchio et al., 2023; Boden et al., 2021; Gruber, 2021). This evolution is due both to clinical and research processes. These processes play a fundamental role for the sector, since the commitment of researchers allows both advancement in the knowledge of research methods and clinical practice (Davey, 2021; Gee et al., 2022; Spring, 2007). It is possible to see how the application of clinical psychology to fields of medical interest is growing and producing results in terms of clinical evidence. The strong background of clinical psychology therefore grows in the presence of new methodologies useful for bringing out new factors contributing to the patient's quality of life and, in a pathological sense, to the decrease in existential quality and expectations.

In this sense the Journal may represent a secure base for the publication of quality scientific articles in line with the needs of the entire sector. The various contributions published over the years attract the attention of colleagues, who can use them for their own research purposes and to guide clinical practice based on the evidence that has emerged in compliance with ethics and clinical methodology. This point appears to be particularly relevant, as it has often emerged that the predatory attitudes of some Journals undermine the field of research (Cobey et al., 2018; Lukić et al., 2014; Mathew & Patel, 2022; Yamada & Teixeira da Silva, 2022). A third fundamental point has been addressed in recent years. The third mission in fact represents that example of public engagement through which the results of clinical research can be transmitted to other sectors and to the non-specialist public (Albulescu et al., 2014; Brandt et al., 2018; Culum et al., 2013; Pinheiro et al., 2015; Settineri, 2023).

A particular theme with respect to the advancement of the sector in the scientific field appears to be originality. Some important contributions have highlighted the advantages and limitations of methodologies aimed at proving the originality of scientific contributions in the publishing field (Barlösius, 2019; Boring, 1927; Børresen, 2016; Dirk, 1999; 19. Guetzkow et al., 2004). In particular Hou et al. (2022) highlighted how the *scientometric* approach represents a series of methodologies generally based on the citation of articles and related *ex post* analyses. In this sense it is possible to think about how typical scientometric indicators, as in the case of Altmetrics (Priem et al., 2012), classic indexes for Journals such as Impact Factor, Scimago Journal Ranking, Alternative Metrics have been successful in the evaluation of Journals and are considered by the Ministries in terms of performance. In this sense, it is possible to note how the issue is more specific to the Journal than to the individual researcher, and that the results obtained from the indexes act as a guide for the researchers themselves in order to select a quality target for the submission. What emerged from the work of Hou and colleagues, as in the case of other contributions referring to originality and quality is that these indicators are external to the research itself. Shibayama & Wang (2020) suggested that it is still necessary to distinguish influence from originality in science. Today we are witnessing many advances in this field, so it is possible to note how the analyses referring to originality (Existing measures of originality) and to the peer review process range from "Analysis of Knowledge components" to "Citation networks" to the "Analysis of knowledge combination" to arrive at the constitution of "Knowledge unit networks" and "Semantic similarity models". Again, Hou and colleagues (2022) suggested a particular model of originality based on the analysis of the relationships between the set of similar links in each semantic link together with the average of the semantic pairs and the sum of the links in the single document.

These methodologies represent points of interest that should be discussed in terms of *Infometrics* in order to compare their effectiveness and usability in the editorial field. Shibayama & Wang (2020) distinguished different types of measures referring to scientific contributions. In fact, distinguish basic measures referring to the citation contents of a single contribution, weighted measures based on the rank of belonging of the cited and citing articles, measures of originality (as in the cases previously discussed) or qualitative-quantitative measures and finally prediction of future citation based on regression models and therefore dependence. These contributions reflect the state of the art regarding the question based on influence and originality, leaning towards a quantitative and basically *ex post* orientation. As is known, the peer review process is preceded by preliminary assessments useful for the continuation of the peer evaluation. In this sense, although the issues mentioned above represent advances and methodologies to be evaluated, the first evaluations could be inspired by considering fundamental questions. For example, this is the case of the qualitative status of the work in terms of content and form, the presence of high-quality contributions capable of supporting the authors' declarations and results, as well as the prediction of the interest aroused by the contribution in a general and with full reference to the question of originality.

The rapid advancement highlights some problematic points that also refer to the concept of certification and some fixed points that we should be used to considering. With reference to the long impact of the peer review process, due in historical terms to the *Philosophical transaction* of the *Royal Society of London* (1665), it is possible to note some important reflection points. *Nature* provided for a large number of active debates on editorial issues, as in the case of the digital object identifier which today appears irreplaceable although some series of high-level contributions do not include dois. Some of the debates turn out to be particularly indicative of ongoing processes, as in the case of "Certification in a Digital Era", "Evolving Peer Review for the Internet" and "Wisdom of the Crowds".

Some fundamental points remain indispensable, as in the case of ethics, epistemology, State and Ministerial indications. In the specific case of the life of a Journal, it is fundamental to reflect on adherence to the declared aim and scopes, as well as a constant process of analysis of the research designs, methodology, adequacy of the involved samples, formulation of the hypotheses, relevant ethic committees' approval, processing of the results and their comparison with existing high-quality literature, contributions considered in terms quality and purpose.

This is understood within an epistemological framework supporting the entire process of theoretical and practical research. What has been stated therefore refers to research processes as well as to the life of a Journal, whose purpose remains that of allowing the emergence of quality scientific contributions.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any potential conflict of interest.

References

1. Albulescu, V. L., Litra, M., & Neagu, C. (2014). The “third mission” of universities and some implications. *UPB Science Bulletin, Series D*, 76(2), 301-312.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6053.2009.01036.x>
2. Baker, T. B., McFall, R. M., & Shoham, V. (2008). Current status and future prospects of clinical psychology: Toward a scientifically principled approach to mental and behavioral health care. *Psychological science in the public interest*, 9(2), 67-103. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18136696>
3. Barchetta, S., Martino, G., Craparo, G., Salehinejad, M. A., Nitsche, M. A., & Vicario, C. M. (2021). Alexithymia is linked with a negative bias for past and current events in healthy humans. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(13), 6696. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243918808370>
4. Barlösius, E. (2019). Concepts of originality in the natural science, medical, and engineering disciplines: An analysis of research proposals. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 44(6), 915-937.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243918808370>
5. Bochicchio, V., Mezzalana, S., Maldonato, N. M., Cantone, E., & Scandurra, C. (2023). Olfactory-related quality of life impacts psychological distress in people with COVID-19: The affective implications of olfactory dysfunctions. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 323, 741-747. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2022.12.049>
6. Boden, M., Zimmerman, L., Azevedo, K. J., Ruzek, J. I., Gala, S., Magid, H. S. A., ... & McLean, C. P. (2021). Addressing the mental health impact of COVID-19 through population health. *Clinical psychology review*, 85, 102006. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102006>
7. Boring, E. G. (1927). The problem of originality in science. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 39(1/4), 70-90.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1415402>
8. Børresen, T. (2016). Originality in Research—Is Your Manuscript Original?. *Journal of Aquatic Food Product Technology*, 25(1), 1-1. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10498850.2016.1116333>
9. Brandt, L., Schober, B., Schultes, M. T., Somoza, V., & Spiel, C. (2018). Supporting Third Mission activities at Universities: Deans' opinions and recommendations. *Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung*, 13(2), 21-40.
<https://doi.org/10.3217/zfhe-13-02/02>
10. Caputo, A., Vicario, C. M., Cazzato, V., & Martino, G. (2022). Psychological Factors as Determinants of Medical Conditions, Volume II. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 865235.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.865235>
11. Christensen, A. J., & Ehlers, S. L. (2002). Psychological factors in end-stage renal disease: an emerging context for behavioral medicine research. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 70(3), 712.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.70.3.712>
12. Cobey, K. D., Lalu, M. M., Skidmore, B., Ahmadzai, N., Grudniewicz, A., & Moher, D. (2018). What is a predatory journal? A scoping review. *F1000Research*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.15256.1>
13. Conversano, C. (2019). Common psychological factors in chronic diseases. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 2727.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02727>

14. Ćulum, B., Rončević, N., & Ledić, J. (2013). Facing new expectations—Integrating third mission activities into the university. *The academic profession in Europe: New tasks and new challenges*, 163-195.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4614-5_9
15. Davey, G. C. (2021). *Psychopathology: Research, assessment and treatment in clinical psychology*. John Wiley & Sons.
16. Dirk, L. (1999). A measure of originality: The elements of science. *Social Studies of Science*, 29(5), 765-776.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/030631299029005004>
17. Gee, D. G., DeYoung, K. A., McLaughlin, K. A., Tillman, R. M., Barch, D. M., Forbes, E. E., ... & Shackman, A. J. (2022). Training the next generation of clinical psychological scientists: A data-driven call to action. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, 18, 43-70. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-081219-092500>
18. Gruber, J., Prinstein, M. J., Clark, L. A., Rottenberg, J., Abramowitz, J. S., Albano, A. M., ... & Weinstock, L. M. (2021). Mental health and clinical psychological science in the time of COVID-19: Challenges, opportunities, and a call to action. *American Psychologist*, 76(3), 409. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000707>
19. Guetzkow, J., Lamont, M., & Mallard, G. (2004). What is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences?. *American Sociological Review*, 69(2), 190-212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240406900203>
20. Hajcak, G., Klawohn, J., & Meyer, A. (2019). The utility of event-related potentials in clinical psychology. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, 15, 71-95.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050718-095457>
21. Hou, J., Wang, D., & Li, J. (2022). A new method for measuring the originality of academic articles based on knowledge units in semantic networks. *Journal of Informetrics*, 16(3), 101306.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2022.101306>
22. Levine, G. N., Cohen, B. E., Commodore-Mensah, Y., Fleury, J., Huffman, J. C., Khalid, U., ... & American Heart Association Council on Clinical Cardiology; Council on Arteriosclerosis, Thrombosis and Vascular Biology; Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing; and Council on Lifestyle and Cardiometabolic Health. (2021). Psychological health, well-being, and the mind-heart-body connection: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*, 143(10), e763-e783.
<https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0000000000000947>
23. Lukić, T., Blešić, I., Basarin, B., Ivanović, B. L., Milošević, D., & Sakulski, D. (2014). Predatory and fake scientific journals/publishers: A global outbreak with rising trend: A review. *Geographica Pannonica*, 18(3), 69-81. <https://doi.org/10.5937/GeoPan1403069L>
24. Mathew, R. P., & Patel, V. (2022). Predatory journals-The power of the predator versus the integrity of the honest. *Current Problems in Diagnostic Radiology*, 51(5), 740-746.
<https://doi.org/10.1067/j.cpradiol.2021.07.005>
25. Pinheiro, R., Langa, P. V., & Pausits, A. (2015). The institutionalization of universities' third mission: Introduction to the special issue. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 5(3), 227-232.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2015.1044551>
26. Priem, J., Parra, C., Piwowar, H. A., Groth, P., & Waagmeester, A. (2012, May). Uncovering impacts: a case study in using altmetrics tools. In *SePublica@ESWC* (pp. 40-44).

27. Ricciardi, L., Spatari, G., Vicario, C. M., Liotta, M., Cazzato, V., Gangemi, S., & Martino, G. (2023). Clinical Psychology and Clinical Immunology: is there a link between Alexithymia and severe Asthma?. *Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.13129/2282-1619/mjcp-3704>
28. Settineri, S. (2023). Italian Academic Third Mission and Clinical Psychology. *Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.13129/2282-1619/mjcp-3780>
29. Shibayama, S., & Wang, J. (2020). Measuring originality in science. *Scientometrics*, 122(1), 409-427. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03263-0>
30. Silvestro, O., Ricciardi, L., Catalano, A., Vicario, C. M., Tomaiuolo, F., Pioggia, G., ... & Martino, G. (2023). Alexithymia and asthma: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1221648>
31. Spring, B. (2007). Evidence-based practice in clinical psychology: What it is, why it matters; what you need to know. *Journal of clinical psychology*, 63(7), 611-631. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20373>
32. Vita, R., Caputo, A., Quattropani, M. C., Watt, T., Feldt-Rasmussen, U., Puleio, P., ... & Martino, G. (2020). Quality of life in patients with hyperthyroidism: where do we stand?. *Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.6092/2282-1619/mjcp-2521>
33. Yamada, Y., & Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2022). A psychological perspective towards understanding the objective and subjective gray zones in predatory publishing. *Quality & Quantity*, 56(6), 4075-4087. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01307-3>



©2023 by the Author(s); licensee Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, Messina, Italy. This article is an open access article, licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported License. Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2023). International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).
DOI: 10.13129/2282-1619/mjcp-3952