

## Challenges of Biomedical Science Advances-Effective Publishing, Communication and Exchange

**Aleksandar S\***

Department for Applied Mechanics, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**\*Corresponding author:** Aleksandar Susic, Department for Applied Mechanics, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Croatia, Tel: +38516168570; Email: asusic@fsb.hr

**Received Date:** April 17, 2020; **Published Date:** June 04, 2020

### Editorial

Regarding challenges of engineering design of products-success depends on specific product and utilization knowledge, appropriate design and research experience (R&D), customer and prospective user feedback and knowledge about certain products requirements and functionality. Analogous, Biomedical (Engineering) Science Advances and devices/solutions rely on proper identification of criterions to be met, utilization of specifics and many other relevant parameters asf, but it ultimately depends on the premise that all the relevant knowledge and technologies should be properly integrated. But, it is not that easy.

Biomedical Sciences, as defined by the UK Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education Benchmark Statement in 2015, includes those science disciplines whose primary focus is the biology of human health and disease and ranges from the generic study of biomedical sciences and human biology to more specialised subject areas, where disciplines and professions involved are merged by objectives. As such, the biomedical sciences have a much wider range of academic and research activities and economic significance than that defined by hospital laboratory sciences, so the Biomedical Sciences are the major focus of bioscience research and funding in the 21st century. One of most prominent outcome is advances that impact significantly upon the health and well-being of individuals and entire society, but the gained knowledge, experience and emerged new technologies should also be noticed. It is thus important to emphasize specialisms within biomedical science that may be traditionally grouped in these main divisions: specialisms involving life sciences, specialisms involving physiological science and specialisms involving medical physics or bioengineering. It is somewhat obvious that divisions mentioned are just the tip of the

iceberg, and since specialisms included are at least 40 and still growing in number, implies necessity of inter and multidisciplinary merging. With this said, one should recognize another perspective of biomedical sciences that reveal necessity to integrate knowledge and contributions from various academic and professional communities, but at the same time, there is no proven protocol or framework how it should be done. This opens another challenge, or problem, if not addressed properly. Deep and narrowed academic, research and professional scope of interest provide great results, specialized contributions and knowledge, however their synthesis as well as their dissemination are another challenges that needs to be recognized. In most cases it isn't so, and in others can be applied very partial. We can argue why and how and so on, but the essence of this challenge is very complex, with many stakeholders involved, and from various perspectives. It can be recognized that the Biomedical Science System (BSS) is structured by at least few stakeholder groups: the scientists, scholars and everyone involved in R&D, then the biomedical industry companies, grants and funding providers and finally the publishers of discoveries and findings. Of course, legislators and formal approval bodies are involved, but we're discussing the exchange and communication issues within BSS community and everyone that is involved in this exchange.

Let's use anecdotal example to simplify perspective: At one occasion I needed advice from mathematician since references were dealing with numerous issues and topics, and I couldn't find the appropriate mathematical solution. After some time, we have managed to understand each other, but firstly we needed to adopt terminology mutually. As conclusion on our consultation, mathematician discussed: 'mathematicians have many areas of expertise, within them we have developed many appropriate methods, solutions

and models, but we don't know all of their real life purposes unless someone asks as you did, then we can even improve them, not only present their possible utilization. Moreover, with real world problems that need to be solved, we can also appropriately test all of our solutions, and create even better ones". This short story - anecdote emphasized several important issues for everyone dealing with academic and research publishing, reference use/review, reference acquiring and consequently citation, all necessary for the purpose of BSS advances.

In very abundant research/scientific and professional scopes, their narrowed specialization and limited time to follow advances of significant cognitions, providing adequate and timely source is crucial. This is even more present in biomedical sciences, where so many research and professional communities are involved. It is also understandable that the published papers and their results are addressed towards the specific problems, covered by Journals aims and scope with objective to reach its readers, so may not be adapted for wider audience involved. Thus, it is recognized that although so many problems are already solved, they might be literally buried under a myriad of published papers, databases and vast source of knowledge, subdivided by countless reasoning's. And as another significant fact, so many papers aren't published at all due the Journals policies to reject but a few percentages of submitted papers, regardless the papers quality, scientific contribution or importance, thus I will be free to tag such Journals as spoiled brat Journals since they prefer mostly papers with very abundant funding, and of course, native English speakers, while others are left aside, or simply rejected as irrelevant. I believe that many can concur with similar experience, at least once in their career, if not even more recurrent. This is opportunity for open source Journals, but the fact that many researchers deal with severe insufficient funding and support, is another part of the problem even for open source publishing. Even in scenarios when everything seems to be managed properly, there's still one important issue that this Editorial is about. There is significant lack of understanding between scholars with various backgrounds, whether because of terminology or perspective on the same problem, the problem characterization or myriad of possible reasons. Anyhow, there is lack of synthesis of knowledge throughout the references about the specific topic and finally, narrowed scope of the Journals that miss to connect the perspectives. On the other hand, very wide set aims and

scope of the Journals require endless referee source that are competent to provide appropriate and relevant paper evaluation, beside just grammar or other language issues. Just to accentuate, I completely support quality and novelty of the papers, but on the other hand, scholar with proper personal ethics aims to contribute on that basis without the doubt. Moreover, many academic communities, even if insufficiently funded and equipped, whether they are or not native English speakers, also offer their contribution to the world. Benevolence and competence of the referees, without arrogant attitude and capable to reach the essence of the contribution, and to suggest improvements to the scholars and other involved can be another step towards better communication and exchange of knowledge and ideas. There is also potential for dissemination of perspectives and even for a new cooperation that might emerge.

In conclusion, since the biomedical science is multi and inter disciplinary field of expertise, many different groups of profiles and with multitude of specialisms are involved, invention of platform that would enable effective resource of published or even just submitted papers, knowledge and ideas exchange, will improve and solve many parts of the issues even those not mentioned in this Editorial. Let's just name a few, and the reader may be free to add anything that applies: identification of mutually compatible and competent partners, ease of simplifying of access to grants, better and comprehensive results and outcomes, asf. Besides just publishing our papers, they need to be promoted and visible, accessed, read and understood, but the scientific publishing and librarians still struggle to offer proper and unified platform, because of the economic priorities.

Hence, when you open the pages of Current Scientific Research in Biomedical Sciences (CSRBS), you can see that although the primary goal of this Open Source platform is to gather scientific contributions, it can be also recognized as platform to connect everyone involved to the similar interest or topic, to collaborate, exchange and advance our efforts internationally. It is up to publishers which policy they choose, and what their primary service is and for whom. I believe that CSRBS can recognize their opportunity for the benefit of all, which partly they already have done, by gathered multinational Editorial Board, from various professions. Let's support this vision without frontiers.

We can analyze the past, but the future is still to be written...