The Fate of the Scientific Papers in Surgical Nursing Congresses in Turkey: Do We Publish What We Have Presented?
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Abstract: Background: The scientist's important responsibility is to conduct scientific research. With this responsibility, publication of information obtained after a scientific study is completed is the last phase and the most important step of the scientific method. It is necessary to publish the information that is the result of the research, to mediate new information and to be useful to the world. Objectives: The aim of this study was to determine the journal publication rate of the papers presented at at Surgical Nursing Congresses in Turkey in the last 5 years (2012-2016) and to examine the variables related to these rates. Methods: The universe of this descriptive research constitutes research reports presented at Turkish Surgery and operating room nursing, surgical nursing, colorectal surgery nursing, Hepato-pancreato-bilier Surgical Nursing, Neurosurgery Nursing, Emergency Nursing and Cardiovascular Surgery Nursing Congresses organized between 2012 and 2016. The abstracts of the oral and poster presentations were examined and literature analysis was conducted. Results: Out of 1319 papers in 19 abstract books, 752 research papers were examined. 410 (54.5%) of the papers were presented as poster presentations. The majority of the assessed researches was descriptive type (77%). It was determined that the publication rates of the papers 11.9%, 13.5% in verbal reports, 10.7% in poster reports. Conclusions: Our study was the first to evaluate the publication rates of abstracts presented at the nursing congresses. Compared with studies done in different sciences (21-65.7%), this ratio is seen to be low.
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INTRODUCTION

It is one of the important responsibilities of scientists, to do scientific research for produce new solutions to problems related to their fields. With this responsibility, scientists are conducting scientific research using scientific methods to make known the unknown, to search for an answer to a certain problem, to describe and explain the social and cultural elements, and to use the obtained data for humanity and nature. Publication of information obtained after a scientific study is completed is the last phase and the most important step of the scientific method (Sonmez, 2015; Uzbay, 2006; Graf et al., 2007).

New information is only becoming reality by publishing and is called scientific knowledge. For this reason, the researcher should not only stay with the research but also write the knowledge. This is an obligation as ethical as scientific (Sonmez, 2015; Day et al., 2012). In addition, Non-publishing of the study results causes loss of information, and constitutes a significant waste of energy, materials and funds (Yolcu, 2015; Schulte et al., 2012).

The two main ways of disseminating science are presenting at conferences or publishing in a peer-reviewed journal. Since congress abstracts that are submitted to a society prior to the meeting are short and can therefore only include basic data, publication in a peer-reviewed journal is considered to be the gold standard for sharing scientific data. Additionally, the rate of publication of the studies presented in conference is one of the broadly accepted quality features of a congress, indicating the scientific value (Schulte,et al., 2012; Frost et al., 2015).

Although the publication rates of congress papers have been examined in many disciplines, such a study has not been found in nursing.

The aim of this study was to determine the journal publication rate of the papers presented at at Surgical Nursing Congresses in Turkey in the last 5 years (2012-2016) and to examine the variables related to these rates.
METHODS

The study is a literature review. In the study, the papers presented at surgical nursing congresses, between the years 2012-2016 in Turkey were examined. Firstly, we examined surgical nursing congress organized in Turkey. Seven congresses including Turkish Surgery and operating room nursing, surgical nursing, colorectal surgery nursing, hepatopancreato-biliary surgical nursing, neurosurgery nursing, emergency nursing and cardiovascular surgery nursing congresses which are institutional and organized regularly, were included in the study.

Society which organizing the congress and the congress secretary were informed about the research by telephone and e-mail and abstract books were requested. As a result of the congresses web sites and the returns, all the abstract boks of the congresses organized between the years of 2012-2016 were reached.

While the inclusion criteria for the study were the research report and paper related to surgical nursing, review and case report were excluded from the study. In this context, out of 1319 papers in 19 abstract books, 752 research papers were examined. The rest of the papers constituted review and case reports. 752 papers were grouped in terms of some variables (presentation type, year and congress presented, type of research) and added to the database. In order to evaluate the status of publication, the names of each abstract author were searched first. For those which could not be identified, then the researchers’ biographies were examined. The papers of the non-CV researchers or non-existent papers in their biographies have been searched in google, pubmed /medline database by writing their names in Turkish and English. The congress abstract’s content was directly compared with the publication’s content. If the study hypothesis, methods, sample size, results and follow-up period were identical, the abstract was graded “published.”

If a publication was found before the congress, the abstract was graded as “published” if the hypothesis, methods, sample size, results and follow-up period were identical. For each publication, the name and impact factor of the journal, in which index the journal is scanned, publication language were noted. Before starting to the study, permission was obtained from the ethics committee of social sciences, and associations or the organizing committee organizing the congress were informed.

Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS 21.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, Illinois, USA; 2009). Descriptive analysis was performed.

RESULTS

We reviewed a total of 752 study abstracts (342 oral and 410 poster) presented in the congresses organized in Surgical Nursing field from 2012 to 2016. Ninety of those were published until August 2017 in peer-reviewed journals.

Although the publication rates were close to each other, poster abstracts were seen to be presented at the rate of 54.5%. The proceedings turned into publications consisted of oral abstracts at the rate of 51.2%. Publication rates of the oral abstracts were higher than the poster abstracts. It was determined that 11.9% total papers report were published, including 13.5% of verbal reports, 10.7% of poster reports (Table 1).

Table 1. Publication rate according to the presentation format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations Type</th>
<th>Number of abstracts</th>
<th>Publication number</th>
<th>Publication rate *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| *Publication percent of total papers |

Table 2. Distribution of Papers and Publications According to the Research Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number of publications</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Review</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reviewed abstracts were examined in terms of the research patterns and shown in Table 2. It was observed that the abstracts were mostly in descriptive type (77%) and similarly, the publication numbers of the descriptive studies were higher (62.2%).

Tabla 3. Distribution of the publications in terms of their characteristics
When the language, publication time and the journals of the published abstracts were examined, it was determined that 61.1% were published in English, 88.9% were turned into a publication after the proceeding, 54.4% were published in journals reviewed in field indexes other than SCI, SSCI, SCI-expanded, AHCI, ESCI (Table 3).

When the language, publication time and the journals of the published abstracts were examined, it was determined that 61.1% were published in English, 88.9% were turned into a publication after the publication time, and 44.5% of the studies endexed in field index outside SCI, SSCI, SCI-expanded, AHCI, ESCI. When the language, publication time and the journals of the published abstracts were examined, it was determined that 61.1% were published in English, 88.9% were turned into a publication after the publication time, and 44.5% of the studies endexed in field index outside SCI, SSCI, SCI-expanded, AHCI, ESCI (Table 3).

**DISCUSSION**

Scientific meetings are necessary environments for meeting and collaborating with colleagues, introducing new ideas and following the most current information (Schulte et al., 2012; Raju et al., 2017). Also, they are the most common areas where results of a study can be presented to colleagues (Raju et al., 2017). Despite all these opportunities, many abstracts presented in the scientific meetings are not published in full-text articles in peer-reviewed journal (Frost et al., 2015).

There are many studies evaluating publication rates of abstracts represented in scientific meetings and congresses of various disciplines. Since there is no study about this topic in the nursing field, the results of the present study were compared with the other studies in medicine. In this study, it was determined that the publication rates of the papers 11.9%. In studies on the subject, it was stated in the studies that the publication rate was 56.3% in otorhinolaryngology field (Lau et al., 2016), 30.9% in gastroenterology field (Raju et al., 2017), 22.6% in colorectal surgery field (Meral et al., 2017), 46% in hand surgery (Abzug et al., 2017), 21% in optometry (Bakkum et al., 2015), 65.7% in cervical spine surgery (Okafor et al., 2015), and 45.2% in shoulder and elbow surgery field (Miquel et al., 2017). It was determined that only 44.5% of the studies presented as abstracts were fully published in the systematic review conducted by Scherer et al. (2007) examining 79 reports and 29729 abstracts. The publication rate in the present study was found to be lower compared to the studies conducted in other fields.

When the publication rates were evaluated in terms of the presentation type, the publication rate of the oral abstracts was higher in the present study similar to the other studies. The oral presentations were turned into publications by the rate of 35.4% out of 64.4% in shoulder and elbow surgery and 19.5% out of 29.7% in colorectal surgery (Meral et al., 2017; Miquel et al., 2017). This rate may have been found to be higher since the studies assessed to have higher quality during the reviewers’ evaluation of the conference proceedings were asked to be presented verbally.

Although the evaluation was made based on the impact factor of the journals in the studies, such evaluation was not made in the present study by considering the status of publishing the abstracts in journals without impact factor. If the journals were considered in terms of SCI, non-SCI and peer-reviewed journal, the abstracts were published mostly in non-SCI journals. Among the studies conducted in colorectal surgery, 56.1% of them were published in SCI-e journals (Meral et al., 2017). While most of the medical studies were composed of clinical studies, experimental studies, and case reports, majority of the proceedings in the present study were composed of descriptive researches.

While the conversion time of the abstracts to publications was determined as 15-27.7 months in the studies, similarly it was found as 20.8 months in the present study (Yolcu, 2015; Lau et al., 2016; Meral et al., 2017; Miquel et al., 2017).

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The present study is important because it is the first study evaluating the publication rates of the abstracts presented in the nursing conference. The publication rate of the abstracts presented within the last 5 years in surgical nursing congresses organized in Turkey was found as 11.9%. Compared to the studies conducted in different disciplines, this rate was seen to be low. Considering that the new information gain the realism and are named as scientific information only by publications, the conversion of the studies to publication is recommended. It is thought that encouraging authors to conduct high quality researches in the future, and to follow the publication process of the abstracts in the scientific meetings will be very useful.
will increase the publication rate and enhance the scientific quality of the congresses.

It is recommended to conduct similar studies on congresses organized in nursing field and develop practices that will encourage researchers to do publications. In addition, qualitative interviews about this process can be conducted with researchers who turn or do not turn their studies into publications.

LIMITATIONS

Since the present study was conducted using Pubmed/Medline and Google Scholar databases, abstracts that have been accepted by the scientific journals but have not been indexed in these two large databases might be unnoticed.

The short time elapsed from the congress to the evaluation of the publication status (1-6 years) might have caused the publication rate to be low.
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