

The Editorial Dilemma in Medical Journals: An Opinion

Abdul Wahab Alahmari

Radiology Specialist, Ministry of Health, Abha, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Corresponding Author: Abdul Wahab Alahmari, Radiology Specialist, Ministry of Health, Abha, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Received Date: 18 August 2022 | **Accepted Date:** 05 September 2022 | **Published Date:** 10 October 2022

Citation: Abdul Wahab Alahmari (2020) The Neuroimaging Documentation of Psychedelic Drugs' Effect on the Brain: dmt, lsd, Psilocybin, and Ibogaine as Examples: A Mini Review. 5(5): DOI: [10.31579/2692-9422/036](https://doi.org/10.31579/2692-9422/036)

Copyright: © 2020 Abdul Wahab Alahmari, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of The Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

I have published many papers in different medical journals and I noticed there is something that I would like to call it "The Editorial Dilemma". This editorial dilemma is form of bureaucracy that editors of journals make in front of science publishing. The editors will ask to change the article many times, until the article is not the same idea that the author submitted in the 1st time. This dilemma as well characterized by delay of publishing article which will take 6 months to 1 year to publish one article and maybe even more time. The formatting of medical journals is different and each journal ask for different styles of formatting and citation. Most of these journals request publishing fees, open-source fees, archiving the article "indexed" on PubMed fees, etc. These obstacles put forward by the editor are restrictions against science which had led to form the research centers publishing groups which is "a formal malpractice". This practices where endless list of authors, list their names on the paper since publishing needs a team effort and funding for publishing of only one paper. The editor can jump in the peer-reviewing process to become a reviewer then reject the paper or ask for changes which lead to create "preprint online depositories" to avoid the editor dilemma. The editors shape what type of science should be published or not. They determine what science is? And what is not! The editorial dilemma is even chasing the online preprint depositories by forcing them to remove papers from their websites. This level of madness made by the Aristocratic editors is shutting down science in every way possible. I submitted a rare case report before to *the Radiology Journal of Case Reports* and they asked me to provide a histopathological confirmation for the rare disease! I told the journal that the patient refused to undergo any biopsy operation. The journal refused to publish my paper because the editor jumped in with the reviewers and refused to publish with no histopathology confirmation; even though; 5 top neuroradiologists reviewed the case report and all agreed that this case is extremely rare and they never saw anything like it (i.e., like Dr. House cases), but the editor rejected the case, so his vote takes on 5 neuroradiologists votes. This shows that editors are the biggest dilemma in the way of science.

I used to publish my papers in prominent journals in radiology. Usually, I submits my papers then with editorial process my paper change to the point I do not recognize my paper anymore. The editor makes the decision about everything in my paper. They change the title, any of the contents, any image, and any text that the editor does not like which will be gone otherwise I will not get published. Some of my papers reach the point until it is not what I want to say and they totally change my ideas and my points. They simply deformed some of my published papers, so I switch to journals which has lower editorial control and censorship and of course less prominent in the field of radiology. The Editors are the ones control everything. They choose which paper get published and which paper do not get published based on their personal subjective opinions. I tried to publish my opinion about standardizing the radiology machines between all the companies to prevent the need for training radiographers over and over on different machines from different companies. Each company make their generic names to the point it became very confusing. I submitted my paper to the *British Journal of Radiology* and they rejected my opinion. I submitted another paper about standardizing radiology programs worldwide to close the gap between radiology programs worldwide and make one system which will allow radiographers to be able to transfer to another country easily after passing the required tests and be able to practice. I submitted this opinion to *the Journal of Radiology* in the United States and they rejected my paper. I submitted a very rare never existed neuroradiology MRI image as a clinical image to *the New England Journal of Medicine* and I received a rejection from the editor saying "we get too many pictures, no thanks we are not interested". Meanwhile, the same journal publishes pictures of condition that are not either rare or good. Mostly they publish based on personal favors and whether they know the person. *The American Journal of Neuroradiology* publish similar nonsense in the medical journal as "art pictures". They publish some dark building pictures in one of their issues. I do not know what buildings have to do with neuroradiology, but in the same time, a neuroradiology rare cases do not get published as a clinical photo!