



Letter to the Editor

Australasian contribution to neurological literature published in high-impact journals: Time for better collaboration?


Dear Editor,

We recently surveyed publication and collaboration patterns in seven high-impact neurology journals [1]. This involved a review of all *in press* articles over a two-month period in late 2016, yielding 204 articles overall (of which 107 were research studies). Bibliometric data of research studies were examined further.

Australian researchers produced eight studies (7.5%). Six of the studies involved collaboration with other countries; collaborators were most commonly from Germany ($n = 3$), the United States ($n = 3$), China ($n = 2$) and the United Kingdom ($n = 2$). The studies in general were of high-quality (e.g. systematic reviews and large prospective series).

Research from New Zealand, on the other hand, was much less substantial; only a single published case report was found. Of note, similar or higher quantity and quality of studies originated from such countries as Slovenia (one systematic review and one case series), Thailand (one large prospective series) and Czech Republic (one large prospective series).

Underlying such output disparity between Australia and New Zealand are likely several factors, which may include discrepancies in the two countries' human and financial resources allocated to neurological research. Collaborative efforts between the two countries are only likely to strengthen research output. For example, studies by the Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society Clinical Trial Group are regularly published in such journals as the *New England Journal of Medicine* [2], the *Lancet* [3] and *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* [4].

Australasian clinicians and researchers have contributed to significant advances to patient care (and continue to do so). The unified health system—including almost universal coverage of the population by general practitioners—as well as the preserved and

cherished indigenous health in New Zealand provide unique opportunities which, in turn, could complement research from Australia. It is time for clinicians and scientists from the two countries to put their hands together in order to produce neurological research that is superior—in both quality and quantity—to the current state.

Conflicts of interest

No conflicts of interest to disclose.

References

- [1] Alamri Y. Current patterns of collaboration in published neurology research: Author collaboration in neurological research. *EMPA J* 2017 [in press].
- [2] Young P, Saxena M, Bellomo R, et al. Acetaminophen for Fever in Critically Ill Patients with Suspected Infection. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373(23):2215–24.
- [3] Davidson AJ, Disma N, de Graaff JC, et al. Neurodevelopmental outcome at 2 years of age after general anaesthesia and awake-regional anaesthesia in infancy (GAS): an international multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2016;387(10015):239–50.
- [4] Reade MC, Eastwood GM, Bellomo R, et al. Effect of Dexmedetomidine added to standard care on ventilator-free time in patients with agitated delirium: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2016;315(14):1460–8.

Yassar Alamri*

Canterbury District Health Board, Christchurch, New Zealand
Department of Medicine, University of Otago, Christchurch, New Zealand

New Zealand Brain Research Institute, Christchurch, New Zealand

* Address: New Zealand Brain Research Institute, 66 Stewart Street, Central Christchurch 8011, New Zealand.
E-mail address: yassar.alamri@nzbri.org