Nurse Education Today 30 (2010) 420–427

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Nurse Education Today

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/nedt

# The development of a ranking tool for refereed journals in which nursing and midwifery researchers publish their work

Patrick A. Crookes [a,b,*], Samantha L. Reis [c], Sandra C. Jones [c,b]

[a] Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences, University of Wollongong, Australia
[b] School of Nursing, Midwifery and Indigenous Health, University of Wollongong, Australia
[c] Centre for Health Initiatives, University of Wollongong, University of Wollongong, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

*Article history:*
Accepted 24 September 2009

*Keywords:*
Bibliometrics
Research measurement
Research personnel
Information science

SUMMARY

Publication in quality journals has long been a yardstick for measuring academic performance, although there is a divergence of opinions as to how to define and measure "journal quality". For some time the primary tools for assessing journal quality have been the ISI Journal Citation Reports and the Journal Impact Factors (JIFs), although it has been argued that these are less appropriate for practical disciplines such as nursing midwifery. In order to accurately reflect the nature of nursing and midwifery as a discipline, given the inherent flaws of using just one indicator of journal quality to assess performance overall, this project was designed to develop a tool which combined both objective and subjective methods to produce a ranking system which is specifically relevant to the disciplines of nursing and midwifery. This project succeeded in developing the Journal Evaluation Tool (JET), through extensive consultations with experts in the fields of nursing and midwifery. This tool may overcome some problems associated with the sole use of the journal impact factor, and may be utilised as an alternative measure of journal quality. The new tool was tested using a sample of 52 responding journals; and has now been disseminated to nursing and midwifery bodies in Australia and New Zealand, along with instructions for its use and recommendations for future research.



## Introduction

Publication in quality journals has long been a yardstick for measuring academic performance, although this has been associated with a debate as to what defines 'journal quality'. With the foreshadowed introduction of the Research Quality Framework (RQF) in Australia, subsequently superseded by the Evaluation of Research Activity (ERA), there was an imperative to develop an agreed ranking of refereed journals in all disciplines, including nursing and midwifery. Such a ranking is deemed necessary to measure and demonstrate the quality of research outputs which will be a central requirement of this exercise. The UK has recently been through a similar process – the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) – and journal rankings were both an input to, and a potential outcome of, this exercise (Geary et al., 2004).

Although there are already selective registers of scholarly and refereed journals (e.g. DEST Register of Refereed Journals), these lists do not assign rankings to journals, and thus cannot be used to provide more specific assessments of journal quality. Currently, the primary bibliometric tool for assessing journal quality is the ISI Journal Citation Reports (a database of citation data from over 7500 journals in over 60 countries) which utilises Journal Impact Factors (JIFs) to rank journals.

The Journal Impact Factor was originally devised to enable researchers and librarians to map the network of journals, and the development of particular issues, throughout the various disciplines (Garfield, 1999, 2006; Moed, 2005). As such, the JIF was not originally intended as a gauge of 'quality', but rather was meant for use by librarians as a 'bibliometric indicator', so they may better monitor subscription and cancellation rates for journals in their collections (Garfield, 1999, 2006; Johnstone, 2007). The JIF for a particular journal can be derived by summing the number of citations received in that year (e.g. 2005) to articles published in the two preceding years (2004 and 2003), divided by the number of citable ('source') articles published by the journal over that 2 year period (Johnstone, 2007; Moed, 2005). Because the ISI rankings are measured over a 2 year period, JIFs guard against biases towards journals which are older and which have higher frequencies of publication (in terms of the number of issues per year), as well as those which publish a greater number of articles per issue (Moed, 2005). While there are clear advantages to having a simple, cross-disciplinary, quantifiable and (arguably) objective tool to rank journals, some authors claim that ISI JIFs may be subject to

* Corresponding author. Address: Centre for Health Initiatives, Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences, University of Wollongong, Northfields Avenue, Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia. Tel.: +61 2 213174; fax: +61 2 4221 4718.
*E-mail address:* patrick_crookes@uow.edu.au (P.A. Crookes).

0260-6917/$ - see front matter © 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2009.09.016

biases (Joseph, 2003), and may not *on their own* represent a definitive measure of journal quality (Johnstone, 2007).

Use of the impact factor alone may lead to biases in journal evaluation because:

- High levels of 'author self-citation' (authors citing their own previous work) and 'journal self-citation' (when journals preferentially publish research with citations to their journal) may lead to increased JIFs (Daya, 2004; DuBois et al., 2000).
- Particularly high impact individual articles contribute unevenly to the JIF for that journal (Seglen, 1997).
- Selective publishing of reviews can inflate the JIF. Review papers are frequently cited, and contain many citations, and thus can contribute to a disproportionately high impact factor for a journal (Cameron, 2005; Kurmis, 2003; Seglen, 1997).
- JIFs are influenced by the research field – impact factors tend to be higher for journals that have a broader interest in basic research, but lower for those with narrower, more specific or clinical research fields (Seglen, 1997).
- JIFs may not accurately reflect the quality of research for clinicians, who publish in peer-reviewed journals less frequently. In this sense, clinicians are less likely than researchers to influence the impact factor (through citation), and are therefore not given the opportunity to 'vote' for articles which are of great relevance and use in practical settings (Jette, 2005). This may be particularly pertinent in more clinically based fields like nursing and midwifery.
- Articles advancing knowledge more generally- or providing guidelines for practical application- may not be widely cited, but may serve the purpose of saving lives, particularly in areas like clinical medicine (Cameron, 2005).

Furthermore, inter-area comparison using the impact factor has been argued to be invalid and potentially misleading, due to cross-disciplinary differences in citation rates, referencing systems, and article length (Kurmis, 2003). Thus there is general agreement that the ISI reports should not be the *sole* measure of journal quality. It has been noted that methods of quantifying the impact of research on practice, the academic community and society as a whole are still being developed (Council for the Humanities, Arts, Social Sciences, 2005), and there is still no agreed upon uniform and parsimonious way to evaluate research across all disciplines (Doyle et al., 1996). What constitutes 'quality' research may not be equivalent in all fields, and this is particularly true for practical disciplines such as nursing and midwifery. Research appearing in low ISI impact journals and journals which are not included in current citation listings (as well as books) can be valuable in areas such as nursing, regardless of the impact factor (or lack of) assigned to that publication.

These issues highlight the need to develop a ranking system specific to the disciplines of nursing and midwifery, and the need to use additional information/methods rather than the impact factor alone to accomplish this. The impact factor can be a valuable and useful tool if used in *conjunction* with other subjective means of ranking journals. This project aimed to address this issue by developing an innovative tool to rank nursing and midwifery journals.

## Objectives

In order to accurately reflect the nature of nursing and midwifery as a discipline (Johnstone, 2007), and given the inherent flaws of using just one indicator of journal quality to assess performance overall (Liu, 2003), it is suggested that both objective and subjective methods be integrated to produce a new ranking system for nursing and midwifery journals. The overarching objective of the research was to systematically derive a tool to rank refereed journals where researchers in the disciplines of nursing and midwifery publish. Journals would then be allocated to empirically derived 'quality bands'.

In order to achieve this goal, it was additionally aimed to:

1. Generate a comprehensive list which captured all journals relevant to nursing and midwifery.
2. Recruit an expert panel to derive a framework, and specific criteria, for judging the quality of nursing or midwifery journals.
3. From this framework, determine 'quality bands' to accurately characterize the quality of particular nursing or midwifery journals.
4. Make this criteria, list and additional information available as a tool for other researchers to use, so they may generate their own scores and rankings for journals.

In this way, this project aimed to produce a ranked list of existing refereed nursing and midwifery journals and, more importantly, provide a journal evaluation tool to allow for the inclusion of future new journal titles. In the event, this exercise proved to be exceedingly timely as the list of journals, based on the JET assessment, was used by the ARC as the basis for its accepted journal list to be used in the ERA exercise. Thus nursing and midwifery are among a very small group of disciplines which have been able to submit views on the list based on any form of empirical work or pan-discipline agreement.

## Methodology and results

*Phase 1: Literature review (conducted concurrently with Phase 2)*

A comprehensive and systematic literature search and review was undertaken in order to describe and evaluate the various methods of journal evaluation. This review concluded that, although judging the value of journals is an area fraught with difficulty, both objective (e.g. citation based) and subjective (e.g. expert opinion) methods of journal ranking should be integrated to more appropriately judge journal quality. The full review is available from the authors on request, and a summary of the key points is provided below.

Journal Impact Factors (JIFs) (Garfield, 1972, 1996, 1999, 2006) are the predominant means of assessing citation rates, and avoid many of the pitfalls of using raw citation counts. However, they were not designed as a measure of journal quality; and what constitutes 'quality' research may not be equivalent in all fields of research, and this is particularly true for practical disciplines such as nursing. Furthermore, inter-area comparison using the impact factor has been argued to be invalid and potentially misleading, due to cross-disciplinary differences in citation rates, referencing systems, and article length (Kurmis, 2003). Johnstone (2007) argues that the prevalence of the JIF as the primary measure of journal quality may be detrimental to the nursing profession. In particular, the reliance on JIFs may undermine the long-term viability of nursing journals by encouraging nursing authors from Australia and New Zealand to publish only in high impact factor journals, many of which are non-nursing titles.

Alternative indices of journal quality may take a quantitative or qualitative approach. Some quantitative methods of journal quality have been described in previous research. These include the presence/absence of the journal in electronic databases (East, 2006), the holdings and usage in academic libraries (Murphy, 1998), the web impact factor (An and Qiu, 2004), the h-index (Hirsch,

2005), and cognitive mapping (Shewchuk et al., 2006). Qualitative indices may include assessments of review and editorial standards for a particular journal (Extejt and Smith, 1990), evaluation of individual articles within the journal (Fahy, 2005), or use of 'expert opinion' (or 'peer evaluation') to define high quality journals (Fagin, 1982; Butler, 2002). Expert opinion is considered to be the most effective of these methods, but a standard instrument to conduct expert ratings has yet to be devised (East, 2006). Many authors have integrated the JIFs with expert opinion to produce novel ranking methods in their discipline. They argue that rankings should incorporate both objective (e.g. JIFs) and subjective information (Zhou et al., 2001).

*Phase 2: Journal identification*

A comprehensive review was conducted to identify all journals relevant to research in nursing and midwifery. The following databases were searched:

- Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory.
- Meditext.
- Medline.
- Cinahl.
- DEST Register of Refereed Journals.
- Periodicals in Print: Australia, New Zealand and Papua New Guinea.

This list was circulated via email and post to members of the Australian and New Zealand Council of Deans of Nursing and Midwifery (CDNM) and other nursing and midwifery peak bodies in Australia and New Zealand, to ensure that all relevant journals had been included. Following feedback from these bodies, the list was revised to include a total of 609 journals. A document including the coverage, scope, aims, estimated readership, frequency of publication, and impact factor (if relevant) for each journal was comprised.

This list was revised to include only those journals that were refereed. This resulted in a list of 481 journals. From a practical perspective, and keeping in mind that the aim of the project was to develop and refine a tool for journal ranking (rather than a definitive list of all journals in nursing and midwifery), this list was refined to 144 journals, based on the presence of the journals in certain nursing and medical databases. In order to be included in the initial phase of the ranking exercise, journals were required to appear in all three of Ulrich's Periodicals Database, Cinahl and Medline. This was deemed a systematic method of downsizing an unrealistically large number of journals to be ranked, and was in no way intended to be a judgement of the quality of the journals that were excluded. It is expected that these journals will be evaluated using the new tool subsequently to the initial project. The refined journal list can be sighted as part of the report submitted to ANZ CDNM via its web-site (http://www.cdnm.edu.au).

*Phase 3: Delphi survey*

Two rounds of Delphi surveys were distributed to CDNM, Global Alliance of Nursing Educators (GANE) and International Academy of Nurse Editors (INANE) mailing lists. All members on the lists were invited to participate in the first round; those who responded formed the expert panel for the second round. In the first round respondents completed questions regarding what constitutes journal quality, specifically responding to the question: "Please list five 'ideal' criteria by which you think journal quality can be judged." The second round aimed to refine the qualities identified from the first round, with participants asked to rate on a Likert style scale the importance of each of the (23) previously identified "ideal criteria". This produced a quantitative set of data on the importance of each factor.

The first round of the Delphi survey produced results indicating that a broad array of factors were utilised to judge journal quality. Factors were divided into those which pertained to evaluation of:

- the 'articles' comprising the journal (e.g., the quality of writing, the originality of research);
- the authors who publish in the journal (e.g., expertness/seniority of authors);
- the journals' review/editorial standards (e.g., sound criteria for article selection, quality of editorial board, peer review process);
- the quality of the editorials contained in the journal (e.g., thought-provoking, high quality editorial content);
- general factors relating to the journal (e.g., citation rate/impact factor, wide readership);

Overall 23 factors were identified. Although this was considered to be a large number of factors, it was necessary to retain all of these to preserve the detail contained in the qualitative data. The criteria most commonly reported were those pertaining to the quality of articles within the journal, such as the "professional influence and practical utility of articles" and the "significance, importance and timeliness of research". Another commonly reported factor pertained to the "peer review process generally" (i.e., whether the journal is fully refereed, provides double blind reviews, etc.).

The second round of the Delphi survey identified that the criteria that were considered most important in judging journal quality were: that the journal has a good reputation among peers and experts in the field; that the journal has a stringent peer review process; the scholarliness of articles contained within the journal; the strength and rigor of research presented in journals' articles; the writing style (e.g., grammar, correct referencing, etc.) of the constituent articles; and the actual quality of the writing itself (e.g., clarity, readability, etc.).

*Phase 4: Focus group*

A focus group comprised of CDNM members was conducted in order to refine the list of criteria, and to gain ideas and perspectives on how to measure these in practice. The 23 identified criteria were judged by a panel of CDNM members in terms of whether they were 'important' and 'measurable' within the scope of the current project. Those factors that were deemed both 'important' and 'measurable' were considered for inclusion in the final journal ranking tool.

Overall, nine of the 23 criteria were considered both important and measurable (Table 1). These were: the quality of the journals' editorial board; the existence of a stringent peer review process (e.g. fully refereed, 'transparency' of review processes, double blind reviews, etc.); the articulation of clear, objective, and academically sound criteria for article selection; quality assurance processes generally (e.g. rejection rates, minimal time lapse between acceptance and publication of manuscripts); provision of copyright/intellectual property protection for authors; types of articles published by the journal (e.g. reviews, original research articles, editorials); citation rate, impact factor and ISI ranking of journal; ease of accessibility and wide availability (e.g. online access); and inclusion of contributors from a range of countries.

There were a further six criteria that were considered to be important, but not currently measurable (Table 1). These were: the originality of articles in the journal; scholarship/scholarliness of articles; significance/importance and timeliness of articles; strength/rigor of research and/or argument presented in articles; thought-provoking, high quality editorial content; the journal has a good reputation among peers and experts in the field. In the future it is hoped that these can be incorporated into the journal evaluation tool in some way.

**Table 1**
Focus group results.

| | Criteria | Important | Measurable |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Originality of articles in journal | Yes | No |
| 2 | Scholarship/scholarliness of articles | Yes | No |
| 3 | Articles feature multidisciplinary/collaborative research and have international relevance | No | Yes |
| 4 | Writing *style,* e.g. grammar, punctuation, correct referencing, etc. | No | Yes |
| 5 | *Quality* of writing, e.g. clarity, readability, appropriateness of language | No | Yes |
| 6 | The "professional influence" of articles in the journal i.e. practical utility and relevance to practicing nurses and midwives, and influence on health outcomes | No | Yes |
| 7 | Significance/importance and timeliness of articles | Yes | No |
| 8 | Strength/rigor of research and/or argument presented | Yes | No |
| 9 | Expertness/seniority of authors who publish in journal | No | Yes |
| 10 | *Quality* of journals' editorial board | Yes | Yes |
| 11 | The journal has a stringent peer review process, e.g. fully refereed, 'transparency' of review processes, double blind reviews, etc. | Yes | Yes |
| 12 | Journal has clear, objective, and academically sound criteria for article selection | Yes | Yes |
| 13 | Quality assurance processes generally, e.g. Rejection rates, minimal time lapse between acceptance and publication of manuscripts, etc. | Yes | Yes |
| 14 | Thought-provoking, high quality editorial content | Yes | No |
| 15 | Journal offers copyright/intellectual property protection for authors | Yes | Yes |
| 16 | *Types of articles* published by journal, e.g. reviews, original research articles, editorials, etc. | Yes | Yes |
| 17 | Journal is linked with other specialist groups and relevant organisations | No | Yes |
| 18 | Citation rate, impact factor and ISI ranking of journal | Yes | Yes |
| 19 | *Variety* of content within journal, e.g. Balance of theoretical and experimental research, qualitative and quantitative research, etc. | No | No |
| 20 | Journal is easily accessible and widely available, e.g. online access | Yes | Yes |
| 21 | Journal takes an objective and unbiased approach; presents evidence-based research | No | No |
| 22 | Journal features contributors from a range of countries | Yes | Yes |
| 23 | Journal has good reputation among peers and experts in the field | Yes | No |

*Phase 5: Allocation of journals to quality bands and dissemination*

The two round Delphi process and the focus group were utilised to identify all criteria contained in the preliminary tool. Thus the preliminary tool represented the opinions and judgements of both those in the expert panel and the CDNM members involved in the focus group discussion. It is important to note that it incorporated both objective (e.g. ISI impact factors) and subjective (e.g. editorial standards) methods of judging the quality of journals, consistent with the conclusions reached from the systematic literature review.

The preliminary tool was distributed to the editors or managing editors of journals identified in the final journal list, with each journal scored based on their responses. A total of 53 responses were received, with 52 titles included in the results (one was excluded due to a lack of response on one of the critical questions). Journals were scored out of 100, and were allocated to one of four quality bands based on that score.

*Scoring technique*

The scoring technique was developed by the research team and was based on results of Delphi surveys and focus group discussions. Note that Questions 1 and 7 were not included in the final scores, as they were either not useful or were poorly interpreted and therefore produced unreliable data. These modifications made it possible to develop the final Journal Evaluation Tool (JET), for use in the evaluation of nursing and midwifery journals. The final tool is presented in Appendix 1.

*Calculating journal scores and quality bands*

The total raw score for each journal was calculated (maximum possible score was 10). Scores were then converted to percentages, and 'quartile' cut-off scores were utilised to generate four quality bands for ranking of journals.

Scoring for allocation to quality bands is outlined in Table 2. Scores between 0 and 25 were assigned to the lowest quality band (0 journals in this category), which was quality band 4. Scores ranging from 26 to 50 were assigned to quality band 3 (8 journals); scores from 51 to 75 to quality band 2 (30 journals) and scores from 76 to 100 to the top quality band 1 (14 journals).

*Dissemination of JET and results and impact thus far*

The results and the JET are available for download via the CHI (UOW) web-site (www.uow.edu.au/health/chi), and were emailed and posted to other Australian educational institutions, nursing and midwifery bodies (including INANE), and health library lists (e.g. ALIAHealth Libraries Australia). The results of the study were also presented at the annual INANE conference (May 2008) in Padua, Italy. The results and the JET were also sent for the consideration of the coordinators of the ERA journal ranking exercise. Scrutiny of the first iteration of the ERA listings for nursing and midwifery journals suggests that it was almost entirely based on the JET ranking system and list. Feedback from this group also led to those journals not currently ranked being placed in the lowest band due to the inability of the JET researchers to secure the information required to undertake the ranking calculation. This request was acceded to for pragmatic reasons, but the score was replaced with N/A. It should therefore be noted that a score of N/A (and subsequent placement in Band 4) does not reflect the *quality* of these journals, rather it reflects the absence of a completed JET form. As it is planned that the JET list will be regularly updated, it is hoped that all journals currently without a ranking will eventually be ranked and appear on the JET list. In this way, JET rankings are an ongoing process, which will hopefully be expanded to include all refereed journals where nurses and midwives publish.

**Table 2**
Scoring for quality bands.

| Quality band | Score | Assessment of initial 52 journals (*n*) |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 76–100 | 14 |
| 2 | 51–75 | 30 |
| 3 | 26–50 | 8 |
| 4 | 0–25 | 0 |

## Conclusion and recommendations

Overall, the results from this project indicate that although impact factors may be an objective and frequently used method of ranking journals, these may not on their own accurately reflect the value of nursing and midwifery journals. The systematic literature review (Phase 2) highlighted the need for a new journal ranking tool, which integrates both objective and subjective information in order to more appropriately evaluate journals in the fields of nursing and midwifery.

This project succeeded in developing the Journal Evaluation Tool (JET), through extensive consultations with experts in the fields of nursing and midwifery. JET is based on criteria identified and deemed relevant by nursing and midwifery researchers and journal editors. This tool may overcome some problems associated with the sole use of the journal impact factor, and may be utilised as an alternative measure of journal quality.

The new tool was tested using a sample of 52 responding journals. Results highlighted areas in need of improvement, and the tool was revised accordingly. It is however, recommended that the criteria deemed as important but not currently measurable be incorporated in JET once a more reliable way of quantifying these can be found. The new tool has now been disseminated to nursing and midwifery bodies in Australia and New Zealand, along with instructions for its use and recommendations for future research.

Recommendations arising from this research include:

- The full journal list (of all refereed journals in which nurses and midwives publish) should be evaluated using the newly developed JET. This is necessary both for further refinement of the tool, and so that the currently unranked journals may be included in a final 'master' list of ranked nursing and midwifery journals. It was not possible within the scope of this project to rank the full journal list, however this is intended to be part of the continued development and application of the new tool.
- The project highlighted a number of criteria which were consistently considered important by both the focus group and the expert panel, but which are currently unmeasurable or rely on subjective judgements and unknowable information. These criteria include the originality and scholarliness of articles in the journal, the significance and timeliness of articles, the strength of research presented, the quality of editorial content, and the reputation of the journal among peers and experts in the field. It is recommended that these factors are incorporated into the JET if a reliable way of measuring them can be developed.
- The JET is now publicly available on the CHI and CDNM websites. The ranked list of journals will be updated on a regular basis. This will build upon this research by allowing new journals not currently included in the full list or the current ranked list to be formally included in the ranking process.
- It is noted that ISI impact factors are modified frequently. This will alter the outcome of the ranking process, and thus, re-ranking should be conducted on a regular basis in accordance with updated ISI reports.
- The JET contains many criteria which may be applicable to a range of journals beyond those in nursing and midwifery. Thus, it is recommended that the JET is pilot tested on a diverse range of journals, so its value for use in other disciplines can be established, and common factors which constitute 'journal quality' more broadly may be identified.

The development of the JET represents a valuable starting point in defining how nursing and midwifery academics judge journal 'quality'. However, the challenge of ranking journals is complicated by the idea that 'quality' is largely judged based on subjective criteria. Whether 'quality' is defined as usefulness in practice, originality, or scientific scholarship of the journals' constituent articles (or any combination of these factors) is still largely a matter of opinion and relies on subjective judgements. For this reason, future research should seek to build upon this strong conceptual base in order to more completely define and measure journal quality for nursing and midwifery disciplines.

Addendum to this paper:

Since this initial round of work, two further rounds of calling for submissions and subsequent ranking have taken place. This includes re-calculating JET scores based on changes in ISI JIF's. The number of journals formally assessed and ranked has now risen to 158. These rankings are provided as Appendix 2. It is intended that this will be updated regularly with an up to date list kept on the CDNM web-site (see above).

## Appendix 1. The Journal Evaluation Tool (JET)

University of Wollongong 

Journal Evaluation Tool (JET)

What is the name of your journal?

_____

Please highlight your response CLEARLY and explain your answer where necessary.

(1) Is your journal included in the current (2005) ISI Journal Citation Reports? YES NO

If so, please provide details of the ranking and impact factor of the journal:

_____

_____

(2) What criteria, if any, does your journal use for selecting its editorial board?

☐ Doctoral level qualifications
☐ Other formal qualifications
☐ Reviewers from a range of countries
☐ Professional diversity
☐ Years of experience as a reviewer
☐ Years of experience as an author
☐ Experience in the field

(3) What peer review process, if any, does your journal use to review submissions/manuscripts?

☐ Double blind
☐ Reviewer (only) blind
☐ Author (only) blind
☐ Open review (author and reviewer named)

(4) What *type/s of articles* does your journal publish?

☐ Original research/research
☐ Practice papers
☐ Educational Papers
☐ Letters to editor
☐ Brief report/research brief
☐ Literature review/review article
☐ Theoretical/Methodological papers
☐ Editorials

(5) What format is your journal published in?

☐ Print
☐ Online
☐ Print and online

Thank you

## Appendix 2. Current JET rankings of journals in which nursing and midwifery researchers publish their work, as of 7.9.09

Journals meeting the initial inclusion criteria but who are yet to complete the JET are included in Band 4 (with N/A as the score). It is important to note that a score of N/A does **not** indicate a rating of the quality of the journal, but rather the absence of a completed JET form.

Scoring for quality bands.

| Quality band | Score |
|---|---|
| 1 | 76–100 |
| 2 | 51–75 |
| 3 | 26–50 |
| 4 | 0–25 |

Current results from journal ranking exercise as of 7/9/09.

| Quality band | Journal title | JET score/100 | Suggested ERA rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Journal of Advanced Nursing | 100 | A* |
| 1 | Birth: Issues in Perinatal Care | 100 | A* |
| 1 | Pain Management Nursing | 100 | A* |
| 1 | Journal of Midwifery and Women's Health | 100 | A* |
| 1 | Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing | 100 | A* |
| 1 | Journal of Nursing Scholarship | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Oncology Nursing Forum | 90 | A* |
| 1 | The Journal of Adolescent Health | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Journal of Family Nursing | 90 | A* |
| 1 | American Journal of Nursing | 90 | A* |
| 1 | European Journal of Cancer Care | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Journal of Rural Health | 90 | A* |
| 1 | AJIC - American Journal of Infection Control | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care | 90 | A* |
| 1 | The International Journal of Nursing Studies | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Applied Nursing Research | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Midwifery | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Journal of Transcultural Nursing | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Journal of Gerontological Nursing | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Nursing Inquiry | 90 | A* |
| 1 | Nursing Outlook | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal of Obstetric, Gynecology and Neonatal Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Biological Research for Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Archives of Psychiatric Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal of Vascular Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Nurse Education Today | 80 | A |
| 1 | Nursing Research | 80 | A |
| 1 | Research in Nursing and Health | 80 | A |
| 1 | Health Expectations | 80 | A |
| 1 | International Journal of Nursing Practice | 80 | A |
| 1 | Maternal and Child Health Journal | 80 | A |
| 1 | Qualitative Health Research | 80 | A |
| 1 | Advances in Nursing Science | 80 | A |
| 1 | Australasian Emergency Nursing Journal | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal of Child Healthcare | 80 | A |
| 1 | International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare | 80 | A |
| 1 | Progress in Cardiovascular Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | International Journal of Mental Health Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal of Clinical Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Australian Critical Care | 80 | A |
| 1 | International Journal of Urological Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | International Nursing Review | 80 | A |
| 1 | International Wound Journal | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal of Renal Care | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal for Healthcare Quality | 80 | A |
| 1 | Research in Gerontological Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal of Primary Health Care | 80 | A |
| 1 | Nurse Researcher | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal of Emergency Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Heart and Lung – The Journal of Acute and Critical Care | 80 | A |
| 1 | Geriatric Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Nursing Economics | 80 | A |
| 1 | Nursing Praxis in New Zealand | 80 | A |
| 1 | Australian Journal of Primary Health | 80 | A |
| 1 | International Journal for Quality in Health Care | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing | 80 | A |
| 1 | Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing | 80 | A |
| 2 | Contemporary Nurse/Advances in Contemporary Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Nursing Care Quality | 70 | B |
| 2 | Nursing Education Perspectives | 70 | B |
| 2 | Nursing Ethics | 70 | B |
| 2 | Public Health Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | British Journal of Neuroscience Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | Issues in Mental Health Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Neuroscience Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | Practice Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Wound Care | 70 | B |
| 2 | Canadian Journal of Nursing Leadership | 70 | B |
| 2 | Collegian | 70 | B |
| 2 | Women and Birth | 70 | B |
| 2 | Nursing Forum | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Forensic Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | Nursing and Health Sciences | 70 | B |
| 2 | Orthopaedic Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | New Zealand College of Midwives Journal | 70 | B |
| 2 | Advanced Emergency Nursing Journal | 70 | B |
| 2 | International Journal of Older People Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | The Journal of Perinatal Education | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Christian Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | Nursing Standard | 70 | B |
| 2 | Nursing Philosophy | 70 | B |
| 2 | Cancer Nursing Practice | 70 | B |
| 2 | Nursing Older People | 70 | B |
| 2 | Emergency Nurse | 70 | B |

(*continued on next page*)

| Quality band | Journal title | JET score/ 100 | Suggested ERA rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Learning Disability Practice | 70 | B |
| 2 | Primary Health Care | 70 | B |
| 2 | Mental Health Practice | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Radiology Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | JNP – The Journal for Nurse Practitioners | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Pediatric Health Care | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Pediatric Nursing: Nursing Care of Children and Families | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Professional Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | International Emergency Nursing (formerly "Accident and Emergency Nursing") | 70 | B |
| 2 | Western Journal of Nursing Research | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Nursing and Healthcare in Chronic Illness | 70 | B |
| 2 | Sexual Health | 70 | B |
| 2 | Healthcare Infection | 70 | B |
| 2 | Health Reports | 70 | B |
| 2 | Clinical Nurse Specialist: The Journal for Advanced Nursing Practice | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of Perianesthesia Nursing | 70 | B |
| 2 | Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners | 70 | B |
| 2 | European Journal of Oncology Nursing | 60 | C |
| 2 | Journal of Nursing Management | 60 | C |
| 2 | Nephrology Nursing Journal | 60 | C |
| 2 | Nursing in Critical Care | 60 | C |
| 2 | Pediatric Nursing | 60 | C |
| 2 | The Journal of School Nursing | 60 | C |
| 2 | British Journal of Midwifery | 60 | C |
| 2 | International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship | 60 | C |
| 2 | Australian Journal of Rural Health | 60 | C |
| 2 | Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing | 60 | C |
| 2 | Evidence-Based Midwifery | 60 | C |
| 2 | The Health Care Manager | 60 | C |
| 2 | Health Information and Libraries Journal | 60 | C |
| 2 | ORL-Head and Neck Nursing | 60 | C |
| 2 | RCM Midwives Journal | 60 | C |
| 2 | Journal of Care Management and Home Health Care | 60 | C |
| 2 | Neonatal, Pediatric and Child Health Nursing | 60 | C |
| 2 | International Journal of Nursing Terminologies and Classifications | 60 | C |
| 2 | Nurse Education in Practice | 60 | C |
| 2 | Perspectives in Psychiatric Care | 60 | C |
| 2 | Japan Journal of Nursing Sciences | 60 | C |
| 2 | Canadian Journal of Midwifery, Research and Practice | 60 | C |
| 2 | Nursing for Women's Health | 60 | C |
| 2 | Musculoskeletal Care | 60 | C |
| 2 | Online Brazilian Journal of Nursing | 60 | C |
| 2 | Practice Development in Health Care | 60 | C |
| 2 | Learning in Health and Social Care | 60 | C |
| 2 | AORN Journal | 60 | C |
| 2 | Air Medical Journal | 60 | C |
| 2 | Teaching and Learning in Nursing | 60 | C |
| 2 | Intensive and Critical Care Nursing | 60 | C |
| 2 | International Journal of Integrated Care | 60 | C |
| 2 | OJIN: The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing | 60 | C |
| 3 | The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing | 50 | C |
| 3 | Breastfeeding Review | 50 | C |
| 3 | International Journal of Palliative Nursing | 50 | C |
| 3 | Plastic Surgical Nursing | 50 | C |
| 3 | Home Health Care Service Quarterly | 50 | C |
| 3 | Midwifery Matters | 50 | C |
| 3 | Nursing Management | 50 | C |
| 3 | Clinical Simulation in Nursing | 50 | C |
| 3 | The Internet Journal of Health Care Administration | 50 | C |
| 3 | International Breastfeeding Journal | 50 | C |
| 3 | Australian and New Zealand Continence Journal | 40 | C |
| 3 | Neonatal Network | 40 | C |
| 3 | Tennessee Nurse | 40 | C |
| 3 | Newborn and Infant Nursing Reviews | 40 | C |
| 3 | Nurse Leader | 40 | C |
| 3 | Seminars in Oncology Nursing | 40 | C |
| 3 | Health Care and Informatics Review Online | 40 | C |
| 3 | Journal of Rural and Tropical Public Health | 40 | C |
| 3 | Human Resources for Health | 30 | C |
| 4 | Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation | 20 | C |
| 4 | American Journal of Critical Care | N/A | |
| 4 | American Journal of Hospice and Palliative Medicine | N/A | |
| 4 | Arthritis Care and Research | N/A | |
| 4 | Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | British Journal of Community Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | British Journal of Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Canadian Journal of Nursing Research, The | N/A | |
| 4 | Cancer Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Clinical Journal of Oncology Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Clinical Nursing Research | N/A | |
| 4 | Community Practitioner | N/A | |
| 4 | Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice | N/A | |
| 4 | Creative Nursing: A Journal of Values, Issues, experience and Collaboration | N/A | |
| 4 | Critical Care Medicine | N/A | |
| 4 | Critical Care Nurse | N/A | |
| 4 | Critical Care Nursing Quarterly | N/A | |
| 4 | Curationis: South African Journal of Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Dermatology Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Disaster Management and Response | N/A | |
| 4 | Health Care for Women International | N/A | |
| 4 | Holistic Nursing Practice | N/A | |
| 4 | Home Healthcare Nurse | N/A | |
| 4 | Insight: The Journal of the American Society of ophthalmic Registered Nurses | N/A | |
| 4 | Intensive and Critical Care Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | International Journal of Psychiatric Nursing Research, The | N/A | |
| 4 | Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal for Nurses in Staff Development | N/A | |

| Quality band | Journal title | JET score/ 100 | Suggested ERA rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Journal of Community Health Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Cultural Diversity | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Holistic Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Infusion Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Intellectual Disabilities | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of National Black Nurses' Association | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Nursing Administration | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Nursing Education | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Nursing Law | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Nursing Measurement | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Nursing Research | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Perinatal and Neonatal Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Perioperative Practice | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Practical Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of the New York State Nurses Association | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Trauma Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Kansas Nurse | N/A | |
| 4 | MedSurg Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Nephrology News and Issues | N/A | |
| 4 | Nurse Educator | N/A | |
| 4 | Nurse Practitioner: American Journal of Primary Health Care, The | N/A | |
| 4 | Nursing Administration Quarterly | N/A | |
| 4 | Nursing History Review | N/A | |
| 4 | Nursing Journal of India | N/A | |
| 4 | Nursing Leadership Forum | N/A | |
| 4 | Nursing Science Quarterly | N/A | |
| 4 | Occupational Health | N/A | |
| 4 | Policy, Politics and Nursing Practice | N/A | |
| 4 | Practicing Midwife, The | N/A | |
| 4 | Rehabilitation Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Research and Theory for Nursing Practice | N/A | |
| 4 | Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem | N/A | |
| 4 | Revista Latino- Americana de Efermagem | N/A | |
| 4 | Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care | N/A | |
| 4 | Urologic Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Canadian Operating Room Nursing | N/A | |
| 4 | Critical Care Clinics | N/A | |
| 4 | Diabetes Educator | N/A | |
| 4 | Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Critical Care | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Human Lactation | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Intensive Care Medicine | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of the Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurse Society | N/A | |
| 4 | Journal of Trauma | N/A | |
| 4 | Ostomy/Wound Management | N/A | |
| 4 | Pediatric Critical Care Medicine | N/A | |
| 4 | Pflege | N/A | |
| 4 | Progress in Transplantation | N/A | |
| | | N/A | |

## References


An, L., Qiu, J., 2004. Research on the relationships between Chinese journal impact factors and external web link counts and web impact factors. Journal of Academic Librarianship 30 (3), 199–204.

Butler, L., 2002. Identifying "highly-rated" journals – An Australian case study. Scientometrics V53 (2), 207–227.

Cameron, B.D., 2005. Trends in the use of ISI bibliometric data: Uses, abuses and implications. Portal: Libraries and the Academy 5 (1), 105–125.

Council for the Humanities, Arts, Social Sciences, 2005. Measures of quality and impact of publicly funded research in the humanities, arts and social sciences. Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra.

Daya, S., 2004. Self-citation and the journal impact factor. Evidence-based Obstetrics and Gynecology 6 (4), 159–160.

Doyle, J.R., Arthurs, A.J., Mcaulay, L., Osborne, P.G., 1996. Citation as effortful voting: A reply to Jones, Brinn & Pendlebury. Omega-International Journal of Management Science 24 (5), 603–606.

DuBois, F.L., Reeb, D., 2000. Ranking the international business journals. Journal of International Business Studies 31 (4), 689–704.

East, J.W., 2006. Ranking journals in the humanities: An Australian case study. Australian Academic and Research Libraries 37 (1), 3–16.

Extejt, M.M., Smith, J.E., 1990. The behavioral sciences and management: An evaluation of relevant journals. Journal of Management 16 (3), 539–551.

Fagin, C.M., 1982. The quality of nursing journals as rated by deans of nursing schools. Heart and Lung: Journal of Acute and Critical Care 11 (1), 65–68.

Fahy, K.M., 2005. Quality and significance of Australian midwifery research. Australian Midwifery Journal 18 (1), 8–15.

Garfield, E., 1972. Citation analysis as a tool in journal evaluation. Science 178 (60), 471–479.

Garfield, E., 1996. How can impact factors be improved? British Medical Journal 313 (n7054), 411.

Garfield, E., 1999. Journal impact factor: A brief review. Canadian Medical Association Journal 161 (8), 979–980.

Garfield, E., 2006. The history and meaning of the journal impact factor. Journal of the American Medical Association 295 (1), 90–93.

Geary, J., Marriot, L., Rowlinson, M., 2004. Journal rankings in business and management and the 2001 research assessment exercise in the UK. British Journal of Management 15 (2), 95–142.

Hirsch, J. E. (2005). *An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output.* arxiv:/arXiv:physics/0508025 v5, 29 September.

Jette, A.M., 2005. How do you measure a journals worth? Physical Therapy 85 (12), 1275–1276.

Johnstone, M.J., 2007. Journal impact factors: Implications for the nursing profession. International Nursing Review 54 (1), 35–40.

Joseph, K.S., 2003. Quality of impact factors of general medical journals. British Medical Journal 326 (7383), 283.

Kurmis, A.P., 2003. Current concepts review: Understanding the limitations of the journal impact factor. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery – Series A 85 (12), 2449–2454.

Liu, J.L., 2003. Quality of impact factors of general medical journals. Research quality can be assessed by using combination of approaches. British Medical Journal (Clinical Research ed.) 326 (7395), 931–932.

Moed, H.F., 2005. Citation analysis of scientific journals and journal impact measures. Current Science 89 (12), 1990–1996.

Murphy, P.S., 1998. Journal quality assessment for performance based funding. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 23 (1).

Seglen, P.O., 1997. Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. British Medical Journal 314 (7079), 498–502.

Shewchuk, R.M., O'Connor, S.J., Williams, E.S., Savage, G.T., 2006. Beyond rankings: Using cognitive mapping to understand what health care journals represent. Social Science and Medicine 62 (5), 1192–1204.

Zhou, D., Ma, J., Turban, E., 2001. Journal quality assessment: An integrated subjective and objective approach. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management 48 (4), 479–490.