

## FROM THE EDITOR

Russia has found itself under new conditions following the events that began in the spring of 2022, and decisions are being made that radically change the vector of the scientific and educational policy of the last two decades. This applies in our case to publications in journals indexed in Scopus and Web of Science databases. It is reported that the Government of the Russian Federation supported the proposal of the Ministry of Education and Science to suspend the accounting of publications of Russian scientists indexed in the international databases Web of Science and Scopus in 2022, and the accounting of their participation in foreign scientific conferences. Minister Valery Falkov, during a meeting with university rectors on March 21, said: "We do not urge you to abandon publications in Web of Science and Scopus. Russia must remain on the frontier of world science. But we need to proceed from the standpoint of our national interests."

So, the emphasis is on our national interests. This is good. But it remains unclear why it was necessary to escalate the situation to such a state? Back in the summer of 2020, the RAS Commission in a report on countering the falsification of scientific research on predatory journals and translated plagiarism published data that showed that "more than 1,100 Russian authors participated in translated plagiarism, including more than 30 heads of Russian universities and their departments. In total, about 23700 "garbage" publications have been published in these "predatory" journals. The cost of one "garbage" publication could reach up to 6000 euros." Why was this possible? Of course, it is possible and necessary to make claims against scientists who have been convicted of plagiarism. But it was necessary to understand the reasons that caused this wave of low-quality scientific products.

The key reason is, of course, the bureaucratic way of managing science, focused on purely quantitative indicators. The negative consequences of this approach have been obvious for a long time, and the cited report appeared almost two years ago. Why has this become a problem only now? Why have national databases been considered second-rate? Why have authorities only now started to think about how to improve them? It is not necessary to be a prophet to predict that the improvement of domestic databases will take place bureaucratically, with the invention of new and new indicators... But the main thing is not even this, but the fact that, in general, the system of organization of science and education requires a profound transformation.

