

Advancing Health Science Research and Discovery

Editorial

Gabriel J. Sanders¹

¹Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights KY, USA

Corresponding author: Gabriel J. Sanders, sandersg1@nku.edu

Open Access

Published: March 4, 2021



Copyright, 2021 by the authors. Published by Research Directs and the work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Research Directs in
Health Sciences: 2021,
Volume 1 (Issue 1): 1

About Research Directs

Research Directs is a series of open access journals dedicated to providing health-based researchers with an affordable open access, peer-reviewed publishing platform. Research Directs in Health Sciences (RDHS) aims and scope is moderately broad and the journal aims to enhance basic and applied research in health sciences. Topics can include, but are not limited to the following categories of research in the field: healthy living, aging, epidemiology, disease treatment, health disparities, medicine, behavioral science, physical activity and many health-related topics that impacting society today and in the future. Furthermore, a goal of the journal is to publish concise manuscripts in the health sciences. Therefore, authors are encouraged to submit direct and abridged research that is focused and impactful to their own line of inquiry in the form of *Direct Original Research*.

As explained on the journal's website, *Direct Original Research* is a type of manuscript designed to support research and discovery by publishing data in a direct way that avoids excessive citations and unnecessary jargon that limits the promptness of peer-review and publication. As always, quality is paramount in research and haste in today's fast-paced climate is also becoming imperative for scientific advancement. A *Direct Original Research* is the same as original research but written in a concise manner with the goal of providing direct and citable research in the field at an accelerated rate.

Confirmation and Disconfirmation

To further scientific discovery, both significant and non-significant data is relevant. RDHS encourages authors to provide non-significant data when it supports or refutes competing or noncompeting theories. In addition to the significance levels, or lack thereof, clinical significance is an important factor to consider when publishing health science-related data. If clinical significance is discovered, but not statistical significance, authors are encouraged to report the data and elaborate in detail regarding the findings and the impact the data may have on society.

When studying humans and health behavior, it is well understood that a great deal of variability in the data could occur. Moreover, outlier data is often omitted in the literature and RDHS is committed to providing a platform that encourages authors to submit data that supports positive or negative outcomes for outlier or particularly

infrequent data. Further, while large sample sizes are ideal, they are not always feasible. Thus, the journal welcomes data from small data sets that warrants publication, because this type of data can often result in ideas for new and novel research.

Conclusions



In conclusion, the journal welcomes manuscripts from research studies guided by scientifically sound methodologies in the health sciences. The journal is committed to developing a rigorous peer-reviewed journal that promotes scientific discovery via direct research. Previous research has been published to suggest the need for data to be reported as is, even if the results reveal significant or non-significant outcomes and RDHS is in support of these findings¹⁻⁴.

References

1. Arunachalam L, Hunter IA, Killeen S. Reporting of Randomized Controlled Trials With Statistically Nonsignificant Primary Outcomes Published in High-impact Surgical Journals. *Ann Surg.* 2017;265(6):1141-1145.
2. Chuard PJC, Vrtilek M, Head ML, Jennions MD. Evidence that nonsignificant results are sometimes preferred: Reverse P-hacking or selective reporting. *PLoS biology.* 2019;17(1).
3. Gates S, Ealing E. Reporting and interpretation of results from clinical trials that did not claim a treatment difference: survey of four general medical journals. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9(9).
4. Hazell L, Shakir SAW. Under-reporting of adverse drug reactions. *Drug Safety.* 2006;29:385-396.