During the period from 5th to 7th July of the 2019 17th International Conference on Informatics, Management in Technology and Healthcare (ICIMTH 2019) was held in Athens, Greece.

The title of the 17th ICIMTH Conference was: “Health Informatics Vision: From Data via Information to Knowledge” (1). At the Conference were presented: 4 keynotes, 89 papers, 18 poster presentations, 4 Invited workshop and 2 Special Panel Sessions by presenters from over 30 countries in the world. Special Session has organized as EFMI Honorary Session during which Anne Moen, former President of EFMI and Ragnar Nordberg, former Treasurer of EFMI, received certificates as new elected Honorary Fellows of EFMI at EFMI Council meeting held in Zagreb, Croatia in 2018.

The conference represents one of the largest European gathering in the field of Medical informatics: Medical/Health/Biomedical Informatics, Biomedical Engineering, Information Science, Health Informatics, Clinical Informatics, Public Health Informatics, Healthcare IT, Decision Support and Intelligent Systems, Diagnostic Technologies for Medical Decision Support, Formalization of Knowledge, Ontologies, Clinical Guidelines and Standards of Healthcare, Telemedicine, Interoperability in Healthcare Systems, Imaging, Health Information Management, Knowledge Management, Health Technology Assessment, E-learning and Education, Robotics and Virtual Reality, Socio-Economic Issues, Standards, Social and Legal Issues.
Aim of this article is to present Google Scholar Index disadvantages. Google Scholar is a free of charge accessible web search engine that indexes on the full text of literature (1). It is a place where you can evaluate author and the quality of their articles. The research of this project was done through Google Scholar because it is used daily by academic community (1, 2), and also it is a place where your publication can be found. A recent study shows that 50% of the authors’ publication activity is covered (3). Google Scholar is a place where the formalization of authorship which is not true, takes the form is subject to individual content manipulation. It has a wide range of digital form, indexes of journals (h5 index, h5 metric), the work of one author should be opened and left as author’s reference. The work has a descriptive character, and the conclusions are the result of the long-standing work of this author in this area.

2. METHODS

The work has a descriptive character, and the conclusions are the result of the long-standing work of this author in this area. The Google Scholar platform is subject to individual content manipulation, has a wide range of individual content manipulation, is not adequate, does not identity to provide a dead author, work on the work that is used for assessment of the work of one author require a further search for an ideal platform and an ideal way to assessment of one author work, the question remains whether it is necessary to evaluate anybody work, whether it is an ideal tool that each researcher can use to inform the public about his research work. The Google Scholar database-the best source for quick search of the scientific literature is the best source for quick search of the scientific literature. Empiric analyses of information scientists’ professional behaviors (retrieved on May 20th, 2019). The H index of the author, obtained by ResearchGate and Google Scholar results on the work of an author requires a further search for an ideal platform and an ideal way to assessment of the work of an author. The question remains whether it is necessary to evaluate anybody work, whether it is an ideal tool that each researcher can use to inform the public about his research work. The question remains whether it is necessary to evaluate anybody work, whether it is an ideal tool that each researcher can use to inform the public about his research work.

3. RESULTS

These are questionable criteria for the evaluation of the work of this journal or author, the number of quotes of a particular journal is subject to manipulation and poor quality recognition, the work of one author in this area cannot be defined, because authors personally making assessments which publication or some other scientific decision making. ResearchGate and Google Scholar results on the work of an author require a further search for an ideal platform and an ideal way to assessment of one author work, the question remains whether it is necessary to evaluate anybody work, whether it is an ideal tool that each researcher can use to inform the public about his research work. The question remains whether it is necessary to evaluate anybody work, whether it is an ideal tool that each researcher can use to inform the public about his research work.

4. DISCUSSION

The work has a descriptive character, and the conclusions are the result of the long-standing work of this author in this area. The H index of the author, obtained by ResearchGate and Google Scholar results on the work of an author requires a further search for an ideal platform and an ideal way to assessment of the work of an author. The question remains whether it is necessary to evaluate anybody work, whether it is an ideal tool that each researcher can use to inform the public about his research work. The question remains whether it is necessary to evaluate anybody work, whether it is an ideal tool that each researcher can use to inform the public about his research work.

5. CONCLUSION

Although the scientific community is citing the assessment of one author work, the fact is that the deliverables produced by Google Scholar are not perfect and that they do not need to be something that is used by assessment of the work of an author. The question remains whether it is necessary to evaluate anybody work, whether it is an ideal tool that each researcher can use to inform the public about his research work. The question remains whether it is necessary to evaluate anybody work, whether it is an ideal tool that each researcher can use to inform the public about his research work.
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have done by Professor Arie Hasman (2-4). The Organizing Committee, led by Professor John Mantas and his team, chaired by Paris Galos, have done also a really great job.

We hope that “ICIMTH 2020” Conference which is now traditional scientific event in the field of Biomedical Informatics in Europe and larger, next year will attract larger number of participants, because event like this certainly deserves it.

All papers are published in the Proceedings of ICIMTH 2019, by IOS Press publisher, Amsterdam, and papers are indexed in MEDLINE. Presented papers show that Information technologies certainly have growing use in all segments of medicine and its use certainly represents the future of all disciplines and subdisciplines of medicine and healthcare protection.

Author of this report at ICIMTH 2019 Conference presented very two interesting presentations: first one, about most frequent mistakes of statistical analysis of PhD students thesis, and second one about disadvantages of Google Scholar Index, as one of most frequent index used currently in the praxis, but with a lot of mistakes (5, 6).

It was discussed during ICIMTH 2019 Conference with many participants as very important topic, who agreed with my opinion. But, very few academics and scientists openly written about it. We shall see feed-back of the critics for my comments, conclusions and recommendations what to do in the future and who, how, and what need to do for improving Google Scholar Index.

Webometrics use this index as very important platform for assessment of academic institutions and universities and professional academic staffs, but very few people make evaluation of that. Somebody need to do it, definitely.
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