The Editor's Bookshelf

Please write to annamaria.rossi@iss.it if you wish to send new items or become a member of the EASE journal blog (http://ese-bookshelf.blogspot.com) and see your postings published in the journal.

EDITORIAL PROCESS

Ford E. **Defining and characterizing open peer review: a review of the literature**. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 2013; 44(4):311-326
This article examines the literature discussing open peer review, identifies common open peer review definitions, and describes eight common characteristics of open peer review: signed, disclosed, editor-mediated, transparent, crowd-sourced, pre-publication, synchronous, and post-publication review. It further discusses benefits and challenges to the scholarly publishing community posed by open peer review.
doi: 10.1353/scp.2013.0028

Huh S. **The new era of Journal of Neurogastroenterology and Motility: what should be prepared to be a top journal in the category of Gastroenterology and Hepatology.** *Journal of Neurogastroenterology and Motility* 2013;19(4):419-421
The author explains what the editors of a journal indexed in the Web of Science should do in order to improve all processes of editing and publishing, ie editorial board, description including aims and scope, instructions to authors, publication ethics, cover page design, lay-out style of text, manuscript management system, review process, training of reviewers, budget including article processing charge, eISSN, PMC XML or JATS XML, PubReader, CrossRef XML for DOI, CrossCheck, CrossMark, FundRef, ORCID, QR code, journal homepage, journal app for smart phone and smart pad, and multimedia data.
doi: 10.5056/jnm.2013.19.4.419

ETHICAL ISSUES

Gasparyan AY, Ayvazyan L, Akazhanov NA, *et al*. **Self-correction in biomedical publications and the scientific impact.** *Croatian Medical Journal* 2014;55:61-72
The authors conducted searches through PubMed, based on the author information, to retrieve errata, duplicate, and retracted publications. A striking increase in the number of corrections appeared in 2013. Duplicate and retracted article types were those most frequently recorded, and a sizeable amount of them came from highly productive countries. In particular, findings revealed an increase of duplicate items, which mostly came to the light in the digitization and open-access era. The study suggests that the increased self-correction in biomedicine is due to the attention of readers and authors, who spot errors.
doi: 10.3325/cmj.2014.55.61

Marušić A, Ferenčić SF. **Adoption of the double dummy trial design to reduce observer bias in testing treatments**. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 2013;106(5):196-198
The use of the double dummy trial is reported to reduce observer bias. Although the use of placebo controls (dummy treatments) and blind assessment to decrease observer bias in clinical trials was introduced at the end of the 19th century, it was not until the second half of the 20th century, that placebo controls became more widely used. The preparation of the placebo interventions becomes more complicated: to control for both delivery methods, the trial needs to have adequate control groups for both treatments – an approach referred to as the 'double dummy' trial.
doi: 10.1177/0141076813485350

Stern S, Lemmens T. **Legal remedies for medical ghostwriting: imposing fraud liability on guest authors of ghostwritten articles**. *Medical Writing* 2013;22(4):264-271
In industry-controlled research, several examples have revealed the use of ghostwriters, and the recruitment of academics as guest authors despite not fulfilling authorship criteria. The authors suggest that the practice of ghostwriting could be deterred through the imposition of legal liability on the guest authors. Thus, a guest author's claim for credit of an article could constitutes a legal fraud.
doi: 10.1179/2047480613Z.0000000 00164

Wager E, Kleinert S. **Why do we need international standards on responsible research publication for authors and editors?** *Journal of Global Health* 2013;3(2):020301
Most journals concentrate on style and formatting but give little or no information about research and publication ethics. Peer review cannot, by itself, prevent fraud or misconduct. This article include position statements and the Guidelines on Responsible Research Publication for authors and editors, that were developed after a wide international consultation with input from researchers and editors. They aim to establish international standards and to describe responsible research reporting practice.
doi: 10.7189/jogh.03.020301

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

Das N, Das S. **Hiring a professional medical writer: is it equivalent to ghostwriting?** *Biochemia Medica* 2014;24(1):19-24
Several international guidelines including the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) guidelines require authors to acknowledge the contribution of medical writers. This article discusses this acknowledgement and emphasizes on how acknowledging medical writing support can go a long way in curbing the menace of scientific misconduct including ghostwriting. Some biomedical editors predict a gradual shift from the traditional authorship system

to a model of contributorship: even medical writers who do not always qualify as authors would receive adequate acknowledgement for their contribution.
doi: 10.11613/BM.2014.004

Murugesan R. **Publishing a journal in English: tips for journal editors who are non-native English speakers.** *Science Editing* 2014;1(1):46-48
This article is aimed at non-native English speaking journal editors who wish to improve the standard of English in their journals. It describes several types of language professionals who can be involved in preparing a scientific manuscript for publication. Among them, the author's editor is a person who helps an author improve the language and presentation of a manuscript; a copy-editor works for a range of clients (ie publishers, universities, individual authors) and is involved in the author's publishing goals.
doi: 10.6087/kcse.2014.1.46

PUBLISHING

Barić H, Andrijašević L. **Why should medical editors CARE about case reports?** *Croatian Medical Journal* 2013;54:507-509
In September 2013, CARE (CAse REport) guidelines were presented and published in several journals. Even though case reports are indispensable for medical progress since they bring attention to novel entities, in the evidence based era of impact factors and citations, they are often considered to be less valuable and often neglected by both publishers and readers, due to their low citation rates. However, case reports have not only changed and grown more complex in their form, but continue to report on a wide range of topics other than direct clinical experience.
doi: 10.3325/cmj.2013.54.507

Libkind AN, Markusova VA, Mindeli LE, *et al*. **Bibliometric indicators of Russian journals by JCR-Science Edition, 1995-2010**. *Acta Naturae* 2013;5(3):6-12
A representative empirical bibliometric analysis of the Russian journals covered by the Journal Citation Reports-Science Edition (JCR -SE) for the period 1995–2010 has been conducted for the first time at the macro level (excluding subject categories). The growth in the number of articles covered by JCR is ahead of the growth rates of Russian publications. The Russian research performance is staggering (approximately 30,000 articles per year) although the coverage of Russian journals has expanded to 150 titles. Over the past 15 years a twofold increase in the impact factor of the Russian journals has been observed. Measures to improve the quality of Russian journals are proposed, as for example the quality of their translation into English.

Singleton A. **The first scientific journal**. *Learned Publishing* 2014;27(1):2-4
On the occasion of the 350th anniversary of the publication of the first scientific journal, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society (Phil Trans), the editor of Learned Publishing took a close look at the early issues of this journal to see how much has changed in journal publishing since that time. Surprisingly he discovered many features that are associated with the modern journal, and that today are named as: contents lists and indexes, letters to the editor, news and views, FAQs, book reviews, errata, adverts, illustrations, referencing, and peer review.
doi: 10.1087/2014101

RESEARCH EVALUATION

Eyre-Walker A, Stoletzki N. **The assessment of science: the relative merits of post-publication review, the impact factor, and the number of citations.** *PLoS Biology* 2013;11(10):e1001675
This article investigates three methods of assessing the merit of a scientific paper: subjective post-publication peer review, the impact factor of the journal in which the article was published, and the number of citations gained by a paper. According to the conclusions, the three measures of scientific merit considered are poor; in particular subjective assessments are an error-prone, biased, and expensive method by which to assess merit. The authors argue that the impact factor may be the most satisfactory of the methods considered, since it is a form of pre-publication review. However, it is likely to be a very error-prone measure of merit that is qualitative, not quantitative.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1001675

Finardi U. **Correlation between Journal Impact Factor and citation performance: an experimental study**. *Journal of Informetrics* 2013;7(2):357-370
This article studies how the correlation between the Journal Impact Factor and the (time-weighed) article Mean Received Citations (intended as a measure of journal performance) has evolved through time. It focuses on a sample of hard sciences and social sciences journals from the 1999 to 2010 time period. Correlation coefficients (Pearson's Coefficients as well as Spearman's Coefficients and Kendall's τα) are calculated and then tested against several null hypotheses. The results show that in most cases Journal Impact Factors and their yearly variations do not display a strong correlation with citedness. Differences also exist among scientific areas.
doi: 10.1016/j.joi.2012.12.004

Tort ABL, Targino ZH, Amaral OB. **Rising publication delays inflate journal impact factors**. *PLoS ONE* 2012;7(2):e53374
In this study the authors used publication records of neuroscience journals to analyze the evolution of publication delay over the last decade, and to study whether this phenomenon can alter journal impact factors. They showed that online-to-print lags (that is, the delay between online availability of an article and its print publication) have risen steeply in recent years, and that they led to earlier citations, and thus to an increase in impact factors. According to the authors, a simple means to

avoid distortions such as the one described is the indexing of articles by scientific databases on the date of their online appearance, rather than on that of their publication in print.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0053374

SCIENCE

Chalmers I, Bracken M, Djulbegovic B, *et al*. **How to increase value and reduce waste when research priorities are set**. *The Lancet* 2014;383(9912):156-165
This is the first article in a series of five papers published in *The Lancet* about "Research: increasing value, reducing waste". It is focused on the reductions in waste of resources resulting from decisions about what research to do. Four recommendations are given: the ways to improve the yield from basic research should be investigated; the funders should inform about the transparency of processes; investment in additional research should be preceded by systematic assessment of existing evidence; and finally, sources of information about research in progress should be strengthened and developed and used by researchers.
doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62229-1

Larivière V, Ni C, Gingras Y, *et al*. **Global gender disparities in science**. *Nature* 2013;504:211-213.
In this paper the authors present a cross-disciplinary bibliometric analysis of: relationship between gender and research output; extent of collaboration; and scientific impact of published papers. They used the following parameters: authorship; co-authorship; and citations. Their findings confirm that gender imbalances persist in research output worldwide. Globally, women accounted for fewer than 30% of fractionalized authorships of scientific papers; in terms of collaboration, women tended to be more "domestically oriented" (ie, focused on within country collaborations) than men; and papers with women in prominent author positions received fewer citations (on average) than those with men in the same positions.
doi:10.1038/504211a

SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

Brownell SE, Price JV, Steinman L. **Science communication to the general public: why we need to teach undergraduate and graduate students this skill as part of their formal scientific training**. *The Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education (JUNE)* 2013;12(1):E6-E10
The authors argue that incorporating formal communication training into undergraduate and graduate curricula for aspiring scientists will enhance the quality of discourse between scientists and the lay public. They provide general recommendations for those interested in developing basic science courses with an emphasis on communication with a layperson audience, with specific examples derived from their own training experience whose focus is analysis of primary scientific literature and mastery of scientific content.

Doshi P, Goodman SN, Ioannidis JPA. **Raw data from clinical trials: within reach?** *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences* 2013;34(12):645-647
Many scientific disciplines have accepted that raw data, protocols, and analysis codes should be widely available. Making raw data from clinical trials widely publically available should reduce selective reporting biases and enhance the reproducibility of and trust in clinical research. Some of the caveats and limitations in proposed data-sharing policies are potentially restrictive, and the authors argue in favor of more widespread availability of data from clinical research.
doi: 10.1016/j.tips.2013.10.006

Maqbool F, Bahadar H, Abdollahi M. **Science for the benefit of all; The way from idea to product**. *Journal of Medical Hypotheses and Ideas*. epub February 2014
Mutual coordination between academia and industries is extremely important for the growth of science. The spread of ideas is only possible with publication and distribution of information to all in the world. Unpublished new ideas remain hidden. It is necessary that all scientists share their ideas, opening new opportunities for others to work in the various aspects them. It is important to ponder new ways in science, generate new ideas and share with others, so the concept of "science for the benefits of all" remain alive forever.
doi: 10.1016/j.jmhi.2014.02.002

Anna Maria Rossi
Publishing Unit
Istituto Superiore di Sanità, Rome
annamaria.rossi@iss.it

National and University Library in Zagreb (http://www.nsk.hr)