

News notes

News Notes are compiled by John Hilton (hilton.john@gmail.com)

Some of these items are taken from the EASE journal blog (<http://ese-bookshelf.blogspot.co.uk>) where full URLs may be found

ICMJE recommendations update

The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) has updated its *Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals*. Changes include new guidance on the appropriate use of corrections, retractions, and retractions-with-republication, and expanded sections on sex/gender and image manipulation. The updated recommendations are available from the ICMJE website (icmje.org/recommendations), where you can also find an annotated version indicating what's changed (icmje.org/news-and-editorials).

Data citation roadmaps

The Joint Declaration of Data Citation Principles was published in 2014 by the Data Citation Synthesis Group, part of FORCE11 (force11.org/groups). A new group, the Data Citation Implementation Group has led the publication of two roadmaps for scientific publishers (*BioRxiv* 2017;100784) and scholarly data repositories (*BioRxiv* 2016;097196), to help in the implementation of the principles.

Publisher ORCID requirements

Following a move by some funders to require researchers to have an ORCID identifier (orcid.org), some major publishers, including PLOS, Wiley, and the American Chemical Society, have joined a growing group of publishers also now requiring authors to supply an ORCID ID when submitting articles. PLOS requires all corresponding authors to have an ORCID ID, and displays ORCID

IDs on published articles and blog posts (see plos.org/orcid). Wiley will require an ORCID ID from the submitting author on more than 500 of its journals. All organisations have signed an ORCID open letter about the requirement.

Scholarly Commons Working Group

On 19-20 September 2016, the FORCE11 Scholarly Commons Working Group held its second workshop at the University of California, San Diego. The Scholarly Commons is defined as “an information space based on common agreement on standards and principles”, and the second workshop aimed to “put the infrastructure and policy pieces together that make the global Scholarly Commons tick”. You can read the meeting notes, the draft principles of the commons, and more at www.force11.org/group/scholarly-commons-working-group and on the Unlocking Research blog (unlockingresearch.blog.lib.cam.ac.uk; 22 September 2016).

Partnership on data discoverability

Publisher Springer Nature has formed a partnership with Figshare (figshare.com). The aim is to support authors contributing to more than 300 BioMed Central or Springer Open journals who wish to (or are required to) make their data available. Each data file gets a DOI and is hosted on a distinct repository on Figshare (springernature.figshare.com) and is also viewable alongside the accompanying article using a widget. You can read more about the partnership on the Digital Science News Blog (digital-science.com/blog/news; 15 December 2016).

The Vienna Principles

The Open Access Network Austria (oana.at) has developed the Vienna Principles (viennaprinciples.org), described as “a vision for scholarly communication”. The 12 principles

cover accessibility, discoverability, reusability, reproducibility, transparency, understandability, collaboration, quality assurance, evaluation, validated progress, innovation, and public good.

Open access anniversaries

20 December 2016 was the 10th birthday of PLOS One, the first ‘megajournal’. Since its launch the journal has included 165,000 articles, and the journal now has 6000 academic editors, 20 staff editors and 25 support staff. In 2016 the journal used 66,900 peer reviewers. The full story is told on the PLOS EveryOne blog (blogs.plos.org/everyone; 20 December 2016). 14 February 2017 also sees the 15th anniversary of the Budapest Open Access Initiative (budapestopenaccessinitiative.org), where the term ‘open access’ was introduced. The Open Society Foundation has been conducting a survey to assess views on the values, impact, and continued relevance of the initiative.

PaperHive

PaperHive (paperhive.org) sets itself the impressive goal of “simplifying research communication and transforming reading into a process of collaboration”. It does this by allowing researchers to search for papers and enabling discussion directly within the browser, so readers can attach questions or additional analysis directly to the text. Public contributions are given a CC-BY-4.0 licence for reuse and attribution.

Preprints innovation

OSF Preprints (osf.io/preprints) is a preprints repository and aggregator built by the Open Science Framework (osf.io), an initiative of the Center for Open Science (cos.io). The service aggregates preprints from *arXiv*, *BioRxiv*, and many other open preprint servers. Another application, Papr (jhubiostatistics.shinyapps.io/papr) allows ratings of preprints.

Signs a paper's authorship was bought

The Retraction Watch blog (retractionwatch.com; 24 October 2016) reports on work done to help editors identify whether a scientific paper's authorship was bought. Peggy Mason at the University of Chicago, and Maria Sol Bernardez Sarria of Yale University, formerly associated with the Ethics Committee of the Society for Neuroscience, which publishes the *Journal of Neuroscience*, have identified seven key items to look for which may indicate fraudulent authorship on articles.

CiteScore

Elsevier has released a new journal metric called CiteScore (journalmetrics.scopus.com). CiteScore is comparable with the Impact Factor, but it looks at a three-year period (compared with two years for Impact Factor) and it includes a broader range of articles, such as editorials and news, in the calculations. CiteScore is also free and updated monthly, but there is a charge for access to the underlying dataset. You can read more on the Scholarly Kitchen blog (scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org; 12 December 2016).

Beall's List closes

The list of "predatory" journals and publishers maintained by Jeffrey Beall at the University of Colorado has been shut down. Beall closed the site hosting the list (scholarlyoa.com) in January 2017, although copies of the lists can be found on archive.org. Beall gave no reason for the closure, resulting in much speculation. The most recent update to the list had been published in December 2016.

oaDOI

oaDOI (oadoi.org) is a new search engine for open access versions of articles. It is being developed by the Impactstory team (impactstory.org) and funded by the Alfred P Sloan

Foundation. It starts with a DOI and searches a variety of sources, including the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Crossref, DataCite, BASE, and Digital Science's library of DOI prefixes, as well as searching repository and journal article pages directly. An oaDOI link is like a DOI link, but will deliver an open access version of the article, if one is available. The oaDOI system expands on a previous search engine, doai.io, developed by BASE.

Language barriers

A team from the University of Cambridge assessed the degree to which language remains a barrier to knowledge transfer in science. The researchers searched Google Scholar for biodiversity conservation articles published in 2004. They found 75,000 articles, about a third of which were not in English. The authors propose approaches for effectively including non-English scientific knowledge and for improving the availability of translations of new and existing knowledge available only in English. The paper was published in *PLOS Biology* (2016;14:e2000933).

Women in peer review

Is there gender bias in peer review? A recent analysis of genders and ages of authors and reviewers for 20 American Geophysical Union (AGU) journals from 2012 to 2015 provides some insight. The analysis (*Nature* 2016;541:455-7) revealed that women were used less as reviewers than expected, based on the proportion of women who were AGU members or authors published in AGU journals. This seemed to result from authors and editors suggesting women as reviewers less often, and a slightly higher decline rate among women.

Relative Citation Ratio

The US National Institutes of Health has introduced a new metric to evaluate research outputs. The

Relative Citation Ratio (RCR) uses the co-citation network to normalise the number of citations, and the methodology was published in *BioRxiv* (30 March 2016). A tool called iCite (icite.od.nih.gov) can be used to calculate RCRs from articles in PubMed. Digital Science (digital-science.com) has adopted the new metric for its companies. Also appearing in *BioRxiv* (11 September 2016) is a paper by senior staff at several leading science publishers, challenging the inappropriate usage of Journal Impact Factors.

Why are articles retracted?

BioMed Central's research integrity team looked at 134 retractions from BioMed Central journals from 2000 to 2015. About three-quarters of the retractions were due to some form of misconduct (compromised peer review, plagiarism, or data fabrication). Most of the peer review-related retractions were linked to an apparent systematic manipulation of the peer review process across multiple publishers that took place in March 2015. Other retractions were due to honest error by authors or the publisher. The study was published in *BMJ Open* (2016;6:e012047).

Manifesto for reproducible science

There has been much focus on reproducibility of science across many scientific disciplines. A recently published "manifesto" sets out to identify measures to "optimize key elements of the scientific process: methods, reporting and dissemination, reproducibility, evaluation and incentives." The manifesto, by Marcus Munafò and colleagues (*Nature Human Behaviour* 2017;1:00210) argues for preregistration as a solution to many issues, as well as touching on open access, data sharing and adherence to reporting guidelines such as the TOP guidelines.