# The editor's bookshelf

Bookshelf is compiled by Anna Maria Rossi (annamaria.rossi@iss.it). Please contact Anna Maria if you wish to send items or become a member of the EASE journal blog (http://esebookshelf.blogspot.co.uk) and see your posts published in the journal.

## **ECONOMICS AND FUNDING**

Miller P. Martino F. Gross S, et al. Funder interference in addiction research: an international survey of authors. Addictive Behaviors 2017;72:100-105 This study investigates funder (eg industry, government or charity) interference in addiction science. Interference appears to be common by governments and internationally, and similar proportions of reported interference from commercial and government funders were found. Strategies to increase transparency in the addiction science literature, including mandatory author declarations concerning the role of the funder, are necessary internationally. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.03.026

## **EDITORIAL PROCESS**

Downey SM, Geraci SA. Manuscript development and publishing: a **5-step approach.** *The American* Journal of the Medical Sciences 2017;353(2):132-136 This article articulates a 5-step approach for successfully developing and publishing a manuscript in a peer reviewed journal. The authors combine existing tutorials with their collective experience. The 5 steps identified instruct would-be authors to: know their material and determine their audience; outline their manuscript; be ethically vigilant; develop individual sections and submit their manuscript; and respond to reviewers' comments. doi: 10.1016/j.amjms.2016.12.005

### **ETHICAL ISSUES**

Fanelli D, Costas R, Ioannidis IP. Meta-assessment of bias in science. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 2017;114(14):3714-3719 Actual prevalence of biases across disciplines is unknown. To gain a comprehensive picture of the potential impact of bias in science, the authors probed for multiple bias-related patterns and risk factors in a large random sample of metaanalyses taken from all disciplines. The magnitude of these biases varied widely across fields and was overall relatively small. However, it was observed there was a significant risk of small, early, and highly cited studies to overestimate effects and of studies not published in peer reviewed journals to underestimate them. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1618569114

McCoy MS, Emanuel EJ. Why there are no "potential" conflicts of interest. JAMA 2017;317(17):1721-1722 The notion of a potential conflict of interest (COI) reflects the mistaken view that a COI exists only when bias or harm actually occurs. Distinctions between potential and actual COI are rooted in a basic misunderstanding of the concept of a COI and its ethical significance. These invidious distinctions should be avoided. A COI exists when a secondary interest has the potential to bias a physician's or a researcher's primary interest in pursuing patient wellbeing and generalisable knowledge.

Schiermeier Q. Science publishers try new tack on copyright breaches. *Nature* 2017;545(7653):145-146 Rise in copyright breaches prompts industry to discuss ways to allow 'fair sharing' of articles. Science publishers seem to be changing tack in their approach to researchers who breach copyright. Instead of demanding that scientists or network operators take their papers down, some publishers are

doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.2308

clubbing together to create systems for legal sharing of articles — called fair sharing — which could also help them to track the extent to which scientists share paywalled articles online. doi: 10.1038/545145a

#### **LANGUAGE AND WRITING**

Liu W. The changing role of non-English papers in scholarly communication: evidence from Web of Science's three journal citation indexes. Learned Publishing 2017;30(2):115-123 Non-English languages are widely used, but their roles in scholarly communication are relatively underexplored. This study shows that English is increasingly being used as the dominating language from natural sciences and social sciences to arts and humanities. However, a large number of non-English papers can be found in some applied disciplines of sciences and social sciences, and they have consistently played an important role in arts and humanities disciplines from the beginning of 1975. doi: 10.1002/leap.1089

#### **PUBLISHING**

Bierer BE, Crosas M, Pierce HH. Data authorship as an incentive to data **sharing.** The New England Journal of Medicine 2017;376:1684-1687 The use of research data by persons other than those who originally gathered the data is termed "data sharing". It creates an obligation for the original investigators, who obtain funding, design studies, collect and analyse data, and publish results, to make their curated data and associated metadata available to third parties. The authors believe that both as a matter of fairness and as a matter of providing an incentive for data sharing, the persons who initially gathered the data should receive appropriate and standardised credit that can be used for academic advancement, for grant applications, and in broader situations. doi: 10.1056/NEJMsb1616595

Shamseer L, Moher D, Maduekwe O, et al. Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical journals: can you tell the difference? A cross-sectional comparison. BMC Medicine 2017:15:28

The authors carried out a cross-sectional comparison of characteristics of three types of biomedical journals: potential predatory, presumed legitimate open access, and presumed legitimate subscription-based journals. Thirteen evidence-based characteristics by which predatory journals may potentially be distinguished from presumed legitimate journals were identified.

doi: 10.1186/s12916-017-0785-9

Shashok K. Can scientists and their institutions become their own open access publishers? arXiv:1701.02461 This article offers a personal perspective on the current state of academic publishing, and posits that the scientific community is beset with iournals that contribute little valuable knowledge, overload the community's capacity for high-quality peer review, and waste resources. Open access publishing can offer solutions, but commercial journal publishers have influenced open access policies and practices in ways that favour their economic interests. One way to free research from constraints on access is the diamond route of open access publishing, in which institutions and funders that produce new knowledge reclaim responsibility for publication via institutional journals or other open platforms.

Vasilevsky NA, Minnier J, Haendel MA, et al. Reproducible and reusable research: are journal data sharing policies meeting the mark? PeerJ 2017 Apr 25;5:e3208
Publishers could play an important role in facilitating and enforcing data sharing; however, many journals have not yet implemented data sharing policies and the requirements vary widely across journals. This study analysed the pervasiveness and

quality of data sharing policies in 318 biomedical journals: only a minority of biomedical journals require data sharing, and there is a significant association between higher impact factors and journals with a data sharing requirement. doi: 10.7717/peerj.3208. eCollection2017

#### **RESEARCH EVALUATION**

Davis P. Citation performance indicators - A very short introduction. The Scholarly Kitchen 2017 May 15

This post provides a brief summary of the main citation indicators used today to highlight their salient strengths and weaknesses. These indicators are grouped based on the design of their algorithm: the group *Ratio-based indicators* is built on the same model as the Impact Factor, by dividing citations counts by document counts; the group *Portfoliobased indicators* calculates a score based on a ranked set of documents; and the last group *Network-based indicators* seeks to measure influence within a larger citation network.

Lagace N. NISO releases recommended practice covering outputs of its multiyear project in alternative assessment metrics. Serials Review 2016;42(4):337-338. NISO, the National Information Standards Organization, announced the publication of its latest Recommended Practice, NISO RP-25-2016, Outputs of the NISO Alternative Assessment Metrics Project, in September 2016. This document is the culmination of a two-phase project initialised in 2013 and designed to support the uptake of altmetrics. To further facilitate adoption of these new assessment measures, the scholarly community developed consensus work via NISO that addresses several areas of the altmetric environment: definitions and use cases; persistent identifiers, output types, and data metrics; and data quality. doi: 10.1080/00987913.2016.1246343)

#### **SCIENCE**

Klitzman R, Pivovarova E, Lidz CW. Single IRBs in multisite trials. Question posed by the new NIH policy. JAMA 2017;317(20):2061-2062 The National Institutes of Health (NIH) announced a new policy (effective September 25, 2017) to mandate that nonexempt multisite research with humans funded by the NIH be reviewed by a single institutional review boards (IRBs). Underlying the policy is the belief that the use of single IRBs for multisite studies avoids duplicate and possibly conflicting IRB reviews and thereby streamlines and accelerates the review

doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.4624

### **SCIENCE COMMUNICATION**

Ke Q, Ahn Y-Y, Sugimoto CR. A systematic identification and analysis of scientists on Twitter. PLoS ONE 2017;12(4):e0175368. The authors developed a systematic method to discover scientists who are recognised as scientists by other Twitter users and self-identify as scientists through their profile. They studied the demographics, sharing behaviours, and interconnectivity of the identified scientists in terms of discipline and gender. Twitter has been employed by scholars across the disciplinary spectrum, with an overrepresentation of social and computer and information scientists, underrepresentation of mathematical, physical, and life scientists, and a better representation of women. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0175368

Thanks to John Glen.

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