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://ese-bookshelf.blogspot.co.uk) and see your posts published in the journal.

ECONOMICS AND FUNDING

Wilcock J. **Putting an end to download-and-go: the website's role in a content marketing ecosystem.** *Learned Publishing* 2018;31(2)
Publishers must think of their websites as marketing tools as well as content delivery systems. The five major strategies of content marketing are promotion, personalisation, targeting, consumerisation, and analysis and optimisation. It gives publishers: increased site traffic; extended site visits; new readers, subscribers, and authors; and high brand visibility.
doi: 10.1002/leap.1131

Van Noorden R. **Science in East Asia – by the numbers.** *Nature* 2018;558:500-501
In East Asia several science powerhouses are investing strongly in science. China and Japan are the biggest economies in the area and have giant scientific workforces, but also South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, and Hong Kong are investing heavily in science as an engine for growth. Interesting tables are included.

EDITORIAL PROCESS

Rigby J, Cox D, Julian K. **Journal peer review: a bar or bridge? An analysis of a paper's revision history and turnaround time, and the effect on citation.** *Scientometrics* 2018:114(3):1087-1105
This article explores the journal peer review process and seeks to examine how the reviewing process might itself contribute to the citedness of papers. The study provides evidence, albeit limited to a single journal in the Social Sciences field, that the peer review process may constitute a form of knowledge production and is not the simple correction of errors. Furthermore, the number of reviewers and of the disciplines of the reviewers involved may play a role in manuscript quality development.
doi: 10.1007/s11192-017-2630-5

Schroter S, Price A, Flemyng E, *et al.* **Perspectives on involvement in the peer-review process: surveys of patient and public reviewers at two journals**. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:e023357
In 2014/2015, the *BMJ* and *Research Involvement and Engagement (RIE)* became the first journals to routinely include patients and the public in the peer review process of journal articles. This survey explores the perspectives and early experiences of these reviewers. The results suggest that is feasible to introduce them alongside the peer review process. Patient and public reviewers greatly appreciate the opportunity to be involved and also indicated areas for development.
doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023357

Shashok K, Matarese V. **Post-publication peer review in biomedical journals: overcoming obstacles and disincentives to knowledge sharing.** *RT, A Journal on Research Policy & Evaluation* 2018;1.
Why is it difficult to publish post-publication peer review (PPPR)? Editorial communications are not always as helpful as they should be, online manuscript management systems are often complicated and can be confusing, and article processing charges (APCs) can exclude potentially suitable manuscripts from consideration if a waiver is not available. Moreover, research evaluation policies, editorial priorities and economic factors may create disincentives. The authors offer suggestions for editors and publishers, institutions, and research evaluation policy makers on ways to facilitate knowledge sharing through PPPR.
doi: https://doi.org/10.13130/2282-5398/10125

Science Media Center blog. **The preprint dilemma: good for science, bad for the public? A discussion paper for the scientific community**. 17 July 2018
There is a quiet revolution taking place in scientific publishing. One aspect of the revolution is "preprints", the practice of making scientific papers available to any experts for scrutiny before journal peer review and publication. This essay is an appeal to the scientific community – researchers, publishers and communicators – to take stock and engage in a discussion of the wider impacts of preprint.

ETHICAL ISSUES

Bernard C. **Gender bias in publishing: double-blind reviewing as a solution?** *eNeuro* 8;5(3):ENEURO.0225-18.2018
Many studies point at a gender bias in favour of males for award and acceptance of both grants and publications. At *eNeuro* journal there is a balance between submission and acceptance that avoids gender bias. The journal adopts a double-blind review system, ie any information that explicitly identifies the authors is removed at the submission stage. According to the author, this minimises gender bias during the evaluation of the paper.
doi:10.1523/ENEURO.0225-18.2018

Holman L, Stuart-Fox D, Hauser CE. **The gender gap in science: how long until women are equally represented?** *PLoS Biology* 2018;16(4):e2004956
Despite recent progress, the gender gap appears likely to persist for generations, particularly in surgery, computer science, physics, and maths. The gap is especially large in authorship positions associated with seniority, and prestigious journals have fewer women authors. The authors of this article estimated that men are invited by journals to submit papers at approximately double the rate of women.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.2004956

Utrobičić A, Marušić A. **Transparency of retracting and replacing articles.** *The Lancet* 2018;391(10127):1244-1245
Most article retractions are due to misconduct, but about 20% are retracted because of an unintentional error or methodological flaw. To credit the correction of an honest error, journals have begun a practice of retraction with republication of a corrected article. But stakeholders in communicating research do not have a consistent approach to handling corrections for honest errors.
doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30487-2

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

Andresen K, Laursen J, Rosenberg J. **Outlining and dictating scientific manuscripts is a useful method for health researchers: a focus group interview.** *SAGE Open Medicine* 2018;6:2050312118778728
The authors investigated the experiences and difficulties for young, experienced researchers when writing articles using a detailed outline and dictation of the first draft. Results showed that outlining and dictating sciencific manuscripts is considered by those researchers a useful method. With dictation, a full first draft of a paper can be produced in a few hours.
doi: 10.1177/2050312118778728

Bhardwaj P, Yadav RK. **Harmonising format and style requirements for scientific and medical publications: time to address a long-pending dream.** *Medical Writing* 2018;27(2):71-75
Many times good data get rejected because of the lack of harmonisation in structure, format, and style of manuscripts. These key challenges, including word count, referencing, and citation, are discussed in this article. A framework for a possible solution is also provided.

PUBLISHING

Giraldo O, Garcia A, Corcho O. **A guideline for reporting experimental protocols in life sciences.** *Peer J* 2018;6:e4795
Experimental research should be reproducible whenever possible. Having precise descriptions of the protocols is a step in that direction. This article presents a guideline for describing key content for reporting experimental protocols in life sciences, together with the methodology followed in order to develop the guideline. The authors propose a checklist including 17 data elements that are considered fundamental to facilitate the execution of the protocol.
doi: 10.7717/peerj.4795

Ioannidis JPA, Klavans R, Boyack KW. **The scientists who publish a paper every five days**. *Nature* 2018;561:167-169
To highlight uncertain norms in authorship, the authors identified the most prolific scientists of recent years. They searched Scopus for authors who published more than 72 papers in any one calendar year between 2000 and 2016, and they found more than 9,000 individuals. Whether and how authorship is justified unavoidably varies for each author and each paper, and norms differ by field of research.

Nicholas D, Watkinson A, Abrizah A, *et al*. **What publishers can take away from the latest early career researcher research**. *Learned Publishing* 2018;31(3)
Early career researchers (ECRs) are the key researchers of the future, millennials born between 1982 and 2004 and grown up in a digital environment. ECRs often think differently from their seniors and appear to have a mission based on openness, sharing, and transparency. This article aims to investigate how the ECRs are doing with regard to matters near to publishers. They know – and appear to care – little about publishers but trust them as publishing and reviewing facilitators.
doi: 10.1002/leap.1165

Priyadarshini S. **India targets fake journals**. *Nature* 2018;560:537
In India, some universities have recommended the inclusion of predatory journals in the country's "white list" of approved journals. This list was released by the University Grants Commission in January 2017. Now the Indian government is cracking down on this practice and is telling universities to stop promoting predatory publications.

Sheldon T. **Preprints could promote confusion and distortion**. *Nature* 24 July 2018
Thousands of papers are submitted every month to the arXiv and bioRxiv platforms, which make manuscripts available before they have been peer reviewed and accepted for publication. According to the author, this holds substantial risks for the broader community of readers: weak works could get overblown in the media, while better works could be ignored. He believes that the scientific community should take measures to keep preprints from distorting the public's understanding of science.

Silver S. **Death of scientific journals after 350 years**. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 2018; 365 (14)
Scientific journals have virtually disappeared as subscription-based familiar paper copies. These have been replaced by article access on internet sites followed by open access. This commentary describes this rapidly changing situation in scientific publication and predicts the end of the traditional scientific journal as a familiar means of communication.
doi: 10.1093/femsle/fny130

SCIENCE

Fanelli D. **Is science really facing a reproducibility crisis, and do we need it to?** *PNAS* March 12,2018:201708272
Is there a reproducibility crisis in science? This narrative postulates that a large and growing proportion of studies are unreliable due to the declining quality and integrity of research and publication practices. This article provides an overview of recent evidence suggesting that this narrative is mistaken, and argues that a narrative of epochal changes and empowerment of scientists would be more accurate.
doi: 10.1073/pnas.1708272114