

News notes

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

Some of these items are taken from the EASE Journal Blog (<http://esebookshelf.blogspot.com>) where full URLs may be found

Resource Identification Initiative

The Resource Identification Initiative is a pilot project instigated by the FORCE11 community (force11.org) and run by a group of collaborators motivated to improve the reproducibility of research findings. Research Resource Identifiers (RRIDs), which are unique, machine-readable, free, and consistently applied, are being allocated to a limited set of resources: antibodies, model organisms, and software and database tools, all drawn from established registries. A Resource Identification Portal (scicrunch.org/resources) provides a convenient entry point for authors. Several publishers and journals have recently endorsed the project and are participating in pilots to implement RRIDs (www.force11.org/node/4463).

Nature offers double-blind peer review

Nature Publishing Group has announced (*Nature* 2015;518:274) that authors submitting papers to *Nature* or one of the other *Nature* research journals will be able to opt for double-blind peer review (where both the author and reviewer are anonymous). The move follows trials in *Nature Geoscience* and *Nature Climate Change*.

WHO calls for all trials to be reported

The World Health Organization (WHO) has issued a strong statement on public disclosure of clinical trial results (www.who.int/ictrp/results). It calls for clinical

trial results to be publicly reported within 12 months and for results of unpublished trials to be made available. It asks organisations and governments to find ways to achieve this. Ben Goldacre, co-founder of AllTrials (alltrials.net), writing in *PLOS Medicine* (2015;12:e1001821), suggests ways of achieving high standards and preventing reports being withheld.

New COPE guidelines

The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) has published new guidelines on sharing of information among Editors-in-Chief regarding possible misconduct. The guidelines (available at publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines) were developed from a COPE Forum discussion and subsequent Discussion Document, and aim to guide Editors-in-Chief who are considering cases across multiple journals.

Research integrity: journal and conference

A new journal from BioMed Central (biomedcentral.com) will focus on peer review and research ethics. *Research Integrity and Peer Review* will be launched in June at the World Conference on Research Integrity in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (www.wcri2015.org). Editors-in-Chief of the journal will be publishing consultant Liz Wager and Iveta Simera of the EQUATOR Network, with Stephanie Harriman and Maria Kowalczyk of BioMed Central's research integrity team. The journal will cover all aspects of integrity, including peer review, reporting, and research and publication ethics, with a particular focus on current controversies, limitations and solutions. The theme of the WCRI conference is "Research rewards and integrity: improving systems to promote responsible research".

WAME statement on peer review

The World Association of Medical

Editors (WAME) has responded to reports of manipulation of the peer review process with a statement. The statement, published on the WAME website (www.wame.org), contains guidance on peer reviewer selection, avoiding selection of fraudulent peer reviewers, and detecting fraudulent peer review.

Project CRediT

Some years after the Wellcome Trust and Harvard University co-hosted a workshop to explore contributorship and attribution models, the team behind it has coalesced into Project CRediT (projectcredit.net), led by Wellcome Trust and Digital Science, and facilitated by CASRAI (the Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information) and NISO. It is "an ongoing effort to standardize a contributor role taxonomy to facilitate transparent disclosure of authorship and contributorship practices in scholarly writing." The taxonomy is now available at dictionary.casrai.org/Contributor_Roles and the project is moving into the implementation phase.

Norwegian journal editor resigns

The long-standing Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of the Norwegian Medical Association* (*Tidsskriftet for Den Norske Legeforening*), Charlotte Haug, has resigned, following disagreements with the journal's owners about how to take it forward. The *BMJ* (2015;350:h766) reports that several leading medical journal editors raised serious concerns about the resignation, expressing support and admiration for Haug, who is also vice-chair of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Research Councils UK OA policy review

An independent review of the Research Councils UK (RCUK; rcuk.ac.uk) open access policy looked at the impact of implementation

of the policy on higher education institutions. It found that improvements were needed in communication to ease confusion and generate better awareness, and also noted that the policy was creating a two-tier system for gold versus green open access. Another review will be held in 2016.

CHORUS progress

CHORUS (Clearinghouse for the Open Research of the United States; www.chorusaccess.org) is the publisher-led solution developed in response to US federal agencies' requirements for public access to funded research. CHORUS has recently partnered with the CLOCKSS Archive (clocks.org) to support archiving. CHORUS members will be able to use this link-up to ensure permanent access to content. CHORUS is also looking at links with data repositories.

Freedom APCs

Cogent OA, an open-access publisher backed by Taylor & Francis, has launched a new model for article-processing charges (APCs). 'Freedom APCs' are intended to match charges to an author's ability to pay. If authors are not able to secure funding from their funding agency, institution or employer, they pay from a range based on their circumstances.

TRANSFER transferred to NISO

The Transfer Code of Practice, developed by UKSG (www.uksg.org) to provide guidance when a journal changes ownership, is now being maintained by the National Information Standards Organization (NISO). The most recent version has been republished as a NISO Recommended Practice, and associated documentation is available at www.niso.org/workrooms/transfer.

Peer review at Scientific Reports

One of the editors of *Scientific Reports*, an open-access journal published by Nature Publishing Group (www.nature.com/srep) resigned (via Twitter) in response to the journal's

decision to offer authors the option to pay for a quicker peer-review process for their submitted papers. Mark Maslin, from University College London, UK, objected to the creation of a two-tier system favouring well-funded groups. The accelerated peer-review is being provided by the Rubriq service (www.rubriq.com), which recruits peer-reviewers and pays them for each completed review. Subsequently a large number of editors at the journal wrote to NPG to share their concerns, which are shared on www.peerreviewneutrality.org. NPG's response is on the Of Schemes and Memes blog (blogs.nature.com; 8 April 2015).

Bookmetrix

Bookmetrix (bookmetrix.com) is a new metrics tool developed by Springer and Altmetric (altmetric.com). The aim is to capture and display more useful metrics for usage and readership of books and book chapters. Bookmetrix brings the kinds of altmetrics used for journal articles into the books realm. Metrics are also displayed on the company's SpringerLink platform (link.springer.com) and to users of Papers (papersapp.com), the reference manager app.

Elsevier trials publishing peer review reports

Elsevier is looking at ways of giving peer reviewers more credit for their work. A pilot project, called *Publishing Peer Review*, follows a successful initiative by Elsevier journal *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, which began publishing selected peer review reports alongside published articles. The project will involve five journals.

SFEP/SI joint conference

The Society for Editors and Proofreaders (sfep.org.uk) and the Society of Indexers (indexers.org.uk) are holding a joint conference in York, UK, on 5–7 September 2015. There is more information on the societies' websites. EASE members are entitled to discount registration.

DOAJ

In January 2015 the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ; www.doaj.org) invited publishers to re-apply for all their journals listed in the directory. This follows the introduction of an updated and extended journal application form last year. For the 10,000 unchecked journals currently in the directory, there will be a grace period of up to 15 months for re-application. DOAJ is looking for volunteer editors to help with its ongoing work. Some listed journals will also be eligible for a DOAJ Seal of Approval, for which there are six criteria: archiving; article identifiers; delivery of metadata to DOAJ; machine-readable licensing information; CC licensing (CC BY, CC BY-SA or CC BY-NC); deposit policy registered.

DOI Chronograph

CrossRef (crossref.org) has been working with Wikipedia to explore ways that DOIs are used there. This has led to further explorations about how DOIs are used on the open web, with the aim of understanding broader approaches to citation. One result of this work is the DOI Chronograph (chronograph.labs.crossref.org), which allows you to trace the use of DOIs over time.

FORCE2015

The FORCE11 Group held its annual meeting in January 2015 in Oxford, UK (force11.org/meetings/force2015). The meeting provided an opportunity to debate the future of research communication, and on the conference website you can watch videos of the presentations and sign up to take part in ongoing projects and view the submissions for FORCE11's 1K Challenge (What would you do with £1k today to make research communication better?)

With thanks to Dieter Scholz.

John Hilton
Editor, Cochrane Editorial Unit,
Cochrane Collaboration, London, UK
hilton.john@gmail.com