

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

CASE launched

The Council of Asian Science Editors (www.asianeditor.org) was launched in July, during the Asian Science Editors' Conference and Workshop in Seoul, Korea. Emeritus Professor Jong Kyu Ha (Seoul National University, Korea) was elected as the first president, and Professor Hyungsun Kim (Inha University, Korea) is the Secretary-General. *Science Editing* is now the official journal of CASE (esciencediting.org). Inaugural members are 137 editors from 21 countries. CASE aims to improve the quality of science journals published in Asia by consulting regulations on the editing and sharing of information.

Editors clash with publisher

The editorial board of the journal *Prometheus: Critical Studies in Innovation* (www.tandfonline.com/cpro20) threatened to resign after its publisher, Taylor & Francis, intervened in the publication of an article (2013:31:229-239) that was critical of publishing industry practices. There was a long stand-off while the author and editor argued with the publisher about its requirement for large cuts to the article. The delay prompted the editorial board to publicly threaten mass resignation, and the publisher eventually allowed publication with minor edits.

Clarity on authorship

Debate on authorship never goes away, and attempts to pin down 'who did what?' or 'who is responsible for what?' have been partially successful. The latest attempt to bring clarity comes from a team of researchers from Harvard University and the Wellcome Trust. They have developed a 14-point taxonomy that enables authors to

consulted the collected experience that is the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) cases database. COPE has now developed a taxonomy of cases (publicationethics.org/cope-case-taxonomy), which as well as providing a quick way to browse cases also gives a useful overview of the field.

The 1% of scientific publishing

A recent paper by John Ioannidis and colleagues in *PLoS One* (2014:9:e101698) claims that only 1% of scientists publish a paper every year. At the other end of the scale, about 3300 scientists publish ten or more papers a year. In a commentary in *Science Insider* (news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider; 11 July 2014) Prof Ioannidis calls for "more opportunities to a wider pool of scientists, especially younger ones, to help them secure continuity of productivity and excellence."

Open access survey

In July, Taylor & Francis published a new survey of authors on attitudes to open access (www.tandfonline.com/page/openaccess/opensurvey). The results could be compared with a similar survey done last year, and all the data tables have been published

authors had increased confidence in the benefits of open access compared with 2013, with continuing concerns about licensing options and poor-quality journals.

Should research fraud be a crime?

A recent 'head to head' debate in *The BMJ* (2014:349:g4532) put the cases for and against the proposal that research fraud should be a crime. Zulficar Bhutta (Toronto, Canada) says that criminal sanctions are needed to slow the increase in misconduct. Julian Crane (Wellington, New Zealand) counters this argument with the view that criminalisation is unlikely to work and may undermine trust. Where do you stand?

COPE case taxonomy

If you've ever had to deal with a tricky ethics issue, you may well have

The editor's bookshelf

Please write to annamaria.rossi@ese.it if you wish to send new items or become a member of the *EASE Journal Blog* (<http://ese-bookshelf.blogspot.com>).

EDITORIAL PROCESS

Cleary M, Walter G, Daly J. **Dealing with peer review: what is reasonable and what is not?** *Collegian* 2013;20(3):123-125

Peer review is a central process in publishing. Carefully constructed peer reviews are likely to result in a substantially strengthened article. Thus peer reviewers play a vital role in the advancement of knowledge and do so for little recognition or reward: many editors, editorial board members, and reviewers provide their services voluntarily. They ensure that no poor-quality manuscripts are published, thereby maintaining the reputation of the journal and the quality of scientific knowledge. doi: 10.1016/j.colegn.2013.06.004

Paolucci M, Grimaldo F. **Mechanism change in a simulation of peer review: from junk support to elitism.** *Scientometrics* epub February 2014

In this work the authors developed a computational model as an heuristic device to represent, discuss, and compare theoretical statements and their consequences. Employing a theoretical approach supported by agent-based simulation, they examined computational models of peer review, performing the replication of simulations using different mechanisms. Plausible changes showed that peer review can withstand a substantial amount of cheats, causing just a graceful decline in total quality. doi: 10.1007/s11192-014-1239-1

ETHICAL ISSUES

Amos KA. **The ethics of scholarly publishing: exploring differences in plagiarism and duplicate publication across nations.** *Journal*

journals are discussed in detail. The article emphasizes the importance of adhering to the guidance on COI from learned associations such as the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). It also considers joint efforts of authors, peer reviewers, and editors as a foundation for appropriately defining and disclosing potential COIs. doi: 10.3325/cm.2013.54.600

Godecharle S, Nemery B, Dierickx K. **Guidance on research integrity: no union in Europe.** *The Lancet* 2013;381(9872):1097-1098

The authors retrieved and analysed 49 national guidelines addressing research misconduct and promoting scientific integrity, published by 19 European countries. They found a highly heterogeneous picture within and between European countries resulting in a confusing situation. In addition, they had great difficulty in retrieving the guidelines of 12 countries. The harmonization of those guidelines is therefore necessary. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60759-X

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

Diekhoff T, Schlattmann P, Dewey M. **Impact of article language in multi-language medical journals - a bibliometric analysis of self-citations and impact factor.** *PLoS One* 2013;8(10):e76816

This article analyzed the influence of English-language articles in multi-language medical journals. The findings suggested that a larger share of English articles in multi-language medical journals is associated with greater international visibility and recognition. Fewer self-citations were found as they are not needed to artifactually increase the impact factor with a greater share of original articles in English. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0076816

PUBLISHING

Bould MD, Hladkowitz ES, Pigford AE, et al. **References that anyone can edit: review of Wikipedia citations**

of the *Medical Library Association* 2014;102(2):87-91

This study explored national differences in plagiarism and duplicate publication in retracted biomedical literature. The national affiliations of authors and reasons for retraction of papers accessible through PubMed that were published from 2008 to 2012 and subsequently retracted were determined. While the United States retracted the most papers, China retracted the most papers for plagiarism and duplicate publication. Rates of plagiarism and duplicate publication were highest in Italy and Finland, respectively. Unethical publishing practices cut across nations. doi: 10.3163/1536-5050.102.2.005

Brookes PS. **Internet publicity of data problems in the bioscience literature correlates with enhanced corrective action.** *PeerJ* 2014;2:e313

Data integrity is a common discussion topic, with a widely held assumption that publicity surrounding such matters accelerates correction of the scientific record. This study aims to verify whether such public discussion of data integrity has actually had any effect. The results show that it is correlated with greater levels of subsequent actions to correct the scientific record by enhancing the motivation of journals, authors or institutions. doi: 10.7717/peerj.313

Gasparyan AY, Avvazyan L, NAKazhanov NA, et al. **Conflicts of interest in biomedical publications: considerations for authors, peer reviewers, and editors.** *Croatian Medical Journal* 2013;54:600-608

This article overviews evidence on common instances of conflict of interest (COI) in biomedical publications. Financial relationships of research institutions and their investigators is the most conspicuous source of COI. Comprehensive policies on disclosure of financial and non-financial COIs in scholarly journals are presented as proxies of their indexing in evidence-based databases, and examples of successful medical