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://esebookshelf.blogspot.com) where full URLs may be found

WAME code of conduct
The World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) has developed a professional code of conduct for medical journal editors. The code of conduct covers six areas: research integrity; personal development; policies and behaviour; editorial independence; best practice; and relevance. You can read the code on the WAME website (wame.org/news; 12 May 2016).

Invited reproducibility paper
The journal *Information Systems* has introduced a new article type: the invited reproducibility paper. Directly addressing the lack of reproducibility in science, the journal, published by Elsevier, is inviting authors to co-author a report of a verified reproduced experiment. All code and data are made available on Mendeley Data (data.mendeley.com), which recently came out of beta development. You can read more on the Elsevier Connect blog (www.elsevier.com/connect; 11 April 2016).

Badges for books
Altmetric has enabled Badges for Books, for displaying how much attention a published book and its individual chapters have received. The badges (see altmetric.com/products/books) are linked to ISBNs and record mentions in mainstream media, policy documents, reference managers, blogs, social media, and peer review platforms. The service launched on the Taylor & Francis Routledge Handbooks Online platform.

Peer Review Week 2016
The second Peer Review Week will take place from 19 to 26 September 2016. As announced at the EASE conference in May, the theme will be 'Recognition for Review', looking at how to recognise all those involved in peer review. This year sees over 20 organisations involved in the planning the week, chaired by Alice Meadows (ORCID). Everyone involved in peer review is encourage to take part by planning events or publications, and by following social media activity via #PeerRevWk16 and #RecognizeReview.

Retract and replace
The principle of 'retract and replace' is gaining popularity as an approach for handling papers that must be retracted, but due to honest error rather than misconduct. Both The Lancet and JAMA journals have adopted this process, retracting an article and promptly replacing it with a new version. In an interview for Retraction Watch (retractionwatch.com; 20 June 2016), Annette Flanagin of The JAMA Network explains how it works, including the publication of a formal Notice of Retraction and Replacement, which is cross-linked with the retracted and replaced article.

How Can I Share it?
How Can I Share it? (www.howcanishareit.com) is an initiative of the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM), launched in May 2016. A long-standing STM working group has been exploring the effects of scholarly collaboration networks (SCNs), such as ResearchGate, Mendeley, Readcube and many others. The working group developed a set of voluntary principles for article sharing, endorsed by many publishers and SCNs, and the new site aims to provide practical information on all aspects of sharing articles.

Crossref accepting preprints
Crossref members will soon be able to assign DOIs (digital object identifiers) to preprints. This is a reversal of a long-established principle of prohibiting DOIs for preprints for fear of "muddying the scholarly record". You can read more about the decision on the Crossref blog (blog.crossref.org; 5 May 2016). The preprint DOI will need to be different from the DOI assigned to the accepted version of record, and Crossref is developing guidelines and tools to help researchers identify the 'best available version' of a document. These are expected to be available by September 2016.

Funder-supported publishing
UK-based research funder Wellcome is launching a new publishing platform for its funded researchers. Wellcome Open Research (wellcomeopenresearch.org), which launches in autumn 2016, is a collaboration between Wellcome and F1000Research (f1000research.com), with the aim of enabling faster and more transparent communication of research findings. The open-access platform enables "immediate publication followed by transparent, invited peer review and inclusion of supporting data" and all charges will be funded by Wellcome. Meanwhile *eLife* (elifesciences.org), the innovative, open-access journal set up by Wellcome, the Max Planck Institute and Howard Hughes Medical Institute in 2012, has secured further funding. *Nature* (1 June 2016) reports that the funders will provide a further £25 million (€30 million) to support the journal through to 2022 as the journal seeks other funding options.

COAR-UNESCO statement
UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) and the Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR) have issued a joint statement on open access (unesco.org; 9 May 2016). The statement supports open access but highlights three areas that need to be addressed if article-processing charges are adopted as a publishing model: consideration of resource-poor institutions and regions; avoiding further consolidation of the publishing industry; and the need to reduce costs. The statement concludes:

"It is imperative that governments and the research community encourage a variety of approaches to the implementation of OA."

Open Scholarship Initiative

"What should the future of scholarly publishing look like? How about open access? Who should decide? Can journals become more affordable and accessible? Will journals continue to serve as the primary means of communicating research? Can institutional repositories work together more effectively to integrate the world's knowledge?" These are the big questions addressed by the ambitious Open Scholarship Initiative, a 10-year project of the US National Science Communication Institute (nSCI; nationascience.org) in collaboration with UNESCO. The inaugural meeting, held in Fairfax, Virginia, USA in April 2016 was preceded by a structured program of work for participants and resulted in detailed outputs across multiple workstreams. You can read more about the outputs and the ongoing conversations, as well as plans for the next meeting, at osinitiative.org.

Springer Nature: research data policies

Springer Nature is introducing a set of standardised research data policies, aiming to have "the most comprehensive and inclusive research data policy of any large publisher". Aiming where possible to harmonise policies across many journals, while recognising the different data sharing needs and expectations of different communities, Springer Nature has opted for a modular set of policies and an implementation strategy. There are four main types of policy: (1) data sharing encouraged; (2) evidence of data sharing encouraged; (3) statements of data sharing required; (4) data sharing and peer review of data required. The policies are explained on the SpringerOpen Blog (5 July 2016).

Research Integrity in the Netherlands

The Dutch government has committed €8 million to explore research misconduct and reproduce key studies. As reported by *Times Higher Education* (www.insidehighered.com; 23 June 2016), all researchers in the Netherlands will be questioned about their possible involvement in research misconduct or 'sloppy science', and a fund will be set up for replication of research that has influenced policy or gained media attention.

COMPARE findings

The COMPARE project investigated the issue of outcome switching (when outcomes listed in a trial protocol are not include in the trial report, or vice versa) in trials published in major medical journals. The project team, led by Ben Goldacre at the Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine at the University of Oxford, UK, has now published its findings and responses from the journals it examined. They looked at 67 trials in five journals, and found 354 outcomes not reported and 357 outcomes added, with only nine of the trials having perfectly reported outcomes. The group then submitted letters to the editors, and explored the issues arising, such as unpublished protocols, outdated or incomplete registry entries, and CONSORT compliance. You can read the full study results and a series of blog posts on the project website (compare-trials.org).

Nature Index 2016

The Nature index is a database of author affiliation information from 68 high-quality science journals since 2012, compiled by Nature Research. The data, which are freely available, show that the United States remains the largest contributor, followed by China and Germany. China has shown the highest growth. Harvard University is the highest contributing university, and IBM the highest corporate contributor. You can explore the data for regions, disciplines and institutions at natureindex.com.

Author asked to peer review own paper

A Turkish researcher, Serder Sayan, was surprised when he was asked to peer review a submission to the *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*. The paper was a fully plagiarised copy of one of Sayan's own papers, previously published in another journal. Sayan published an article describing the experience (*Review of Social Economy* 2016;74(1):75-82), and was also interviewed for Retraction Watch (retractionwatch.com; 12 May 2016). Sayan explains how initially he was impressed that he'd been asked to peer review, as the paper was clearly in his area of expertise, and it took him a few minutes to establish it was his own work, and he then contacted the journal editor to explain what had happened. The paper was rejected and the author contacted.

Relative Citation Ratio

The US National Institutes of Health has introduced a new metric to evaluate reseaerch outputs. The Relative Citation Ratio uses the co-citation network to normalise the number of citations, and the methodology was published in *bioRxiv* (biorxiv.org; 029629; 30 March 2016). A tool called iCite (icite.od.nih.giv) 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* (Lariviere et al; doi.org/bmc2) is a paper by senior staff at several leading science publishers, challenging the inappropriate usage of Journal Impact Factors.

SSRN and SocArXiv

In May 2016 the Social Science Research Network (SSRN; www.ssrn.com) was acquired by Elsevier, which plans to develop it alongside Mendeley. There were concerns at the sale of a not-for-profit organisation to a large publisher, but Elsevier has indicated that there will be no changes to the service. At almost the same time, a new preprint service for social science was announced, developed with the Center for Open Science (cos.io) to develop SocArXiv, a "free, open access, open source archive for social science research".

Thanks for contributions: James Hartley, Joan Marsh