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

Nature data policy

From September 2016, all research papers accepted for publication in *Nature* and 12 other *Nature* journals will have to include a statement on access to the study's data. The policy, announced in an editorial in *Nature* (7 September 2016) will require a statement reporting the availability of the "minimal data set necessary to interpret, replicate and build on the findings reported in the paper" along with details about publicly available data sets and reasons for any access restrictions.

Changes at *eLife*

eLife, the open-access journal supported by three major research funders (elifesciences.org), has announced that it will start charging from 2017. Since its launch in 2012, the journal has had no charges, supported entirely by grants from the funders. The 'publication fee' will be $2500. The move is explained in an editorial in the journal (2016;5:e21230), and follows the announcement in June 2016 of continuing investment by the founding organisations. The journal has also announced a partnership with Hypothes.is to create an annotation 'layer' for *eLife* (elifesciences.org/elife-news; 14 September 2016).

The rise of preprints

The growth of *ArXiv*-inspired preprint publishing platforms continues, with the arrival of *engrXiv* (engrxiv.org), *SocArXiv* (socopen.org) and *PsyArXiv* (psyarxiv.org), for engineering, social sciences, and psychological sciences, joining *BioRXiv* (biorxiv.org). All three are hosted by the Open Science Framework (osf.io/preprints) and run by steering committees. In addition, in June 2016 publisher MDPI has launched *Preprints* (preprints.org), a multidisciplinary preprint platform. Preprints are gaining popularity across science and humanities as a means for researchers to rapidly and openly publish new findings, ahead of peer review and journal publication.

PLOS contributor taxonomy

PLOS has adopted the CRediT Taxonomy of author contributions, a community-developed open standard developed by publishers (including PLOS), researchers and institutions working as CASRAI (casrai.org). The taxonomy is not used to determine authorship, which is covered by separate guidelines, but enables research teams to define in details who contributed a piece of work. Each author may have multiple contributor roles, but some contributors may not qualify as authors. The taxonomy is being incorporated in the PLOS submission system to enable contributor data to be machine readable and linked to ORCID IDs. You can read more on the Official PLOS Blog (blogs.plos.org/plos; 8 July 2016).

Wellcome publisher requirements

Research funder Wellcome has published a set of requirements for publishers that provide open-access publishing for Wellcome grant-holders. The focus is on immediate deposition to PubMed Central, CC-BY Creative Commons licensing, and association of metadata with funding details. The requirements, which come into force in April 2017, are available on the Wellcome website (welcome.ac.uk).

Altmetrics developments

The National Information Standards Organization has published recommended practices for altmetrics. 'Outputs of the NISO Alternative Assessment Metrics Project' (NISO RP-25-2016; niso.org/publications/rp) is a product of the NISO Altmetrics Initiative (niso.org/topics/tl/altmetrics_initiative), started in 2013 and funded by the Alfred P Sloan Foundation. The recommended practice was created by three working groups, focusing on stakeholder requirements, user stories, and data quality, and defines altmetrics as "multiple digital indicators related to scholarly work'. Adding to this, Altmetric, one of the main providers of altmetrics, has created an open-access resource called 'What are altmetrics?' (whatarealtmetrics.com).

Sentinels of Science

The Sentinels of Science Awards aimed to honour "the highest achievers in peer review across the world's journals". The awards were organised by Publons (publons.com) as part of Peer Review Week 2016 (19-25 September; peerreviewweek.wordpress.com) with sponsorship from publishers and other companies. The overall winner, Jonas Ranstam, from Lund University in Sweden, recorded an impressive 661 reviews for 16 journals on the Publons platform in the past year. You can read more about Ranstam's achievements and also view the top reviewers in different fields on the Publons blog (blog.publons.com; 24 September 2016).

China tackles misconduct

The Chinese Ministry of Education has issued rules to define academic misconduct around six areas (plagiarism, fraud, falsification, inappropriate authorship, false information, and dealing in papers) and has specified how misconduct cases will be handled, as reported in *Beijing Today* (29 July 2016). And in September the Chinese State Food and Drug Administration published a report indicating that 80% of clinical trials relating to new drug applications have fabricated data (sciencealert.com; 1 October 2016). It's not clear to what extent journal publications are involved.

Best Practice Journal Research Network

"Unlike clinical medicine, where evidence is considered fundamental to practice, journals still operate largely in

a 'black box' mode without sufficient evidence to drive their practice. We believe there is an immediate need to substantially increase the amount and quality of research by journals to ensure their practice is as evidence based as possible." That's the thinking behind the Best Practice Journal Research Network, proposed by David Moher and Philippe Ravaud in a recent editorial (*PLOS Medicine* 2016;14:154). The aim is to increase the amount of research addressing relevant questions in journalology, and journals are invited to register at www.bpjrn.com.

New reporting guidelines for adverse events

Medical Publishing Insights and Practices (MPIP; www.mpip-initiative.org) and the International Society for Medical Publication Professionals (ISMPP; ismpp.org) have published guidelines to encourage clinically relevant and more informative adverse event reporting in clinical trial publications. Included are five consensus recommendations, covering clinical relevance, event descriptions, statistical analysis, text descriptions, and discussion in context. The guidelines, published in The *BMJ* (2016;355:i5078), supplement the CONSORT Harms Extension (www.consort-statement.org/extensions).

Academic clickbait

Can the title of a paper affect how much attention the article gets? A recent study suggests that authors should use similar principles that apply to sharing non-scholarly content. The study found that titles with "result-oriented positive framing" and more interesting phrasing received higher Altmetric scores, while articles with longer titles and titles with wordplay have lower Altmetric scores. The study looked at articles published in *Frontiers in Psychology* in 2013 and 2014 (*The Winnower* 2016;3: 3:e146723).

AllTrials and OpenTrials

The AllTrials campaign (alltrials.net; 7 October 2016) has published a roadmap to demonstrate how various groups can help to achieve the aim of all trials being registered and reported. The guidance for scholarly publishers and journals includes five recommendations: (1) adopt ICMJE policy and CONSORT guidelines; (2) ensure compliance with ICMJE and CONSORT; (3) link published papers with register entries and linked papers; (4) consider papers for publication at the protocol stage; (5) conduct and publish an annual audit of compliance. The recent World Health Summit in Berlin, Germany, saw the launch of a beta version of the OpenTrials platform. OpenTrials (opentrials.net) is an "open, easy-to-use, linked database of information about the world's clinical trials" developed by Open Knowledge International (okfn.org) and Ben Goldacre from the University of Oxford EBM Data Lab (ebmdatalab.net).

The Parasite Awards

Inspired by the controversial term "research parasites" to refer to people who re-analyse others' data, as used in an editorial in the *New England Journal of Medicine* (21 January 2016), a group at the University of Pennsylvania have initiated The Parasite Awards (researchparasite.com), which are supported by a group of journals and funders. There are two awards, for "outstanding contribution from a junior parasite" and for a "sustained period of exemplary research parasitism". The winners will be announced in January 2017.

UK co-operation on data and metrics

In July 2016 four of the UK's leading research organisations (Higher Education Funding Council for England, Research Councils UK, Universities UK, and the Wellcome Trust) launched the Concordat on Open Research Data, which proposes a series of principles for working with research data. The concordat was developed with input from other stakeholders and aims to ensure that UK researchers' data are made openly available "in a manner consistent with relevant legal, ethical, disciplinary and regulatory frameworks and norms, and with due regard to the costs involved." You can read the document on the JISC website (www.jisc.ac.uk). The same organisations, with JISC, have also formed a Forum for Responsible Metrics, tasked with advancing the agenda set out in the 2015 Metric Tide report (www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/metrics). The Forum was announced at a panel discussion at the recent ALPSP conference (see the ALPSP Blog; blog.alpsp.org; 27 September 2016).

Lawsuit against OMICS

The US Federal Trade Commission is suing the publisher OMICS International (www.omicsonline.org), alleging deceptive practices, including having editorial board members unaware of their membership, performing little or no peer review, and not revealing publication fees until after an article is accepted for publication. OMICS' conference business is also charged with promoting conferences deceptively. The company has responded saying the lawsuit is "frivolous and baseless." The details are on the FTC website (www.ftc.gov) and reported by Retraction Watch (retractionwatch.com; 26 August 2016)

Statcheck on PubPeer

Statcheck is an algorithm that automatically compares reported and recalculated *P* values in published psychology papers. It was developed by researchers at Tilburg University in the Netherlands, who have extended the work to enable automatic posting of findings to PubPeer (pubpeer.com), post-publication peer review platform. As reported by Retraction Watch (retractionwatch.com; 2 September 2016) these Statcheck notes (which are created even if no error is found) are being added to 50,000 papers on PubPeer, with varying reactions from the papers' authors. The data and methods have also been published (Hartgerink *et al*, *Data* 2016;1(3):14).

John Hilton
Editor, Cochrane Editorial Unit, Cochrane, London, UK
@jheditor
jhilton@cochrane.org