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

Tennant JP, Waldner F, Jacques DC, *et al*. **The academic, economic and societal impacts of Open Access: an evidence-based review**. *F1000Research* 2016;5:632
This review presents published evidence of the impact of open access on the academy, economy and society. The evidence points to a favourable impact of OA on the scholarly literature through increased dissemination and reuse. OA has the potential to be a sustainable business venture for new and established publishers, and can provide substantial benefits to research- and development-intensive businesses, including health organisations, volunteer sectors, and technology. The social case for OA is strong, in particular for advancing citizen science initiatives, and leveling the playing field for researchers in developing countries.
doi: 10.12688/f1000research.8460.3

EDITORIAL PROCESS

Allison DB, Brown AW, George BJ, *et al*. **Reproducibility: a tragedy of errors**. *Nature* 2016 Feb. 3 530(7588):27-9
Mistakes in peer-reviewed papers are easy to find but hard to fix. Post-publication peer review is not consistent, smooth or rapid. Many journal editors and staff seemed unprepared or ill-equipped to investigate, take action or even respond. The authors summarise their experience, the main barriers they encountered, and their thoughts on how to make published science more rigorous.
doi: 10.1038/530027a

Baldwin M. **In referees we trust?** *Physics Today* 2017;70(2):44-49
The imprimatur bestowed by peer review has a history that is both shorter and more complex than many scientists realise. This article reviews the history of peer review, for journals and grant-giving bodies, and reveals that it has undergone many changes, only becoming the standard for scientific acceptability relatively recently. It discusses the present situation and the pressures it faces today.
doi: 10.1063/PT.3.3463

Mani H. **Footprint of a paper: accountability in academic publishing.** *The Lancet* 2016;338(1004):562-563
The publishing process is unaccountable to readers and is not transparent. In a published paper, there is no record of previous submissions to other journals and the comments it might have received in the journey to final publication. A transparent and openly recorded submission and review process would result in accountability, improve the quality of papers and the peer review process, and reduce the chances of previously reported systematic cheating. A database for registering any paper before submission could issue an internationally recognised identification number that could help track the submissions.
doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31217-X

ETHICAL ISSUES

Heneberg P. **From excessive journal self-cites to citation stacking: analysis of journal self-citation kinetics in search for journals, which boost their scientometric indicators**. PLoS One 2016;11:e0153730
Little is known about the kinetics of journal self-citations. The author hypothesises that they may show a generalizable pattern within particular research fields or across multiple fields. Currently used scientometric indicators provide only limited protection against unethical behaviours. An algorithm is needed, to search for potential citation networks and allow their efficient elimination. The algorithm could be based on differences in the number of citations received from a journal during the impact factor calculation window (post-publication years 1–2) and the number of citations received only later (eg post-publication years 4–7).
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0153730.s001

Teixeira da Silva JA. **Are pseudonyms ethical in (science) publishing? Neuroskeptic as a case study.** *Science and Engineering Ethics* 2016
In science publishing there are increasingly strict rules regarding the use of false identities for authors, the lack of institutional or contact details, and the lack of conflicts of interest, and such instances are generally considered misconduct. The author focuses on Neuroskeptic, a prominent science critic, primarily on the blogosphere and in social media, highlighting the dangers associated with the use of pseudonyms in academic publishing.
doi: 10.1007/s11948-016-9825-7

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL

Dove JG. **Full discovery: what is the publisher's role?** *Learned Publishing* 2017;30(1):81-86
Readers of all kinds rely on a variety of 'discovery pathways', such as search engines, library systems, and electronic links, some of which are blind to the content they desire. The National Information Standards Organization (NISO)'s Discovery to Delivery (D2D) Topic Committee has developed a grid comparing the various ways in which content is shared with the ways in which users discover the content. This article brings to light a few of the current obstacles and opportunities for innovation by publishers, aggregators, search engines, and library systems.
doi: 10.1002/leap.1086

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

Leventhal P. **A checklist to improve your writing.** *Medical Writing* 2017;26(1)
This article provides a checklist of eight items to improve an author's writing. Several of the checklist items are discussed in detail in other articles in the same issue of Medical Writing, although this article provides explanations and examples for each item as well as a series of exercises to help put them into practice.

Writing an effective journal article submission cover letter. San Francisco Edit 2017
The journal editor is going to decide whether to send the article to the reviewers by reading the letter and the abstract of the manuscript. The cover letter is an important component of the submission process. It should contain information which will generate interest and encourage the journal editor to evaluate the manuscript.

PUBLISHING

Barbui C, Addis A, Amato L, *et al*. **Can systematic reviews contribute to regulatory decisions?** *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 2017;73(4):507-509
What is the potential usefulness of systematic reviews in responding to regulatory needs? By collecting, analysing and critically appraising all relevant studies on a specific topic, stakeholders can use them as a basis for clinical and policy recommendations, including regulatory recommendations. They may simultaneously produce new findings and summarise existing knowledge, with the potential for informing regulatory decisions more pragmatically and rapidly than other research designs.
doi: 10.1007/s00228-016-2194-y

Carey LC, Stretton S, Kenreigh CA, *et al*. **High nonpublication rate from publication professionals hinders evidence-based publication practices**. *PeerJ* 2016 May 10;4:e2011
Publication professionals who are not ghostwriters work with leading medical researchers and funders around the world to plan and prepare thousands of publications each year. Research presented at ISMPP Annual Meetings has rarely been published in peer-reviewed journals. The high rate of non-publication by publication professionals has now been quantified and is of concern. Publication professionals should do more to contribute to evidence-based publication practices, including - and especially - their own work.
doi: 10.7717/peerj.2011

RESEARCH EVALUATION

Gonzalez-Valiente CL, Pacheco-Mendoza J, Arencibia-Jorge R. **A review of altmetrics as an emerging discipline for research evaluation.** *Learned Publishing* 2016;29(4).229-238
This article analyses the scientific production of publications on altmetrics as an emergent discipline for research evaluation. The aim is to identify the investigative tendencies that characterise the subject. In all, 253 documents indexed by Web of Science and Scopus databases were retrieved, showing a growth in articles from 2005 to 2015. Half the publications come from the USA and the UK. The highest co-occurrence of terms was in social media-altmetrics, followed by Twitter-altmetrics.
doi: 10.1002/leap.1043

Sinatra R, Wang D, Deville P, *et al.* **Quantifying the evolution of individual scientific impact**. *Science* 2016;354(6312)
Are there quantifiable patterns behind a successful scientific career? The authors analysed the publications of 2,887 physicists, as well as data on scientists publishing in a variety of fields. They quantified the changes in impact and productivity throughout a career in science, finding that impact, as measured by influential publications, is distributed randomly within a scientist's sequence of publications.
doi: 10.1126/science.aaf5239

SCIENCE

Crowe S, Giles C. **Making patient-relevant clinical research a reality**. *BMJ* 2016;355:i6627
A wide gap exists between what generally receives funding and what patients, carers, and the public would like to see examined. Incorporating patient perspectives more thoroughly into clinical research would broaden its scope and help answer the research questions likely to bring about the biggest improvements in our understanding of disease. Nevertheless, several problems underlie our current inability to make research relevant to patients and the wider public. The *BMJ* insists that all submitted research include a statement describing how the authors did or did not involve patients. The journal also operates a system of patient peer review.
doi: 10.1136/bmj.i6627

SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

Zehr EP. **With great power comes great responsibility — A personal philosophy for communicating science in society.** *eNeuro* 2016;3(5):ENEURO.0200-16.2016
The article is based mostly on the author's own experiences - as a neuroscientist - with popular culture as the link between science and the general public, eg, using icons in popular culture to serve as vehicles for communicating science. He discusses the "middle-ground hypothesis" using popular culture for science communication and applying the "FUNnel model," where popular culture is used as a lead-in and wrap-up when discussing science.
doi: 10.1523/ENEURO.0200-16.2016

Thanks to John Glen.

Anna Maria Rossi
Publishing Unit
Istituto Superiore di Sanità, Rome
annamaria.rossi@iss.it