

## The editor's bookshelf

Bookshelf is compiled by Anna Maria Rossi ([annamaria.rossi@iss.it](mailto: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

Pulverer B. **Open Access—or Open Science?** *The EMBO Journal* 2018:e101215

Open Access mandates in Europe raise the question whether the priority is to reduce publishing costs, or the overdue conversion to Open Science communication. At risk are not only high-quality journals, but also community institutions and international research collaboration. (doi:10.15252/embj.2018101215)

### EDITORIAL PROCESS

Bravo G, Grimaldo F, López-Iñesta E, *et al.* **The effect of publishing peer review reports on referee behavior in five scholarly journals.** *Nature Communications* 2019;10:322

The authors examined the effect of publishing peer review reports on referee behaviour in five scholarly journals in a pilot study at Elsevier. Publishing reports did not significantly compromise referees' willingness to review, recommendations, or turn-around times. Younger and non-academic scholars were more willing to agree to review and provided more positive and objective recommendations. Only 8.1% of referees agreed to reveal their identity in the published report. These findings suggest that open peer review does not compromise the process, at least when referees are able to protect their anonymity. (doi:10.1038/s41467-018-08250-2)

Ross-Hellauer T, Görögh E. **Guidelines for open peer review implementation.** *Research Integrity and Peer Review* 2019;4:4  
Open peer review is moving into the

mainstream, but it is often poorly understood and surveys of researcher attitudes show important barriers to implementation. This article presents best-practice guidelines for the introduction of the various open peer review traits for publishers and editors. The guidelines offer practical and pragmatic advice. Main points of guidance are (a) set open peer review goal(s), (b) listen to research communities, (c) plan technologies and costs, (d) be pragmatic in approach, (e) further communicate the concept, and (f) evaluate performance. (doi: 10.1186/s41073-019-0063-9)

Tennant JP. **The state of the art in peer review.** *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 2018; 365(19):fny204

The article asserts the importance of peer review as a defining characteristic of the formal research publication process, assesses some of the traditional ways it has been conducted over recent years, and presents modern developments in the form, function and value that the process can play. Using a series of tables to illustrate the differences between present and future, the author considers some enhancements and developments that peer review may benefit from, looking at its role in certification and the reputation of individual researchers, moderation and quality control of research, engagement incentives, and the way in which these are all inextricably linked. Appropriate acknowledgement is given to each key stakeholder in the traditional process, such as publishers, societies and individual researchers, evaluating the values in the current system and the benefits innovation would bring. (doi:10.1093/femsle/fny204)

### ETHICAL ISSUES

Goldacre B, Drysdale H, Dale A, *et al.* **COMPare: a prospective cohort study correcting and monitoring 58 misreported trials in real time.** *Trials* 2019;20:118

The article documents the extent

to which misreporting occurs in published papers in five journals endorsing Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) over a six-week period. It establishes whether it was possible to publish correction letters on all misreported trials as they were published, and monitors responses from editors and trialists to understand why outcome misreporting persists despite public commitments to address it. Suggested improvements include: changes to correspondence processes at journals, post-publication peer review, changes to CONSORT's mechanisms for enforcement, and novel strategies for research on methods and reporting. (doi.org/10.1186/s13063-019-3173-2)

Malički M, Utrobičić A, Marušić A. **Correcting duplicate publications: follow up study of MEDLINE tagged duplications.** *Biochemia Medica* 2019;29(1):010201

The study investigated duplicate publications (DPs) indexed in MEDLINE to determine the reasons behind them, whether the journals had undertaken or had planned any actions to address them — specifically retraction or correction, how visible those corrections were on the journals' websites, and whether there was a change in DP citation counts after the publication of notices of duplication. Results showed that 46% of DPs remain unaddressed by journals and DPs continue to be cited even after journals have published notices of duplication. (doi: 10.11613/BM.2019.010201)

### LANGUAGE AND WRITING

**Developing an effective title.** *San Francisco Edit* 2018

The title defines the contents of a manuscript in as few words as possible. An effective title "sells" the manuscript to the reader immediately and influences whether or not a reader will read the manuscript. It should include all essential words in the right order so the topic of the manuscript is accurately and fully

conveyed. The golden rules are: express only one idea or subject; put an important word first; be concise; use simple word orders; and be as descriptive as possible.

Skinningsrud K. **Editing for writers who have English as an additional language.** *Medical Writing* 2018;27(3):14-17

Editors of English are typically met with expectations to make a quick fix of documents that need more radical changes than authors think. They should improve readability, identify and discuss illogical and ambiguous content, check grammatical issues in the writer's first language that are different in English, and anything that deviates from clear, concise, consistent, well-formed prose. A good way of communicating effectively with authors is to give reasons for suggested changes, and ideally, to name the problems.

## PUBLISHING

Banks M. **IOP Publishing to work on diversity in peer review.** *Physics World* 2018;31(10):15

IOP Publishing is the publishing company of the Institute of Physics, based in London (UK). IOP Publishing found that women who are corresponding authors on scientific articles have slightly less chance than men of having their articles accepted in IOP journals, and women are also less likely to be invited to review papers. This article outlines recommendations to deal with this. (doi: 10.1088/2058-7058/31/10/13)

Hartley, J. **Some reflections on being cited over 10,000 times.** *Scientometrics* 2019;118(1):375-381

The author reflects on factors that have affected the citations of his many publications. He finds (i) that published original textbooks were cited more than edited collections of original or reprinted articles; (ii) that articles on student learning attracted more citations than ones on academic writing and on text design; (iii) that articles written with others were cited more when he was the first or second

author, and (iv) that titles with colons attracted more readers than titles with question marks. (doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2966-5)

Spedding M, Barrett J, Morgan ET, *et al.* **Plan S: A threat to quality of science?** *Science* 2019;363(6426):462

According to Plan S (a consortium of funders led by the European Research Council), after 1 January 2020, scientific publications reporting results of publicly funded research must be published in compliant OA journals or on OA platforms. According to the authors of this Letter, Plan S emphasises only the OA aspect of the journal, not the quality of the science the journal publishes. Further concerns are raised in three other contributions to this *Science* letters section. (doi:10.1126/science.aaw2017)

## SCIENCE

Breedvelt JJE, Rowe S, Bowden-Jones H, *et al.* **Unleashing talent in mental health sciences: gender equality at the top.** *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 2018;213(6):679-681

Society is undergoing a shift in gender politics. Science and medicine are part of this conversation, not least as women's representation and pay continue to drop as one progresses through more senior academic and clinical levels. The academic output of women is less often cited, and they suffer from underrepresentation in authorship. Differences are also reflected in pay: for example, across the whole NHS there is an overall pay gap of 8.6% in favour of men. Naming and redressing these inequalities needs to be a priority for us all. (doi: 10.1192/bjp.2018.249)

Shannon G, Jansen M, Williams K, *et al.* **Gender equality in science, medicine, and global health: where are we at and why does it matter?** *The Lancet* 2019;393(10171):560-569

This review provides a high-level synthesis of global gender data, summarizes progress towards gender equality in science, medicine, and global health, reviews the evidence

for why gender equality in these fields matters in terms of health and social outcomes, and reflects on strategies to promote change. It highlights missed and future opportunities, as well as the need to draw on contemporary social movements to advance the field. (doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)33135-0)

Woitowich NC, Woodruff TK. **No female mice or cells? NIH reviewers still might score grant OK.** *Nature* 2018;565:25

An increasing number of scientists are including female animals in their experimental designs and analyses and reporting of preclinical studies, as required by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) policy in 2016. The quantitative data are positive overall, but some NIH reviewers are not necessarily considering that inclusion when they score an application for funding. (doi: 10.1038/d41586-018-07875-z)

Wu L, Wang D, Evans JA. **Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology.** *Nature* 2019;566:378-382

The authors analysed more than 65 million papers, patents and software products in the period 1954–2014, and demonstrated that across this period smaller teams have tended to disrupt science and technology with new ideas and opportunities, whereas larger teams have tended to develop existing ones. They showed a correlation between the size of the research team and scientific results by describing and validating a citation-based index of “disruptiveness”, that decreases as the team size increases. (doi: 10.1038/s41586-019-0941-9)

Thanks to Duncan Nicholas and John Glen.

**Anna Maria Rossi**

*Scientific Communication Unit  
Istituto Superiore di Sanità, Rome  
annamaria.rossi@iss.it*