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://esebookshelf.blogspot.co.uk) and see your posts published in the journal.

ECONOMICS AND FUNDING

Ellison TS, Koder T, Schmidt L. et al. Open access policies of leading medical journals: a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open 2019;9(6):e028655. Academical and not-for-profit research funders are increasingly requiring that the research they fund must be published open access, with some insisting on publishing with a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to allow the broadest possible use. But most leading medical journals do not offer to authors reporting commercially funded research an open access licence that allows unrestricted sharing and adaptation of the published material. Commercial research funders lag behind academical funders in the development of mandatory open access policies, and it is time for them to work with publishers to advance the dissemination of the research they fund

(doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028655)

Heaven D. Bitcoin for the biological literature. Nature 2019;566:141-142 Scientific publishing is increasingly adopting the technology underlying cryptocurrencies. ScienceMatters, an open-access publishing platform that posts peer-reviewed short papers and single-observation studies — research that most journals would dismiss. It is developing a peer-review process based on the Bitcoin blockchain technology - a public, but tamperproof database of transactions shared across thousands of computers around the world. Using a peer-review platform called Eureka, ScienceMatters will this year begin offering its tripleblind peer-review process. (doi:10.1038/d41586-019-00447-9)

EDITORIAL PROCESS

Al-Khatib A, Teixeira da Silva JA. Rewarding the quantity of peer review could harm biomedical research. Biochemia Medica 2019;29(2):020201. This paper aims to present evidence that while voluntary peer review may aid researchers, rewarding the quantity or the volume of peer review is likely to lure academics into providing poor quality peer review. Pressurized peer review may create a perverse incentive that negatively affects the integrity of the biomedical research record. For this reason, the authors argue that peer review should remain a voluntary mission, and should not be prompted by the need to attain tenure or promotion. (doi: 10.11613/BM.2019.020201)

Glonti K, Cauchi D, Cobo E, *et al.* **A scoping review on the roles and tasks of peer reviewers in the manuscript review process in biomedical journals**. *BMC Medicine* 2019;17:118

The paper is based on an analysis of 222 articles drawn from key database sources such as Scopus, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, as well as grey literature, and peer review training resources such as the Publons Academy. A total of 2,026 statements relating to peer review tasks were extracted from these articles, and reduced to 73 unique statements and grouped into 6 themes. The article and its figures highlight many recurring foundational features of peer review, which build towards defining a robust framework for training and skills development. (doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1347-0)

Squazzoni F. Peer review is not just quality control, it is part of the social infrastructure of research. *LSE Impact Blog* 2019. In this post, the author argues that understanding peer review as simply an exercise in quality control blinds us to the complex historical, political and social dimensions that enhance the credibility of the process.

ETHICAL ISSUES

Chivers T. Does psychology have a conflict-of-interest problem? *Nature* 2019;571:20-23

Some star psychologists do not disclose in research papers the large sums they earn for talking about their work. They do not consider the speaking fees and consulting income to be conflicts of interest (COIs). One solution could be for researchers to simply publish a regularly updated page of all their potential COIs, perhaps with approximate income levels. This could be attached to their unique Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID), which could be linked to from research papers. (doi:10.1038/d41586-019-02041-5)

Kretser, A, Murphy D, Bertuzzi, S. et al. Scientific integrity principles and best practices: recommendations from a Scientific Integrity Consortium. Science and Engineering Ethics 2019; 25(2):327-355 A Scientific Integrity Consortium developed a set of recommended principles and best practices that can be used broadly across scientific disciplines as a mechanism for consensus on scientific integrity standards and to better equip scientists to operate in a rapidly changing research environment. Two principles that represent the umbrella under which scientific processes should operate are: foster a culture of integrity in the scientific process; and evidence-based policy interests may have legitimate roles to play in influencing aspects of the research process, but those roles should not interfere with scientific integrity. Nine best practices are also described for fostering scientific integrity. (doi:10.1007/s11948-019-00094-3)

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

Duncan N. How to choose a journal and write a cover letter. *Saudi Journal*

of Anaesthesia 2019;13 (5):35-41 This article provides details on the factors involved in optimal journal selection, giving insights into how to identify suitable journals, why particular criteria are important and ideal methods to approach this task. The article also includes a spreadsheet tool for tracking information about potential titles of interest and submission details, and finally, provides notes on supporting your submission with an effective cover letter.

Journal submission checklist. San

Francisco Edit 2019 It is important to prepare a manuscript properly, part of which is to follow the journal's guidelines. Almost all journals have their guidelines on their website as well as publish their guidelines quarterly or in every issue. A general checklist to assist the author in ensuring his/ her manuscript meets all the journal's requirements is provided.

PUBLISHING

Aguzzi A. **"Broken access" publishing corrodes quality.** *Nature* 2019;570:139

The author proposes an alternative model for open access publishing: Public Service Open Access. In his model, journals would complete for funds from public research agencies. These research grant-style applications would then be reviewed by scientists and scientific publishing specialists. He says a similar system is working for the journal he directs (*Swiss Medical Weekly*), and that if the author-pay model continues, there could be long-term damage to the integrity of the scientific record. (doi:10.1038/d41586-019-01787-2)

Carcel C, Woodward M, Balicki G, *et al.* **Trends in recruitment of women and reporting of sex differences in large-scale published randomized controlled trials in stroke.** *International Journal of Stroke* 2019;May 27:1747493019851292 Analyzing study results by sex may unmask important and easily addressed clinical differences for prevention and control of stroke. Little progress has been made in the inclusion of female participants and the reporting of sex differences in stroke randomized controlled trials. Key stakeholders, such as funders and journal editors, should provide clear guidance and effective implementation strategies to researchers in the scientific reporting of sex. (doi:10.1177/1747493019851292)

RESEARCH EVALUATION

Ioannidis JPA, Thombs BD. A user's guide to inflated and manipulated impact factors. European Journal of Clinical Investigation 2019;00:e13151 According to the authors, given that the journal impact factor is so welldocumented to be widely misused and abused, the Journal Citation Report should stop reporting it and replace it by the more appropriate median citations per article, median citations per review and median citations per other type of article, also excluding journal self-citations. (doi:10.1111/eci.13151)

SCIENCE

Banzi R, Canham S, Kuchinke W, et al. Evaluation of repositories for sharing individual-participant data from clinical studies. *Trials* 2019;15;20(1):169.

Data repositories can play an important role in the effective and safe sharing of individual-participant data (IPD) from clinical studies. The analysis of the current landscape of data repositories allowed a detailed description of available repositories and the assessment of their suitability for hosting data from clinical studies. Some repositories are more mature because of their support for clinical dataset preparation, contractual agreements, metadata and identifiers, different modalities of access, and long-term preservation of data. (doi:10.1186/s13063-019-3253-3)

Ovseiko PV, Pololi LH, Edmunds LD, et al. Creating a more supportive and inclusive university culture: a mixed-methods interdisciplinary comparative analysis of medical and social sciences at the University of Oxford. Interdisciplinary Science Reviews 2019;44(2):166-191 The authors report and discuss the results of an interdisciplinary comparative study into the culture of medical and social sciences at the University of Oxford, UK, to understand how to accelerate women's advancement and leadership while creating a more supportive and inclusive university culture for all faculty and staff. The study suggests women's experiences of the university culture are not only different to, but are less positive than those of men. Gender disparity in the perceptions of the university culture across both sciences with regard to gender equity and self-efficacy in career advancement suggests that institutional change efforts to increase gender equity and provide more support with career advancement to all faculty and staff must accelerate.

(doi:10.1080/03080188.2019.1603880)

Thomas KB, Paarlberg RA. ICMJE requirements for sharing individual participant data from interventional clinical trials. Medical Writing 2019;28(2):66-73 Sharing of deidentified/anonymised individual participant data is rapidly becoming the norm. The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) recently implemented requirements for data sharing as a condition for considering publication of clinical trial reports in member journals. These requirements are: manuscripts that are based on results of a clinical trial submitted

on or after July 1, 2018, must contain a Data Sharing Statement at the manuscript submission stage; and interventional clinical trials that began enrolling participants on or after January 1, 2019, must include a Data Sharing Plan in the trial's public registration record.

Thanks to Duncan Nicholas.

Anna Maria Rossi

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