

The editor's bookshelf

Please write to annamaria.rossi@iss.it if you wish to send new items or become a member of the EASE journal blog (<http://ese-bookshelf.blogspot.com>) and see your postings published in the journal

EDITORIAL PROCESS

Nicholas D, Watkinson A, Jamali HR, *et al.* **Peer review: still king in the digital age.** *Learned Publishing* 2015;28(1):15-21

The article presents one of the main findings of an international study of 4000 academic researchers that examined how trustworthiness is determined in the digital environment when it comes to scholarly reading, citing, and publishing. The study shows that peer review is still the most trustworthy characteristic of all. There is, though, a common perception that open access journals are not peer reviewed or do not have proper peer review systems.
doi:10.1087/20150104

Waltman L, Costas R. **F1000 recommendations as a potential new data source for research evaluation: a comparison with citations.** *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 2014;65(3):433-445

Faculty of 1000, abbreviated F1000, and recently renamed F1000Prime, is a commercial, online, postpublication peer review service for biological and medical research. Reviews are produced by more than 5000 peer-nominated researchers and clinicians. This article presents a large-scale analysis of F1000 recommendations, focusing in particular on comparing recommendations with citations: about 2% of the publications in the biomedical literature received at least one F1000 recommendation.
doi:10.1002/asi.2014.65.issue-3/issuetoc

ETHICAL ISSUES

Berghammer G. **Good clinical practice (GCP): a universal call for ethics in biomedical research.** *Medical Writing* 2014; 23(2):106-112

Today, the principles of good clinical practice (GCP) form an integral part of the development of new medicines. GPC provides an international ethical and scientific quality standard designed to protect the rights and safety of individuals consenting to participate in clinical trials and to ensure the integrity and credibility of clinical research data. This article traces the historical roots of GCP and takes a look at the role GCP principles play in the life of the medical writer.
doi: 10.1179/2047480614Z.000000000209

Katavić V. **Retractions of scientific publications: responsibility and accountability.** *Biochemia Medica* 2014;24(2):217-222

This evidence-based opinion piece gives a short overview of the increase in retractions of publications in scientific journals and discusses various reasons for that increase. Also discussed are some of the recent prominent cases of scientific misconduct, the number of authors with multiple retractions, and problems with reproducibility of published research. Finally, some of the effects of faulty research on science and society, as well as possible solutions, are discussed.
doi: 10.11613/BM.2014.024

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL

Bravo E, Calzolari A, De Castro P, *et al.* **Developing a guideline to standardize the citation of bioresources in journal articles (CoBRA).** *BMC Medicine* 2015;13:33

Evaluating bioresources' use and impact requires that scientific publications accurately cite such resources. This article proposes for the first time a guideline for reporting bioresource use in research articles: the CoBRA, Citation of BioResources in Journal Articles. Adopting this guideline will improve the quality of bioresource reporting and will allow their traceability in scientific publications, thus increasing the recognition of bioresources' value and relevance to research.
doi:10.1186/s12916-015-0266-y

Pastori MM, Sarti M, Pons, M, *et al.* **Assessing the impact of bibliographical support on the quality of medical care in patients admitted to an internal medicine service: a prospective clinical, open, randomised two-arm parallel study.** *Evidence-Based Medicine* 2014;19:163-168

Some research studies suggest that library services professionally provided have an effect on health outcomes for patients. This study confirmed the feasibility of bibliographical assistance in daily medical practice in an internal medicine service of a non-university hospital in Ticino Canton (Switzerland). In particular, it was very useful and effective for patient care to have a dedicated physician who daily sends the bibliographical research results by email to the clinical team within 12 hours of asking the focused question.
doi:10.1136/ebmed-2014-110021

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

Guillemard M. **What every medical writer needs to know.** *Medical Writing* 2014;23(2):134-135

A medical writer is never done with learning. Learning means getting involved in the digital environment and using tools like social media, websites, and blogs to enhance online presence and develop career. Medical writers should have a strong online presence such as: websites with a portfolio of work, a professional profile on LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook and Google+ accounts.
doi:10.1179/2047480614Z.000000000215

PUBLISHING

Code share, (editorial). *Nature* 2014;514:536

A core element of many papers is the computercode used by authors in models, simulations, and data analysis. In an ideal world, this code would always be transportable and easily used by others. *Nature* editorial policy now mandates that when code is central to reaching a paper's conclusions, it requires a statement describing whether

that code is available and setting out any restrictions on accessibility.
doi:10.1038/514536a

Bastian H. A stronger post-publication culture is needed for better science. *PLoS Medicine* 2014;11(12):e1001772
The author states that both improving research quality and reducing waste in science require a stronger post-publication culture. Today post-publication evaluation is highly fragmented. Dedicated websites have been developed for discussing and sharing research among authors, and PubMed Commons (for which the author is editor) enables post-publication commenting and linkages by the PubMed authorship community. Skill developments should be considered in critiquing research; capturing post-publication intellectual effort more rigorously is essential for better science
doi:10.1371/journal.p.med.1001772

Clement TP. Authorship matrix: a rational approach to quantify individual contributions and responsibilities in multi-author scientific articles. *Science and Engineering Ethics* 2014;20:345-361
The author proposes a rational method for assessing the responsibilities of an author of a scientific multi-author manuscript. This new paradigm conceptually divides an article into four basic elements for which individual responsibilities can be assigned: ideas, work, writing, and stewardship. The outcome is an authorship matrix, that provides all necessary information for deciding the rank of an author.
doi:10.1007/s11948-013-9454-3

Hill T. Identifying legitimate open access journals: some suggestions from a publisher. *Learned Publishing* 2015;28:59-62
The author outlines a set of criteria by which authors and readers can identify legitimate publishers. These criteria are based on the following considerations: readers should be regarded as customers and they should be offered a variety of services; journals should be included in databases and indexes, that indicates compliance with technical and publishing standards;

publishers should ensure that authors meet ethical and legal obligations to maintain the integrity of the literature; they should also demonstrate awareness of open access conventions, and provide information on the nature of the peer-review process and of the editorial process.
doi:10.1087/20150109

RESEARCH EVALUATION

Caves CM. High-impact-factor Syndrome. *APS News* 2014;23(10):8,6
The author discusses the use of the bibliometric high impact factor used as a proxy for assessing a scientist's work and the malign influence this is having. He suggests a number of ways to try to prevent this influence and to conform to best practice for conducting and evaluating research.

SCIENCE

Austin J. What it takes. *Science* 2014;344(6190):1422
Science Careers posted a widget that lets early-career scientists calculate the probability that they will someday become principal investigators. Four factors are indicated as the most important ingredients of academic career success: be male, be selfish, be elite and publish in journals with high impact factors. They are linked to rigorous, serious, and significant research, and demonstrate the wide gap between science's ideals and incentives.
doi: 10.1126/science.344.6190.1422

Collins FS, Tabak LA. Policy: NIH plans to enhance reproducibility. *Nature* 2014 Jan. 27
The authors discuss the significant initiatives that the US National Institutes of Health is exploring to restore the self-correcting nature of preclinical research. They share the concern that the complex system for ensuring the reproducibility of biomedical research is failing. This has compromised the ability of today's researchers to reproduce others' findings, demanding immediate and substantive action. The NIH is firmly committed to making systematic changes that should reduce the frequency and severity of this problem.

SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

Ekins S, Perlstein EO. Ten simple rules of live tweeting at scientific conferences. *PLoS Computational Biology* 2014;10(8):e1003789
Increasingly, some scientists are using Twitter as a vehicle to summarize presentations and posters at conferences in real time, which is defined as "live tweeting." The advantage is that the information tweeted is open and free to anyone around the globe. From the authors' experiences, the success of live tweeting appears dependent on the engagement of conference organizers with Twitter and its active encouragement before, during, and after the meeting. The authors propose ten simple rules to encourage live tweeting.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003789

Jones TM, Fanson KV, Lanfear R, et al. Gender differences in conference presentations: a consequence of self-selection? *PeerJ* 2:e627
Women continue to be under-represented in the sciences, with their representation declining at each progressive academic level. The authors compared gender differences in exposure and visibility at an evolutionary biology conference for attendees at two different academic levels: student and post-PhD academic. Women presenters spent on average ~20% less time presenting their research than men of an equivalent academic level. This highlights important gender differences in conference strategy. Potential underlying reasons for this gender bias are discussed, with recommendations to avoid similar gender biases at future conferences.
doi: 10.7717/peerj.627

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