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

Breuning M, Backstrom J, Brannon J, *et al.* **Reviewer fatigue? Why scholars decline to review their peer's work.** *PS: Political Science & Politics* 2015;48(4):595-600
The double-blind peer review process is central to publishing in academic journals, but it also relies heavily on the voluntarily efforts of anonymous reviewers. To evaluate the degree to which scholars suffer from the resulting "reviewer fatigue", the authors empirically evaluated the reasons scholars offered when declining to review for the *American Political Science Review.* Just over one-quarter of them declined requests to review. For those who decline, reviewer fatigue is only one of several reasons: scholars are willing to review but they often face many demands on their time and substantial workloads overall.
doi:10.1017/S1049096515000827

Menéndez J. **More on double-blind review.** *APS News* 2015;24(10):4
This letter gives reasons why double-blind review should not be optional and also why it would be valuable in avoiding institutional or country bias.

Slavov N. **Point of view: making the most of peer review.** *eLIFE* 2015 November 11;4:e12708
Many of the legitimate concerns about papers raised on blogs and other platforms are being ignored by journals. Journals should publish referee reports, and referees should be encouraged to sign their reports. Journals should also consider non-anonymous post-publication comments submitted to certain platforms within a certain time after the paper has been published.
doi:10.7554/eLIFE.12708

ETHICAL ISSUES

Bohannon J. **How to hijack a journal.** *Science* 2015;350(6263):903-905
In the past few years fraudsters have been snatching entire web addresses, right out from under the noses of academic publishers, erecting fake versions of their sites, and hijacking their journals, along with their web traffic. The usual method is to build a convincing version of a website at a similar address and then drive web traffic to the fake site. Unsuspecting visitors who log into the hijacked journal sites might give away their passwords or money as they try to pay subscription or article processing fees.
doi:10.1126/science.350.6263.903

Hvistendahl M. **China pursues fraudsters in science publishing.** *Science* 2015;350(6264):1015
China's main research agency is cracking down on scientists who use fake peer reviews to publish papers, demanding that serious offenders return research funding. Since 2012 scores of authors, many of them Chinese, have been snagged in a peer-review scandal involving papers published in international journals. Journals discovered that authors provided email addresses to accounts controlled by the perpetrators, and then reviewed their own work.
doi:10.1126/science.350.6264.1015

Ison DC. **The influence of the Internet on plagiarism among doctoral dissertations: an empirical study.** *Journal of Academic Ethics* 2015;13(2):151-166
This study collected empirical data to investigate the potential influence the Internet has on significant higher education artefacts by comparing dissertations written prior to the widespread use of the Internet with those written in a period of ubiquitous Internet use. It studied Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) dissertations written in English and published by accredited universities in the USA and Canada. A sample of 384 dissertations were analysed. Results suggest that the Internet may not be significantly impacting the prevalence of plagiarism in advanced levels of higher education.
doi:10.1007/s10805-015-9233-7

Menezes RG, Kharoshah MA, Madadin M, *et al.* **Authorship: few myths and misconceptions.** *Science and Engineering Ethics* e-pub 15 December 2015;1-5
This article addresses and dispels some of the popular myths and misconceptions surrounding the authorship of a scientific publication, as this is often misconstrued by beginners in academia, especially those in the developing world. While ethical issues in publishing related to authorship have been increasingly discussed, not much has been written about the myths and misconceptions about who might be an author.
doi:10.1007/s11948-015-9742-1

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

Gilliver S. **Online plain English and readability resources.** *Medical Writing* 2015;24(1):20-22
To encourage individuals and businesses to write in simpler English, private and government-backed enterprises have created a number of freely available online resources. While most relate to general English use, some are devoted to writing about medical matters. In this summary article, the author takes a brief look at what is available and how good it is.
doi:10.1179/20474806 4Z.000000000272

PUBLISHING

Bandrowski A, Brush M, Grethe JS, *et al.* **The Resource Identification Initiative: a cultural shift in publishing.** *Journal of Comparative Neurology* 2016;524(1):8-22
The Resource Identification Initiative was launched as a pilot project to improve the reporting standards for research resources in the Methods sections of articles and thereby improve identifiability and scientific

reproducibility. The pilot engaged over 25 biomedical journal editors from most major publishers, as well as scientists and funding officials. Authors were asked to include Research Resource Identifiers (RRIDs) in their articles prior to publication for three resource types: antibodies, model organisms, and tools (ie software and databases). doi:10.1002/cne.23913

Jorm AF. **Can a medical researcher have too many publications?** *The Medical Journal of Australia* 2015;203(5):230-1
Most prolific researchers may not be adhering to authorship guidelines: the author argues that very high publication rates should be seen as indicating poor authorship practices and should be discounted when evaluating track record. doi:10.5694/mja15.00194

Jubb M, Goldstein S, Amin M, *et al.* **Monitoring the transition to open access. A report for the Universities UK Open Access Co-ordination Group.** Research Information Network. August 2015;105 p.
Reliable indicators should be gathered on key features of the transition to open access (OA) in the UK. The findings presented in the report from this study are a first attempt at generating such indicators covering five sets of issues: OA options available to authors; accessibility; usage; financial sustainability for universities; and financial sustainability for learned societies.

Resnik DB, Wager E, Kissling GE. **Retraction policies of top scientific journals ranked by impact factor.** *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 2015;103(3):136-139
The purpose of this study was to provide updated information on the retraction policies of major science journals. The specific aims were to: determine the percentage of the top 200 science journals ranked by impact factor that have a retraction policy; analyse the content of journal retraction policies; and ascertain whether having a retraction policy is associated with impact factor, scientific discipline, or status as a review journal. Results showed that the majority of journals had a retraction policy, and almost all of them would retract an article without the authors' permission. COPE's guidelines appear to have had a significant influence on journal retraction policies. doi:10.3163/1536-5050.103.3.006

Krumholz HM. **The end of journals.** *Circulation* e-pub 2015 November 10
According to the author, there are at least 9 deficiencies in the current publication model that fuel the sense that journals as we have known them are approaching their final act. Among them: the publication process is too long; the expense of publishing is growing rapidly; the configuration of articles prohibits a comprehensive and in-depth approach to a scientific question; peer review and the journal decision-making process occur without much external scrutiny and transparency. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.115.002415

RESEARCH EVALUATION

Bourne PE, Lorsch JR. Green ED. **Sustaining the big-data ecosystem.** *Nature* 2015 November 5;527
Biomedical big data offer tremendous potential for making discoveries, but the cost of sustaining these digital assets and the resources needed to make them useful have received relatively little attention. Funders should encourage the development of new metrics to ascertain the usage and value of data and when we have a better understanding of data usage, we can develop business models for storing, organising and accessing them. Tools and rewards that incentivise researchers to submit their data to data resources in ways that maximise both quality and ease of access, are also needed. doi:10.1038/527S16a

Milat AJ, Bauman AE, Redman S. **A narrative review of research impact assessment models and methods.** *Health Research Policy and Systems* 2015;13:18
The purpose of this narrative literature review is to synthesize evidence that describes processes and conceptual models for assessing policy and practice impacts of public health research. The literature is characterised by an over reliance on bibliometric methods to assess research impact. Future impact assessment processes could be strengthened by routinely engaging the end-users of research in interviews and assessment processes. doi:10.1186/s12961-015-0003-1

SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

Helbing D, Pournaras E. **Society: build digital democracy.** *Nature* 2015 November 5;527(7576):33-34.
Open sharing of data that are collected with smart devices would empower citizens and create jobs, say the authors of this article. A research team has started to create a distributed, privacy-preserving 'digital nervous system' called Nervousnet. It uses the sensor networks that make up the Internet of Things, including those in smartphones, to measure the world around us and to build a collective 'data commons'. doi:10.1038/527033a

Whelan J. **Medical journalism: another way to write about science.** *Medical Writing* 2015; 24(4):219-221
True journalism differs from public relations and uncritically reproducing press releases. It involves doing background research into the context surrounding the findings being reported, seeking comments from independent experts, and highlighting the negative as well as positive aspects. In this article, the author pulls together information for medical writers interested in journalism or science writing. doi:10.1179/2047480615Z.000000000327

Thanks to John Glen

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