

## News notes

NewsNotes are compiled by John Hilton ([hilton.john@gmail.com](mailto:hilton.john@gmail.com))

Some of these items are taken from the EASE Journal Blog (<http://esebookshelf.blogspot.com>) where full URLs may be found

### GPP3

This year has seen the publication of GPP3: Good Publication Practice for Communicating Company-Sponsored Medical Research. The guidelines were first published in 2003 and updated in 2009. The latest update includes new content on authorship, ghostwriting, author payment, medical writers, and data sharing. GPP is supported by the International Society for Medical Publication Professionals (ISMPP). GPP3 was published in the *Annals of Internal Medicine* (2015;163:461), with supporting material available on the ISMPP website ([www.ismpp.org/gpp3](http://www.ismpp.org/gpp3)).

### Core competencies for editors

A project to develop a list of core competencies for scientific editors of biomedical journals is being led by David Moher at the Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Canada. The aim is to develop a globally accepted minimum set of core competencies for editors of peer-reviewed journals. The team is now inviting current or former editors of biomedical journals to take part in a needs assessment and subsequent consultation process. You can find out more at [www.surveymonkey.com/r/NWGXQJ7](http://www.surveymonkey.com/r/NWGXQJ7).

### Data exchange and metadata

The big open access repository networks in Europe, the United States, and Latin America are working with the Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR; [www.coar-repositories.org](http://www.coar-repositories.org)) and the Center for Open Science (COS; [cos.io](http://cos.io)) to exchange data, work towards consensus on metadata and common vocabularies, and assess common technologies. You can read more

about the collaboration between OpenAire ([www.openaire.eu](http://www.openaire.eu)), La Referencia ([lareferencia.redclara.net](http://lareferencia.redclara.net)) and SHARE ([share-research.org](http://share-research.org)) on the COAR website.

### GRID

The Global Research Identifier Database (GRID; [www.grid.ac](http://www.grid.ac)) is a new freely available dataset of research organisations, accompanied by unique identifiers. It has been compiled by Digital Science, which has identified 50,000 institutions across the world. The aim is to encourage innovation, mapping and data visualisation, but editors may find the data useful. You can read more about GRID on the Digital Science News Blog ([www.digitalscience.com/blog](http://www.digitalscience.com/blog); 12 October 2015) and you can download the data from [www.grid.ac/downloads](http://www.grid.ac/downloads).

### Peer Review Week

With the aim of “celebrating” peer review, four organisations with varied perspectives and interactions with peer review instigated Peer Review Week (#PeerRevWk15), in the week of 28 September 2015. Wiley ([wiley.com](http://wiley.com)), ORCID ([orcid.org](http://orcid.org)), Sense About Science ([senseaboutscience.org](http://senseaboutscience.org)) and Science Open ([scienceopen.com](http://scienceopen.com)) led the way, with other organisations joining in. A Storify curated by ORCID ([storify.com/ORCID\\_Org](http://storify.com/ORCID_Org)) captures some of the 1500 tweets, and there are useful summaries on Springer Source ([www.springersource.com](http://www.springersource.com); 2 October 2015) and the F1000 Research blog ([blog.f1000research.com](http://blog.f1000research.com); 3 October 2015).

### Single-figure publication

Had enough of long articles full of words? One scientist has proposed the concept of ‘single figure publication’, consisting of a figure, its legend, and a methods section. Results and discussion sections are optional. William Mobley (University of California, San Diego, USA) came up with the idea as a way of speeding publication and creating concise, accessible units of knowledge that

are machine-readable. The approach, which sits between a traditional article and a nanopublication, is described in more detail in an editorial in *F1000 Research* (2015;4:268).

### Retraction Watch birthday

The Retraction Watch blog continues to grow in importance, recently celebrating its fifth birthday with a \$300,000 grant from the Laura and John Arnold Foundation ([www.arnoldfoundation.org](http://www.arnoldfoundation.org)) to assist the blog’s parent organisation, the Center for Scientific Integrity, to continue work on a retraction database and other initiatives.

### RIO

*Research Ideas and Outcomes* (RIO; [riojournal.com](http://riojournal.com)) is an ambitious new broad-scope journal that aims to publish “all outputs of the research cycle”, including proposals, data, methods, workflows, software, reports, articles, and many more. The journal is also taking a flexible approach to publishing services, aiming to “decouple the traditional scholarly journal into its component services” and making use of the ARPHA ([arphahub.com](http://arphahub.com)) collaborative writing, peer review and publishing platform. Another novel feature is that research outputs can be linked to impact categories based on UN Development Goals and EU Societal Challenges.

### New overlay journal

A new mathematics journal, *Discrete Analysis*, will not be accepting any new submissions. It is an ‘overlay journal’, consisting only of links to preprints already published on arXiv ([arxiv.org](http://arxiv.org)), accompanied by a short description. Articles considered for publication in *Discrete Analysis* will be peer-reviewed then published with a unique DOI in a standard journal-like format. One of the journal’s founders, Timothy Gowers, explains more, and answers some questions, on his blog ([gowers.wordpress.com](http://gowers.wordpress.com); 10 September 2015).

### New US ethics guidelines

The US Department for Health and Human Services has stated that it will update guidelines on human research ethics to reflect recent scientific developments. BioEdge ([bioedge.org](http://bioedge.org); 26 September 2015) reports that the updated guidelines may include informed consent for biospecimens, improved consent forms, new rules on oversight of research, and new data security safeguards.

### Coalition for Responsible Publication Resources

Academics engaged in the article-writing process can access a wide range of services from organisations offering to help with every stage of the process, from writing through to publishing and beyond. While many of these services are valued and reliable, others are money-making scams or are operating unethically. The Coalition for Responsible Publication Resources ([www.rprcoalition.org](http://www.rprcoalition.org)) is a proposal for a voluntary badge scheme to help researchers choose reliable services. The initiative was launched by Donald Samulak (Cactus Communications and Editage), and the group is seeking input from organisations and individuals.

### PubPeer Foundation

The PubPeer website ([pubpeer.com](http://pubpeer.com)), a popular forum for post-publication discussion of scientific papers, was until recently run by an anonymous team. They maintained their anonymity for the same reasons that they permitted anonymous comments: fear that open criticism could jeopardise careers. However, the site's success has led to the formation of the non-profit PubPeer Foundation, and the team behind PubPeer are revealed (they are all practising scientists) as they commit to the development of PubPeer. You can read more on the PubPeer blog ([blog.pubpeer.com](http://blog.pubpeer.com); 31 August 2015).

### Reproducibility Project: Psychology

August 2015 saw the publication in *Science* (2015;349:aac4716) of the first results from the Reproducibility

Project: Psychology. The project, presented on Open Science Framework ([osf.io/ezcu](http://osf.io/ezcu)), aimed to replicate 100 'foundational studies' in basic psychology research. The main findings, that replication effects were half the magnitude of original effects, and that significant results were seen in 97% of original studies but only 36% of replications, received widespread media coverage.

### Penelope update

Penelope ([www.peneloperesearch.com](http://www.peneloperesearch.com)) may be the closest we have come to software than can do the job of a science editor. The 'manuscript scrutiny' system assesses a wide range of attributes of a submitted manuscript, and proposes fixes and application of relevant standards. Penelope has recently received funding and support from Digital Science, and the system will be piloted with two journals. You may like to test Penelope's EQUATOR Wizard tool ([peneloperesearch.com/equatorwizard](http://peneloperesearch.com/equatorwizard)), being developed in collaboration with the EQUATOR Network ([equator-network.org](http://equator-network.org)), which helps researchers establish which reporting guidelines are relevant to their article.

### Wikipedia, Elsevier and OA

The Wikimedia Foundation, the organisation that runs Wikipedia, works with publishers, libraries and other organisations to give free access to subscription content for Wikipedia editors, with the intention of ensuring that Wikipedia content is supported by the best possible sources. However, in the case of a recent arrangement with Elsevier, the arrangement prompted some heated debate, with some arguing that it would lead to an increased number of sources that were inaccessible to readers (and prompting readers to pay subscription fees), which may be incompatible with Wikipedia's status as an open access/open knowledge project. You can read more in *Ars Technica* ([arstechnica.co.uk](http://arstechnica.co.uk); 14 September 2015).

### Citing retracted papers

The aim of retraction is to correct the scientific record, but how

many retracted articles continue to be cited? Using a well-known case of multiple retractions (anaesthesiologist Scott Reuben's 25 retractions following his 2009 conviction for data fabrication) as an example, Austrian researchers have found that five years later 11 of the articles continued to be cited, with only about a quarter of the citing articles mentioning the retraction (*Science & Engineering Ethics*; 2015:July 7). You can read more about this and other similar studies on the Retraction Watch blog ([retractionwatch.com](http://retractionwatch.com); 14 July 2015).

### Keep it short?

What's the most effective length for a title? A study of 20,000 papers on Scopus ([scopus.com](http://scopus.com)) compared title length with number of citations, and found that the shorter titles received the most citations. When the researchers re-ran the analysis factoring in journal impact factor, the citation benefit of shorter titles only applied to articles published between 2007-2010, with no correlation for more recent articles. The study, published in *Royal Society Open Science* ([rsos.royalsocietypublishing.org](http://rsos.royalsocietypublishing.org); 26 August 2015), offers no firm conclusions, and prompts many hypotheses.

### Nature OA survey

The annual Author Insights survey run by Nature Publishing Group/Palgrave Macmillan demonstrated a shift in science researchers' perceptions about open access, with 27% expressing 'concern', compared with 40% in 2014. The full anonymised survey results are freely available from *Figshare* ([figshare.com](http://figshare.com); search for 'Author Insights'). The survey also found that researchers selected journals based on reputation, relevance, peer review quality, and Impact Factor.

**John Hilton**

Editor, Cochrane Editorial Unit,  
Cochrane Collaboration, London, UK  
[hilton.john@gmail.com](mailto:hilton.john@gmail.com)