

## 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

### Editors of *Lingua* resign

In October 2015 the editors and entire editorial board of the journal *Lingua* ([journals.elsevier.com/lingua](http://journals.elsevier.com/lingua)) resigned after the journal publisher did not agree to the editors' proposals to make the journal fully open access. The departing editors intend to start a new open access journal, to be called *Glossa*, published by Ubiquity Press. Elsevier is recruiting new editors and editorial board for *Lingua*. The dispute was widely reported, and there was support for the departing editorial team from a number of library and academic organisations.

### Making ORCID mandatory

In November 2015 a number of publishers agreed to require authors to supply their ORCID IDs when submitting manuscripts. The Royal Society, PLOS, and eLife Sciences joined with ORCID to publish an open letter ([available on orcid.org](http://orcid.org)) explaining the decision and offering guidance on implementation to other publishers, with EMBO Press, *Science* journals, ScienceOpen and others publishers signing up. Authors submitting to the The Royal Society journals or to *eLife* from January 2016 onwards will be required to supply ORCID IDs, while the other signatories will implement the requirement in the near future.

### Project THOR

THOR (Technical and Human Infrastructure for Open Research; [project-thor.eu](http://project-thor.eu)) is a project funded by the European Commission as part of the Horizon 2020 programme. The project aims to "establish seamless integration between articles, data,

and researchers across the research lifecycle" and follows on from the ODIN project ([odin-project.eu](http://odin-project.eu)). Ten partner organisations across the research infrastructure will work to build relationships between contributors, research artefacts (including data), and integrate organisations into the ORCID ([orcid.org](http://orcid.org)) and DataCite ([datacite.org](http://datacite.org)) systems.

### PRO Initiative

A group of academic scientists have established the Peer Reviewers' Openness (PRO) Initiative ([opennessinitiative.org](http://opennessinitiative.org)), which proposes that peer reviewers should only fully peer review manuscripts that meet the minimum requirements for openness. These requirements focus on the public availability and documentation, where possible, of all data, materials, code or any other fundamental components of the research. The PRO Initiative website includes detailed guidelines for authors seeking to ensure openness and transparency.

### Annotating all knowledge

More than 50 publishers, technology organisations and scholarly websites have formed a coalition with Hypothes.is, with the aim of applying the principles of annotation technology to scientific publications. The aim is to implement a "native and universal collaborative capability" rather than relying on an array of proprietary commenting systems. As well as being used for note-taking and post-publication discussion, such systems could be used for peer review, copy editing, and linking/classification. You can read more at [hypothes.is/annotating-all-knowledge](http://hypothes.is/annotating-all-knowledge).

### Think Check Submit

Think Check Submit ([thinkchecksubmit.org](http://thinkchecksubmit.org)) is a checklist developed by a coalition of organisations "to help researchers identify trusted journals for their

research". The initiative, launched on 1 October 2015, was prompted by concerns about 'predatory' journals or publishers, and has been endorsed by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

### RIO launch editorial

An editorial by the editors of new journal *Research Ideas and Outcomes* (RIO; [riojournal.com](http://riojournal.com)) sets out in detail the aims and processes of the journal. The editorial (RIO 2015;1:e7547) emphasises that science is a cyclical process, rather than just a set of findings. The journal enables researchers to create a "permanent public record for every step within their research cycles – including those not traditionally published."

### ELIXIR EXCELERATE

ELIXIR ([www.elixir-europe.org](http://www.elixir-europe.org)) is a pan-European infrastructure for biological information, and the project moved into the implementation phase in September 2015, with €19 million of EU Horizon 2020 funding. The ELIXIR EXCELERATE programme will aim to integrate Europe's bioinformatics resources.

### Most-cited retractions

Many retracted papers continue to be cited after they have been retracted. The Retraction Watch team has compiled a list of the top 10 most cited retracted papers ([retractionwatch.com](http://retractionwatch.com); 28 December 2015). Top of the list was a paper by Fukuhara *et al* published in *Science* in 2005, and retracted in 2007, with at least 750 citations since retraction. Many of the papers were cited more after retraction than before, and retraction seems to have no impact on citation rate, although post-retraction citations may have acknowledged the retraction, with the retraction notice itself gaining over 100 citations.

### Matters

A new journal, *Matters* ([sciencematters.io](http://sciencematters.io)), aims to publish

single scientific observations, on the basis that these are the “true unit of science”. The journal uses an online guided writing tool for submissions and will operate a triple blind peer review system, whereby neither the peer reviewers nor the handling editors know the identity of the authors. The journal will guarantee publication of all “scientifically solid” observations, while higher rated observations will be published in a sister journal, *Matters Select*. Once the first ‘seeding’ observation is published, subsequent observations can be published, and a proprietary algorithm will create links between observations. Once authors have published sufficient observations, they are encouraged to submit a “narrative integration of their observations” to a third journal, *Matters Narratives*. The journals are open access and authors must pay a fee to submit. Some of that fee is passed on to editors and reviewers.

### OpenCon Community Collaborate

OpenCon ([www.opencon2015.org](http://www.opencon2015.org)) is a conference for early career researchers interested in open access, open education and open data, supported by the Right to Research Coalition ([www.righttoresearch.org](http://www.righttoresearch.org)) and SPARC ([sparc.arl.org](http://sparc.arl.org)). In November 2015 the team launched OpenCon Community Collaborate ([www.opencon2015.org/collaborate](http://www.opencon2015.org/collaborate)) as a forum for connecting and supporting individuals and organisations undertaking initiatives in open access.

### EQUATOR Oncology Project

The EQUATOR Network has started compiling a set of resources relating to oncology. The aim is to help clinicians and researchers to implement reporting guidelines in cancer research, and the project is supported by Cancer Research UK. You can read the collected resources and plans for the future on the EQUATOR website ([www.equator-network.org](http://www.equator-network.org)).

### China tackling fraud

The problem of fraud in peer review is being tackled by Chinese research organisations. An investigation by the Chinese Association for Science and Technology led to major research agencies demanding that offenders return funding. The story was reported in *Science* (20 November 2015). Six editing companies formed the Alliance for Scientific Editing in China to try to raise standards.

### Hijacking journals

A report in *Science* ([sciencemag.org](http://sciencemag.org); 19 November 2015) explores a recent development: hijacking of journal websites.

### PRISMA-P checklist

The PRISMA statement ([prisma-statement.org](http://prisma-statement.org)) provides reporting guidelines for systematic reviews. Its extension for systematic review protocols (PRISMA-P) was published in 2015. To help authors follow PRISMA-P when submitting protocols, a new checklist has been published (*Systematic Reviews* 2016:5:15) and will be a requirement for authors submitting protocols to the *Systematic Reviews* journal.

### ICMJE recommendations updated

The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) has updated its Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals (previously called the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Medical Journals). The updated recommendations, published in December 2015, are available from the ICMJE website ([icmje.org](http://icmje.org)), and an annotated PDF indicating the changes is also available.

### ICMJE data sharing proposal

The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) is seeking feedback on a series of proposed data-sharing requirements for those submitting clinical trial reports to its member journals. These will require authors to share individual patient data no later than

six months after publication, for clinical trials that start enrolling patients a year after the requirements are adopted. Authors would also be required to include a data-sharing plan as part of clinical trial registration. The proposals were published simultaneously in member journals (20 January 2016), and feedback is sought on the ICMJE website ([icmje.org](http://icmje.org)).

### The One Repo

There are more than 4000 institutional repositories listed in the Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR; [roar.eprints.org](http://roar.eprints.org)), and while there have been regional approaches to aggregating content, there is no way of searching across all repositories. Index Data, with support from SPARC Europe ([sparceurope.org](http://sparceurope.org)), is building The One Repo, which aims to capture content from all repositories. You can try out the demo ([onerepo.net](http://onerepo.net)) or read more about the project on The One Repo Blog ([blog.onerepo.net](http://blog.onerepo.net)).

### COPE guide updated

The Committee for Publication Ethics’ Short Guide to Ethical Editing for New Editors has been revised and updated. The new guide is available from the COPE website ([publicationethics.org](http://publicationethics.org)).

### Hijacking journals

A report in *Science* ([sciencemag.org](http://sciencemag.org); 19 November 2015) explores a recent development: hijacking of journal websites. This goes beyond the practice of stealing another journal’s name or branding, or even using a very similar looking website address, and involves the actual takeover of another journal’s website domain. This can happen when an organisation neglects to keep up payments on hosting (as happened to CrossRef in 2015 when DOIs stopped working briefly after the [doi.org](http://doi.org) domain registration expired).

**John Hilton**

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