

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://ese-bookshelf.blogspot.co.uk>) and see your posts published in the journal.

ECONOMICS AND FUNDING

Schäfer MS, Metag J, Feustle J, *et al.* **Selling science 2.0: what scientific projects receive crowdfunding online?** *Public Understanding of Science* Sept 19, 2016; pii:0963662516668771
Crowdfunding has emerged as a potential source of finance for research in recent years. This study identifies and tests factors influencing the success of scientific crowdfunding projects by drawing on news value theory, the “reputation signalling” approach, and economic theories of online payment. A standardised content analysis of 371 projects on English- and German-language platforms reveals that each theory provides factors influencing crowdfunding success and that projects presented on science-only crowdfunding platforms have a higher success rate. Also, projects are more likely to be successful if their presentation includes visualisations and humour.

EDITORIAL PROCESS

Cobey KD, Galipeau J, Shamseer L, *et al.* **Report on a pilot project to introduce a publications officer.** *CMAJ* 2016;188(12):E279-80.
The primary function of a publications officer should be to provide institutional guidance and support to researchers and trainees on how to prepare manuscripts for journal submission as well as advice on publication topics (open access, metrics, ethics and integrity). The authors began a pilot project in which they hired a publications officer at their institution, The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, and describe their experience.
doi: 10.1503/cmaj.151340

ETHICAL ISSUES

Al-Khatib A, Teixeira da Silva JA. **Stings, hoaxes and irony breach the trust inherent in scientific publishing.** *Publishing Research Quarterly* 2016;32(3):208-19
The use of stings, hoaxes, and irony in academic journals contributes to the overall level of mistrust and erosion of ethical values in science publishing. The authors focused on six such cases and explain why such studies why such studies undermine trust and integrity and why such bogus publications are best left to blogs or non-academic forms of publishing science-related topics.
doi:10.1007/s12109-016-9473-4

Resnik DB, Tyler AM, Black JR, *et al.* **Authorship policies of scientific journals.** *Journal of Medical Ethics* 2016;42(3):199-202
The authors analysed the authorship policies of a random sample of 600 journals from the Journal Citation Reports database, 62.5% of which had an authorship policy. Journals from the biomedical sciences and social sciences/humanities were more likely to have an authorship policy than journals from the physical sciences, engineering or mathematical sciences. A significant finding of the study is that none of the journals with authorship policies addressed the use of equal-contribution statements.
doi: 10.1136/medethics-2015-103171

Sokol D. **Teaching medical ethics: useful or useless?** *BMJ* 2016;355:i6415
Probably for the first time in history, UK-trained doctors at all levels, and in all specialities, now receive formal ethics training at medical school. It is not known whether teaching ethics to medical students makes any long term difference to their clinical practice, especially if it is delivered in the early years. According to the author, the bulk of this teaching should take place after qualification, in the clinical setting. Before that, most students care about one thing only: passing exams.

Yet, the very presence of ethics in the curriculum is important. It sends a message that ethics is an intrinsic and valued part of medical practice.
doi: 10.1136/bmj.i6415

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL

Editorial. **Announcement: where are the data?** *Nature* 537;138
Starting September 2016, all research papers accepted for publication in *Nature* and an initial 12 other *Nature* titles were required to include information on whether and how others can access the underlying data. These data-availability statements should report the availability of the ‘minimal data set’ necessary to interpret, replicate, and build on the findings reported in the paper. Where applicable, such statements should include details about publicly archived data sets that have been analysed or generated during the study. This new policy will be implemented across the diverse range of *Nature* journals by early 2017.
doi: 10.1038/537138a

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

De Faoite D. **Medical gems.** *Medical Writing* 2016;2:30-31
Every discipline employs its own secretive words – jargon that allows initiates to communicate with one another in a way that excludes others. The world of medicine is no exception. The idioms used by doctors and surgeons range from the humorous to terms which seem designed to deliberately obscure the real meaning of the word. Other phrases stand out simply because of the incongruous pairing of everyday words. This article contains some real-life examples of all these because, as it is known, sometimes words have more than one meaning.

Pferschy-Wenzig EM, Pferschy U, Wang D, *et al.* **Does a graphical abstract bring more visibility to your paper?** *Molecules* 2016;21(9):pii: E1247

A graphical abstract (GA) represents a piece of artwork intended to summarise the main findings of an article for readers at a single glance. Many publishers currently encourage authors to supplement their articles with GAs, in the hope that it will result in improved overall visibility of the publication. To test this assumption, the authors statistically compared publications with or without GA published in *Molecules* between March 2014 and March 2015: contrary to their expectations, manuscripts published without GA performed significantly better in terms of PDF downloads, abstract views, and total citations than manuscripts with GA.
doi: 10.3390/molecules21091247

PUBLISHING

Garner P, Hopewell S, Chandler J, *et al.* **When and how to update systematic reviews: consensus and checklist.** *BMJ* 2016;354:i3507
Updating of systematic reviews is generally more efficient than starting all over again when new evidence emerges, but to date there has been no clear guidance on how to do this. The panel for updating guidance for systematic reviews (PUGs) issued this guidance to help authors of systematic reviews, commissioners of reviews, and editors decide when to update a systematic review, and how to go about it.
doi: 10.1136/bmj.i3507

Morgan DJ, Dhruva SS, Wright SM, *et al.* **2016 Update on medical overuse: a systematic review.** *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2016;176(11):1687-92
Overuse of medical care is an increasingly recognised problem in clinical medicine. This review promotes reflection on the top 10 original research articles published in 2015 that are most likely to reduce overuse of medical care, organised into 3 categories: overuse of testing, overtreatment, and questionable use of services. The number of articles on medical overuse doubled from 2014 to 2015.
doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.5381

RESEARCH EVALUATION

Foz CW, Paine CET, Sauterey B. **Citations increase with manuscript length, author number, and references cited in ecology journals.** *Ecology and Evolution* 2016;1-10
The authors examined the relationship between citations received and manuscript length, number of authors, and number of references cited for papers published in 32 ecology journals between 2009 and 2012. They found that longer papers, those with more authors, and those that cite more references are cited more. This is likely because longer papers contain more data and ideas and thus have more citable elements. However, there is also a perception among ecologists that shorter papers are more impactful.
doi: 10.1002/ece3.2505

Nicholas D, Clark D, Herman E. **ResearchGate: reputation uncovered.** *Learned Publishing* 2016;29(3):173-82
ResearchGate (RG) is a scholarly social network possessing, probably, the most comprehensive set of reputational metrics and has the potential to supplant publishers as the prime deliverer of scholarly reputation. This study aims to assess RG's reputational facilities and its conclusions are as follows: RG provides a rich, albeit confusing, amount of reputational data; struggles with the deployment of alternative, engagement metrics, such as Q&A and follower data, which can lead to reputational anomalies; employs usage data in an especially effective manner; and leads the field in the way it engages with the scholar.
doi:10.1002/leap.1035

Sandström U, van den Besselaar P. **Quantity and/or quality? The importance of publishing many papers.** *PLoS One* 2016;11(11):e0166149
This study investigates the relation between productivity and production of highly cited papers. Results show that there is not a strong correlation between productivity (number of

papers) and impact (number of citations), that also holds for the production of high impact papers.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0166149

Tonia T, Van Oyen H, Berger A, *et al.* **If I tweet will you cite? The effect of social media exposure of articles on downloads and citations.** *International Journal of Public Health* 2016;61(4):513-20
The authors studied whether exposing scientific papers to social media (blog posts, Twitter, and Facebook) has an effect on article downloads and citations. Results showed that social media exposure did not have a significant effect on traditional impact metrics. However, other metrics may measure the added value that social media might offer to a scientific journal, such as wider dissemination.
doi: 10.1007/s00038-016-0831-y

SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

Collins K, Shiffman D, Rock J. **How are scientists using social media in the workplace?** *PLoS One* 2016;11(10):e0162680
This study demonstrates that while the use of social media is yet to become widespread among scientists, those in a variety of disciplines, but predominantly the academic life sciences, use these platforms to exchange scientific knowledge, generally via either Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, or blogs. Whilst few believe that Facebook is suitable for science communication, a high percentage of scientists read science blogs, and approximately half have written their own. Many share science-themed blogs with their professional colleagues and most believe that blogs have a role to play in increasing public understanding of science. The use of Twitter by scientists appears to be a new movement.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0162680

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