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Our Publishers' Area is back

For those of you who have a journal indexed in DOAJ, you may now log in to your account, upload metadata to us or update your account. We’ve provided new tools to make metadata uploading easier and we encourage you to start using them.

New application process

There is a new process to get journals indexed in the DOAJ. All journals must apply using our new Application Form. Due to the extensive and detailed information we require, only a journal’s publisher should complete the application form.
Sustainable Practices for Populating Repositories Report

There is an active, thriving community of open access repositories worldwide and their visibility is rising as funding agencies and governments implement open access policies. Still, repositories must continue to adopt strategies that demonstrate their value to the wider research community. Therefore COAR has now published the report, “Incentives, Integration, and Mediation: Sustainable Practices for Population Repositories”. It profiles a variety of successful practices for populating repositories from around the world. Aim of this report is to assist the global repository community in implementing sustainable methods for recruiting content. The profiles were gathered from organizations across the globe, and represent a mixture of approaches involving the introduction of incentives; integration of the repository with other institutional services; and/or mediation of the deposit process. The practices reflect a tradition of innovation and openness in the repository community, and are characterized by creative approaches to staffing, imaginative software developments, and adoption of novel policies.

Read the full report “Incentives, Integration, and Mediation: Sustainable Practices for Populating Repositories”.

Disponible en español: “Incentivos, Integración y Mediación: Prácticas Sostenibles para pobar Repositorios”.
This report describes a number of profiles of sustainable practices for populating repositories that fall into three broad categories:

- **Incentives**: promoting the benefits of repositories through advocacy and metrics, as well as the adoption of policies/mandates that require deposit

- **Integration**: amalgamating repository services with other institutional services like research information systems and research biographies

- **Mediation**: implementing tools, workflows, and agreements that ease and simplify the deposit process
Eight profiles of sustainable practices for populating repositories:

1. Advocacy
2. Institutional Mandates
3. Metrics
4. Recruitment and Deposit Services
5. Research Biographies
6. Institutional Profiles
7. Publisher Agreements, and
8. Direct Deposit
Both academics and administrative staff need to know how they are going to benefit from depositing in and working with their institutional repository.”

(the UK Open Access Implementation Group)
Advocacy

Researchers must feel the repository is their own.”

(Eloy Rodrigues, the University of Minho in Portugal, a talk at the Couperin Conference 2013)
A global event, now in its 7th year, promoting Open Access as a new norm in scholarship and research.

**Blog Posts**

SPARC Open Access Meeting Innovation Fair Projects Showcase OA Week ideas

At this week’s SPARC Open Access Meeting in Kansas City, MO two Innovation Fair participants presented projects to get more people involved in Open Access Week.

One from Robyn Hall at MacEwan University Library - she created an Open Access Comedy Festival to draw people.

And one from Fred Roscoe…

Welcome to Open Access Week
Sign Up or Sign In

**OA Week Events**

* Planning an OAW event? Post your event details to the OAW section of the Open Access Directory.
* Looking for OAW events to attend? Browse the same section of the OAD, which is organized by region.
* Want to see what people did last year for ideas for this year? Check out last year's archive.

Organization by:

SPARC Open Access Meeting Innovation Fair Projects Showcase OA Week ideas

Welcome to Open Access Week
Sign Up or Sign In

**Facebook**

Welcome to Open Access Week
Sign Up or Sign In

**Groups**

Open Access MexicoOpen access Algeria
29 members 2 members
Commentary

Open access: academic publishing and its implications for knowledge equity in Kenya

Duncan Mwangangi Matheka, Joseph Nderitu, Daniel Mutonga, Mary Iwaret Otiti, Karen Siegel and Alessandro Rhyll Demaio

For all author emails, please log on.

Published: 9 April 2014

Abstract (provisional)

Traditional, subscription-based scientific publishing has its limitations: often, articles are inaccessible to the majority of researchers in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where journal subscriptions or one-time access fees are cost-prohibitive. Open access (OA) publishing, in which journals provide online access to articles free of charge, breaks this barrier and allows unrestricted access to scientific and scholarly information to researchers all over the globe. At the same time, one major limitation to OA is a high publishing cost that is placed on authors. Following recent developments to OA publishing policies in the UK and even LMICs, this article highlights the current status and future challenges of OA in Africa. We place particular emphasis on Kenya, where multidisciplinary efforts to improve access have been established. We note that these efforts in Kenya can be further strengthened and potentially replicated in other African countries, with the goal of elevating the visibility of African research and improving access for African researchers to global research, and, ultimately, bring social and economic benefits to the region. We (1) offer recommendations for overcoming the challenges of implementing OA in Africa and (2)
Advocacy

“The majority of institutions running a successful repository have an open access ‘champion’ who has played a major role in persuading staff to engage with the repository… It is important for a senior member of University management to take the lead in promoting the repository and its benefits [not the library]. Champions within subject areas are also important, as different areas of the institution will have different concerns about open access.”

(The UK Open access Implementation Group)
Institutional Mandates
ORBi and Open Access News

The Webometrics rankings for January 2014 are out!
21/02/2014

ORBi is ranked 34th out of 1746 repositories in the world - across all categories. Another leap up 13 places compared to the last rankings published in July 2013!

In the institutional rankings, ORBi ranks 25th out of 1660 (up 8 places) and 16th in the European rankings.

Encouraging results, especially when we see that of the 1680 institutional repositories, ORBi ranks just behind NASA, HAL, the University of California, Virginia Tech, CERN, MIT, Queensland, Southampton, and Minho...

Benchmarks in the field!

More info...

2 million downloads from ORBi!
17/12/2013

Files submitted to ORBi have broken the two million download barrier!

With more than 2,200 downloads per day, 2013 saw the number of downloads rising from 1 million to 2 million. Impressive growth and visibility which shows no signs of stopping.

Do you want to increase your chances of being seen and downloaded? It’s simple, put your papers on Open Access. Documents submitted in Open Access to ORBi are downloaded 30 times more often than those with restricted access.

More info...

Launch of the Open Access button
18/11/2013

Open Access button

@bernardrentier:
- University that doesn't know what papers its faculty publishes is like a factory that doesn't know what it produces.
- An empty repository is useless; a partly filled repository is partly useless; there is a need for an institutional OA policy.
@bernardrentier:
- Don't impose, just inform researchers that only publications in the repository will be considered for evaluation
- Mandate, keep authors at the core, communicate permanently, be coherent, reduce constraints
- @ORBi_ULg – a personal workspace, provides statistics and has a widget to generate publications lists – content in personal/faculties webpages
At the University of Nebraska-Lincoln monthly download statistics were crucial to convincing faculty of the worth of the repository. “Faculty began to compete with each other for most downloads. Faculty sold the repository to each other. By creating a “buzz” around the publishing work, the coordinator was able to change the viewpoint from why participate to how to participate.”
Professor Tom Cochrane, the deputy vice chancellor of Technology, Information and Learning Support at Queensland University of Technology in Australia: OA content in the repository has offered the university “much richer data for quality and impact assessment".
Altmetrics

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Altmetrics are new metrics proposed as an alternative to the widely used journal impact factor and personal citation indices like the h-index. The term altmetrics was proposed in 2010,[1][2] as a generalization of article level metrics,[3] and has its roots in the twitter #altmetrics hashtag. Although altmetrics are often thought of as metrics about articles, they can be applied to people, journals, books, data sets, presentations, videos, source code repositories, web pages, etc.[4] Altmetrics cover not just citation counts, but also other aspects of the impact of a work, such as how many data and knowledge bases refer to it, article views, downloads, or mentions in social media and news media.[5][6]
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Adoption [edit]

Various websites and projects are calculating altmetrics, including ImpactStory,[7][8] Altmetric.com,[7][9] Plum Analytics,[7][10][11] and Citedh.[12] Several publishers have started providing such information to readers, including BioMed Central, Public Library of Science,[13] Frontiers,[14] Nature Publishing Group,[15] and Elsevier. For example, Elsevier announced in a press release to be "increasingly looking at additional metrics, including so called Altmetrics, as a measure of influence of journals and authors".[16] Starting in March 2009, the Public Library of Science also introduced article-level metrics for all articles.[13] Funders have started showing interest in alternative metrics,[17] including the UK Medical Research Council.[18] Altmetrics have been used in applications for promotion review by researchers.[19]

Furthermore, several universities, including the University of Pittsburgh are experimenting with altmetrics at an institute level.[19]

However, it is also observed that an article needs little attention to jump to the upper quartile of ranked papers,[20] suggesting that not enough sources of altmetrics are currently available to give a balanced picture of impact for the majority of papers.

Important in determining the relative impact of a paper, a service that calculates altmetrics statistics needs a considerably sized knowledge base. The following table shows the number of papers covered by services:
Recruitment and Deposit Services

“Assisted deposit, either through departmental administrative staff or librarians, accounted for relatively high deposit rates for economics in the Queensland and Melbourne IRs.”

(A study by Xia et. al., which looked at deposit rates at seven institutions in Australia and the UK)
Recruitment and Deposit Services

Concordia University in Canada uses publisher’s alerts, maintains a Refworks database of new faculty publications, tags relevant citations, and uses this all as the starting point for faculty outreach to populate their repository.
The University of Kansas has expanded their one-person repository operation into a cross-departmental team staffed by librarians and paraprofessionals with expertise in their tasks, resulting in a substantial increase in the volume of content deposited. They have developed a workflow that “has been a great success, allowing easy handoffs between several individuals in two different departments and expanding to provide greater efficiency as processes develop. The system was designed with tools to simplify operations, such as the RefWorks interface, and the ability to add new features as needed, such as the publisher data.” The repository “is reportedly growing at a rate of approximately 6000 items per year.”
Recruitment and Deposit Services

At Harvard University, for example, they employ several students that perform most of the hands-on metadata entry required for contributions into the repository, as well as faculty outreach, education, and support.

Similarly, at the William & Mary Law School repository in the US, students added almost 5,000 documents in the first six months of the repository's existence.
Recruitment and Deposit Services

Rights checking services can also be automated. The College of Wooster in the US, for example, has developed a script that automates permissions lookup in the SHERPA/RoMEO database.

The script has been made freely available for others to use adapt in their own repository environment, and has been integrated into repository operations elsewhere.
Direct Deposit

Automated Article-Deposit

With repositories now rapidly gaining pace, many organizations find populating their repositories a challenge, particularly as researchers are required to duplicate efforts to upload files into a repository.

Together with SpringerOpen, BioMed Central can reduce this burden by automatically populating repositories via the SWORD (Simple Web-service Offering Repository Deposit) protocol. This transfers complete article content (including PDFs, additional files and article metadata) from one repository to another. Please contact your Sales Representative for more information.

Benefits of Automated Article-Deposit

- **Time-saving**: Automated deposit into the repository requires less time and effort from both authors and repository administrators.
- **Policy/mandate compliance**: The service enables automatic compliance with the increasing number of open access deposit and self-archiving mandates from institutions and funding bodies.
- **Repository population**: Adding content to a repository can be a major challenge for institutions. Automated Article-Deposit makes repository population easy and ongoing.

Automated Article-Deposit feeds are offered as standard, at no additional charge to BioMed Central Members and Open Repository Enhanced customers. They are also available as a separately chargeable service to non-Members. Contact the Institutional Sales team or refer to our Automated Article-Deposit FAQ for more information.

UK Open Access Implementation Group: http://open-access.org.uk/information-and-guidance/advocacy/


International Open Access Week: http://www.openaccessweek.org

ROARMAP: Registry of Open Access Repositories Mandatory Archiving Policies: http://roarmap.eprints.org

ORBi: Open Repository and Bibliography: http://orbi.ulg.ac.be


Altmetrics - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Altmetrics

Self-archiving to Institutional Repositories Is Improved by Assisted and Mandated Deposit; Disciplinary Culture is not a Factor by Gaby Haddow: http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/1486


SHERPA/RoMEO API: http://pastebin.com/sXknBHDq

Automated Article-Deposit, BioMed Central: http://www.biomedcentral.com/libraries/aad#
A study funded by the European Commission (EC) suggests that OA is reaching the tipping point, with around 50% of scientific papers published in 2011 now available for free.

“The tipping point for OA (more than 50% of the papers available for free) has been reached in several countries, including Brazil, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Slovenia, the US, as well as in biomedical research, biology, and mathematics and statistics.”


**OA policies:** the majority of 48 major science funders considered both OA publications in journals & self-archiving in OA repositories.

More than 75% accepted embargo periods of between six to 12 months.


Observatory of...
Scientific output and Open Science policies for Europe and beyond...
See our services. Learn how you may benefit or participate.
Open Access in Horizon 2020

Open access to scientific peer reviewed publications has been anchored as an underlying principle in the Horizon 2020 and is explained in the Regulation and the Rules of Participation as well as through the relevant provisions in the grant agreement (see Article 29 “Dissemination of results - Open Access - Visibility of EU funding”; pages 60-63 of the Multi-beneficiary General Model Grant Agreement, Version 1.0, December 11, 2013) as well as exceptions for confidentiality (article 36), security (article 37), personal data (article 39).

Are you supposed to deposit? > What to deposit > Where to deposit > When to deposit

Open access to research data: the Open Research Data Pilot

A novelty in Horizon 2020 is the Open Research Data Pilot which aims to improve and maximise access to and re-use of research data generated by projects. It will be monitored with a view to developing the European Commission policy on open research data in future Framework Programmes.

Are you supposed to deposit? > What to deposit > Where to deposit > When to deposit
GitHub integration
Want to preview the public beta of GitHub integration? Just Sign in with your GitHub account and click here.

New to ZENODO?
- **Research. Shared.** — all research outputs from across all fields of science are welcome!
- **Citable. Discoverable.** — uploads gets a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) to make them easily and uniquely citable.
- **Community Collections.** — accept or reject uploads to your own community collections (e.g., workshops, community digital repositories).
- **Funding** — integrated in reporting lines for research funded by the European Commission via OpenAIRE.
- **Flexible licensing** — because not everything is under Creative Commons.
- **Safe** — your research output is stored safely for the future in same cloud infrastructure as research data from CERN's Large Hadron
Introducing ZENODO!

(All) Research. Shared.
— your one stop research shop!

All research outputs from across all fields of science are welcome! ZENODO accepts any file format as well as both positive and negative results. However, we do promote peer-reviewed openly accessible research, and we do curate your upload before putting it on the front-page.

Citable. Discoverable.
— be found!

ZENODO assigns all publicly available uploads a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) to make the upload easily and uniquely citable. ZENODO further supports harvesting of all content via the OAI-PMH protocol.

Community Collections
— create your own repository

ZENODO allows you to create your own collection and accept or reject all uploads to it. Creating a space for your next workshop or project has never been easier. Plus, everything is citable and discoverable.

Safe
— more than just a drop box!

Your research output is stored safely for the future in same cloud infrastructure as research data from CERN's Large Hadron Collider using a CERN's battle-tested repository software INVENIO used by some of the world's largest repositories such as INSPIRE HEP and CERN Document Server.

Reporting
— tell your funding agency!

ZENODO is integrated into reporting lines for research funded by the European Commission via OpenAIRE. Just upload your research on ZENODO and we will take care of the reporting for you. We plan to extend with further funding agencies in the future so stay tuned!

Flexible Licensing
— not everything is under Creative Commons

ZENODO encourages you to share your research as openly as possible to maximize use and reuse of your research results. However, we also acknowledge that one size does not fit all, and therefore allow for uploading under a multitude of different licenses and access levels*.

* You are responsible for respecting applicable copyright and license conditions for the files you upload.
Community Collections

Communities created and curated by ZENODO users

AG Univerlage (Working Group of University Presses)

The Working Group of German speaking University Presses from Europe is a group of institutional scholarly presses that aim to disseminate their publications as user-friendly and as freely as possible. Open Access therefore is a strong topic in the group. ...

Curated by: Margo Bargheer

ALAMSA project

The collection of main results and publications on FP7 funded project ALAMSA.

Curated by: Igor

American Chemical Science Journal

American Chemical Science Journal (ISSN: 2249-0205) aims to publish high quality papers (Click here for Types of paper) in all aspects of chemical science. The journal also encourages the submission of useful reports of negative results. This is a ...

Curated by: SCIENCEDOMAIN International

American Journal of Experimental Agriculture

American Journal of Experimental Agriculture (ISSN: 2231-0606) is a multidisciplinary journal in the field of agriculture and biology. The journal publishes original scientific papers, short communications, review articles and case studies. This is a ...

Curated by: SCIENCEDOMAIN International

Annual Review & Research in Biology

The aim of Annual Review & Research in Biology (ARRB) (ISSN: 2231-4776) is to publish high quality critical reviews, research articles, mini-reviews and short communications with broad areas of Aerobiology, Agriculture, Anatomy, Astrobiology, ...

Curated by: SCIENCEDOMAIN International

Aptamers

Fera are a UK Government Agency. Our website is www.defra.gov.uk/fera. We specialise in finding solutions for food, food safety, chemical safety, bee health and environmental issues. We offer bespoke research for customers wishing to find solutions ...

Curated by: Tracker

Want your own community?

It’s easy. Just sign-up and create a new community.

- **Curate** – accept/reject what goes in your community collection.
- **Export** – your community collection is automatically exported via DAI-PMH
- **Upload** – get custom upload link to send to people
800+ scholarly societies embrace OA

(Peter Suber & Caroline Sutton)
Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing

Introduction

The Committee on Publication Ethics, the Directory of Open Access Journals, the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, and the World Association of Medical Editors are scholarly organizations that have seen an increase in the number of membership applications from both legitimate and non-legitimate publishers and journals. Our organizations have collaborated in an effort to identify principles of transparency and best practice that set apart legitimate journals and publishers from non-legitimate ones and to clarify that these principles form part of the criteria on which membership applications will be evaluated.

These criteria are largely derived from those developed by the Directory of Open Access Journals. Note that additional membership criteria may also be used by each of the scholarly organizations. The organizations intend to share information in order to develop lists of legitimate journals and publishers. We do not intend to develop or publish a list of publishers or journals that failed to demonstrate they met the criteria for transparency and best practice.

This is a work in progress and we welcome feedback on the general principles and the specific criteria. Background on the organizations is below.

About the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, http://publicationethics.org/)
1. Peer review process: All of a journal’s content, apart from any editorial material that is clearly marked as such, shall be subjected to peer review. Peer review is defined as obtaining advice on individual manuscripts from reviewers expert in the field who are not part of the journal’s editorial staff. This process, as well as any policies related to the journal’s peer review procedures, shall be clearly described on the journal’s Web site.
2. Governing Body: Journals shall have editorial boards or other governing bodies whose members are recognized experts in the subject areas included within the journal’s scope. The full names and affiliations of the journal’s editors shall be provided on the journal’s Web site.
3. Editorial team/contact information
Journals shall provide the full names and affiliations of the journal’s editors on the journal’s Web site as well as contact information for the editorial office.
6. Identification of and dealing with allegations of research misconduct: Publishers and editors shall take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred, including plagiarism, citation manipulation, and data falsification/fabrication, among others. In no case shall a journal or its editors encourage such misconduct, or knowingly allow such misconduct to take place. In the event that a journal’s publisher or editors are made aware of any allegation of research misconduct relating to a published article in their journal – the publisher or editor shall follow COPE’s guidelines (or equivalent) in dealing with allegations.
10. Conflicts of interest: A journal shall have clear policies on handling potential conflicts of interest of editors, authors, and reviewers and the policies should be clearly stated.
Post publications tools & metrics

Peer review
Personal reference
Journals
Citations
Usage stats
Altmetrics
Discover the full impact of your research.

What's my impact?
Carl Boettiger
56 products expand all

article

Early warning signals and the prosecutor's fallacy

Modeling stabilizing selection: Expanding the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model of adaptive evolution
(2012) Evolution

IS YOUR PHYLOGENY INFORMATIVE? MEASURING THE POWER OF COMPARATIVE METHODS
(2012) Boettiger, Coop, Ralph Evolution

Treebase: an R package for discovery, access and manipulation of online phylogenies

rfishbase: exploring, manipulating and visualizing FishBase data from R.

Fluctuation domains in adaptive evolution
(2010) Boettiger, Dushoff, Weitz Theoretical Population Biology

Quantifying limits to detection of early warning for critical transitions

Tipping points: From patterns to predictions.
dataset

Data from: Is your phylogeny informative? Measuring the power of comparative methods
(2012) Boettiger, Coop, Ralph et al. Dryad Digital Repository

Data from: Fluctuation domains in adaptive evolution

Regime shifts in ecology and evolution (PhD Dissertation)
(2012) Carl Boettiger Figshare

Ensemble Behavior from Individual Dynamics in Multispecies Forest Populations (Senior Thesis)
(2013) Carl Boettiger, David Huse, Stephe Pacala Figshare

Lab Notebook, 2012
(2013) Carl Boettiger Figshare

Stochastic impediments to biological diversification (IIASA Application)
(2013) Carl Boettiger Figshare

Adaptive Dynamics: Branching Phenomena and the Canonical Equation (Junior Paper)
(2013) Carl Boettiger Figshare

Clonal Interference Models in Population Genetics (Junior Paper)
(2013) Carl Boettiger, David Huse Figshare

Management for an uncertain world: robust decision theory in face of regime shifts (NSF Biology Postdoc Application)
(2013) Carl Boettiger Figshare

slides

Is your phylogeny informative?
Slideshare

Open Science
Slideshare

Scioslides
Slideshare

IIASA Progress Report 2
Slideshare

ESA 2012 talk
Slideshare
It has become more important where to publish than what to publish
The Journal Impact Factor (IF) is frequently used as the primary parameter with which to compare the scientific output of individuals and institutions.

The IF, as calculated by Thomson Reuters, was originally created as a tool to help librarians identify journals to purchase, not as a measure of the scientific quality of research in an article.

The IF has a number of well-documented deficiencies as a tool for research assessment.
The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), initiated by the American Society for Cell Biology (ASCB) together with a group of editors and publishers of scholarly journals, recognizes the need to improve the ways in which the outputs of scientific research are evaluated. The group met in December 2012 during the ASCB Annual Meeting in San Francisco and subsequently circulated a draft declaration among various stakeholders. DORA as it now stands has benefited from input by many of the original signers listed below. It is a worldwide initiative covering all scholarly disciplines. We encourage individuals and organizations who are concerned about the appropriate assessment of scientific research to sign DORA.

San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment

Putting science into the assessment of research

There is a pressing need to improve the ways in which the output of scientific research is evaluated by funding agencies, academic institutions, and other parties.

To address this issue, a group of editors and publishers of scholarly journals met during the Annual Meeting of The American Society for Cell Biology (ASCB) in San Francisco, CA, on December 16, 2012. The group developed a set of recommendations, referred to as the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. We invite interested parties across all scientific disciplines to indicate their support by adding their names to this Declaration.

The outputs from scientific research are many and varied, including: research articles reporting new knowledge, data, reagents, and software; intellectual property; and highly trained young scientists. Funding agencies, institutions that employ scientists, and scientists themselves, all have a desire, and need, to assess the quality and impact of scientific outputs. It is thus imperative that scientific output is measured accurately and evaluated wisely.

The Journal Impact Factor is frequently used as the primary parameter with which to compare the scientific output of individuals and institutions. The Journal Impact Factor, as calculated by Thomson Reuters, was originally created as a tool to help librarians identify journals to purchase, not as a measure of the scientific quality of research in an article. With that in mind, it is critical to understand that the Journal Impact Factor has a number of well-documented deficiencies as a tool for research assessment. These limitations include:

News About DORA

- Academic Assessment: Nature vs. Nurture - [click for article]

- Why we are not ready for radical changes in science publishing - [click for article]

- Nobel Laureate Schekman Offers NIH His First Post-Prize Talk - [click for article]

- Editorial: "Dear DORA" - [click for article]

- Science publishing: The golden dub [article]

- DORA has been translated into Japanese
1. Do not use journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles, to assess an individual scientist's contributions, or in hiring, promotion, or funding decisions.

The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)

http://am.ascb.org/dora/
How journals like Nature, Cell and Science are damaging science
The incentives offered by top journals distort science, just as big bonuses distort banking

Randy Schekman
The Guardian, Monday 9 December 2013 19.30 GMT
Jump to comments (278)
Funders and universities, too, have a role to play. They must tell the committees that decide on grants and positions not to judge papers by where they are published. It is the quality of the science, not the journal's brand, that matters.

(How journals like Nature, Cell and Science are damaging science by Randy Schekman:  
http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/dec/09/how-journals-nature-science-cell-damage-science)
“My personal belief is that we should be focusing on developing effective and diverse measures of the re-use of research outputs. By measuring use rather than merely prestige we can go much of the way of delivering on the so-called impact agenda, optimizing our use of public funds to generate outcomes but while retaining some say over the types of outcomes that are important and what time-frames they are measured over.”

re-use in industry
re-use in public health
re-use in education
re-use in policy development & enactment
re-use in research

Cameron Neylon: (S)low impact research and the importance of open in maximising re-use: [http://bit.ly/ntbzQ6](http://bit.ly/ntbzQ6)
Ideally, all collected data should be available for further analysis.
I estimate that 80% of all data is collecting dust in drawers or is dying on a hard disk.
How to fix a broken system: Article-Level Metrics at the Public Library of Science by Martin Fenner:

Debating Open Access:
https://www.britac.ac.uk/openaccess/debatingopenaccess.cfm

Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing.
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