

In this issue

From Keith and Denise

The Popularity
of Irreproducibility

ORCID News

Participation
in ORCID @ CMU

Open Access News

Actions for Researchers

Actions for Librarians

We want to hear
from you

Send us your questions,
suggestions for topics, and
information to include in
the SC Digest.

Contact
David Scherer

From Keith and Denise

This is the last issue of the SC Digest to be published by Keith and Denise because Denise is retiring February 1, 2016. Until CMU Libraries hires a new Scholarly Communications Librarian, David Scherer will be assuming some of Denise's responsibilities, including the SC Digest.

The Popularity of Irreproducibility

[Altmetric](#) recently released a list of the most shared and discussed academic research of the last 12 months. CMU researchers were among the 270 co-authors of the fifth most shared and discussed article entitled "Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science." Unable to reproduce the findings of most of the 100 studies they attempted to reproduce, studies published in three top psychology journals, the authors observe:

Reproducibility is not well understood because the incentives for individual scientists prioritize novelty over replication.... Journal reviewers and editors may dismiss a new test of a published idea as unoriginal. The claim that 'we already know this' belies the uncertainty of scientific evidence.

The article was mentioned in 74 news stories, 60 blog posts, 1975 tweets, 42 Facebook posts, 15 Google+ posts, 6 Reddit posts, and 7 Wikipedia references, giving it an Altmetric score of 2294. The article is available [here](#). Its full Altmetric report is available [here](#).

Having captured so much attention, will this article affect the public trust and funding for psychological science? Would attempts to reproduce the findings of studies in other disciplines yield similar results? Perhaps science would be better supported and accelerated if we incentivized reproducibility and replication.



ORCID Mandates

An [ORCID](#) is a persistent identifier for a person. Getting and using an ORCID ensures that you will be accurately identified and connected with your research activities, outputs and affiliations. ORCID integrations increase efficiency. That's why over 200 grant application and publishing systems, association management systems and research information systems collect and connect researcher ORCID. And why funders, publishers and institutions are beginning to mandate ORCID.

According to a recent [survey](#), a majority of researchers support mandates requiring ORCID. Roughly 72% of the 6,000 survey respondents think ORCID mandates would be good for the global research community. Publisher mandates were the most popular at 75%, followed by funder and institutional mandates (both 67%) and scholarly society mandates (64%). Respondents agreed that ORCID integrations help improve data quality and make the internet work better.

Funder Requirements and Integrations

Fourteen research funders on six continents are now ORCID members. Eight funders require researchers to have an ORCID, including Autism Speaks and the Department of Transportation in the U.S. and the Qatar National Research Fund (QNRF) in Qatar.

Funders can use ORCID to streamline reporting processes for grant applications and outcomes and to facilitate other efficiencies in the ecosystem. ORCID encourages funders to:

- Collect the principal investigator's ORCID at time of application
- Pull data from the principal investigator's ORCID Registry record to populate some of the application data fields
- Collect the ORCIDs of all researchers supported on the award at time of notice
- Embed the ORCIDs in the award data
- Update the awardee's ORCID Registry record with the name and ID of the funder and the name and ID of the grant

Publisher Requirements

Beginning January 1, 2016, the Royal Society requires authors to provide their ORCID at manuscript submission. The following publishers will begin requiring authors to provide an ORCID in 2016:

- American Geophysical Union
- eLife
- European Molecular Biology Organization
- Hindawi
- Institute of Electrical & Electronics Engineers
- Public Library of Science

Other Integrations

Publishing

- [Aries Systems](#) – manuscript submission and single sign-on
- [ArXiv](#) – link your ORCID and ArXiv author identifier
- [Crossref](#) – auto-update your ORCID Registry record every time you publish a paper
- [DataCite](#) – auto-update your ORCID Registry record every time you publish a dataset

Peer Review

- [Hypothesis.is](#) – ORCID and web-based annotations
- [Publons](#) – add your peer review activities to your ORCID record

Profile Systems

- Frontier – import all the publication data in your ORCID record into your [Loop](#) profile
- National Institutes of Health – connect your ORCID with your [SciENcv](#) profile
- National Institute of Materials Science – [Ninja](#) researcher directory in the NIMS Digital Library

Research Metrics

- [Altmetric](#)

Research Information Platforms

- [Elsevier](#) – manuscript submission (EES, EVise), discovery (Scopus), and research intelligence (SciVal,/Pure)
- [Symplectic Elements](#) – Symplectic Profile
- [Thomson Reuters](#) – EndNote, ScholarOne, ResearcherID, Web of Science, Converis, InCites

Participation in ORCID @ CMU

College	Dept	Faculty	Staff	Postdoc	Doctoral	Masters	U-grad	TOTAL
CFA	ARC	2			5	6		13
CFA	DES	3		1	1	2		7
CFA	DRA	2				2		4
CFA	MUS	1				1	1	3
DC	CNBC	2			3			5
DC	ENG	4	1		2			7
DC	HIS	2			2			4
DC	ML	2			2	1		5
DC	PHI	11			3	3		17
DC	PSY	12		1	2			15
DC	SDS	2			3			5
DC	STA	5			10	1	2	18
DC	Other	1	1				4	6
HC		15	2	1	16	36		70
MCS	BSC	18			16	6	1	41
MCS	CMY	11		2	27			40
MCS	MSC	6		2	5			13
MCS	PHY	34		9	19		1	63
MCS	MBIC	2						2
MCS	Other	2					1	3
CIT	BME	11	1	3	7	5		27
CIT	CEE	16	1	2	14	5		38
CIT	CHE	16	2		12	3		33
CIT	CYLAB	3	1					4
CIT	ECE	35	9	6	27	23		100
CIT	EPP	11	4	1	13			29
CIT	ICES	8	1					9
CIT	ICT	1	1			3		5
CIT	INI	1	1			14		16
CIT	MEG	19	1	3	13	11	1	48
CIT	MSE	16	8	1	11	2	1	39
CIT	SV	4	4	1	1			10
CIT	Other	2					1	3
SCS	CB	5	1		1			7
SCS	CS	29	3	6	19	3	3	63
SCS	HCI	9	2		7	5		23
SCS	ISR	13	1	2	6	7		29
SCS	LTI	10		1	7	17	1	36
SCS	MLG	3			12	1		16
SCS	ROB	26		2	14	8		50
SCS	SE				6	3		9
SCS	Other		1					1
TSB		24		2	16	18	2	62
Other		35	35	2		13		
CMU	TOTAL	434	81	48	302	199	19	1,083

As of January 5, 2016, over a thousand CMU researchers had used the [ORCID @ CMU](#) web application to create an ORCID or capture their pre-existing ORCID and link it to their Andrew ID in CMU's identity management system.

If you have not yet used the [ORCID @ CMU](#) web application, please do. Learn more [ORCID @ CMU FAQ](#).

Call for Sensible Open Access Solutions

October 12, 2015, the League of European Research Universities (LERU) issued a [statement](#) calling for sensible solutions to open access quandaries. The aim is to facilitate stakeholder interactions that yield coordinated goals. Targeted goals include:

- Clarifying the allocation of costs in open access publishing, which entails understanding why Article Processing Charges (APC) levied to publish open access in [hybrid journals](#) far exceed the APCs levied to publish in fully open access journals.
- Developing a business model that transparently avoids [double dipping](#) by using an institution's or consortium's investment in journal subscriptions to offset the APCs affiliated authors must pay to publish open access in hybrid journals.
- Standardizing as-short-as-possible embargo periods per discipline and around the globe to avoid confusion.

As of January 2016, at least 8,800 people and organizations had [signed](#) the statement.

Global Flip to Open Access

In early December, 2015, 96 invited representatives from 19 countries in Asia, Europe and North America met in Berlin, Germany, to discuss the Max Planck Society's proposal to flip subscription journals to open access. An [analysis](#) conducted by the Max Planck Digital Library found that a flip to open access would entail no financial risk and possibly lower the overall cost of scholarly publishing.

The goal of the Berlin meeting was to reach consensus for an internationally coordinated effort to shift library journal budgets from subscriptions to open access article processing charges (APCs). Discussion focused on an expression of interest (EOI) that would garner support and move the initiative forward. The EOI will be published in the near future. Organizations will be invited to sign the EOI to galvanize global interest in the flip to open access. The conference report is available [here](#).

Pay It Forward

Carnegie Mellon University is a strong advocate of open access. The global flip proposed by the Max Planck Society is intriguing. But converting the cost of scholarly communications from reader-side pays (subscription) to author-side pays (open access)—a business model known as Gold open access—will have huge implications for CMU and other research institutions. A relatively small number of U.S. research universities generate a disproportionately large percentage of published research articles.

The Pay-It-Forward project at the University of California (UC) is investigating the financial sustainability of the Gold open access publishing model. At a recent meeting of the Coalition for Networked Information, UC Davis University Librarian MacKenzie Smith and California Digital Library Interim Director Ivy Anderson gave an [update](#) on the project investigation, including data on journal budgets and expenditures, publishing costs, and author and publisher attitudes about APCs. The latest news on the project is being tracked [here](#).

Actions for Researchers

Request Funding to Publish Open Access

CMU Libraries can help CMU authors pay the Article Processing Charge (APC) often levied to publish open access. The Libraries will pay 80% of the APC up to a maximum of \$1500 per article if the request for financial support meets the eligibility requirements. The eligibility requirements and application form are [here](#).

Use Discounts to Publish Open Access

CMU Libraries' affiliations provide discounts on APCs to encourage open access publishing.

Discounts are not necessarily applied automatically. CMU authors should inform the publisher or note the reduced fee on the invoice. Current discounts are:

- American Chemical Society – 25% discount; ACS members receive a [deeper discount](#)
- BioMed Central – 15% discount
- Chemistry Centry – 15% discount
- F1000 Research – 10% discount
- Nucleic Acids Research – 50% discount
- Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences – 25% discount; see the [directions](#)
- Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC) – 15%; see also below “Publish OA in RSC Journals for Free”
- SpringerOpen – 15%

Publish Open Access for Free with RSC

CMU Libraries participates in the Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC) [Gold for Gold](#) program. The program provides a limited number of vouchers per year for CMU authors to publish open access in RSC journals free of charge. Vouchers are distributed on a first come, first served basis. When notified that your article has been accepted for publication, request a voucher code from David Scherer, daschere@andrew.cmu.edu. Enter the voucher code in the appropriate box on the [Gold for Gold Application](#) form.

Win an #OpenCMU T-shirt

Sixteen CMU researchers have already won by providing open access to their work. You too can win. See the #OpenCMU [t-shirt giveaway](#) details.

Beware Commercial Interests

Commercial companies serve stockholders, not necessarily the best interests of researchers and educators. Two recent phenomena highlight the tension and force the question: Should commercial companies continue to have a role in scholarly publishing?

In October 2015, ProQuest cancelled the Renaissance Society of America's subscription to the popular database *Early English Books Online* (EEBO). Notified of the cancellation, the society's executive committee issued a written [statement](#) indicating that ProQuest had decided to cancel the Society's unique subscription because it reduced potential revenue from library subscriptions. No society subscriptions would be permitted. Word swiftly spread on Twitter as academics fumed. The next day, ProQuest issued a written [statement](#) that assured the Renaissance Society's continued access to EEBO, but masked the economic interest that had precipitated the mayhem. ProQuest simply apologized for the confusion. Read the [article](#) in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

In November 2015, the six editors and 31 editorial board members of *Lingua*, a top journal in linguistics, all resigned in protest. The group wanted to convert *Lingua* from an expensive subscription journal to an affordable open access journal, but the publisher, Elsevier, insisted on high open access fees. (Elsevier's profit margin in 2014 was [37](#) percent.) The group that resigned from *Lingua* will start a new open access journal, *Glossa*, in January 2016. Elsevier plans to continue *Lingua* with a new team, but Stefan Müller (Free University of Berlin) warned linguists not to join the new team because doing so would “harm the community.” Müller said he “would not hire anybody who did something like that.” Tweets applauded Müller for “playing hardball.” Alyson Reed, executive director of the Linguistic Society of America, said linguists have different views on publishing models, but members “feel solidarity” with the protest by the *Lingua* editors. Read the *Inside Higher Ed* article [here](#), the *Wired* article [here](#), the *Fortune* article [here](#).

Step Up Your Outreach Efforts

We have many initiatives that require your attention and outreach to succeed. Please let Keith know what you do to promote these initiatives and the response you receive.

Tools survey – Encourage your faculty and graduate students to take Utrecht University’s survey at <http://tinyurl.com/SCtoolSurvey> so we can better understand and support their workflow. Participants receive a graph comparing their workflow with that of their peers. The survey closes February 1, so your aggressive promotion is imperative when the semester begins.

ORCID – As noted on page 2 of this SC Digest, the Royal Society now requires authors to provide an ORCID with manuscript submission and six other publishers have announced they will begin requiring an ORCID in 2016. These publishers have issued an [open letter](#) encouraging other publishers to join them in requiring ORCID and following an implementation best practice.

ORCID @ CMU – Given increasing requirements from funders and publishers, it’s increasingly important for CMU researchers to have an ORCID and to populate their ORCID Registry record. The table on page 3 indicates where targeted outreach is needed. To increase efficiency here at Carnegie Mellon, CMU researchers need to link their ORCID and Andrew IDs by using the [ORCID @ CMU](#) web application. The recent ORCID [survey](#) indicates that we also need to ensure that those who have an ORCID understand why, how and when to use it.

#OpenCMU – Carnegie Mellon is committed to opening access to CMU work. The [#OpenCMU](#) campaign continues, aiming to increase:

- Awareness of CMU’s [position](#) on key initiatives and what CMU Libraries is doing to support them
- Use of [Research Showcase @ CMU](#) (# of full-text deposits, # of downloads, # of researchers, departments and centers with content in Research Showcase, % of CMU dissertations deposited in Research Showcase)
- Use of the Libraries’ [APC fund](#) (# of requests, # of faculty and departments requesting)
- Use of [Creative Commons](#) licences
- Use of [Data Management Services](#)

Remember to mention the #OpenCMU [t-shirt giveaway](#) to help us identify CMU champions of open.

Three Minute Thesis competition (3MT) – [3MT](#) is an internationally recognized competition that challenges PhD students to present a compelling oration on their thesis and its significance in just 3 minutes, in language that anyone can understand. CMU Libraries will host our third 3MT competition spring semester 2016. Registration deadline is January 24. David Scherer is organizing the event. Please help David promote 3MT.

Engage with New Metrics

Recently Mike Taylor (Elsevier), Rachel Borchardt (American University) and Rebecca Reznik-Zellen (University of Massachusetts Medical School) presented a webinar on what librarians need to know about article, author and journal metrics. They addressed providing metrics-related library services for individuals to inform career development and publishing decisions, described how to conduct a faculty research performance assessment using SciVal, and provided an overview of the new Scopus Article Metrics module. The presentations provide tips on targeted outreach to faculty and graduate students. You can view the webinar recording, download the slides, and link to related resources [here](#).