Carnegie Mellon University
University Libraries

Scholarly Communications
Digest

May 2015

In this issue

We want to hear from you

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

Contact
Denise Troll Covey

From Keith and Denise

In local news, this issue of the SC Digest announces CMU Libraries' participation in a pilot of the new service called Kudos. In the broader scholarly communications landscape, the issue focuses on important developments related to copyright reform and strategic innovations to address problems in peer review.

Get Kudos

The University Libraries is participating in a pilot project with a new service called Kudos. Why? Because we want to:

- Help CMU researchers maximize the reach and impact of their published work.
- Help the University identify the best ways to promote CMU research.
- Encourage innovations designed to increase research impact.

With Kudos, you can quickly describe your work in plain language, link it to materials that add context, and share it on social networks. You can maybe do this with other platforms, but only Kudos enables you to measure the direct effect of these activities on citations, downloads and altmetrics. Using Kudos can help you choose the best tools and strategies to promote your work, thereby increasing your efficiency. In a previous Kudos pilot, publications promoted using Kudos received on average 19% more downloads than those in a control group.

Kudos is free and easy to use. Get started at http://www.growkudos.com/invitation?inst=6612.

From June through December 2015, the Libraries will receive anonymized reports of CMU researcher use of Kudos and its effect on the reach and impact of their work. We'll provide feedback on the design of the reports and the data-viewing dashboard. See the Kudos @ CMU FAQ for more information or contact Denise Troll Covey, Scholarly Communications Librarian, troll@andrew.cmu.edu.

KUDOS
Greater Research Impact

Problems with Peer Review

After identifying defects in peer review and strategies tested to improve it, the conclusion of a 2006 article by Richard Smith (Chief Executive UnitedHealth Europe) is striking. Almost a decade later, the challenge remains:

So peer review is a flawed process, full of easily identified defects with little evidence that it works. Nevertheless, it is likely to remain central to science and journals because there is no obvious alternative, and scientists and editors have a continuing belief in peer review. How odd that science should be rooted in belief.

- Defects in traditional pre-publication peer review: Slow and expensive, Inconsistent, Bias, Abuse
- Strategies to improve it: Blinding reviewers to authors, Opening up peer review, Training reviewers

Fake Peer Review

The Washington Post recently reported that BioMed Central (BMC) retracted 43 papers because the peer reviews were fabricated. Jigisha Patel, BMC's associate editorial director for research integrity, said the problem is "how scientists are judged."

The Committee on Publication Ethics is "aware of systematic, inappropriate attempts to manipulate the peer review processes of several journals across different publishers." The journals are reviewing manuscripts to determine how many articles may need to be retracted.

According to Ivan Oransky and Adam Marcus, co-editors of the blog Retraction Watch, fake peer reviews accounted for 170 article retractions across several journals in the past few years. Last year 60 articles in the *Journal of Vibration and Control* were simultaneously retracted following discovery that the reviews were submitted by people using fake names. The recent BMC retractions suggest a more sophisticated fraud because there are similarities between the suggested reviewers, but no apparent connection between the authors.

Fake peer review occurs when authors suggest reviewers who agree in advance to provide a positive review, a group of authors agree to peer review each others' manuscripts, or reviewers impersonate real people or use fake names.

Verified Peer Review

Publons aims to make peer review faster and more efficient and effective. Why? To speed up science. How? By working with reviewers, publishers, funders and universities to turn peer review into a measurable research output.

Using peer review information gathered from reviewers and publishers, Publons produces detailed reviewer profiles with publisher-verified peer review contributions. Reviewers control how each review is displayed on their profile (blind, open or published), and can include both pre-publication and post-publication reviews.

Publons enables you to record, showcase, and verify your peer review activity. Simply upload your peer review history and choose how much information to disclose. You can use your official reviewer record in promotion and funding applications. You can also comment on or endorse the contributions of your peers. You earn merit points for each activity. Get enough endorsements on one of your open reviews or contributions and Publons will assign it a DOI you can cite.

Publons is free for academics. See a sample profile here and sample merit statistics here. To get started, go here.

c

Post-Publication Peer Review

Post-publication peer review (PPPR or P3R) obviously occurs after publication. The article may or may not have undergone traditional pre-publication peer review prior to P3R. P3R reviewers may be invited or voluntary, named or anonymous. P3R is controversial and misunderstood, but not without value or champions.

According to biologist [Lenny Teytelman](#), one of the deterrents to P3R is that it cannot improve the published article. It is, however, very effective at flagging problems missed by pre-publication peer review and identifying articles that should be retracted. Other values inhernet in P3R lie dormant until the research community incentivizes constructive criticism by enabling article versioning as [F1000Research](#) has done.

While we wait for more publishers to embrace versioning, Teytelman advises depositing your manuscript on a preprint server such as [bioRxiv](#) or [arXiv](#) (which support versioning), soliciting reviews from peers, using the reviews to improve your paper prior to submission and publication in a journal, and then continuing to improve your paper after publication based on P3R. He recommends encouraging reviewers to post their reviews on [PubPeer](#).

PubPeer Journal Club

[PubPeer](#) is a post-publication peer review (P3R) website created by an anonymous group of scientists. PubPeer enables unnamed researchers to submit positive or negative comments on research papers. It notifies the authors when comments are submitted and invites them to respond, encouraging thoughtful dialogue and adding a dimension of article impact independent of journal impact factor and citation counts. You can see an example [here](#).

Picked up by journals and other media outlets ([pubpeer.com/press](#)), comments on PubPeer can influence future and past publications. An API is available to enable third parties to display PubPeer comments on their websites or in their software.

Why are PubPeer reviewers not named? To maintain the rigor and anonymity of the closed pre-publication peer review process traditionally used by journals. Reviewers can, if they choose, reveal their identity.

See the [PubPeer FAQ](#) for more information.

Copyright News

Take Back Your Copyright

Have you published a book that is now out of print? Want to get the copyright back from the publisher? The Authors Alliance developed a guide to help you do that. Download a free copy of Understanding Rights Reversion: When, Why, & How to Regain Copyright and Make Your Book More Availble. The blog post about the guide explains that it "is the product of extensive outreach to the publishing industry," including interviews with authors, publishers, and literary agents.

Co-Authors, Co-Owners and Open Access

Section 101 of the Copyright Act defines a "joint work" as "a work prepared by two or more authors with the intention that their contributions be merged into inseparable or interdependent parts of a unitary whole." Section 201(a) says "authors of a joint work are co-owners of the copyright in the work." What co-ownership means is a matter of interpretation for the courts. According to the ruling in Weinstein v. University of Illinois 811 F.2d 1091 (7th Cir. 1987), each co-owner of a copyright can exercise the rights independently, subject to a duty to account for profits to the other copyright holders.

This means that if your publisher's policy allows deposit in an open access disciplinary or institutional repository, you can put your co-authored work in such a repository without your co-author's permission. Search the SHERPA RoMEO database to see what your publisher's policy allows. If deposit in an institutional repository is allowed, deposit your work in Research Showcase @ CMU.

Fair Use Index

The US Copyright Office recently launched the Fair Use Index. The database provides public access to searchable summaries of major fair use decisions. The Index is searchable by court and subject matter and provides a helpful starting point for those wanting a better understand of how federal courts have applied the fair use doctrine to particular categories of works or types of use, for example, music, internet/digitization, or parody. The Index is not a substitute for legal advice.

Recommended Copyright Reform

April 29, 2015, Maria Pallante, Register of Copyrights, testified before the House Judiciary Committee Hearing on Copyright Review. Among her many recommendations, she explicitly called for:

- A comprehensive revision of Section 108, which imposes limitations on exclusive copyrights in support of libraries and archives
- A legislative solution to the orphan works problem (An orphan work is copyright protected, but the copyright owner cannot be identified or located.)
- Study and analysis of the scope and efficacy of the notice and takedown and safe harbor provisions of the Digital Millenium Copyright Act (DMCA, Section 512)
- A voluntary pilot program of Extended Collective Licensing to enable mass digitization projects and allow full-text access to the digitized content for research and educational purposes
- A study of the moral rights the US is obligated to recognize under international treaties, e.g., an author's right to attribution and to prohibit certain uses of her work

Many of these recommendations could yield problems for libraries and those we serve. We need to watch developments closely and advocate for our constituencies.

Coalition to Promote Balanced Copyright

Called Re:create, the coalition brings together innovators, creators and consumers in a united push for balanced copyright. The agenda is available here.

Actions for Researchers

Get found. Get read. Get cited.
Participate in the Kudos pilot

[Kudos](#) could help you maximize the reach and impact of your published work and identify the activities and channels most effective for promoting your research. In a pilot program, publications promoted using the Kudos rtools eceived on average 19% more downloads than those in a control group.

Kudos is free and easy to use. Get started at http://www.growkudos.com/invitation?inst=6612.

See the [Kudos @ CMU FAQ](#) for more information about Kudos and CMU Libraries' participation in the Kudos pilot. Or contact Denise Troll Covey, Scholarly Communications Librarian, troll@andrew.cmu.edu.

Get recognized. Get ready.
Participate in ORCID @ CMU

If you have already used the ORCID @ CMU web app, thank you! If you have not, join the over 900 CMU researchers who have. Why? Because an ORCID ID, a unique persistent identifier for you, will reduce red tape, increase efficiency, improve data quality, promote reuse of your work and enhance your online presence.

1. Go to https://orcid.library.cmu.edu.
2. Click the appropriate button, either **Create My ORCID** or **Provide Existing ORCID**.
3. Authenticate with your Andrew ID.
4. Follow the brief onscreen instructions.

   If you create an ORCID ID, you'll receive email from ORCID asking you to claim your ORCID account. Click on the secure link in the message, create an ORCID password, and access your ORCID record. *Do not use a password for a CMU account as your ORCID password.*

See the [ORCID @ CMU FAQ](#) for more information or contact Denise Troll Covey, Scholarly Communications Librarian, troll@andrew.cmu.edu.

Beware of Predatory Publishers

They come in all shapes and sizes. Subscription publishers can be predatory. Open access publishers can be predatory. Look for the following tested indicators to help you determine the quality of a publishing venue.

Positve indicators:

- A clear statement of mission, scope, audience, copyright and peer review process
- Editorial board members with good reputations
- Respected societal or institutional affiliations
- Clear, easily found explanation of any fees charged
- Signs of adherence to standards, e.g., DOI, ISSN
- For open access journals: membership in the [Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association](#) (OASPA), indexing in the [Directory of Open Access Journals](#) (DOAJ) or a commercial database

Negative indicators:

- The website is difficult to locate or identify
- A missing or vague statement of mission, scope, audience, copyright or peer review process
- Spamming authors to recruit content
- Obtrusive advertising
- The same lead authors in multiple issues

When in doubt, check appropriate listservs and sources such as [The Chronicle of Higher Education](#) for indications of a journal's reputation. Reputations can change over time.

For more information, see the 2014 [article](#) by Sarah Beaubien and Max Eckard.

Actions for Librarians

Counteract Misconceptions of OA

Predatory publishers predate open access (OA), but there is no doubt that fee-charging open access journals have increased the number of predators. Monica Berger and Jill Cirasella argue in a recent [article](#) that librarians can play an important role in helping researchers avoid becoming prey. How? Educate researchers. Tell them:

- Predatory behavior is not a function of the publication model. There are predatory subscription journals and predatory open access journals.
- Journal quality is likewise not a function of the publication model. There are high quality subscription journals and high quality open access journals.
- Charging a fee does not mean a journal is low quality or a vanity press. Some high quality journals -- both subscription and open access journals -- charge author fees.
- Most open access journals do not charge a fee. Many subscription journals do charge a fee (e.g., page charges, color printing).
- Open access can be achieved by publishing in an open access venue or by depositing a copy of the work in an open access repository.
- Open access publishing venues include open access journals and hybrid journals, i.e., traditional subscription journals that make articles available open access upon payment of a fee.
- Open access repositories include disciplinary repositories such as Social Science Research neetwork ([SSRN](#)) and Research Papers in Economics ([RePEc](#)), and institutional respositories such as [Research Showcase @ CMU](#).

Read and Follow Keith

Want to know what's on CMU Dean of Libraries Keith Webster's mind? Read Keith's [blog](#) *The Library of the Future* and follow him on Twitter [@CMKeithW](#).

ACRL Environmental Scan 2015

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) recently published [Environmental Scan 2015](#). The scholarly communications section of the Scan focuses on the library as publisher, copyright and fair use, altmetrics and open access.

The University Libraries supports open access by publishing CMU theses, dissertations and other gray literature, the [Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality](#), and selected conference proceedings, including those of the upcoming [Society for Economic Measurement Annual Conference](#). We also support publication of the [Journal of Logic and Analysis](#).

We advise on best practices in fair use and the development of CMU policies and guidelines related to copyright, author rights and preservation. In 2014, Research Showcase Coordinator Katie Behrman implemented attachment of Creative Commons licenses to content in Research Showcase and use of the Altmetrics doughnut for works in the repository that have a DOI.

As noted in the Environmental Scan, going forward we need to continue to develop workflows and consultation services to support deposits of CMU work in Research Showcase and in disciplinary and agency repositories in compliance with funder mandates. We need to continue to lead educational initiatives on open access and author rights. And we need to

- Encourage publishers and aggregators to index open access journals
- Study how the increasing availability of open access content should inform subscription decisions
- Help researchers identify the best social media and tools to share their work and increase its impact -- The Kudos pilot could help with this.
- Assist researchers in using traditional and alternative metrics to document the impact of their work