



HAL
open science

Publier La Science - Numéro 4

Jeanine Martelli, Eric Lichtfouse, Marjolaine Hamelin, Virginie Lelièvre

► **To cite this version:**

Jeanine Martelli, Eric Lichtfouse, Marjolaine Hamelin, Virginie Lelièvre. Publier La Science - Numéro 4. INRAE. , 2014, Guy Richard. hal-03862367

HAL Id: hal-03862367

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03862367>

Submitted on 21 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

publier la science



numéro 04 / juin 2014

- Publier d'abord, évaluer ensuite
- Bibliométrie et évaluation de la recherche
- Publier dans les mégarevues

PUBLIER LA SCIENCE

Numéro 4, juin 2014

EDITORIAL -----	2
RESEAUX SOCIAUX-----	3
REDACTION -----	3
FACTEUR D'IMPACT-----	4
LIBRE ACCES -----	5
EVALUATION-----	6
DROIT D'AUTEUR -----	7
ETHIQUE ET FRAUDE -----	7
MODELES DE PUBLICATION -----	8
COLLOQUES-----	9
OUTILS-----	9
HUMOUR-----	10

Numéros en accès libre à https://listes.inra.fr/sympa/d_read/veillecaps

Pour vous abonner : <https://listes.inra.fr/sympa/subscribe/veillecaps>

Pour vous désabonner : <https://listes.inra.fr/sympa/sigrequest/veillecaps>

Directeur de la publication : Guy Richard

Editeur-en-chef : Eric Lichtfouse

Réalisation : Jeanine Martelli (responsable de la veille), Eric Lichtfouse (animateur de la CAPS),
Marjolaine Hamelin, Virginie Lelièvre

Cellule d'Assistance à la Publication Scientifique (CAPS)

Département Environnement et Agronomie (EA)

Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique

Contact : caps.departea@orleans.inra.fr, <http://www.ea.inra.fr>

Couverture : Guillaume Decaux – <http://www.alcide.fr>

ISSN 2269-7314

Publier la Science est une sélection d'informations sur la publication et la rédaction scientifique diffusée trimestriellement. Dans un souci de synthèse et de lisibilité, les informations diffusées sont parfois modifiées par rapport à leurs versions originales sans pour autant en dénaturer le sens. S'il s'avère toutefois que ce n'est pas le cas, les personnes et sources citées dans Publier la Science peuvent à tout moment, demander la rectification voire la suppression des informations diffusées les concernant en nous écrivant à caps.departea@orleans.inra.fr.

Publier d'abord, évaluer ensuite

C'est la devise étonnante de la nouvelle revue généraliste F1000Research qui propose un modèle inédit de publication en accès libre. Ce modèle défie en effet les fondements classiques de la recherche qui veulent que les résultats soient jugés par les pairs avant d'être publiés ! Surprenante au premier abord, cette innovation pourrait rencontrer le succès auprès des chercheurs pour les raisons suivantes. Tout d'abord la publication de la version soumise est très rapide, en quelques jours après une simple vérification technique. La version soumise possède un identifiant numérique, donc l'article est citable immédiatement. Cette rapidité devrait plaire au chercheur pour qui les délais de publication des revues traditionnelles sont trop longs, pouvant facilement s'étendre de 3 à 12 mois, voire plus. Ceci même si paradoxalement le chercheur est lui-même partiellement responsable de ces longs délais en tant qu'évaluateur des articles des collègues...

La version soumise est ensuite évaluée par des experts de manière 'ouverte', c'est à dire que les noms et les rapports des évaluateurs sont publiés à côté de l'article. C'est encore une innovation car les rapports restent secrets et anonymes dans la plupart des revues classiques. Une originalité supplémentaire est que ces rapports sont citables avec un identifiant numérique propre ! Cette manœuvre astucieuse valorise la tâche très laborieuse des évaluateurs et résout partiellement deux problèmes majeurs : la difficulté croissante des éditeurs à recruter des évaluateurs parmi les scientifiques, et l'absence de prise en compte du travail d'évaluation dans les carrières des scientifiques. Les évaluateurs bénéficient en outre d'une réduction de 125 à 500 dollars sur le prix de publication d'un futur article. Après évaluation une version révisée de l'article est publiée avec un nouvel identifiant numérique.

F1000Research facture à l'auteur entre 250 et 1000 dollars les charges de production et de publication en accès libre, moyennant quoi l'auteur garde les droits sur son œuvre. Ce coût est plus faible que ceux des grandes maisons d'édition en accès libre PloS et BioMed Central dont les tarifs varient entre 1350 et 2250 dollars ; et sont très loin des coûts de production de la prestigieuse revue Nature, estimés entre 30000 et 40000 dollars par article (Van Noorden, Nature 495, p. 429, 2013). Enfin la présentation des articles sur le site est soignée, adaptée à une lecture rapide et met en valeur les rapport des évaluateurs. Evaluation ouverte, publication ouverte, édition ouverte... La recherche se dirige vers un accès universel aux connaissances !

Mes remerciements pour la lecture !

@EricLichtfouse



Réseaux sociaux

ResearchGate aids debunking of stem cell study

Blog GIGAOM. Mars 2014

ResearchGate, the 4-million-strong academic social network, has just scored a major victory in its quest to turn the research process upside-down – its platform proved instrumental in the debunking of a major stem cell study, which on Friday resulted in a very apologetic roll-back from the Japanese institute that put out the original study.

The original study came out in *Nature*, the peer-reviewed scientific journal, earlier this year. It purported to show that it was possible to turn normal blood cells into master stem cells by dipping them in a mild acid solution. Stem cells hold great promise for the future of medicine, but there's a lot of controversy around current harvesting techniques, particularly when embryos are involved, and this would have provided a terrific workaround.

<http://gigaom.com/2014/03/14/academic-social-network-researchgate-aids-debunking-of-stem-cell-study/>

Rédaction

Publish or perish - but when is the right time?

Blog Readcube, 24 avril 2014

Anyone who works in academic science knows the foremost importance of publications. They are the be-all and end-all of academia. Publications are your "currency" and ticket to career advancement. It goes without saying that academic scientists should publish as often as possible in journals of the highest profile possible. "Publish or perish" as they say. However, have you ever considered the timing of publishing? Have you given any thought to when you should publish your work? When is there "enough" data to publish a paper? Should you publish all the data you have?

These aren't trivial questions; you can't just answer those questions by saying publish any time you can with any data you have. Sometimes you shouldn't publish any time, and sometimes you should hold some data back. The timing of publishing in science is important and should be considered....

<http://blog.readcube.com/post/83782120280/publish-or-perish-but-when-is-the-right-time#.U15zjFFsDOJ>

How to identify yourself as an academic writer

Blog TAA, Text and Academic Author Association. 18 avril 2014

Why is doctoral writing such a challenge? This question is a vital one given the centrality of writing to all that we do as academics. It's common for new graduate students to feel as though their writing skills have suddenly become worse, as though the adequate writing skills honed over their undergraduate years have abandoned them just when they need them the most [...] The easiest way to confront these difficulties is by acquainting oneself with the normal contours of the graduate writing process...

<http://blog.taaonline.net/2014/04/how-to-identify-yourself-as-an-academic-writer/>

Tips on using commas, brackets, and dashes

Editage Insights, Grammar and Writing. 18 mars 2014

When it comes to writing, all information is not equal: some of it is given as an aside—not essential, but interesting, useful, or "nice to know." How do you mark this kind of information? The most common, and least obtrusive, way is to enclose such information within a pair of commas, as in "Potassium cyanide, which has a characteristic bitter-almond smell, is a deadly poison." Grammarians call the additional information a "non-restrictive clause" and the pair "non-defining commas." But that is another post...

<http://www.editage.com/insights/quick-tips-on-using-commas-brackets-and-dashes>

Who did what? Clarifying author roles benefits researchers, publishers and students.

Blog Scientific American, Bonnie Swoger, USA. 23 avril 2014

Scholarly scientific publishing has a lot of traditions that are not transparent to the reader such as peer review or the non-payment of authors. The existence of many authors on a single paper is also a bit of a mystery. Why are there so many? What did they all do? Why are they listed in that order?

<http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/information-culture/2014/04/23/who-did-what-clarifying-author-roles-benefits-researchers-publishers-and-students/>

Researchers reading habits

Blog SciELO in Perspective, 3 avril 2014

These days, researchers are finding themselves exposed to an avalanche of scientific information which is making it a constant challenge to select what is actually relevant and follow recent

developments in a particular field. Studies show that for the first time in 35 years, researchers may have reached a plateau in their capacity to read articles and other sources of scientific information. The concept of reading may even be redefined over the course of time (...) According to Nicholas, in the era of print publishing it was assumed that researchers read the entire article. In digital format, however, researchers for the most part browse the text of the article in search of specific pieces of information. In fact, upon examining the digital trails of access to articles left by researchers, Nicholas is able to conclude that they keep four or five windows open at the same time on different articles, and that the articles with the greatest likelihood of being read are the shortest.

<http://blog.scielo.org/en/2014/04/03/researchers-reading-habits-for-scientific-literature/>

Guide de rédaction scientifique en espagnol

CoopIST – Coopérer en information scientifique et technique (IST), Cirad. 2014

Guía de redacción científica. Ce document PDF du CIRAD reprend en espagnol les fiches consacrées à la rédaction d'un article scientifique.

<http://coop-ist.cirad.fr/aide-a-la-publication/rediger/article-scientifique>

Information et communication scientifiques à l'heure du numérique

Schafer, V. (2014) Communication et information scientifiques à l'heure du numérique, Essentiel d'Hermès, Paris, pp. 63-78.

Cet Essentiel propose des regards croisés interdisciplinaires pour explorer les enjeux et les évolutions récentes de l'information et de la communication scientifiques à l'heure du numérique. Science ouverte, science 2.0, déluge informationnel, chaîne de l'information scientifique, communication institutionnelle des laboratoires et instituts de recherche, blogs de chercheurs, plateformes participatives et collaboratives, accès pour tous à la culture scientifique... autant de thèmes émergents qui concernent les chercheurs et professionnels de l'information et de la communication, et interrogent également les relations science/société et leurs transformations actuelles.

Guide to academic and scientific publication

Linda Olson (2014). How to get your writing published in scholarly journals. eacademia.

Written by an academic author, editor and proofreader, this *Guide to Academic and Scientific Publication* provides practical advice on planning,

preparing and submitting articles for publication in scholarly journals. Its chapters trace the process of producing an academic or scientific paper, starting with a discussion of the essential ingredients of a scholarly article – research, evidence and argument – and the necessity of producing a minimum publishable unit for a top-tier journal. The importance of targeting a reputable journal with the appropriate range, specialisation and impact is addressed, as is the need to make an article a perfect fit for the right journal.

<http://www.proof-reading-service.com/guide/index.html>

Facteur d'impact

Causes for the persistence of impact factor mania

Casadevall A, Fang FC (2014) Causes for the Persistence of Impact Factor Mania. mBio 5. doi: 10.1128/mBio.00064-14

Numerous essays have addressed the misuse of the journal impact factor for judging the value of science, but the practice continues, primarily as a result of the actions of scientists themselves. This seemingly irrational behavior is referred to as "impact factor mania." Although the literature on the impact factor is extensive, little has been written on the underlying causes of impact factor mania. In this perspective, we consider the reasons for the persistence of impact factor mania and its pernicious effects on science. We conclude that impact factor mania persists because it confers significant benefits to individual scientists and journals. Impact factor mania is a variation of the economic theory known as the "tragedy of the commons," in which scientists act rationally in their own self-interests despite the detrimental consequences of their actions on the overall scientific enterprise. Various measures to reduce the influence of the impact factor are considered.

Novel research impact indicators

FENNER, Martin; LIN, Jennifer. Novel Research Impact Indicators. LIBER Quarterly, [S.l.], v. 23, n. 4, p. 300-309, apr.2014. ISSN 2213-056X.

Citation counts and more recently usage statistics provide valuable information about the attention and research impact associated with scholarly publications. The open access publisher Public Library of Science (PLOS) has pioneered the concept of article-level metrics, where these metrics are collected on a per article and not a per journal basis and are complemented by real-time data from the social web or altmetrics: blog posts, social bookmarks, social media and other.

<https://liber.library.uu.nl/index.php/lq/article/view/8427>

Are 90% of academic papers really never cited?

The Impact Blog, LSE, Grande Bretagne. 23 avril 2014

It is widely accepted that academic papers are rarely cited or even read. But what kind of data lies behind these assertions? Dahlia Remler takes a look at the academic research on citation practices and finds that whilst it is clear citation rates are low, much confusion remains over precise figures and methods for determining accurate citation analysis. In her investigation, Remler wonders whether academics are able to answer these key questions.

<http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2014/04/23/academic-papers-citation-rates-remler/>

Traditional and alternative metrics sites compared

Utrecht University, Hollande. Avril 2014

There are many new ways of tracking research impact. They try to capture the presence in new scholarly venues and presence and impact in social media. Collectively, we refer to these as altmetrics, opposed to traditional citation measurement using Web of Science, Scopus and other citation enhanced databases.

[\(cliquer pour voir le tableau en entier\)](#)

Characteristics	Tools/sources			
	JCR	Scopus	Impact Story	PLOS One
metrics for:				
papers		✓	✓ ^a	✓
individuals		✓	✓ ^a	
institutions		✓		
countries		✓		
journals	✓	✓		
traditional metrics:				
citations	✓	✓	✓	✓
altmetrics:				
readers			✓	✓
bookmarks/tags			✓	✓
comments			✓	✓
downloads/views			✓	✓
coverage:				
transparency	✓	✓		✓
multidisciplinary	✓	✓	✓	✓ ^b
access:				
free access			✓	✓
registration necessary			✓	
advanced:				
data download/ management	✓	✓	✓	✓
data standardisation/ cleansing	✓	✓		
normalisation	✓	✓		
API possibilities	✓ ^b	✓ ^b	✓	✓

<http://libguides.library.uu.nl/altmetrics>

Les dérives de l'évaluation de la recherche, du bon usage de la bibliométrie

Gingras, Yves (2014) Les dérives de l'évaluation de la recherche, du bon usage de la bibliométrie, Paris, Raisons d'agir Éditions, 122 p.

Depuis quelques années, le mot "évaluation" agite le monde de la recherche et de l'enseignement

supérieur. On veut tout évaluer : les enseignants, les professeurs, les chercheurs, les programmes de formation et les universités. Les indicateurs "d'excellence" et de "qualité" se multiplient sans que l'on sache toujours sur quelles bases ils ont été construits...

Yves Gingras a donné le 19/05 et le 20/05/2014 une conférence dans le cycle "Sciences en question" :

<http://www6.inra.fr/sciences-en-questions/Conferences-et-ouvrages/Metiers-et-organisation-de-la-recherche/Yves-Gingras>

Libre accès

Les éditeurs prédateurs sur Facebook

La liste des éditeurs prédateurs, élaborée par Jeffrey Beall de l'Université du Colorado, est maintenant sur Facebook.

<https://www.facebook.com/pages/Bealls-List-of-Predatory-Open-Access-Publishers/329861460417572>

Print-on-demand publishers, self-publishing/"Vanity presses" and other non-traditional publishers

Blog Scholarly Open Access. avril 2014

This massive list of non-traditional book publishers has three main audiences:

- 1) authors (whether scholarly/tenure track academics or novelists) who don't want to publish with a disreputable publisher who will not edit or market their work,
- 2) librarians who don't want to accidentally buy public domain reprints masquerading as new titles/editions or bogus "reference" works compiled from Wikipedia or free statistical sources,
- 3) bookbuyers who want to know if the appealing title they see listed on Amazon was traditionally published and edited, or was made available via "print on demand" (POD) services...

<http://scholarlyoa.com/2014/04/08/a-list-of-print-on-demand-publishers-self-publishingvanity-presses-and-other-non-traditional-publishers-for-librarians-and-authors/>

Reuves "prédatrices" : comment les repérer ?

Hypothèse.org, Carnet de recherche Open Edition, Toulouse. 14 avril 2014

Comment savoir si nous avons affaire à une revue "prédatrice" ?

1/ Chercher le nom de la revue sur le blog Scholarly Open Access.

2/ Puis le nom de l'éditeur.

Si ces deux premières étapes s'avèrent infructueuses, il est possible d'approfondir les recherches de la manière suivante :

- 3/ Rechercher l'ISSN sur le portail ISSN.
- 4/ Rechercher le nom de la revue sur ce même portail.
- 5/ La revue affirme être présente dans diverses bases de données internationales et portails de revues dont le DOAJ.
- 6/ Analyser les membres du comité éditorial.

<http://openarchiv.hypotheses.org/2179>

Evaluation

Post-publication peer review

Editage Insights, Publication Buzzwords. 7 avril 2014

What distinguishes pre-publication review from post-publication review? These are some of the crucial aspects:

- **Validation:** In pre-publication peer review, research is screened by two or three peers of the author. Thus, the odds of them spotting every small detail that can raise questions about the credibility of the research are few. In post-publication peer review, the entire scientific community can review the research.
- **Transparency:** Unlike the traditional peer review, which is largely secretive and involves only a selected number of peers, post-publication peer review is open for all who wish to validate the published research. Moreover, it can be direct wherein fellow researchers can openly publish their views about the research, or indirect, wherein they can write to the journal that published the research, contact to the authors themselves, or post their review openly but anonymously.
- **Communication:** Traditional peer review is an exchange of views between the editors, peer reviewers, and authors. On the other hand, post-publication peer review is a communication between experts in the field and the community at large. In this case, the experts' opinions need to be compelling enough to attract attention and discussion. Pre-publication assessment, on the other hand, relies on reviewers' judgment irrespective of its coerciveness.

<http://www.editage.com/insights/post-publication-peer-review-an-unexplored-avenue>

F1000Research: Project to include referee reports in ORCID profiles

Blog de F1000Research, 7 avril 2014

A key aim of the F1000Research approach to publishing is to clean up the peer review process – referees are still invited but this is done after publication (to remove the normal holdups in when the science is shared) and is done completely in the open (with names and referee reports published alongside the article). Open peer review has the added benefit of enabling referees to finally get credit for the not insignificant time and effort required in reviewing the article and writing the report. At F1000Research, we have therefore been working on ways to help researchers get the credit they deserve for this work. We have recently added DOIs (digital object identifiers) to all our referee reports so that the reports are now fully citable, and we have also added view counts to each report.

<http://blog.f1000research.com/2014/04/07/project-to-include-referee-reports-in-orcid-profiles>

Imbalance in individual researcher's peer review activities quantified for four British Ecological Society journals, 2003-2010

Petchey OL, Fox JW, Haddon L (2014) Imbalance in Individual Researcher's Peer Review Activities Quantified for Four British Ecological Society Journals, 2003-2010. PLoS ONE 9(3): e92896. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0092896

Researchers contribute to the scientific peer review system by providing reviews, and “withdraw” from it by submitting manuscripts that are subsequently reviewed. So far as we are aware, there has been no quantification of the balance of individual's contributions and withdrawals. We compared the number of reviews provided by individual researchers (i.e., their contribution) to the number required by their submissions (i.e. their withdrawals) in a large and anonymised database provided by the British Ecological Society. The database covered the Journal of Ecology, Journal of Animal Ecology, Journal of Applied Ecology, and Functional Ecology from 2003–2010. The majority of researchers (64%) did not have balanced contributions and withdrawals. Depending on assumptions, 12% to 44% contributed more than twice as much as required; 20% to 52% contributed less than half as much as required. Balance, or lack thereof, varied little in relation to the number of years a researcher had been active (reviewing or submitting).

Scirev, partage d'expériences sur le peer-review

Ce site permet aux auteurs d'entrer des commentaires par revue sur leurs expériences de peer-review (durée de l'évaluation de leur article, nombre de rapports de reviewers...), et aux éditeurs de donner des informations sur leur revue (nombre de soumissions, taux de rejet...).

<http://scirev.sc/>

Postpublication peer review on social media

Faulkes Z (2014) *The Vacuum Shouts Back: Postpublication Peer Review on Social Media*. *Neuron* 82: 258-260. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2014.03.032

Social media has created new pathways for postpublication peer review, which regularly leads to corrections. Such online discussions are often resisted by authors and editors, however, and efforts to formalize postpublication peer review have not yet resonated with scientific communities.

We can fix peer review now

PubChase Blog, April 18, 2014

Imagine a software company that solicits user feedback with, "Please let us know what does and does not work in the current release and what you would like to see in the future. However, keep in mind that we will not be making any updates to our products and the version you have is the final one." This is the state of post-publication peer review today. We ask scientists to comment on static, final, published versions of papers, with virtually no potential to improve the articles. We ask scientists to waste their time and then take the lack of participation as evidence against post-publication peer review.

<http://blog.pubchase.com/we-can-fix-peer-review-now/>

Droit d'auteur

Publications scientifiques : je publie donc je suis !

Podcast France Culture, 3 avril 2014

Une chronique d'Etienne Klein consacrée à la publication scientifique, à l'évaluation des chercheurs et au facteur H, et au nouveau livre d'Yves Gingras "Les dérives de l'évaluation de la recherche" (6 minutes).

<http://www.franceculture.fr/emission-le-monde-selon-etienne-klein-publications-scientifiques-je-publie-donc-je-suis-2014-04-03>

Le Royaume Uni sanctuarise les pratiques de data mining par une exception au droit d'auteur

Blog S.I.Lex, 1 avril 2014

Le gouvernement britannique est actuellement en train de mettre en œuvre une réforme du droit d'auteur, en agissant sur les exceptions permettant de réaliser certains usages d'œuvres protégées en conformité avec la loi. Le Royaume Uni, par certains côtés, rattrape un retard qu'il pouvait accuser par rapport à certains autres pays d'Europe... Cette réforme comporte aussi des éléments réellement innovants, comme l'introduction d'une exception en faveur du text et data mining.

<http://scinfolex.com/2014/04/01/le-royaume-uni-sanctuarise-les-pratiques-de-data-mining-par-le-biais-dune-exception-au-droit-dauteur/>

Data mining : une étude pointe les obstacles du droit d'auteur en Europe

Magazine Numerama, Societe 2.0. 11 avril 2014

La Commission européenne a publié vendredi le rapport Triaille commandé au cabinet De Wolf & Partners, sur les conflits juridiques entre le droit d'auteur et les pratiques d'exploration de données (data mining). Le rapport confirme que le droit doit évoluer vers plus de flexibilité, avec l'ajout d'une nouvelle exception qui favoriserait l'innovation.

<http://www.numerama.com/magazine/29061-data-mining-une-etude-pointe-les-obstacles-du-droit-d-auteur-en-europe.html>

Droits d'auteur et publication scientifique

URFIST de Paris, sur Slideshare. 8 avril 2014

Présentation de Manuel Durand-Barthez sur les licences Creative Commons et sur les principes du droit d'auteur en publication scientifique, notamment dans le cadre de l'Open Archive Initiative.

<http://fr.slideshare.net/URFISTParis/droitdaui-131017103508phpapp02>

Ethique et fraude

Best practice guidelines on publishing ethics - a publisher's perspective

Blog Rédaction Médicale. 25 mars 2014

Bonne nouvelle avec la publication de la seconde édition des recommandations de bonnes pratiques de publications de Wiley. Il est toujours important de diffuser les bonnes pratiques et ce document est consultable en ligne, et peut-être téléchargé. Le document pdf fait 56 pages car il y a aussi les

diagrammes de COPE. C'est intéressant de les avoir dans un seul document, mais rappelons que ces diagrammes de COPE existent en langue française...

<http://www.h2mw.eu/redactionmedicale/2014/03/bonne-nouvelle-avec-la-publication-de-la-second%C3%A9dition-des-bonnes-pratiques-de-publications-de-wiley-il-est-toujours-imp.html>

The cost of research: are academics paying the price?

Blog Publication Integrity and Ethics (PIE), 22 avril 2014

Senior academics are under increasing pressure to generate research funding in the higher education sector. With government investment in research still sitting well below the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) average in the UK, academics are feeling the strain and seeking alternative methods of funding. How will a change in the funding process affect the work produced by researchers? Currently, the pressure to secure funds has resulted in academics focusing on turning research into profitable business; this can boost university income and also help continuation of further studies.

<http://www.integrity-ethics.com/blog/the-cost-of-research-are-academics-paying-the-price/>

The pitfalls of "salami slicing": Focus on quality and not quantity of publications

Editage Insights, Publication Ethics. 19 mars 2014

What is salami slicing?

It refers to the practice of partitioning a large study that could have been reported in a single research article into smaller published articles. In other words, it means breaking up a single research paper into their "least publishable units," with each paper reporting different findings from the same study. A set of papers are referred to as salami publications when more than one paper covers the same population, methods, and research question.

<http://www.editage.com/insights/the-pitfalls-of-%E2%80%9Csalami-slicing%E2%80%9D-focus-on-quality-and-not-quantity-of-publications-0>

Modèles de publication

Open access inspires new publishing models

Synapse student newspaper, Université de Californie. 17 avril 2014

Many scientists make the assumption that open access journals are non-profit entities because of their "open" nature and the fact that they do not charge subscription fees. In fact, few open access

journals are truly non-profit organizations; many are simply companies generating revenue using a different business model.

<http://synapse.ucsf.edu/articles/2014/04/17/open-access-inspires-new-publishing-models>

CNRSlejournal.fr, site d'information grand public

Groupeement Français de l'Industrie de l'Information (GFII), actualités. Le 3 mars 2014

De la reconstitution de la grotte Chauvet aux dernières découvertes sur les trous noirs, en passant par des éclairages sur la guerre de 14-18... découvrez tous ces sujets et bien d'autres sur CNRSlejournal.fr, le nouveau site d'information scientifique lancé le 4 mars 2014 par le CNRS. A voir en ligne sur <http://lejournal.cnrs.fr>. Destiné au grand public, ce nouveau média gratuit vise à décrypter des résultats scientifiques de plus en plus complexes et à montrer les coulisses de la recherche. Il s'agit également d'alerter sur les sciences émergentes. Son crédo : fournir des informations fiables permettant d'éclairer les grands débats de société.

<http://www.gfii.fr>

Publier dans les mégarevues : pourquoi ? comment ?

Marlene's corner blog, 22 avril 2014

Une nouvelle étude de David Solomon s'intéresse cette fois aux auteurs publiant dans les mégarevues en open access (PLOS ONE, Sage Open, BMJ Open et PeerJ). Voici quelques-uns des résultats récoltés auprès de ces auteurs :

- Le quart des articles est de la recherche originale. Moins de la moitié des articles soumis ont déjà été proposés pour publication dans d'autres revues : l'idée, encouragée par les éditeurs eux-mêmes, c'est de re-soumettre un article refusé dans une mégarevue du même éditeur.

- Les critères de choix prépondérants sont la qualité de la revue et la rapidité du processus de validation ; le facteur d'impact compte aussi, dans une moindre mesure (PLOS et BMJ), ainsi que les critères de validation et le fait que la revue soit en OA (PeerJ). Les auteurs publiant chez Sage Open et BMJ se montrent également sensibles à la réputation de l'éditeur

- Le financement des APCs provient, pour la moitié des auteurs de PLoS ONE et le tiers de ceux de BMJ Open et de PeerJ, des bourses allouées aux projets de recherche eux-mêmes. Une grande proportion des auteurs de Sage Open (60%) et de PeerJ (32%) semblent financer les APCs sur leurs propres deniers, mais il est vrai que ceux-ci sont traditionnellement plus modestes en SHS que pour les sciences dures d'une part (Sage est descendu sous la barre des

100\$), et que les adhésions individuelles proposées par PeerJ sont très abordables d'autre part.

<http://marlenescorner.net/2014/04/22/ils-publient-dans-les-megarevues-pourquoi-comment/>

Solomon DJ. (2014) A survey of authors publishing in four megajournals. *PeerJ* 2:e365

<http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.365>

Opening Science

Opening Science - The Evolving Guide on How the Web is Changing Research, Collaboration and Scholarly Publishing est un ouvrage publié par Springer en janvier 2014. Son contenu est évolutif, et le site web permet de collecter des commentaires et de fournir des révisions des chapitres du livre. The content is Open Access with a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) license.

La partie Vision aborde de nombreux sujets liés à la publication : Altmetrics and Other Novel Measures for Scientific Impact ; Dynamic Publication Formats and Collaborative Authoring...

<http://book.openingscience.org/>

Colloques

COPE : European perspectives on publication

Site du COPE - Publication Ethics, avril 2014

Presentations at the 2014 COPE European Seminar "European perspectives on publication ethics":

- Guidance on research and publication ethics in Europe
- Differences in publication ethics in Central and Eastern Europe
- Conflicts of interest in medical publishing
- Plagiarism detection: manual versus automatic plagiarism detection
- COPE Case Taxonomy
- Poster: Violation of publication ethics in manuscripts submitted to the biomedical journals: analysis and perspectives

<http://publicationethics.org/seminars>

Outils

Docear, le couteau suisse du chercheur

Blog de l'URFIST Rennes. 23 avril 2014

Docear (prononcer dog-ear) est une "suite de littérature académique", sorte de tout-en-un destiné

spécifiquement aux chercheurs. Cet outil fait en effet trois choses différentes, très utiles aux chercheurs :

- il gère les PDF et les annotations sur des PDF : importation, gestion, création automatique de mind maps à partir de PDF... ;

- il crée des cartes heuristiques : Docear est basé sur FreePlane et reprend l'essentiel de ses fonctionnalités ;

- il gère les références bibliographiques : Docear intègre Jabref, peut importer des fichiers bibtex (à partir de Zotero, Mendeley, etc.).

<http://www.sites.univ-rennes2.fr/urfist/blog/2014/04/cartes-heuristiques-pour-lenseignement-et-la-recherche-docear-le-couteau-suisse-du-cher>

PhD on Track : resource for PhD students

<http://www.phdontrack.net/>

PhD on Track is a resource for PhD students who are beginning their research career, and who want to learn more about information and literature for research purposes, and about how to publish research.

Academia stack exchange

Academia is a question and answer site for academics of all levels. It's built and run by you as part of the Stack Exchange network of Questions and Answers sites.

<http://academia.stackexchange.com/>

Elsevier training webcasts

Elsevier, avril 2014

- "How to Get Published" series
- "How to Review a Manuscript" series
- "Introduction to Scholarly Publishing" series
- "The Impact Factor and Other Bibliometric Indicators"
- "Getting Your Paper Noticed"

<http://www.elsevier.com/journal-authors/elsevier-supporting-early-career-researchers/publishing-connect-training-webcasts>

Humour

@EricLichtfouse

Archaeological findings in soil

This is an actual letter from the archives of the Smithsonian

Paleoanthropology Division
Smithsonian Institute
207 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20078

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your latest submission to the Institute, labeled "211-D, layer seven, next to the clothesline post. Hominid skull." We have given this specimen a careful and detailed examination, and regret to inform you that we disagree with your theory that it represents "conclusive proof of the presence of Early Man in Charleston County two million years ago." Rather, it appears that what you have found is the head of a Barbie doll, of the variety one of our staff, who has small children, believes to be the "Malibu Barbie". It is evident that you have given a great deal of thought to the analysis of this specimen, and you may be quite certain that those of us who are familiar with your prior work in the field were loathe to come to contradiction with your findings. However, we do feel that there are a number of physical attributes of the specimen which might have tipped you off to its modern origin:

1. The material is molded plastic. Ancient hominid remains are typically fossilized bone.
2. The cranial capacity of the specimen is approximately 9 cubic centimeters, well below the threshold of even the earliest identified proto-hominids.
3. The dentition pattern evident on the "skull" is more consistent with the common domesticated dog than it is with the "ravenous man-eating Pliocene clams" you speculate roamed the wetlands during that time. This latter finding is certainly one of the most intriguing hypotheses you have submitted in your history with this institution, but the evidence seems to weigh rather heavily against it. Without going into too much detail, let us say that:

- A. The specimen looks like the head of a Barbie doll that a dog has chewed on.
- B. Clams don't have teeth.

It is with feelings tinged with melancholy that we must deny your request to have the specimen carbon dated. This is partially due to the heavy load our lab must bear in its normal operation, and partly due to carbon dating's notorious inaccuracy in fossils of recent geologic record. To the best of our knowledge, no Barbie dolls were produced prior to 1956 AD, and carbon dating is likely to produce wildly inaccurate results. Sadly, we must also deny your request that we approach the National Science Foundation's Phylogeny Department with the concept of assigning your specimen the scientific name "Australopithecus spiff-arino." Speaking personally, I, for one, fought tenaciously for the acceptance of your proposed taxonomy, but was ultimately voted down because the species name you selected was hyphenated, and didn't really sound like it might be Latin.

However, we gladly accept your generous donation of this fascinating specimen to the museum. While it is undoubtedly not a hominid fossil, it is, nonetheless, yet another riveting example of the great body of work you seem to accumulate here so effortlessly. You could know that our Director has reserved a special shelf in his own office for the display of the specimens you have previously submitted to the Institution, and the entire staff speculates daily on what you will happen upon next in your digs at the site you have discovered in your back yard. We eagerly anticipate your trip to our nation's capital that you proposed in your last letter, and several of us are pressing the Director to pay for it. We are particularly interested in hearing you expand on your theories surrounding the "trans-positating fillifitation of ferrous ions in a structural matrix" that makes the excellent juvenile *Tyrannosaurus rex* femur you recently discovered take on the deceptive appearance of a rusty 9-mm Sears Craftsman automotive crescent wrench.

Yours in Science,
Harvey Rowe
Curator, Antiquities