Another year of success and growth

I would like to start my Editor’s note by wishing you and your families all the very best for a safe and joyous holiday season and of course for a prosperous, productive and happy New Year! It is my pleasure to bring you another issue of the ISAJE Newsletter, our sixth since we started this initiative. Although the frequency is not high, the newsletter is a work in progress for six months and I hope that you all appreciate the contents and find the newsletter interesting and useful. All members should remember that this is a members’ newsletter and please do send me any items of interest, topics that you would like to see explored, or items that you would like to share with other members.

A recent new initiative that ISAJE has started in an effort to increase communication between members is the ISAJE LinkedIn page. This group was started in recognition that the once yearly conference, while excellent, is insufficient for facilitating communication between members, particularly those who find it difficult to attend each year. The LinkedIn group allows for ongoing discussions and questions between members. It is a closed group only for ISAJE members and interesting topics, news items, reports and articles of interest to members are frequently posted. Again, this resource can only be useful based on the efforts of ISAJE members, so I encourage you all to join LinkedIn (if you are not already a member this is a very easy and excellent way to connect with colleagues) and find the ISAJE
Success...

2011 has been another successful year for ISAJE. The mentoring scheme continues and some testimony from participants is included to ascertain the use of this program. The WHO Young Scholar Scheme is also attracting an increasing number of participants and it is very rewarding to be able to encourage scholars from developing countries to be able to present their research to an international audience. ISAJE has also been working with many different groups throughout the year to ensure that the interest of Addiction Journal Editors are recognised and represented in many forums. One important initiative was the meeting to discuss a new organisation, ICARA, that would bring together relevant addiction research organisations to work collaboratively. More details on each of these projects if provided in the newsletter.

The 2011 ISAJE annual meeting in Hilton Head, South Carolina was a great success. Several of the presentations are summarised in this newsletter for those who were unable to attend and I would like to thank the presenters who took the time and effort to contribute in this manner. Some photos of the conference are included herein, and unfortunately do not capture the full beauty of Hilton Head Island, where the meeting was held on a world renowned golf course. Although we only had the opportunity to look out on the course, attendees did have some spare time to explore the island on bikes, including the beaches and ruins of plantation houses. The meeting concluded with a dinner cruise of the surrounding waters and we were briefly joined by some dolphins. Alligators were also sighted during the conference, but this was very early in the mornings and did not cause any disturbances. I would like to extend my thanks to Peter Miller and his wife Gay for their true Southern hospitality, which made the conference a pleasure to attend.

I hope to see many of you at the 2012 ISAJE meeting in Portugal and look forward to another productive year for ISAJE. □

Sally Gainsbury
Editor, ISAJE Newsletter
Associate Editor, International Gambling Studies

L to R: Molly Jarvis, Sally Gainsbury, Dan Morgan, Paul Candon
Message from the President

I am sure that, by now, you have all recovered from the Hilton Head Island meeting. Gay and I were pleased to be your hosts and look forward to the 2012 annual meeting in Lisbon. Unfortunately, Margareta Nilson who would have been our hostess for the upcoming meeting has retired and is moving to Germany and will no longer be a member of ISAJE. We will miss her and we wish her well. However, her colleagues at EMCDDA are substituting for her and promise to provide a welcome venue.

As you know, Kerstin Stenius and Tom Babor were responsible for organizing the ICARA satellite meeting at Hilton Head. ICARA is a proposed organization of associations and societies throughout the world that focus on research related to alcohol and drug use as well as abuse and dependence. They have formed a working group that has drafted an initial organizational document and are planning another ICARA planning meeting immediately following our ISAJE conference next year. I would like to personally congratulate both Kerstin and Tom for their efforts in this regard and especially to Kerstin who was able to obtain funds to help support this initial meeting.

Based on issues that were discussed at Hilton Head we are forming a Bibliometrics Committee. Anyone interested in being a part of this should contact me. Molly, with the help of Sally Gainsbury, has established a Linkedin ISAJE group page so members can communicate with one another and share ideas throughout the year. Please become a member and active participant.

We are also in the process of signing up new member editors, some of whom attended our Hilton Head meeting. Please let Molly Jarvis or me know of any new journal or existing journal that might be a potential member of our society.

I look forward to providing you with updates on issues being addressed by your board over the next several months. Feel free to email me (millerpm@musc.edu) with your thoughts and suggestions. □

Peter Miller

Newsletter Idea?

If you come across something your Editor colleagues might find important, contact a newsletter co-editor:

Sally Gainsbury - sally.gainsbury@scu.edu.au
Daryl Boshart - daryl_boshart@camh.net
ICARA: Summary of a Planning Meeting

To ascertain the feasibility of establishing an International Confederation of ATOD Research Associations (ICARA, where ATOD stands for alcohol, tobacco and other drugs), a meeting was held this September, 2011, at Hilton Head, South Carolina. The meeting—hosted by ISAJE—convened a select group of invitees that represented ATOD research societies across the globe, along with interested participants from national (e.g., NIAAA, NIDA), international (e.g., WHO), and regional organizations (e.g., EMCDDA). The meeting focused on the possible establishment of a confederation of research societies.

The ICARA meeting opened with a presentation by Prof. Thomas Babor, Immediate Past President of ISAJE. In his “Introduction to the Addiction Research Confederation Idea,” he described the steady growth of ATOD science during the past 50 years, including specialty journals and research societies. In his closing remarks, he challenged the audience to consider two questions regarding ICARA: Is it a feasible idea? If so, what should be its mission?

The second presentation was given by Professor Mike Daube, who is associated with the World Federation of Public Health Associations (WFPHA). His topic was “Global Cooperation: The Key to Progress.” Professor Daube described the importance of international collaboration in public health, the work of WFPHA and similar organisations, and the role of advocacy in the advancement of evidence-based health policy. His closing message: global problems require global action.

The next presentation was delivered by Dr. Vladimir Poznyak, representing the World Health Organization (WHO). According to Dr. Poznyak, from the perspective of the WHO Secretariat a global network of research societies would facilitate collaboration and communication (using, as an example, a forthcoming WHO meeting with NGOs and professional associations on 12th December 2011 in Geneva). He noted that WHO is committed to working with the relevant partners to shape the international research agenda on alcohol and health, build capacity for research, and support international research networks and projects to generate and disseminate data to inform policy and program development.

Dr. Steven Gust, who directs the international program at the US National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), followed with a presentation outlining the benefits that a research confederation like ICARA could
provide to a research funding organization like NIDA: specifically, by a) identifying ‘unique opportunities’ (e.g., interventions to reduce drug-related HIV transmission), b) providing a forum for coordination among research funding organizations, c) helping to promote NIDA’s international programs, and d) fostering NIDA’s international collaborations and serving as hosting organization for NIDA’s International Forum, which attracts over 300 investigators from as many as 50 countries annually.

The next presentation was given by Professor Ralph Hingson, Director, Division of Epidemiology and Prevention Research, US National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. Professor Hingson described three research priorities that he thought were relevant to the proposed confederation: 1) alcohol, drugs, and driving; 2) alcohol, drugs, and poisoning; and 3) integrated alcohol and drug screening and brief intervention. He suggested that the international research community could be instrumental in standardizing reporting procedures and advocating for drug testing of fatally injured drivers.

Next, Dr. Linda Bosma, Chair, Alcohol Tobacco & Other Drugs (ATOD) Section of the American Public Health Association (APHA), talked about the benefits and challenges of cooperation and exchange across substances. According to Dr. Bosma, the benefits of working across substances include synergy (people who work on one substance can learn from people working in other areas), breaking down the “silos” between substance areas, and increasing the opportunities to network across multiple substances. On the negative side, she indicated that people working in the three substance areas do not always see national issues the same way.

Two panel sessions then delved into questions regarding the scope, mission and functioning of the proposed confederation. Some suggested that their organizations’ governing boards might be concerned about...
the confederation’s travel and membership costs. Others wondered about the benefits that would accrue to their organizations’ constituents, and the possibility that the confederation might engage in advocacy on topics that individual societies would not agree with.

At the end of the day Gerhard Buehringer suggested the following course of action for meeting attendees to consider: appoint a working group to draft a meeting report, revise the draft mission statement (distributed prior to the meeting, see below), review criteria for membership, make preparations for another ICARA planning meeting to be held in conjunction with ISAJE next year, and explore options for funding support.

These suggestions provided a segue to the next day’s proceedings. On day two, the draft mission statement was reviewed and the following resolutions and ideas were proposed:

- ICARA was considered a good acronym, in that it means “friends” in Gaelic and also refers to a cushion protecting a woman’s head in one of the languages spoken in Nigeria.
- Advocacy for specific policies is problematic for many, but for others very important (e.g., the Australian professional society, Korean and Nigerian societies). In the end a consensus was reached that advocacy for evidence based policy could be acceptable for all.
- It was agreed that acceptance of funding from the tobacco, alcohol, gambling and pharmaceutical industries was in some cases and to some extent not acceptable but that as long as the organization could adopt a transparent disclosure policy the receipt of some industry funding would not preclude membership in ICARA. It was suggested that a membership committee would decide on when industry funding becomes a barrier to the independence of member organizations.
- It was agreed that a 1-2 year process would be needed to set up the organization, with annual meetings initially to keep interest up.
- No decision was made regarding headquarters, staff, affiliations (e.g., NIAAA, NIDA; EMCDDA; WHO; UNODC), but the potential involvement of these organizations was considered crucial to the success of ICARA.
- A working group was asked to prepare the meeting report, establish a schedule for teleconferences, and plan for the next meeting. They were also asked to draft a description of possible activities for ICARA, including: a) relations between research scientists and the media and decision-makers; b) a review of the pros and cons of merging alcohol and drug research in different countries; c) exchange of information about research training and quality control.
standards for training; d) possibly education and workforce development; and e) how to get support for interdisciplinary and transnational research.

Work on a mission statement, as proposed by the working group, resulted in the following: ICARA is an international, nongovernmental, multidisciplinary and civil society organization bringing together research societies to promote ATOD science through professional exchange, collaboration and action. The purpose of ICARA is to create an international network of research societies in order to promote, support and enhance research on alcohol, tobacco and other drugs, nationally and internationally.

It was settled that once agreement has been reached as to the mission statement, objectives, activities and membership requirements, by-laws will be drafted consistent with a not-for-profit association and consideration will be given to possible registration of the confederation in an appropriate country.

A proposed logo, developed by Thomas Babor and Deborah Talamini, was also presented.

EMCDDA to host 2012 Annual ISAJE Meeting in Portugal

The European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) will host the next ISAJE Annual meeting, which will take place in Estoril on 27–29 September 2012. The meeting will be preceded by a half-day information session, presenting the work of the EMCDDA at the organisation’s headquarters in Lisbon.

The EMCDDA was established in 1993. Inaugurated in Lisbon in 1995, it is one of the EU’s decentralised agencies. The EMCDDA exists to provide the EU and its Member States with a factual overview of European drug problems and related interventions providing a solid evidence base to support the drugs debate. Today, it offers policymakers the data they need for drawing up informed drug laws and strategies. It also helps professionals and
practitioners working in the field pinpoint best practice and new areas of research.

The EMCDDA became a member of the ISAJE in 2009 in order to reinforce the links between scientific publishing in the field of addiction and the Centre’s work. The cooperation established so far has been proven very fruitful and the EMCDDA is proud to have been chosen to host the ISAJE 2012 meeting.

Lisbon, the capital of Portugal, is situated on the Tagus Estuary, on the European Atlantic coast. Its history goes back to the Phoenicians, but also Greeks and Romans have been here. The Moors ruled large parts of the Iberian Peninsula for over 400 years — including the area which is forming Portugal today. In the 12th century, the Christians reconquered the city, where the Arabic influence still is visible in the old quarters. With Vasco da Gama finding the sea route to India and other discoveries, the golden age of Lisbon began, characterised by the Manueline architectural style with its typical decorative use of maritime motifs. Over the centuries, Lisbon grew and changed. The city centre was almost completely destroyed by the earthquake of 1755, and rebuilt in a layout that is still retained. Today, Lisbon is a bustling, modern city with a population of some 1.9 million people in the greater Lisbon area. Lisbon has an international airport with connections to many European capitals and various transatlantic connections.

Estoril is a suburb of Lisbon and a holiday location, a short train ride away from the capital. With a pleasant climate all year round and a great variety of cultural and leisure activities, among these a casino and an international film festival, golf and sailing events, it is an international hub for the rich and famous. It used to be a meeting place of European royalties and nobility, in particular during the Second World War when, due to Portugal’s neutrality, several royal families went into exile in Estoril, which became known as the ‘Coast of Kings’.

More details about the annual meeting, the programme, and the venue will be announced in due course.

Margareta Nilson
Update: ISAJE Mentoring Scheme

“The time to begin writing an article is when you have finished it to your satisfaction. By that time, you begin to clearly and logically perceive what it is you really want to say.”
– Mark Twain

“When something can be read without effort, great effort has gone into its writing.”
– Enrique Jardiel Poncela

“I'm not a very good writer, but I'm an excellent rewriter.”
– James Michener

These quotes are at the very heart of why we established the NIDA-funded ISAJE Mentoring Scheme. An addiction scientist is only as good as his/her ability to effectively communicate research results to the scientific community. Certainly, strong methodology is essential but publication relies heavily on communication skills. Clear, understandable, and concise written communication involves writing, editing, rewriting, and repeating this process until a manuscript is honed to a fine edge.

Because these skills do not come naturally to young investigators, especially those without adequate mentoring resources in their home universities, ISAJE established the ISAJE/Parint Mentoring Scheme to provide one-on-one support to international academicians from low and middle income countries to facilitate the successful publication of their addiction research. The goal of this program is not to plan or conduct research but to help investigators clearly and concisely communicate research findings to journal editors and reviewers and, eventually, to the scientific community.

We currently have 16 mentors representing the UK, US, Australia, Canada, Germany, and China. Our current group of 8 mentees represents the Slovak Republic, Poland, Ethiopia, Egypt, Thailand, Brazil, and India. Manuscript topics run the gamut from pharmacology to prevention to epidemiology.
to health services research. Most mentor/mentee pairs communicate via email and all find the experience extremely rewarding. Many mentees are close to submitting their manuscripts for publication.

Our plans are to monitor and refine the process and expand our database of mentors and mentees. We are working closely with the NIDA International Program under the direction of Dr. Steve Gust who will be helping us build our stable of participants. We are enthused about these early beginnings and look forward to assisting many more young investigators worldwide.

Feedback from Mentors and Mentees

“Patience, kind understanding and a ‘mentee-directedness’ characterized our ISAJE mentoring relationship from the very beginning. My mentor easily agreed with the writing plan that I proposed, despite it being a year-long commitment, and offered insightful interpretations of the main study findings which helped me to write the discussion section. At the same time, he was very supportive of my work and cared not only about the writing process but also about other unrelated things and tasks which interfered with it.”

“Regular monitoring of work progress worked well in keeping everybody up to date. I emailed my mentor with updates and sent him a growing draft article every month, while the ISAJE staff emailed both of us regularly to check how the paper was proceeding.”

“I am grateful to have been received by [my mentee] with such enthusiasm and warmth. I have recently received from [my mentee] the fruits of his labor, and I could not be more pleased with the process of our work and its results. I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the fears expressed by some of our colleagues about the mentoring program about being asked to do more work than would be appropriate for an editor/mentor could not be more misplaced. [My mentee] has been diligent, committed and competent and his use of me as a mentor has been uniformly intelligent and respectful…”
Mentoring Scheme

intelligent and respectful of our roles. I have enjoyed the process, and I am grateful to be able to count [my mentee] among our colleagues in the work. I strongly encourage our colleagues in ISAJE to consider becoming mentors so that they might also benefit from the program as I have.”

“My experiences with the mentoring program are very positive:

- I appreciate the possibility to discuss my work with someone from a different environment, with a different point of view and experiences
- Our mentor is very professional
- Our contacts with the mentor always have been very nice and encouraging
- Communication via emails worked well

The main problems related to the process were as follows:

- the need to coordinate the schedule not only with the mentor, but also with the co-author of the manuscript
- the lack of time
- my insufficient English skills which led to a significant delay - once, I waited for the mentor's comments while the mentor waited for my new draft!

I also needed to modify my initial expectation that this is a speed way to publishing. Now I perceive the mentoring program as a nice, comfortable way of developing myself and my knowledge and professional skills.”

ISAJE-PARINT Online Mentoring Scheme: Filling a critical gap

The International Program of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) works with colleagues from around the world to find evidence-based solutions to the public health problems of drug abuse, addiction, and drug-related HIV/AIDS. We build partnerships with countries, organizations, and individual researchers to promote new research initiatives, build international research capacity, and disseminate knowledge. One critical and unfulfilled need is the wide scale dissemination of research findings from low
Filling a gap

and middle income countries through peer-reviewed publications.

Publishing a single article can be a challenge, even for researchers well versed in the complex practices of scholarly writing. For those without support from their institutions, or from regions without a history of publishing relevant research, this challenge can be insurmountable.

With NIDA support, ISAJE has taken some important steps to begin to address this need. Of particular importance are the Web site, textbook, and online tutorial, *Publishing Addiction Research Internationally* ([www.PARINT.org](http://www.PARINT.org)) and this new mentoring scheme.

Although the PARINT initiative is a very successful online training program it is intended for individual study and use. What the ISAJE has recognized is there is huge potential additional benefit from a one-on-one relationship with an experienced researcher/writer.

Researchers, program administrators, funding agencies, and journal editors all see great promise in the ISAJE Writing Mentor Program, and the NIDA International Program looks forward to results such as those reported elsewhere in this issue by participants—both mentors and mentees—in the pilot test. We congratulate ISAJE on meeting a critical need in research training and will continue to promote the ISAJE Writing Mentor Program to our constituents. □

Steven W. Gust, Ph.D.
Director, International Program
National Institute on Drug Abuse

2011 Young Scholars Award—Winner Announced

We are very pleased to announce the winner of the 2011 Young Scholars Award.

Gabriel Andreuccetti, a PhD candidate in Epidemiology at the University of Sao Paolo Medical School, Brazil, won this year’s award for his paper "Reducing the legal blood alcohol concentration limit for driving in developing countries: a time for change? Results and implications derived from a time-series analysis (2001-10) conducted
Young Scholar Award

Congratulations to Gabriel Andreuccetti on his winning paper, “Reducing the legal blood alcohol concentration limit for driving in developing countries: A time for change? Results and implications derived from a time-series analysis (2001-10) conducted in Brazil”

in Brazil”, published in Addiction in 2011. The runner up was Hui Cheng, a research associate at the Institute of Mental Health, Peking University, China for her paper "Harsh physical punishment as a specific childhood adversity linked to adult drinking consequences: Evidence from China", also published in Addiction, in 2010.

Applications are invited for the 2012 award. To be eligible, the paper must have been published either online or in print form in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal between 1 July 2009 and 30 June 2012. The research reported should have been carried out predominantly in a low or middle income country, as specified by the World Bank classification. The applicant must be under 35 years old and should be the lead author in the paper being submitted for the award. He or she should hold a current academic or research position in a low or middle income country, or should have held such a position at the time the research for the paper was carried out. The deadline for receiving applications is 31 July 2012. Further details including the full eligibility criteria and application procedure may be obtained from the ISAJE Executive Officer, Molly Jarvis. Please share information about this award as widely as possible.

We are delighted that Addiction journal has offered to sponsor the award, together with ISAJE and the World Health Organisation.
Within the last few years, new bibliometrics have been developed that either complement—or compete with—Thomson Reuters’ impact factor. Two of these new metrics are the Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP) and SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) indicator, both derived from Elsevier’s Scopus database.

One of the criticisms of impact factor measurement is that using it to compare journals from different subject fields is often difficult, mainly because articles in some fields (e.g., life sciences) tend to have many more citations in their reference lists than articles in other disciplines (e.g., social sciences). This tends to elevate impact factors for journals in higher-citation fields compared with journals in lower-citation fields, even if the journals have equal standing in the respective areas.

SNIP, however, factors this “citation potential” into its calculation and aims to level the playing field across disciplines with different citation patterns. Similar to impact factor, SNIP is calculated by determining the average number of times an article is cited in a journal (over a 3-year window, as opposed to impact factor’s 2-year window). But unlike impact factor, this number is then divided by the citation potential—that is, how many citations there are—in articles in the journal’s subject field. (The subject field is not a pre-defined category but is determined by the papers that actually cite that journal and is, therefore, customized for each journal and each calculation of SNIP. For details on the calculation of SNIP, see Moed, 2010.) The intent is for journals to be more equitably compared across fields. This could be important in a subject area such as substance abuse, which spans both higher-citation (e.g., neuroscientific, genetic, biological) and lower-citation (e.g., clinical, sociological) specialties.

SJR, on the other hand, is a “prestige” metric. Its calculation gives extra weight to citations that appear in more influential journals and lower weight to citations that appear in less influential journals. This differs from impact factor, which weighs all citations equally, regardless of the journals they appear in. (The prestige of a journal, and therefore the prestige that it confers on the journals cited within it, is determined by that journal’s own SJR through an iterative process—see González-Pereira et al., 2009, for details on the calculation of the SJR indicator.) SJR also differs from impact factor in that it uses 3 years of citation data and restricts the effect that self-citations—citations from a journal to
that same journal—can have on the statistic. The intent is that journals with greater “impact” in the literature will have higher SJRs than journals with lower influence.

A main drawback of these indicators is the complexity of their computation. Whereas impact factor has a straightforward calculation (i.e., in simplified terms, the number of citations received divided by the number of articles published), SNIP and SJR are calculated through complex, multistep equations that only those steeply versed in statistics and bibliometrics are likely to fully grasp, making evaluation of the effectiveness and stated utility of these metrics difficult for most. Whether this complexity will limit their uptake will likely be determined in coming years.

Although SNIP and SJR are available free on the Internet (at www.journalmetrics.com), they cannot be quickly searched for in predefined subject categories to compare large numbers of related journals simultaneously. To address this, I have presented here all journals in the substance-abuse and addictions field that, to my knowledge, have SNIP or SJR values. The journals are listed in descending order according to their SNIP rank and SNIP value (columns 2 and 3, respectively). Column 4 lists each journal’s rank according to the SJR indicator, and column 5 lists the SJR value.

Paul Candon
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The UK Science and Technology Committee has published a report on the current peer-review system, concluding that in order for other scientists to replicate and build on experiments, all researchers should aim for the gold standard of making their data fully disclosed and publicly available. This responsibility should be undertaken by funders and editors to ensure that published manuscripts contain sufficient information to allow results to be fully replicated. The report states that the fundamental aim of peer-review should be to ensure that all publications are scientifically sound; the integrity of the peer-review process can only ever be as robust as the integrity of the people involved.

The full report is 254 pages long and some of the recommendations include the establishment of an external regulator that would function across disciplines and ensure that all research institutions have a specified member of staff responsible for research integrity. Concerns are raised about the reliance on and weight given to impact factors given the element of chance in being accepted in a high-impact journal. Instead, focus should remain on the quality of each research study and paper published.

Innovative suggestions for improving the current pre-publication peer review process include the use of pre-print services, open peer review, increased transparency and online repository-style journals. Use of new media and social networking is also encouraged, as well as experimentation with post-publication review and commentary as a means of supplementing pre-publication review.

The report recommends greater recognition of the work carried out by reviewers from publishers and employers. Publishers should implement systems for recording and acknowledging the contribution of those involved in peer-review. Importantly, the report states that publishers have a responsibility to ensure that appropriate training is provided for those involved in the peer-review process, including editors, authors and reviewers.

Retractions are surging

An article published in Nature (Noorden, 2011, 478, 26-28) comments on the rising number of retraction notices; increasing from around 30 annually in the early 2000s to more than 400 in 2011. Although the total number of papers published has risen by 44% over the past decade, the number of retractions is greatly outpacing this growth. The increase in retractions may be a result of greater fraud detection, the use of plagiarism and image manipulation software by editors, scientists and reviewers, and journals’ accepting responsibility to take action. However, Noorden cites concerns that many editors are still reluctant to retract articles, that reasons for retractions are often not transparent, that authors often continue to cite retracted articles, and that the stigma associated with retraction may discourage scientists from owning up to mistakes. Suggested improvements to the retraction system include better systems for linking papers to retraction notices, more responsibility placed on journal editors, and greater transparency and clarity about research errors.

Pressure to publish

iThenticate’s white paper, Pressure to Publish: How Globalization and Technology are Increasing Misconduct in Scholarly Research, offers guidelines for how the research community can combat the rise of misconduct and retractions, including how to implement effective processes to protect intellectual property and how to use technology to help screen for originality. The key findings are that submissions to high-impact journals are at an all-time high, cases of misconduct are increasing, and that there is a lack of existing intellectual property processes.

The pressure to publish is increasingly and leads some researchers to take short-cuts to increase their chances of acceptance into well-respected journals. Technology in research has levelled the playing field by enabling researchers in geographically-remote countries to access literature and collaborate with other scientists around the world. Funding access is also less difficult and more research is being conducted, increasing submission rates for many journals. Universities often place high demands on academics to continually publish in the highest ranked journals, which in many cases is unreasonable, and may be increasing the incentive for misconduct.

The report can be accessed at: http://www.ithenticate.com/pressure-to-publish-free-white-paper.
Excessive self-citations can lead to time-out

A post from The Scholarly Kitchen (2011, October, 17) discusses the potential consequences of journals attempting to artificially inflate their impact factors by including an excessive number of self-citations. It is expected that journals, particularly journals with a high degree of speciality, will have a reasonable proportion of their citations coming from within the journal; articles are concentrated by topic and scientific research builds on prior publications. Detecting artificial attempts to increase self-citations is difficult. However, as demonstrated in a presentation by Paul Candon, Managing Editor of Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs at the 2011 ISAJE meeting, most journal rankings stay reasonably stable even when self-citations are removed. Therefore, when investigations reveal that rankings dramatically change when self-citations are removed, journals may have their impact factor suspended for a period. According the Thomson Reuters’ Journal Citation Reports, 33 journals were suspended in 2011 for “extremely high journal self-citation rates”. Examples of previously suspended journals include World Journal of Gastroenterology (90% of citations were self-citations in 2003) the Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences (78% of citations were self-citations in 2007) and Cereal Research Communications (96% of citations were self-citations in 2007). Most suspended journals appear to be relisted after a few years when their self-citation rates appear more reasonable. However, what is not clear is the determination of “reasonable” numbers of self-citations, and whether editors tread this line carefully to increase impact factors without being accused of scientific misconduct. Given the importance that institutions and authors typically place on impact factor, the threat of suspension should be taken very seriously by editors.

Live Reference Works

A new resource has been launched that enables scientific reference works to be published at the pace of scientific discovery. SpringerReference.com is a platform where invited experts can publish reference articles and update existing posts as new scientific discoveries are made. Similar to Wikipedia, but catered toward the scientific community, this platform reduces the time before scientific discoveries are made public by enabling researchers to publish contributions online before publication. Researchers can access the latest articles and updates by reviewing entries.
to ensure their own research is current and based on the latest discoveries. To maintain the quality and integrity of eReferences, all updates are subjected to peer review and only authors invited by editorial boards can make updates to references. All scientists are welcome to make comments on a reference to initiate discussion and debate.

According to Springer, more than 50,000 authors currently participate in and contribute to SpringerReference.com, which was launched in August 2011 with over 146 complete major reference works, including more than 185,000 individual entries. Over time, the unique content will grow as updates are added and the online resource will only contain the latest edition of a reference work to ensure results are not out of date. Springer expects to receive over 30,000 updates each year and researchers can submit updates that will be peer-reviewed. A search for the term *addiction* results in 640 documents from a variety of fields, linking researchers to encyclopaedia entries. This tool may enhance author and editor visibility in the field, in addition to providing access to scientific content. Access is based on institutional subscriptions, and free limited-time trials are available – see [http://www.springerreference.com](http://www.springerreference.com).

---

**EU Author Self-archiving & Open Access**

A European project, named PEER (Publishing and the Ecology of European Research), is running from 2008 to 2012 as a collaboration between publishers, repositories and researchers. It aims to investigate the effects of the large-scale, systematic depositing of authors’ final peer reviewed manuscripts (so called Green Open Access or stage-two research output) on reader access, author visibility, and journal viability, as well as on the broader ecology of European research. One component of the project is to investigate author/reader behaviour in self-archiving and open access. The investigators of that component completed their research recently and published their findings on 6th October.

The first phase of the research included surveys, focus groups and an interdisciplinary workshop to understand the extent to which authors and users are aware of Open Access (OA), the different ways of achieving it, and the factors that influence its uptake. Between 2009 and 2011 there was no real increase in the number of researchers reporting placing a
version of journal articles into an OA repository. Few researchers associated OA with ‘self-archiving’ and anecdotal evidence indicated that some researchers consider making journal articles accessible via OA was not their responsibility. However, authors tended to be favourable to OA and receptive to the benefits of self-archiving in terms of greater readership and wider dissemination of their research, with the caveat that self-archiving does not compromise the pivotal role of the published journal article. Readers expressed concerns about the authority of citing article content from a version other than the final published version, particularly in their own journal articles. Concerns were lower when reading research for other purposes. Open Access Repositories were perceived by researchers as complementary to, rather than replacing, current forums for disseminating and publishing research.

One quote in particular may highlight the difficulties in modifying researcher behaviour, particularly in terms of publication of results: “Academic researchers have a conservative set of attitudes, perceptions and behaviours towards the scholarly communication system and do not desire fundamental changes in the way research is currently disseminated and published”

The PEER website itself containing the full report is at http://www.peerproject.eu.

COPE E-Learning – Publication Ethics

COPE has released the first three of a series of modules designed for journal editors to provide ongoing training and education on ethical publishing. An eLearning program available to all COPE members aims to give editors a deeper understanding of publication ethics and provide practical guidance on how to detect, prevent and handle misconduct. The first four modules, released in October 2011, cover an introduction to publication ethics,
plagiarism, falsification and fabrication. Modules to come will include authorship, conflicts of interest, editor misconduct, reviewer misconduct, redundant publication, selective reporting and unethical research. The first module takes approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Members must log in to access the modules, which consist of a series of slides to work through. The slides contain interactive material to increase user engagement and active learning. Educational material is very clearly presented and the modules refer users to additional resources. Exercises are included such as selecting answers in response to questions and receiving feedback to gauge an editor’s knowledge of publication ethics. The modules include practical tips and strategies, such as actions that can be taken to discourage and prevent misconduct among authors, editors and reviewers. The modules finish with a mini-quiz to check learning and engagement. The eLearning package does not lead to a qualification but members who have completed the modules can print out certificates of participation.

Details can be found at http://publicationethics.org/resources/elearning.

Ethics continued

Authorship Falsification

Ghost authorship occurs when an individual is not acknowledged for their substantial contribution to the production of an article, such as a paid writer or statistician. Honorary authorship, in contrast, is granting authorship status to individuals who do not meet full criteria for authorship, and may have had little (if any) involvement in a study or in writing
the manuscript, such as department heads, junior research assistants, or friends. Both types of false authorship create problems for establishing credit and accountability in research.

A survey by Wislar et al., reported by Davis (Scholarly Kitchen, Oct 31, 2011), surveyed published authors in the top six medical journals to examine the frequency of authorship falsification, replicating a similar survey conducted in 1996. In 2008, self-reports of ghost authorship was 7.9%, down from 11.5% in 1996. By comparison, rates of honorary authorship remained statistically similar over time (17.6% in 2008 vs. 19.3% in 1996). Prevalence of honorary authorship in research articles was higher in 2008 than in 1996, but lower for review articles and editorials. Journals that require authors to detail their contributions showed no differences from journals without these requirements.

The results of this study may be biased by the failure of participants to self-report authorship falsification. A study of members of the American Medical Writers Association and European Medical Writers Association found the incidence of ghost writing was at 42% in 2008, down from 62% in 2005, indicating this practice is still quite common. An editorial by Basking and Gross (Neurology), claimed that the unclear definition of “substantial contribution” in the criteria for authorship established by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors contributes to the problem of inappropriate authorship. Given the importance of ensuring accountability and credit in research, it is important for editors to continually consider their authorship policies and make revisions where necessary.
Social Media for Scholarly Journals

by Rachel Zawada
- Wiley-Blackwell

Why social networking?

Social networking is the building and reflecting of a community of people who share interests and activities through the use of interactive web-based applications. Using social media as a marketing tool is about getting yourself discovered by the colleagues already researching and practicing in your area. To get noticed, you need to distinguish yourself as a resource for your field that attracts visitors naturally.

Online social technologies such as Facebook, Twitter, blogging, or LinkedIn can facilitate and support interactions with your journal in the following ways:

- **Get noticed**
Engaging in social media or blogging on a regular basis will help you achieve constant visibility with your audience. By actively participating in conversations, you stay on their radar and create awareness for yourself or journal.

- **Brand yourself/your journal as a thought leader**
By sharing content and being visible, you’ll establish yourself as the “go-to” person for that topic and be the voice that people trust. You can brand yourself as an expert in your field and make your journal the one that others seek out and turn to.

- **Build a community**
Strengthen your community by making yourself available, reaching out, and sharing information with readers, authors, students, and peers. You form new connections, allow community members to meet one another, and create a deeper dialogue by increasing the number of voices.

- **Develop better ideas**
Armed with blogs, forums and social discussions, you get feedback on ideas before you spend any time developing them. You see what works, what people dislike, and what they want more of, so you can produce more
Social media

of what interests them and less of what puts them to sleep.

- Benefit your journal
Social media offers a venue to show off and talk about your journal in a friendly and informal way. You can highlight what you offer in normal conversation without coming across as too promotional or scientific. You also have the opportunity to answer questions and show journal features to find future readers, authors, or even editorial board members.

How to build a successful site

- Define goals/strategy
Ask yourself what you’re trying to accomplish, whether it be brand awareness, lead generation, manuscript submissions, readership, or more links to your website/content.

- Choose identity/message
Determine if you want to have a personal page or, perhaps, a journal-branded page. Whatever you choose, remember to represent your journal appropriately because you will be the voice behind your brand that is responsible for talking to people in the field.

- Select media
To determine which social platform is right for you, assess what kind of time commitment you are willing to make and what your goals are. For example, Twitter is less of a time commitment than blogging, whereas LinkedIn may be a better venue to connect with authors or future editorial board members.

- Engage
Expressing views or sharing feedback with friends is part of human nature and it’s important to facilitate that same interaction on your site. Avoid becoming a “product pusher” by talking only about yourself, and don’t over-automate by simply setting up a stream of RSS feeds. Social media is about relationship building, and it is your unique personality and insights that will interest the community.

- Assess your progress
Monitor not only how many fans and followers you have, but also how often people are clicking on, liking, retweeting, and subscribing to your content. Remember that engagement within your community over time will be what ultimately leads to longer-lifetime rewards like brand recognition, thought leadership, and loyalty among followers.

See page over for a summary of common social networking sites
## Social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Network</th>
<th>Time Involved</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Tips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Facebook (750 million users) | 2-3 posts per week | - Wall” is a great place to hold surveys to get feedback, or invite debates or discussions  
- “News feed” gains visibility among fans and their friends  
- “Like” and comment on peoples’ posts to build a community around your journal | - Link to journal articles, press coverage that your journal receives, or your blog or Twitter (if you have one)  
- Don’t simply self-promote and risk becoming a “product pusher” |
| Twitter (200 million users) | Tweet every day (140 characters or less) | - Tweeting regularly will help you achieve constant visibility in a fast-paced environment  
- Strengthen community interaction by providing a context for followers to meet each other and interact  
- Utilize comments and messages to develop better ideas | - Link to journal articles, press coverage that your journal receives, blog posts, relevant news stories, and retweet others  
- Send a message that you want to engage - follow people back and retweet others when appropriate |
| Blogging (55 million blogs) | At least one concise entry per week | - Communicate thought leadership on ever-changing industry trends and news  
- Easy for people to find you because blogs are crawled by search engines  
- Inviting feedback allows you to get ideas and build a community | - Post about current studies (and your take on them), interviews with people in the field, and link to your journal content (blogs often cite external resources)  
- Create an RSS feed to your blog so readers can easily “subscribe” to receive your posts |
| LinkedIn (120 million users) | 2-3 times per week | - Establish yourself as a thought leader by asking and answering question in “LinkedIn Answers”  
- Update your status, get noticed  
- Build a community around your journal, society, or industry by starting a LinkedIn Group and inviting members to join (also a great place to recruit authors and editorial board members) | - Start by leveraging your network with existing colleagues, friends, and contacts to find other people who work in your field  
- Leverage all of your social networks - connect your Twitter account and import your blog RSS feed |
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