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Wellcome Open Research

A new way for Wellcome-funded researchers to rapidly publish any results they think are worth sharing.
Wellcome Open Research: making the sharing of results….
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Data availability

Dataset 1 Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.16350618

Dataset 2 Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.26889919

The cumulative list of all scored phenotypes analysed in this study is presented in Dataset 1 (homozygous mutants) and Dataset 2 (wild type embryos). The intermediate and high level slims of the MP ontology used in the analysis are presented in Supplementary table 2 and Supplementary Table 3. All data used in this study is also available from the DMDD web site (https://dmdd.org.uk) where phenotype annotations are available in tabular format by embryo and by line. In addition, they are identified at their appropriate locations within each 3D dataset of embryo images, which can be viewed in all three orthogonal section planes.

Data & Software

- 104 Datasets in public repositories
- 62 Datasets in field-specific repositories
- 21 Software code entries
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**Article Processing Charges**

All content published on Wellcome Open Research is fully Open Access immediately on publication. The publication costs are covered through article processing charges, which are funded centrally by Wellcome. This means that researchers funded by Wellcome can publish on the platform without direct cost to them. Authors will only be asked to provide details of their Wellcome grant on submission.

Article processing charges levied by the service provider, F1000, are based on word counts (of the manuscript main body), irrespective of the article type. Wellcome is only charged a fee for submissions that pass the pre-publication checks and are published. Wellcome receives a 10% discount on F1000’s standard fees; this discount is included in the listed price.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD COUNT</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 1000 words (short article)</td>
<td>£116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-2500 words (medium article)</td>
<td>£387.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 2500 words (long article)</td>
<td>£775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average APC for Wellcome Open Research** - £830 (inc VAT)
**Average APC across all journals used by Wellcome authors** - £2044 (inc VAT)
Wellcome Open Research: a researcher-centric way of publishing

Researchers decide:
- What to share
- When to share
- Who is best placed to review it
- How to respond to reviewer comments
- When to update/revise an article
Wellcome Open Research: Year 1

- Published 142 articles; 100 of which indexed in PubMed
- Articles now indexed by Scopus
- 35 articles have at least one citation
- Most cited article is a data note (6 citations); most viewed article with over 3500 views is a method paper
Rise of funder platforms….

- Growing number of funder platforms – including Gates, Health Research Board, and others
- EC seeking to develop Open Research Europe
- Development of Open Research Central
  - Currently an aggregation service
  - In time, potentially a “funder agnostic” publishing platform
Questions?
ScienceOpen: Research in Context for UCL Press

UCL Town Hall, London 16 January 2018
@Science_Open  @SDawsonBerlin
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Global search environment

38 million research article records
18 million authors
25 thousand journals

Re-Search starts here: Unlock the context around each article and reach a wider interdisciplinary academic universe with ScienceOpen.
More than search: Context as a motor for discovery
The article: A hub of discovery and metrics

Article page:
- Citations
- Comments
- Linked authors
- Related collections
- Similar articles
- Altmetric score
- Read button (link to article on publisher site)

Computation and the Impact of New Technologies on the Photography of Architecture and Urbanism

Authors: Mitchell Schwarz, Dan Crandall,

Abstract

Over the course of history, the meanings of buildings have repeatedly been expanded and altered via the creation of technologically driven information realms. In this paper, we look at the ways in which the digital image may interact with our conceptualization of architectural forms and urban spaces. The paper explores historical and contemporary photographic practices, as well as the current technologies that influence and change the way we consume and interpret our urban environments.
ScienceOpen technical infrastructure underlying discovery environment

**Discovery**
- Similar articles
- Collection banners
- Lay summary

**Metrics**
- Usage dashboard
- Article metrics
- Journal statistics

**Authors**
- ORCID integration
- Statistics dashboard
- Networking

**Interaction**
- Commenting
- Recommendations
- Peer review
Publisher benefits from the ScienceOpen discovery technology:

- **Context:** Place your content in context of top articles in your field and beyond
- **Insight:** Understand how your content is used with ScienceOpen article and journal metrics
- **Usage:** Boost visibility with a link back to your version of record
- **Community:** Use ScienceOpen infrastructure to build communities around your journal
Beyond the journal webpage
Get found in dynamic search on ScienceOpen
A full suite of usage statistics on ScienceOpen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Altmetric</th>
<th>Reviews</th>
<th>Recommends</th>
<th>Shares</th>
<th>Followers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content in context**

Collection's content in context

**Publication statistics**

- Article count
- Article view count
- Average view count
- Share count
- Activity count (aggregated number of recommendations, reviews and comments)

**Article view count**

- 5,108 views
- 3,831 views
- 2,554 views
- 1,277 views

ScienceOpen Launchpad 1/17/2018
Public Post-Publication Review

Street Artist SAM3 Image via http://photovide.com/street-art-murals-world/
Open post-publication peer review mit ScienceOpen / Integration mit CrossRef, ORCID

Review by Lauren Collister

Lauren Collister evaluated the article as:

What are the benefits and drawbacks of using a smartphone app to crowdsource language change data?

- Publication date: 01 September 2016
- DOI: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-UNCAT.A4699763.v1.RIVXZU

- Level of importance: ★★★★★
- Level of validity: ★★★★★
- Level of completeness: ★★★★★
- Level of comprehensibility: ★★★★★

Competing interests: None

Recommend this review: +1 2 people recommend this

Comments

This project is an interesting one and provides a step into the logical next step of studying language change. Using crowd-sourcing via a mobile app available for iOS, the authors collected age and location data for Swiss German speakers and also collected their use of different variables. These data were compared to a 70-year-old dialectological survey of Swiss German to investigate language change.
Versioning on ScienceOpen

Reviews for article Version 2

- Review by John Smith
- Review by Alexander Doe

Reviews for article Version 1

- Review by Jason Barr
- Review by Pahlad Budrakim
- Review by Alexander Doe

Similar articles

Introducing a teaching module to impart communication skills in the learning anaesthesiologists
Authors: Vaijayanti Nitin Gadre, Kalpana Kelkar, Vidya Kelkar ...

Soft tissue profile in Anatolian Turkish adults: Part II. Comparison of different soft tissue analyses in the evaluation of beauty.
Authors: Cem M Caniklioglu, E Erbay

The Boring et al. study falls short of other studies investigating gender and student ratings.
Level of importance: ★★★★★
Level of validity: ★★★★★
Metadata

**Article:** Crossref DOI (with version)
**Author:** ORCID ID
**License:** Creative Commons, Machine-Readable
**Funding body/Grant #:** FundRef
**Affiliation:** Ringgold, GRID
**Data:** DOI Figshare, Zenodo, Dryad
Discovery depends on machine-readable metadata with persistent identifiers.
As an aggregator of information, ScienceOpen will continue to open up, share, add to and explore the context of scholarly research in support of open knowledge goals. Join us!

Contact: Stephanie.Dawson@ScienceOpen.com  
Twitter: @Science_Open, @SDawsonBerlin  
Facebook: www.facebook.com/ScienceOpen
Open Access since 2007

~18,000 peer-reviewed articles a year

Science, Technology & Medicine

A founding member of OASPA

✓ Free access – no charge to access

✓ No embargos – immediately available

✓ Reuse – Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY) - use with proper attribution
The scholarly journals market has undergone huge transformations in recent years; print subscriptions gave way to electronic distribution, the big deal (for better or worse) came to be the dominant business model used to purchase journals, and open access moved from a small radical movement to become a core part of a scholarly publishers journal strategy.

November 2016

Hindawi today announced the signing of a publishing partnership agreement with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). Hindawi will support AAAS by providing post-acceptance publishing services for AAAS’s new Science Partner Journal publishing program. AAAS anticipates its first partner journal will launch in early 2018. 
What is Open Science? It is endeavoring to preserve the rights of others to reach independent conclusions about your data and work.

8:47 PM - 5 Dec 2017
“Open science is about the way researchers work, collaborate, interact, share resources and disseminate results.

...will bring huge benefits for science itself, as well as for its connection with society."
“Current incentive structures in science, combined with existing conventions such as a significance level of 5%, encourage rational scientists to adopt a research strategy that is to the detriment of the advancement of scientific knowledge.”

Retraction trends

In same period, volume of papers increased by 44%

Is science (communication) trustworthy?

- Poorly Designed studies
  - small sample sizes, lack of randomisation, blinding and controls
- ‘p-hacking’ (selective analyses) widespread
- Poorly reported methods & results
- Negative/inconclusive results are not published
- Data not available to scrutinise/replicate

Does prestige ensure ‘quality’?

- Higher ranked journals have more papers retracted\(^1\)
- Papers in higher ranked journals are more likely to report either no or inappropriate statistics\(^2,3\)
- Papers from highly ranked institutions have poorer reporting standards\(^3\)

---


The biggest barrier to data sharing are the perverse incentives in the reward and evaluation systems that make authors reluctant to share:

- The primacy of publications and the journal as a proxy of quality with which to award grants and assign tenure (the impact factor…)
  - Financial bonuses
- Lack of reward for data and other outputs
  - Lack of transparency & poor reporting
  - Publication bias
“As competition for jobs and promotions increases, the inflated value given to publishing in a small number of so-called “high impact” journals has put pressure on authors to rush into print, cut corners, exaggerate their findings, and overstate the significance of their work.

Such publication practices, abetted by the hypercompetitive grant system and job market, are changing the atmosphere in many laboratories in disturbing ways.”
The Bullied Into Bad Science campaign is an initiative by early career researchers (ECRs) for early career researchers who aim for a fairer, more open and ethical research and publication environment. (University of Cambridge)

http://bulliedintobadscience.org/
Impact factors mask huge variation in citations - if you use it you are dishonest and statistically illiterate

@Stephen_Curry #COASP

COASP7 ‘Research and researcher evaluation’ (2015), Stephen Curry (Imperial College London) – available soon from OASPA website

Pride and Prejudice and journal citation distributions: final, peer reviewed version

Posted on September 12, 2016 by Stephen

Today sees the publication on bioRxiv of a revised version of our preprint outlining “A simple proposal for the publication of journal citation distributions.” Our proposal, explained in more detail in this earlier post, encourages publishers to mitigate the distorting effects on research assessment of journal impact factors (JIFs) by providing a simple method for publishing the citation distributions that are so incompletely characterized by the JIF.
Clinical trial registration: Looking back and moving ahead
(Published mid 2007)

New Eng. J. Med. 45 (53.298)
Lancet 24 (38.278)
J. Am. Med. Assoc. 21 (30.026)
Annals Int. Med. 11 (16.733)
Med. J. Aust. 1 (2.813)
Croat. Med. J. 9 (1.796)

Total citations until the end of 2011
(2011 Impact Factor)
Current culture embeds status quo

- Researchers gain from publishing in ‘designer’ journals
- Journals gain financially from their brand/ Journal Impact factor
- Institutions gain financially by hiring and firing based on where researchers publish, not on what they publish (or the mission of the University)
- Research assessment by funders often based on very few publications and brand/impact factor (some are changing)
- Entrenched sub-conscious bias
It's time for academics to take back control of research journals

The evolution into a highly-profitable industry was never planned. Academics must make the case for lower-cost journals.

“Publish or perish” has long been the mantra of academics seeking to make a success of their research career. Reputations are built on the ability to communicate something new to the world. Increasingly, however, they are determined by numbers, not by words, as universities are caught in a tangle of management targets composed of academic journal impact factors, university rankings and scores in the government’s research excellence framework.
“Readers [audience] should note that, in many jurisdictions, use of Sci-Hub may constitute copyright infringement. Users of Sci-Hub do so at their own risk. This study [and talk…] is not an endorsement of using Sci-Hub, and its authors and publishers accept no responsibility on behalf of readers.”

Publisher as service provider

- Encourage and facilitate better forms of credit
  - ORCID
  - CRediT taxonomy
  - Data / software citations
- Protocols
- Preprints
- Citation distributions
- Encourage data / software / materials sharing
- Provide high quality metadata
- Reduce friction
  - Enable connections and discovery
  - Adopt relevant persistent identifiers
  - Reduce the burden on researchers
  - Reduce the burden for funders and institutions
  - Enable a machine readable ecosystem
most of the data needed to support Open Science is controlled by commercial companies, both big and small. This growing reliance on a handful of companies to provide proprietary analytics and decision tools for research funders and universities poses serious risks for the future.
Open Access
Megajournal Project

Ian Caswell
Journals Manager, UCL Press
i.caswell@ucl.ac.uk
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‘Scholarly outputs are typically subjected to a publications process that limits their widespread dissemination. UCL is committed to being a force for good and enlightenment in the world. This includes ensuring that the products of its research are made as widely available as possible.’

Professor David Price, Vice Provost (Research), UCL
About UCL Press

56 fully peer reviewed books
Innovative publication in all subject areas

Over 700,000 downloads in over 200 countries
All publications made available open access
Our Aims for a UCL Press Megajournal

- Rapid publication
- Innovative open peer review
- Interdisciplinary collaboration and community driven
- Reduced administrative burdens
- Providing a home for diverse research outputs
Advantages of a new model at UCL Press

Open, transparent, and accountable | Diverse research outputs | Universal and unrestricted dissemination
Next steps

- Pilot
- Editorial board
- Open peer review
- Launch and further development

RESEARCH DOMAINS ENVIRONMENT
Our platform

See the UCL Press journals at
https://www.scienceopen.com/collection/UCLPress
Stay in touch and get involved, contact:
Ian Caswell
Journals Manager, UCL Press
i.caswell@ucl.ac.uk

Panel Q&A

Chair: Prof David Price, UCL Vice-Provost (Research)

Dr Paul Ayris, Pro-Vice-Provost (UCL Library Services)

Robert Kiley, Wellcome Trust

Stephanie Dawson, ScienceOpen

Catriona MacCallum, Hindawi

Ian Caswell, UCL Press

Source: www.phdcomics.com