




# Open Science dalla A alla Z

Elena Giglia



Roma, 4 ottobre 2018

[elena.giglia@unito.it](mailto:elena.giglia@unito.it)



Perché siamo qui

SE NON SI RAGIONA SUL  
REALE VALORE E IL POTENZIALE TRASFORMATIVO  
DELLA OPEN SCIENCE, LA VEDRETE SOLO COME  
L'ENNESIMO FARDELLO AMMINISTRATIVO

...per farci due domande, anzi tre

- 1) La comunicazione scientifica oggi: funziona?
- 2) L'alternativa Open: cos'è?
- 3) Come si fa Open Access e Open Science in pratica?

# Qualcosa da portare via

Open Access/Open Science è un'opportunità,  
non una minaccia



Jon Tennant ✓  
@Protohedgehog

Following

My first talk of the year! Message is going to be that the opposite of 'open science' isn't 'closed science' - it's bad science.


...il contrario di Open Science è  
«Bad Science», non «Closed Science»

...fare Open Access e farlo correttamente è molto semplice...

...si può fare Open Access nonostante VQR, ASN...

...si può fare Open Science a piccoli passi, non «tutto e subito»

Open Science e Open Innovation hanno un legame stretto



...il migliore esempio di Open Science?




There are

no strangers here  
you haven't met yet!

just friend

Open Access? Open Science?  
...concetti ancora «stranieri», ma forse conviene  
spendere un po' per conoscerli meglio...



# Open Science: non «SE» ma «QUANDO»



@egiglia: #openscience is irreversible JC Burgelman in Venice on #opendata stewardship

Traduci dalla lingua originale: inglese

**Irreversible**

- Digital technologies
- Exponential growth of data
- More researchers and research institutions
- Increase in the scientific production
- Grand Challenges
- Expectations and involvement of citizens
- Accountability, responsiveness and transparency
- Digital "natives"

J.C.Burgelman Nov. 2016



Wilma van Wezenbeek  
@wanwezenbeek

Following

#osc2018 @BurgelmanJean "2018 is the year of no return in #openscience"

Traduci il Tweet

10:32 - 13 mar 2018

9 Retweet 18 Mi piace



1

9

<https://twitter.com/wanwezenbeek/status/973491971288391680>



## NON SI TORNA INDIETRO

Whose side are you on?

**DOVEVANNNO**  
**Le NUVOLE**  
REGIA MASSIMO FERRARI

[when the wind of changes blows, some people build walls, some people build windmills]

Quando soffia il VENTO del CAMBIAMENTO

c'è chi costruisce MURI

e chi MULINI A VENTO



# Open Science



Casper Albers

@CaAl

New preprint. Comments welcome

Valid reasons not to participate in open science practices

Casper J. Albers\*

#### Abstract

The past years have seen a sharp increase in the attention for open science practices. Such practices include pre-registration and registered reports, sharing of materials, open access publishing and attention to reproducibility of research. Despite the overwhelming amount of evidence highlighting the benefits of open science, some researchers remain reluctant. In this paper, I will outline valid reasons for researchers not to participate in open science practices.

#### Discussion

There are no valid reasons.

\*Heymans Institute for Psychological Research, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands. c.j.albers@rug.nl

03:54 - 21 feb 2018

<https://twitter.com/CaAl/status/966279>

471 Retweet 990 Mi piace



# Valid reasons not to participate in open science practices

Casper J. Albers\*

#### Abstract

The past years have seen a sharp increase in the attention for open science practices. Such practices include pre-registration and registered reports, sharing of materials, open access publishing and attention to reproducibility of research. Despite the overwhelming amount of evidence highlighting the benefits of open science, some researchers remain reluctant. In this paper, I will outline valid reasons for researchers not to participate in open science practices.

#### Discussion

There are no valid reasons.

\*Heymans Institute for Psychological Research, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands. c.j.albers@rug.nl





...grazie per l'attenzione!

# Underground

Institute for  
New Economic Thinking

Jan. 2018

Young Scholars Initiative Commission

About Research Commentary Education Events Donate

BLOG VIDEOS COLLECTIONS

## How Pseudoscientific Rankings Are Distorting Research

By Alberto Baccini and Giuseppe De Nicolao

JAN 18, 2018 PUBLIC & PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS INSTITUTIONS, POLICY & POLITICS



ROARS.IT

46 riviste di filosofia lanciano l'attacco contro la classe A di Anvur

Sept. 17, 2018

Feb. 2018

Giuseppe De Nicolao ha condiviso un link nel gruppo: ROARS

ostro articolo sui Competence  
nda affonda i Politecnici di Milano  
Federico II. Con l'aiuto di Anvur),  
ter: "Notizia falsa derivante da  
quella roba assurda che è la  
ittimati a partecipare". Calenda  
merito. Tuttavia, non esita a  
lla roba assurda», uno sfogo che  
articolo. Ovvero che, come  
si, ex-presidente dell'agenzia di  
e classifiche di Anvur "non deve  
nza per rappresentare la reale  
diamo un chiarimento che entri  
esentato, sorge spontanea una  
ui stesso è convinto che le  
», per quale ragione il suo

Ministero ha deciso di impiegarle per scremare gli atenei che faranno domanda per i finanziamenti destinati ai Competence Centers Industria 4.0?

P.S. Il costo di "quella roba assurda" è non meno di 150 milioni di Euro, una cifra quasi quattro volte maggiore dei 40 milioni stanziati per i Competence Centers.

Feb.20, 2017



Finanziamento VQR - Waiting for VQR

La VQR? Uno spreco. Il premio vale 58 MLN, la gara ne costa almeno 30



Anche per Calenda la classifica Anvur è «roba assurda». Perché la usa nel bando Industria 4.0, allora?

...mentre in Italia c'è ANVUR, fuori il mondo sta cambiando...

Three golden retriever puppies are sitting on a red tiled floor. The puppy on the left is looking towards the camera. The middle puppy is looking slightly to the right. The puppy on the right is looking towards the camera. The text 'Occhi nuovi' is overlaid in the top left corner.

Occhi nuovi

...proviamo per oggi a vedere la ricerca e la comunicazione scientifica in modo diverso...

# Comunicazione scientifica è ...

Accesso

CONSERVAZIONE

GESTIONE DEI DIRITTI  
(autori, lettori,  
editori)

Produzione

Economia  
(e profitti)

Costi

(reali e di mercato – «anelastico»)

Tecnologia

Nuovi modelli  
(e loro sostenibilità)

Canali  
(monografie, riviste...)

VALUTAZIONE  
DELLA RICERCA

# Comunicazione scientifica: le funzioni


**REGISTRATION**

[Impact Factor]

**CERTIFICATION**

**REWARD**

Publishing Feb. 22, 2018



*most papers have more authors than readers  
half the literature is never cited*

<https://twitter.com/eggernsf/status/966650401088000002>

**AWARENESS**

**ARCHIVING**

# Il meccanismo nelle riviste



Submission

Peer review

Acceptance/  
rejection

Publication

non c'è compenso  
economico

...ritorno  
atteso:  
reputazione,  
citazioni



# 101 INNOVATIONS IN SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

Jeroen Bosman @jeroenbosman  
Utrecht University Library

## Most important developments in 6 research workflow phases

Science is in transition. This post phase of a project aiming to char communication flows from evolut


	Discovery	Analysis	Writing	Publication	Outreach	Assessment
Trends	social discovery tools	datadriven & crowdsourced science	collaborative online writing	Open Access & data publication	scholarly social media	article level (alt)metrics
Expectations	growing importance of data discovery	more online analysis tools	more integration with publication & assessment tools	more use of "publish first, judge later"	use of altmetrics for monitoring outreach	more open and post-publication peer review
Uncertainties	support for full-text search and text mining	willingness to share in analysis phase	acceptance of collaborative online writing	effect of journal/publisher status	requirements of funders & institutions	who pays for costly qualitative assessment?
Opportunities	discovery based on aggregated OA full text	open labnotes	semantic tagging while writing/citing	reader-side paper formatting	using repositories for institutional visibility	using author-, publication- and affiliation-IDs
Challenges				globalization of	making outreach a two-way discussion	quality of measuring tools

600 innovative tools and si (< 2

Most important developments  
Potential disruptive d

Torino  
8 e 9 marzo  
[Report]

https://101innovations.wordpress.com/  
Survey of scholarly communication tool usage



# Comunicazione scientifica oggi, ovvero...

**We spend 1/3 of the total global  
research budget (~£59/175bn) on  
publishing & communicating results  
that 99% of people cannot access.**




Jon Tennant, *Barriers for Young Researchers*, 7 Sept 2017

... paghiamo gli editori commerciali perché  
mettano sotto chiave il nostro contenuto...



# Comunicazione scientifica oggi, ovvero...



A screenshot of a tweet from Jennifer Hansen (@HansenJen) posted on May 27, 2018. The tweet discusses the issue of scientific research accessibility during crises. It includes a quote from Robert Kiley (@robertkiley) who references the Wellcome Open Research platform. The tweet has 2 retweets and 2 likes. The background of the image is a church interior with pews and a golden altar.


**Jennifer Hansen** @HansenJen [Segui](#)

It's ridiculous that research continues to be inaccessible and the community has to plea to share it when a crisis arises. Accessibility without barrier or restriction should be the norm. I have hope we'll get there, though!

**Robert Kiley** @robertkiley  
The @wellcome calls for open access on Ebola and encourages its researchers to use the @WellcomeOpenRes platform.  
See: [researchprofessional.com/0/rr/news/afri...](https://researchprofessional.com/0/rr/news/afri...)

Traduci il Tweet

18:12 - 27 mag 2018

2 Retweet 2 Mi piace 

<https://twitter.com/HansenJen/status/1000771695026700288>

... paghiamo gli editori commerciali perché mettano sotto chiave il nostro contenuto...

... e paghiamo non poco, per incatenare la conoscenza...



**Peter Suber**

@petersuber

May 13, 2018

The Taylor & Francis journal \_Medical Teacher\_ just published a 5-paragraph (comment on another article.

[doi.org/10.1080/014215 ...](https://doi.org/10.1080/014215...)

For 24 hrs of access to the comment charges \$54. For 30 days of access to the issue in which the comment appears, it charges \$526.

Traduci il Tweet



**Response to article: "Social-media-enabled learning in emergency medicine: A case study of the growth, engagement and impact of a free open access medical education blog".**

(2018). Response to article: "Social-media-enabled learning in emergency medicine: A case study of the growth, engagement and impact of a free open access medical education blog". *Medical Education*



**Jon Tennant**

@Protohedgehog


Following

The smartest business model ever. Have all of your products and services performed for free by researchers, and then sell it back to them with an unholy markup. Try describing the model to a non-researcher, and they mock us for falling for it.

<https://twitter.com/Protohedgehog/status/98543931889741004...>

**Steven Salzberg** @StevenSalzberg1

Nature and other Springer journals make all of their money from free labor provided by scientists, who write all the papers and do all of the peer review. And now they are cashing in: "Springer Nature aims to raise 1.2 billion euros in new money in IPO" [reut.rs/2qqhp93](https://reut.rs/2qqhp93)



Place a Jon Tennant e Bastian Greshake Tzovaras

Matthew Hankins @mc\_hankins · 14 ago

REVIEWERS: The next time you get a reminder from an Elsevier journal about a late review, simply cut and paste the response below

mrgunn @mrgunn

In risposta a @bmwiernik, @ashleydfarley e @dgmacarthur


Give me a break, it was the weekend! I'm just tired of people acting like they deserve free stuff.

Aug. 14, 2018

For researchers, it's like going to a restaurant, bringing all of your own ingredients, cooking the meal yourself, and then being charged \$40 for a waiter to bring it out on a plate for you.

You are the provider, the product, and the consumer.

Jon Tennant, Open Science: just science done right, Sept.



WHY SHOULD YOU PAY TO READ THEM ?

www.plos.org


ALLORA, CARI MIEI NERD...  
IL MODELLO DI BUSINESS  
E' MOLTO SEMPLICE

VOI MI DATE I FRUTTI DEL  
VOSTRO LAVORO GRATIS

VERIFICATE LA LORO  
QUALITA' GRATIS

E ALLA FINE MI PAGATE  
PER POTERVI  
ACCEDERE

CAPITO?!



traduzione: Simone Aliprandi

[https://pbs.twimg.com/media/DO\\_4mzHW0AE9eX3.jpg](https://pbs.twimg.com/media/DO_4mzHW0AE9eX3.jpg)

PEDROMICS

... è «comunicazione»

SEP 9, 2017 @ 11:56 AM 1,527

## The Future Of Academic Publishing Beyond Sci-Hub



GUEST POST WRITTEN BY

G. Geltner



G. Geltner is a historian at the University of Amsterdam. You can visit his blog at [www.guygeltner.net](http://www.guygeltner.net)

If you have a pressing need to read an academic paper that's hiding the quickest course of action may well be to use Sci-Hub. Less myopically, the paper's authors why they continue to cooperate with those for-profit publishers whose high prices have made breaking the law your path of least resistance (ignorance, careerism, apathy, lack of alternatives?). You may also want to inquire with your local government or university how much they spend a year subscribing to journals that contain their own tax-paying citizens' and salaried employees' research (millions), how these terms were negotiated (in secret, sometimes at the publishers' insistence), what impact that has on the free exchange of ideas (devastating), and whether that is a responsible way of spending public funds (hardly).

How did we get and universities desktop published rendered some could still boast

on scholars' conservatism and addiction to prestige, and cashing in on institutional inertia, they not only weathered the storm but in fact became the global gatekeepers of academic research. Instead of disappearing into thin air, conglomerates specializing in academic publishing, including Elsevier, Sage, Springer, Wiley-Blackwell and Taylor & Francis, began charging increasingly higher fees, which are currently estimated at \$10 billion annually.

These and other publishers, including some major university presses, may have shielded and even increased their revenue streams, but they couldn't solve the basic problem. Embargoing the results of research, which is often funded by taxpayers' money, is not only inherently anti-academic, it also reinforces social and global inequalities, with devastating consequences to scientists and the public at large. The tiny club benefiting from huge subscription and processing fees has created, sometimes with the willing consent of academics, a situation whereby universities and governments are buying access to their own scholars' work (including in the form of peer review and editorship) at prices even Harvard can't afford.



# Accesso?



12 marzo: Thomson Reuters, Elsevier, Nature mettono a disposizione gratuitamente i dati e le pubblicazioni su contaminazione nucleare

...che fino al 10 marzo erano chiuse dietro abbonamenti a riviste che nemmeno Harvard può più permettersi...



**Joanne Kamens** ✓  
@JKamens

Segui

In risposta a @jasonpriem e @unpaywall

and btw the "everyone who needs it has access" is completely wrong. I have worked in small biotechs for the last 10 years and hit frustrating paywalls EVERY DAY trying to do good science.

Traduci dalla lingua originale: inglese

15:14 - 4 gen 2018

<https://twitter.com/JKamens/status/948920680590004224>

A screenshot of the Harvard University website. The top left features the Harvard University logo and name. Below it, the text 'THE HARVARD LIBRARY' is displayed. A 'News' section is visible, with a 'News Archive' sidebar listing various articles. The main article is titled 'Faculty Advisory Council Memorandum on Journal Pricing' and is dated April 17, 2012. The article's content discusses the unsustainable situation of journal pricing for the Harvard Library and mentions that Harvard's annual cost for journals from certain providers now approaches \$3.75M.

# Access Scientists should be solving problems, not struggling to access journals

Higher Education Network

It takes an average of 15 clicks for a researcher to find and access a journal article. This time could be much better spent

*Benjamin Kaube*

Mon 21 May 2018 07:30 BST

May 21, 2018

Open access outside academia

Anisha Ahmed



Anne Baber Wallis  
@abwallis

Segui

In risposta a @glynmoody, @edrybicki e @graysouth

I'm an academic and so-called pay walls are irrelevant. We have an excellent library w/access to 1000s of journals via PubMed. There's nothing wrong w/jnl subscriber fees & it wouldn't change 11,000 deaths or the bat hypothesis. 🦇

Traduci il Tweet


12:54 - 7 mar 2018 da Jeffersontown, KY

In risposta a @abwallis, @glynmoody e altri 2

You may have excellent access, but many in the US and around the world don't. Your library spends ~7 million on serials, having lost ~2 million in budget for serials in recent years. Just because a problem doesn't personally impact you, doesn't mean it isn't a problem.

Interestingly, there was a false understanding of scholarly publishing, with research participants believing that articles were paywalled so as to allow the author/ researcher to recuperate their costs themselves. (rather than the publisher profiteering!)

# ... se no, non esisterebbe Sci-Hub



The Scientist » News & Opinion » Daily News  
**American Chemical Society Wins Lawsuit Against Sci-Hub**

**Bernard Rentier** @bernardrentier  
Following

The single fact that providing free information on universal Science is illegal tells us a lot about how absurd it has become, in the Internet era, to rely on the old research publication model. [#FreeOpenAccessNow](#)

**Jon Tennant** @Protohedgehog  
Oh wow. Looks like anyone can now create their own @sci\_hub mirror [github.com/bsidio/sci-hub](https://github.com/bsidio/sci-hub) You can use this to help accelerate research and society by providing free access to millions of research articles. But it's probably illegal, so don't do it.



Traduci il Tweet

08:37 - 10 mag 2018

March 10, 2018

**Preprint** **NOT PEER-REVIEWED**  
"PeerJ Preprints" is a venue for early communication or feedback before peer review. Data may be preliminary.  
[Learn more about preprints or browse peer-reviewed articles instead.](#)

## Sci-Hub provides access to nearly all scholarly literature

Scientific publishing is a rip-off. We fund the research - it should be free

*George Monbiot*



Those who take on the global industry that traps research behind paywalls are heroes, not thieves

in more detail. Finally,  
provided access for 99  
e **suggests the subscrip**  
ne, the overwhelming m  
Internet connection.



**Bianca Gai** In realtà è illegale da sempre. Io per es. idealmente appoggio la sua fondatrice ma non apprezzo il comportamento di alcuni ricercatori che prima pubblicano su riviste chiuse e costosissime rinunciando a tutti i diritti di riproduzione e tanto poi usano sci-hub. Siccome gli abbonamenti (milioni di euro in italia) li paghiamo con i soldi pubblici si danneggia molto la collettività. La soluzione x me è l'open access nativo senza passare dai grandi editori.

Mi piace · Rispondi · 6 g

<https://peerj.com/preprints/5100/>

# [come ottenere il pdf se non avete abbonamento]

## HOW TO GET THE PDF?

Alternatives to the publisher version of full-text journal articles

updated: February 20, 2018

- 1 UNPAYWALL**  
Get full-text of research papers as you browse, using Unpaywall's index of 10 million legal, open access articles. For CHROME | Firefox <http://unpaywall.org/> 
- 2 GOOGLE SCHOLAR BUTTON**  
Easy access to Google Scholar from any web page. Find full text on the web or in your university library. Select the title of the paper on the page you're reading, and click the Scholar button to find it. for CHROME | Firefox <https://address.newlib.it/a/11970w/ed00/google-scholar-button/> 
- 3 KOPERNIO**  
Get instant notifications of available versions from your library or otherwise. Promising features like a personal Locker, saved articles and more. <https://kopernio.com/> 
- 4 OPEN ACCESS BUTTON**  
Free, legal research articles and data delivered instantly or automatically requested from authors. You can do this from the website, or install a browser extension/API. <https://openaccessbutton.org/> 
- 5 HASHTAG #ICANHAZPDF**  
Use the hashtag #icanhazpdf together with a link to the requested publication; if somebody has access, they can send you the PDF. <https://twitter.com/search?q=%23icanhazpdf> 

## HOW TO GET THE PDF?

Alternatives to the publisher version of full-text journal articles

- 8 NARCIS**  
NARCIS provides access to scientific information, including open access publications from the repositories of all the Dutch universities, KNAW, NWO and a number of research institutes, datasets from some data archives as well as descriptions of research projects, researchers and research institutes. <http://www.narcis.nl/>
- 9 OSF PREPRINTS**  
OSF offers access to over 2 million open access preprints. <https://osf.io/preprint/>
- 10 DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS**  
DOAJ offers access to over 10,000 open access journals. <https://doaj.org/>
- 11 SCIENCE OPEN**  
Science Open contains over 37 million articles, a large part in open access. <http://www.scienceopen.com/> 
- 12 SCI-HUB**  
If all else fails, you may be tempted to use Sci-Hub. Do realize, however, that in many countries, including The Netherlands, the use of Sci-Hub is considered as an illegal act, as it involves content protected by copyright laws and licensing contracts.

open access.nl News and events What is open access? In the Netherlands You

## Alternative ways to access journal articles

Feb. 27, 2018


unpaywall

## Unpaywall ovviamente funziona SOLO se l'autore ha depositato

An open database of 17.025.907 free scholarly articles.

We harvest Open Access content from over 50,000 publishers and repositories, and make it easy to find, track, and use.

LEARN MORE GET THE EXTENSION





... ma, almeno, funziona?

The international publishing system is broken!

unsustainable prices

big deal lock-in

publication biases

flawed quality and impact measures

publisher consolidation across the lifecycle

K.Shearer, Next gen repositories, 6 Sept. 2017



**Bernard Rentier**  
@bernardrentier

Following

The single fact that providing free information on universal Science is illegal tells us a lot about how absurd it has become, in the Internet era, to rely on the old research publication model. [#FreeOpenAccessNow](#)

**Jon Tennant** @Protohedgehog

Oh wow. Looks like anyone can now create their own @sci\_hub mirror [github.com/bsidio/sci-hub](https://github.com/bsidio/sci-hub) You can use this to help accelerate research and society by providing free access to millions of research articles. But it's probably illegal, so don't do it.

Traduci il Tweet

08:37 - 10 mag 2018

March 10, 2018

theguardian

The long read

# The hi-tech war on science fraud

The problem of fake data may go far deeper than scientists admit. Now a team of researchers has a controversial plan to root out the perpetrators

Hartgerink is one of only a handful of researchers in on the problem of scientific fraud - and he is perfectly happy to upset his peers.

"The scientific system as we know it is pretty screwed up," he told me last

# «sistema disfunzionale»..

 **ann viera**  
@annviera Segui

Yes! Recommended @petermurrayrust interview "So we've got an incredibly dysfunctional system which was never designed." [library.illinois.edu/scp/podcast/pe...](http://library.illinois.edu/scp/podcast/pe...) "So universities have got to wake up to the fact that this is the wrong way to doing things, and it's unjust. "

**Heather Joseph** @hjoseph  
We \*have\* to keep pushing for alternatives to commercial dominance of scholarly publishing - it IS having a profound effect. Take back ownership of our outputs & do not simply replace one bad biz model (subscriptions) with another (APC dominance) [uk.reuters.com/article/uk-spr...](http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-spr...)

Traduci il Tweet

05:01 - 9 mag 2018

8 Retweet 7 Mi piace 

<https://twitter.com/annviera/status/994049576540819456>

ABOUT ▾ LIBRARIES & HOURS ▾ USIR

 **UNIVERSITY LIBRARY**  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

**Scholarly Communication and Publishing**

Home About SC&P ▾ Copyright ▾ Repositories Open Access Policy ▾ Di


Scholarly Communication and Publishing > Peter Murray-Rust Explains ContentMine and the Open Access Universe

Peter Murray-Rust Explains ContentMine and the Open Access Universe

Posted on May 7, 2018 by Sara Benson

00:00


Download file | Play in new window | Leave a review



May 7, 2018

# ... la rapidità di pubblicazione?

Tempi medi di pubblicazione su rivista per disciplina



... da 9 a 18 mesi...

# ... e la garanzia della peer review?

<https://retractionwatch.com/>

## Retraction Watch

Tracking retractions as a window into the scientific process

## The Retraction Watch Leaderboard

Who has the most retractions on methodology), which to light:

1. Yoshitaka Fujii (total retractions)

### No academic post for fraudster Diederik Stapel, after all

Recently, we reported that social psychologist and renowned data faker Diederik Stapel had found himself a new gig supporting research at



Scoperto da un PhD che ha chiesto i dati originali

*De Telegraaf*: [Continue reading](#) →

### Paper used to support WHO guidelines on preventing infections “has no scientific validity”

March 26, 2018

A surgery journal retracted a 2014 paper last month after discovering that the study has “no scientific validity.”



Mario Schietroma and his coauthors, based at

### Stem cell researchers investigated for misconduct recommended for roles at Italy’s NIH

March 14, 2018

Two stem cell scientists who left Harvard University in the aftermath of a messy misconduct investigation may have found new roles in Italy’s National Institute of Health.



Piero Anversa

According to a document on the institute’s website, which we had translated, Piero Anversa and Annarosa Leri have been approved to start work at the Istituto Superiore di Sanità (ISS) by the institute’s board of directors. However, the

## How the Biggest Fabricator in Science Caught

*Yoshitaka Fujii falsified 183 papers before statistics exposed him.*

BY ADAM MARCUS & IVAN ORANSKY  
ILLUSTRATION BY LOUISA BERTMAN  
MAY 21, 2015

The document says the board unanimously recommended the appointments of Anversa and Leri on January 31 as winning candidates with “a rating of ‘excellent.’”

with a rating of excellent.

# ... e la garanzia della peer review?

Table 3. Most cited retracted articles


First author	Journal	Year published	Year retracted	Times cited*	Reason for retraction
Wakefield	<i>Lancet</i>	1998	2004; 2010	758	Fraud
Reyes	<i>Blood</i>	2001	2009	740	Error
Fukuhara	<i>Science</i>	2005	2007	686	Error
Nakao	<i>Lancet</i>	2003	2009	626	Fraud
Chang	<i>Science</i>	2001	2006	512	Fraud
Kugler	<i>Nature Medicine</i>	2000	2003	494	Fraud
Rubio	<i>Cancer Research</i>	2005	2010	457	Fraud
Gowen	<i>Science</i>	1998	2003	395	Fraud
Makarova	<i>Nature</i>	2001	2006	375	Fraud
Hwang	<i>Science</i>	2004	2006	368	Fraud
Potti	<i>The New England Journal of Medicine</i>	2006	2011	361	Fraud
Brugger	<i>The New England Journal of Medicine</i>	1995	2001	336	Fraud
Van Parijs	<i>Immunity</i>				
Potti	<i>Nature Medicine</i>				
Schön	<i>Science</i>				
Chiu	<i>Nature</i>				
Cooper	<i>Science</i>				
Le Page	<i>Cell</i>				
Kawasaki	<i>Nature</i>				
Hwang	<i>Science</i>				

\*As of June 22, 2012.

[www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1212247109](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1212247109)

an cancer specialist facing  
 final investigation for  
 conduct  
 March 10, 2018

Fusco's work is highly cited, with some 50 papers cited at least 100 times, according to Thomson Scientific's Web of Knowledge.



Fang, Casadevall 2011

# ... e la garanzia della peer review?

## Does scientific misconduct cause patient harm? The case of Joachim Boldt

If you wanted to minimize the real-life effects of misconduct, you might note that some of the retractions we cover are in tiny obscure journals hardly anyone reads. But a new meta-analysis and editorial in JAMA



NCBI Resources How To  
PubMed  
152 National Library of Medicine  
**RETRACTED ARTICLE**  
See: [Retraction Notice](#)  
Anesth Analg. 1996 Aug;83(2):254-61.  
**The effects of albumin versus hydroxyethyl starch solution on cardiorespiratory and circulatory variables in critically ill patients.**  
Boldt J<sup>1</sup>, Heesen M, Müller M, Pabsdorf M, Hempelmann G.

97 ritrattazioni.  
Se si escludono questi studi, la revisione sistematica mostra un aumentato rischio di morte e problemi ai reni

2013

*After exclusion of the studies by Boldt et al, Zarychanski et al found that hydroxyethyl starch was associated with a significantly increased risk of mortality (risk ratio [RR], 1.09; 95% CI, 1.02-1.17) and renal failure (RR, 1.27; 95% CI 1.09-1.47).*

In other words, there was an increased risk of death and kidney failure among those given HES:

*The report by Zarychanski et al highlights the potentially important and adverse effect of scientific misconduct.*

# [fake news, fake data...]

The man behind all this controversy was a 25-year-old Dutch scientist named Chris Hartgerink, based at Tilburg University's Meta-Research Center, which studies bias and error in science. Statcheck was the brainchild of Hartgerink's colleague Michèle Nuijten, who had used the program to conduct a 2015 study that demonstrated that about half of all papers in psychology journals contained statistical error. Nuijten's study was written up in Nature as a valuable contribution to the growing literature acknowledging bias and error in science - but she had not published an inventory of the specific errors it had detected, or

The long read

## The hi-tech war on science fraud

The problem of fake data may go far deeper than scientists admit. Now a team of researchers has a controversial plan to root out the perpetrators

by Stephen Buranyi

“Statcheck is a good example of what is now possible,” he said. The top priority, for Hartgerink, is something much more grave than correcting simple statistical miscalculations. He is now proposing to deploy a similar program that will uncover fake or manipulated results - which he believes are far more prevalent than most scientists would like to admit.

The Guardian, Feb. 2017

When it comes to fraud - or in the more neutral terms he prefers, “scientific misconduct” - Hartgerink is aware that he is venturing into sensitive territory. “It is not something people enjoy talking about,” he told me, with a weary grin. Despite its professed commitment to self-correction, science is a discipline that relies mainly on a culture of mutual trust and good faith to stay clean. Talking about its faults can feel like a kind of heresy. In 1981, when a young Al Gore led a congressional inquiry into a spate of recent cases of scientific fraud in biomedicine, the historian Daniel Kevles observed that “for Gore and for many others, fraud in the biomedical sciences was akin to pederasty among priests”.

# [un gigante coi piedi di sabbia?]

the guardian

## Cut-throat academia leads to 'natural selection of bad science', claims study

Scientists incentivised to publish surprising results frequently in major journals, despite risk that such findings are likely to be wrong, suggests research




The study's authors say that while academics are rewarded for publishing novel work often and in high-profile journals, bad scientific practice will 'run rampant'. Photograph: Ben Broomfield for the Guardian

<https://goo.gl/IUb5WZ>

In which journal underlying

most prestigious journals. However, data from several lines of scientific experiments does not increase with increasing rank of the body of evidence suggests the inverse: methodological quality works in several fields may be decreasing with increasing journal rank to circumvent confounding factors such as increased readership. Quantifiable indicators of methodological soundness in the last decade grew the realization that the very existence of publication bias constitutes one of the major threats to publicly funded science. publish unreliable science eventually erodes public trust in science.



Jeroen Bosman ha ritwittato

**Rebecca Willén** @rmwillen · 13 set

Senior professor after my keynote today: "That slide is awful, you make people lose trust in science. They are practitioners, you can't do this to them!"

Early career researchers / practitioners after same keynote: "Such a great & important presentation! I feel very inspired!"

Traduci il Tweet



La qualità degli studi **DECRESCA** al crescere del ranking

frontiers in Human Neuroscience

REVIEW ARTICLE  
Front. Hum. Neurosci., 20 February 2018 | 1

## Prestigious Science Journals Struggle to Reach Even Average Reliability

Björn Brembs\*

Institute of Zoology—Neurogenetics, Universität Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany

Feb. 20 2018



# ... e il prestigio dell'Impact Factor? / 1

**jadranka stojanovski** @jaca99 Segui

Everyone using impact factor is statistically illiterate, @Protohedgehog at #osfair2017

00:59 - 7 set 2017


10 Retweet 16 Mi piace

@Gr@h@M Steel @McDawg - 7 set  
In risposta a @jaca99

[occamstypewriter.org/scurry/2012/08/13/sick-of-impact-factors/](http://occamstypewriter.org/scurry/2012/08/13/sick-of-impact-factors/)

## The Impact Factor is a bullshit statistic

J.Tennant Barriers for young researchers, 7 Sept 2017



is imposed by a very small number of highly cited papers

Total Cites  
20020  
Source Data

in: 2001 = 528  
2000 = 504  
Sum: 1032

2003 CR Science Edition

Journal: CURRENT BIOLOGY

Mark	Journal Title	ISSN	Total Cites	Impact Factor	Immediacy Index	Citable Items	Cited Half-life	Citing Half-life
<input type="checkbox"/>	CURR BIOL	0960-9822	22589	11.910	2.683	331	3.8	4.0

Journal Impact Factor

Cites in 2003 to items published in: 2002 = 3628  
2001 = 3923  
Sum: 7551


Number of items published in: 2002 = 334  
2001 = 300  
Sum: 634

Calculation: Cites to recent items / Number of recent items = 7551 / 634 = 11.910

oni nell'anno X  
sciti in anni X-1 e X-2

rticoli «citabili»  
negli anni X-1 e X-2

# ... e il prestigio dell'Impact Factor? / 2




Times Higher Education, 5 Nov 2015

## Journal impact factors 'no longer credible'

The measure of scholarly impact is now being manipulated so much that it has ceased to be editorial claims

November 5, 2015

By David Matthews Twitter: @DavidM10urns



The problem is cyclical if you think about it: publishers use the impact factor to appeal to researchers, researchers use the impact factor to justify their publishing decisions, and funders sit at the top of the triangle facilitating the whole thing. One 'chef' of the Kitchen piped in by saying that publishers recognise the problems, but still have to

<http://blog.scienceopen.com/2016/04/how-can-academia-kick-its-addiction-to-the-impact-factor/>

# ... e la valutazione? «Osessione»

“Why do we do science? It’s not to create careers for scientists. It’s to increase knowledge for the benefit of mankind. If the need to sustain the careers of young scientists is getting in the way of the primary objective of science there is something wrong in the way in which we organise and motivate those careers.”

Goodhart’s Law: “when a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure.”

Metrics are subject to manipulation, so we should look carefully not only at the number, but what it is that number purports to measure.

“Not only are we failing to provide the right incentives, we are actually providing perverse ones.”

As long as journal impact factors retain some role in the career development, journals should publish the distribution of their citations. The participants strongly supported the adoption of the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) by publishers, funders and universities. There was a call for open citation data (rather than having to

“Getting away from this obsession with measurement and going back to judgement might be a way forward.”

“People game the system at every level and this risks the loss of valuable research in favour of fashionable research.”

# [ma cosa si misura???

So what now? We think this work clearly highlights a major issue with metrics – they aren't measuring what everyone commonly assumes we are measuring, or at least, are not accurately representing the more abstract perceptions of impact and importance that we measured in our survey.

As hinted earlier, we think our research shows that impact goes beyond citation count, and beyond scholarly impact. Recent articles, such as that in *PLoS Biology* and *Nature*, also call out current evaluation models for researchers. But what can we do to change current practice?



Home About Latest Our books Series

## The academic papers researchers regard that are highly cited




For many years, academia has measured the impact or importance of research using metrics like the Impact Factor and the h-index. Our survey asks researchers to align with their subjective perceptions of what makes a paper important. **Rachel Borchardt and Matthew**

compares researchers' perceptions of significance, importance, and impact with citation data. The results reveal a strikingly large discrepancy between the metric we currently use to measure it.

Academia, we have a problem. What began as an attempt to measure research from us and taken on a life of its own. This problem isn't just being talked about by scholars and researchers and, as a result, is being talked


May 14, 2018

Times Chosen in Survey  
**Shared Widely**



Citations (2013)


Times Chosen in Survey  
**Most Significant**



Citations (2013)


Times Chosen in Survey  
**Most Cited**

Response Frequency




Citations (2013)

Times Chosen in Survey  
**h-index**



Citations (2013)

Times Chosen in Survey  
**Shared: Chemists**



Citations (2013)

# Sono citato, dunque esisto

Epistemological Consequences of Bibliometrics:  
Insights from the Scientific Community, Tommaso  
Castellani, Emanuele Pontecorvo, and  
Adriana Valente

SERRC — October 2, 2014 — 4 Comments

2014

The aim of this paper is to investigate the consequences of the bibliometrics-based system of evaluation of scientific production on the contents and methods of sciences. We observe that the validation of the means of in-depth interviews to a number of researchers. We discuss the implications of the research topic, on the experimental practices. We observe that the validation of the acceptance and diffusion within the practices are self-sustained through possible evolving scenarios, also considering digital archives.

## “I’m Cited, Therefore I Am” Constructs the Scientific Identity

08.09.2015, 03:51 by [Chealsey Bowley](#)

My dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Science, Technology, and Society in the Department of Science, Technology, and Society.

- citazioni
- comportamenti adattivi
- autocitazioni cresciute di 81-179% con la VQR

← Tweet


March 2018



Jelte Wicherts  
@JelteWicherts

Gaming the system: When in 2010 Italian universities incorporated citations in promotion decisions, self-citation rates among social scientists went up by 81-179%

[sciencedirect.com/science/article...](http://sciencedirect.com/science/article...)



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Research Policy

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/jrpol](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jrpol)

## Self-citations as strategic response to the use of metrics

Marco Seeber<sup>a,\*</sup>, Mattia Cattaneo<sup>b</sup>, Michele Meoli<sup>b</sup>, Paolo Malighetti

<sup>a</sup> Department of Sociology, Ghent University, Korte Meer 3, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

<sup>b</sup> Department of Engineering, University of Bergamo, Via Pansalio 7b, 24044 Dalmine, BG, Italy

### ARTICLE INFO

**Keywords:**  
Self-citations  
Post-production misconducts  
Incentives in science  
Strategic scientists  
Sociology of science  
Economics of science

### ABSTRACT

There is limited knowledge on the extent to which questionable practices, namely practices that affect their likelihood. This article explores the factors driving scientists' behaviour in self-citations. We test the hypotheses in the literature on the regulation of a national habilitation system. The sample includes 886 scientists.

how the scientific faculty is dependent on peer reviewed publications.

# [Effetto cobra]

Quando gli inglesi pagavano per ogni cobra ucciso, gli indiani si misero ad allevare cobra per poi ucciderli e intascare

There is a well-known anecdote about British rule in India. In Delhi, officials were concerned that there were too many cobras. To reduce their population, people were paid for each cobra killed. When the administrators found out that some people had started to breed cobras to kill them and collect the reward, they stopped the scheme. The farmed cobras were set free, causing the population to explode.

This is the so-called cobra effect, which describes how incentives in complex systems can have unintended consequences which exacerbate the problem they were trying to solve.

I worry that the KPI-driven impact culture increasingly means that careful, meticulous and incremental science is anathema in the academy, especially for those at the early stages of their careers. There are many who are so attracted by the prospect of success that they are willing to obfuscate, mystify and perhaps falsify research to game the system and reap the plentiful rewards.

Most of all, I worry that instead of working towards an enlightened future, many are simply selling farmed cobras and calling it progress.

I was told impact metrics could make or break careers. Instead, they broke my faith in scientific research



Performance-driven culture is ruining scientific research

**The Guardian Opinions**

The Guardian, 16 Feb 201

GLI INCENTIVI POSSONO  
AVERE CONSEGUENZE  
NON VOLUTE  
PUR DI PUBBLICARE  
«BENE» SI MISTIFICANO  
DATI...VENDIAMO COBRA  
ALLEVATI?



# Falsi?



ROARS  
Return On Academic Research

ROARS 28 marzo 2018



Agli scienziati non basta più pubblicare i propri lavori. E' imperativo che il lavoro pubblicato sia collocato in uno scaffale editoriale che gli conferisca prestigio e influenza. Questa tensione per l'impatto di quanto si pubblica colloca gli articoli scientifici al centro di una rete di metriche che guardano tipicamente a dove si pubblica e a quante volte il lavoro viene citato. Ottenere un buon punteggio attraverso l'applicazione di queste metriche diventa un obiettivo che gli scienziati e gli editori sono disposti a raggiungere barando.

Sul piano collettivo o aggregato, queste nuove pratiche non sono più fondate, come un tempo, sulla produzione di articoli contenenti prove e conclusioni fraudolente. Piuttosto, sono impiegati strumenti fraudolenti per ottenere che l'articolo sia pubblicato, aumentarne l'impatto e gonfiare l'importanza di quanti scrivono con l'autore della pubblicazione incriminata. Sono pratiche assai diffuse. Gli scienziati non devono affannarsi a cercarle, perché di esse esiste un'evidenza quotidiana. La sezione notizie ospitata dalle riviste scientifiche ospita ormai regolarmente liste di autori che indicano quali candidati suggeriti per la peer review del proprio articolo nominativi cui corrispondono falsi indirizzi mail. Lo fanno per poter poi utilizzare quegli indirizzi per fornire revisioni che siano in grado di garantire che l'articolo ottenga la pubblicazione. Il circolo delle revisioni e citazioni si spinge anche oltre, arrivando a scambiare false review in cambio di citazioni da parte dell'autore del pezzo oggetto della falsa review. Altri manipolano le banche dati degli editori in modo da ottenere più inviti a effettuare review di articoli, e in tal modo inserire più citazioni dei propri articoli.

Tutte le metriche della valutazione scientifica sono destinate a essere oggetto di abuso. La legge di Goodhart (che prende nome dall'economista inglese che



# ... e la riproducibilità?



## Rival Scientists Cast Doubt Upon Recent Discovery About Invincible Animals

A recent claim that tardigrades got a sixth of their DNA from microbes is starting to unravel.



ED YONG DEC 4, 2015 [Science Atlantic blog, Dec 4 2015](#)

Home | News & Comment | Research | Careers & Jobs | Current Issue | Archive | Audio & Video | For Authors

News & Comment | News | 2016 | June | Article

NATURE | NEWS

## Sluggish data sharing hampers reproducibility effort

Initiative trying to validate 50 cancer papers finds difficulty in accessing original study data.

Richard Van Noorden

03 June 2015

[doi:10.1038/nature.2015.17694](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2015.17694)

# THE LANCET

Volume 383, Issue 9912, 11–17 January 2014, Pages 166–175



Series

[doi:10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)62227-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62227-8)

Increasing value and reducing waste in research design, conduct, and analysis

Prof John P A Ioannidis, MD<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, Prof Sander Greenland, DrPH<sup>1</sup>, Prof Mark A Hlatky, MD<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, Muin J Khoury, MD<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, Prof Malcolm R Macleod, PhD<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, Prof David Moher, PhD<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, Prof Kenneth F Schulz, PhD<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, Prof Robert Tibshirani, PhD<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>

These issues are often related to misuse of statistical methods, which is accentuated by inadequate training in methods. For example, a study<sup>2</sup> of reports published in 2001 showed that p values did not correspond to the given test statistics in 38% of articles published in *Nature* and 25% in the *British Medical Journal*. Prevalent conflicts of interest can also affect the design, analysis, and interpretation of results. Problems in study design go beyond statistical analysis, and are shown by the poor reproducibility of research. Researchers at Bayer<sup>3</sup> could not replicate 43 of 67 oncological and cardiovascular findings reported in academic publications. Researchers at Amgen could not reproduce 47 of 53 landmark oncological findings for potential drug targets.<sup>4</sup> The current research system places insufficient emphasis on investigators doing rigorous work to obtain reproducible results.

thebmj

Research

Education

News & Views

Campaigns

Archive

<http://www.bmj.com/content/351/bmj.h4320>

Research

Restoring Study 329: efficacy and harms of paroxetine and imipramine in treatment of major depression in adolescence

BMJ 2015; 351 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h4320> (Published 16 September 2015)


Cite this as: *BMJ* 2015;351:h4320

**Conclusions** Neither paroxetine nor high dose imipramine showed efficacy for major depression in adolescents, and there was an increase in harms with both drugs. Access to primary data from trials has important implications for both clinical practice and research, including that published conclusions about efficacy and safety should not be read as authoritative. The reanalysis of Study 329 illustrates the necessity of making primary trial data and protocols available to increase the rigour of the evidence base.

# ...l'efficacia?

Il paradosso

2.100.000



**Richard Menke**  
@mnkrchrd  
Sept. 21, 2018  
Segui

„The 2019 serials marketplace continues to see steady annual publisher price increases with no indicators this will change.”

**EBCSO @EBCSO**  
EBCSO has released the Serials Price Projection Report for 2019: [bit.ly/SS92018](http://bit.ly/SS92018)  
#libraries #academics #journals

- 1. stipendio

Buranyi, June 2017

**The long read**  
Is the staggeringly profitable business of scientific publishing bad for science?

It is an industry like no other, with profit margins to rival Google - and it was created by one of Britain's most notorious tycoons: Robert Maxwell. By Stephen Buranyi

Profit Company Industry  
A. Holcombe, Aug. 2018

10%	BMW	automobiles
23%	Rio Tinto	mining
25%	Google	search
29%	Apple	premium computing
35%	Springer	scholarly publishing
37%	Elsevier	scholarly publishing

<http://wp.me/p14fJ-fm> CC-BY Alex Holcombe

tagli ai budget=  
minore possibilità  
di leggere  
di essere letti

... nell'era del web in cui tutto è disponibile...

It has, currer, subm...  
...ood bash. The  
...ther people's work,  
...thing by third parties  
...in a process called peer review, has been immensely  
...profitable. Elsevier, a Dutch firm that is the world's biggest  
...journal publisher, had a margin last year of 38% on revenues  
... (\$3.2 billion). Springer, a German firm that is the  
...ggest journal publisher, made 36% on sales of  
... .1 billion) in 2011 (the most recent year for which  
... available). Such firms are **Free for all, 4 may 2013**

**Elsevier: +38%**

# Business?



**Library Loon**

@GaviaLib

Segui

For publishers and their quislings, "it's just business" only counts when they are the ones saying it.

When librarians say it, we are "selfish" and "short-sighted."

The genderedness of this particular hypocrisy will be left as an exercise for the reader.

Gli editori accusano le biblioteche che cancellano abbonamenti di essere «egoiste». È business: non ho soldi, non pago

17:51 - 8 mag 2018

<https://twitter.com/GaviaLib/status/993881150249754624>



**Heather Joseph**

@hjoseph

Following

Wow...libraries who cancel outrageously expensive - and unreasonably restrictive- journal subscription bundles are "selfish," and should try and get along better with the publishers who are selling them?? For real???

Traduci il Tweet



**More institutions consider ending their 'big deals' with publishers**

An increasing number of universities are ending, or threatening to end, bundled



**Pat Tully**

@ptully262

Segui

In risposta a @hjoseph

For libraries it is a business decision--it is just not affordable to pay big deal prices and negotiations with publishers often go nowhere. Libraries aren't cancelling out of anger, selfishness or short-sightedness--they can no longer afford the product.

Traduci il Tweet

17:15 - 8 mag 2018

# Love story



**Mike T@ylor** @MikeTaylor · 28 mar

2m04s: "On the side of the scientists there is an atomistic market where, up to now and unfortunately, many of the actors play without having any clue about the economic consequences of their activities."

**Editori monopolistici:**

- dominano il mercato
- hanno profitti grotteschi
- e pretendono di fare i buoni Samaritani della scienza



**Mike T@ylor** @MikeTaylor · 28 mar

3m18s: "When you, the small publishers, discuss with the representatives of the big guys, these are most likely very friendly to you. But [...] when it comes to discussing system changes, when the arguments get tight, the smiles disappear and the greed begins to gleam."

**«se non rinnovate il contratto la scienza nel vostro paese rimarrà indietro»  
CURIOSO CHE A DIRLO SIA UN  
PRODUTTORE DI BUSTE CHE NON HA  
IDEA DI COSA CONTENGANO**



**Mike T@ylor** @MikeTaylor

March 28, 2018

Following

The opening remarks by the hosts of conferences are usually highly forgettable, a courtesy platform offered to a high-ranking academic who has nothing to say about the conference's subject. NOT THIS TIME!

Traduci il Tweet



**Martin Grötschel**  
youtube.com



**Mike T@ylor** @MikeTaylor · 28 mar

2m38s: "On the publishers' side there is a very small number of huge publication enterprises with very smart marketing people. They totally dominate the market, produce grotesque profits, and amazingly manage to pretend to be the Good Samaritans of the sciences."

**Mike T@ylor** @MikeTaylor · 28 mar

4m00s: "One big publisher stated: if your country stops subscribing to our journals, science in your country will be set back significantly. I responded [...] it is interesting to hear such a threat from a producer of envelopes who does not have any idea of the contents."

# Elsevier world

**THE WORLD UNIVERSITY RANKINGS** PROFESSIONAL JOBS SUMMITS RANKINGS

## Elsevier's profits swell to more than £900 million

But 'risks' of open access and a shift away from subscription model could halt growth, publisher's financial results reveal

February 20, 2018

By David Matthews  
Twitter: @DavidMjourn

In a section disclosing the "principal risks" to Elsevier's business, journals are "sold largely on a paid subscription basis".

"There is continued debate in government, academic and library principal customers for our STM [scientific, technical and medical content, regarding to what extent such content should be freely available in its publication," it says.

"Some of these methods, if widely adopted, could adversely affect subscriptions," the results add.



**Peter Suber**  
@petersuber

Following

Pub CEO salaries: Engstrom, RELX [Elsevier] \$14.2m; Smith, ThomsonReuters \$13.4m; McKinstry, Wolters Kluwer \$13.3m. [goo.gl/tT7Y1f](https://goo.gl/tT7Y1f)

15:23 - 13 ott 2017

**Open Access EC**  
@OpenAccessEC

Following

"RELX as a whole – of which Elsevier accounts for a third of revenue – paid out £762 million in dividends to shareholders." i.e. EUR 865 million 🎩🤔🇪🇺🎉

**SPARC Europe** @SPARC\_EU

Elsevier's profits swell to more than £900 million, but 'risks' of #openaccess and a shift away from subscription model could halt growth, publisher's financial results reveal.

[timeshighereducation.com/news](https://timeshighereducation.com/news)

**C. Riesenweber**  
@c\_riesen

Following

Elsevier on #openaccess: "Some of these methods, if widely adopted, could adversely affect our revenue from paid subscriptions"


Well, not adopting them will adversely affect the worldwide exchange of knowledge. Sorry if that's not part of your business model.

**punctum books** @punctum\_books

Fuck Elsevier. Like, seriously fuck them. Enjoy the cash, dudes. Because your time is seriously almost up. [timeshighereducation.com/news/elseviers...](https://timeshighereducation.com/news/elseviers...)

[https://twitter.com/c\\_riesen/status/966562709696335872](https://twitter.com/c_riesen/status/966562709696335872)

1/3 800=288 milioni di soldi pubblici (1.100.000 euro UniTO)



# The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era

Vincent Larivière, Stefanie Haustein, Philippe Mongeon



Published: June 10, 2015 • <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502>

As a researcher, when I wake up in the morning the first thing I think of is

A) "I just love to write more papers about my research"

B) "I just thought of a new way to filter my data that might actually lead to a result that makes more sense"

STM : 50%  
SS: 70%  
HUM: 20%



- Reed-Elsevier
- ◇ Wiley-Blackwell
- ✕ American Chemical Society
- Springer
- Taylor & Francis
- △ Sage Publications

techdirt

TECHDIRT WIRELESS NEWS CASE STUDIES NET NEUTRALITY FREE SPEECH TECHDIRT DEALS!

Main Submit a Story RSS

PODCAST Cookie policy rt - Customize Everything! SOUNDCL

<< Court Sends John Oliver, HBO Back To State... ACLU Tells Court Long-Term Cell Site Location... >>


G.Moody, Elsevier monopoly... Aug 10 2017

## Elsevier Continues To Build Its Monopoly Solution For All Aspects Of Scholarly Communication


from the *but-can-people-be-bothered-to-support-open-alternatives?* dept

Techdirt has just written about the amazing achievements of Sci-Hub, and how it now offers the vast majority of academic papers free online. One implication may be that traditional publishing, with high-cost journals hidden behind paywalls, is no longer viable. But as we noted, that doesn't mean that traditional publishers will disappear. For one thing, many are embracing open access, and finding it pretty profitable (some would say too profitable thanks to things like "double dipping".) But there's another way that academic publishers, particularly the biggest ones with deep pockets, can head off the threat to their profits from developments like Sci-Hub and open access: by...  
Filed Under: academic journals, open access, Sci-Hub, traditional publishing, Wiley-Blackwell, Elsevier, Springer, Taylor & Francis, Sage Publications, American Chemical Society

...arriva ovunque...



Virtual 'suites' of tools/platforms from one company/organization, or supported by the same funder (last update January 2018):




...arriva ovunque...

Publishers are increasingly in control of scholarly infrastructure and why we should care

A Case Study of Elsevier

Written by: Alejandro Posada and George Chen, University of Toronto Scarborough

Published on September 20th 2017





# ... ha uno spiccato senso dell'umorismo

Open science describes a more inclusive, collaborative, transparent world of research. At Elsevier, we're enabling open science through our approach to open access, open data, research integrity, knowledge exchange, metrics and more, to benefit research and society and drive research performance.

Partnering with the research community, Elsevier is developing tools, services and programs that support open science. You can find out more about these below.

## Latest open science stories



Getting a handle on the double-edged sword of technology in science

By Elizabeth Kish, PhD



“Don't weigh the guilt”: 4 lessons from women at the forefront of STEM

By Chrysanne Lowe



<https://www.elsevier.com/about/open-science>

## Open Science

The latest information on Elsevier's activities related to open science

[View our open access journals](#)

This nurse educator gets “excited about data” – here's why

By Alison Bert, DMA

# ... e non dice i prezzi...

- per ottenere i dati: FOIA
- In Italia: [Legge trasparenza] CRUI – Amministrazione Trasparente – Bandi di gara e contratti pubblici

Reading: Opening the Black Box of Scholarly Communication Funding: A Public Data Infrastructure for Financial Flows in Academic Publishing

Article

Opening the Black Box of Scholarly Communication Funding: A Public Data Infrastructure for Financial Flows in Academic Publishing

Authors: Stuart Lawson, Jonathan Gray, Michele Mauri



Home > News > CARL Members Release Journal Subscription Cost Data

### CARL Members Release Journal Subscription Cost Data

May 11, 2018 - University library members of the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) have jointly released their 2016-17 expenditure data for journal and database subscriptions licensed

May 11, 2018	NEWS
34.3%	
CARL Members Release Journal Subscription Cost Data	10.4%
	7.9%

Costs in Finland

... (sher). The total cost...  
... (le, so we...  
... (recently e...  
... (non-profit p...  
... (014).



senza clausole di confidenzialità non potrebbero segmentare il mercato

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Elsevier	£34,177,020	£36,781,827	£39,079,332	£39,476,813	£39,812,145

	£16,369,917	£16,875,190
	£7,940,116	£8,542,997
		£10,828,334
		£5,990,818
		£2,925,607
		£1,885,485
		£4,430,900

Dec 3, 2016



Martin Paul Eve

Professor of Literature, Technology and Publishing at Birkbeck, University of London

### Referring Elsevier/RELX to the Competition and Markets Authority

Today, along with Stuart Lawson and Jon Tennant, I have submitted the below as a complaint to the Competition and Markets Authority, making good on the advice of Ann McKechin, MP at the Inquiry into Open Access in 2013. The document is also available as a PDF.

Re: RELX Group in  
Dear Sir/Madam,

We write to complain about the industry 58.14/1 ("P

- Abuse of a dominant position
- Problems in a market

- ✉ Email
- 📖 Books

# Todos contra Elsevier, el gigante editorial científico que cobra a España 25 'kilos' al año

Feb. 15 2018

¿Cuánto gasta nuestro país cada año en suscripciones a revistas científicas? El Confidencial analiza y calcula lo que nuestras universidades y centros pagan al principal editor mundial

FRENTE A LOS 10 DE ALEMANIA O LOS 9 DE FINLANDIA

...profitto, solo e sempre profitto

Prospectus dated April 25, 2018

**SPRINGER NATURE**

Prospectus

for the public offering

#### *10.2.4 Increasing Number of Offset Deals*

During the periods under review, so-called “offset deals” have further gained ground. Under an “offset deal”, a consortium of institutions located in the relevant country gains access to journals in exchange for a lump sum, which is comprised of a readership fee covering access to non-open access content and a publication fee covering article processing charges (“APCs”) of a pre-determined number of articles authored by researchers at those institutions. These articles are then made freely available on an open access basis around the world. We have entered into offset deals in a number of countries, including in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Sweden and Austria. While these offset deals may not always be as economically attractive as individual contracts, they allow us to capture a large number of customers with a single contract.

[Springer Prospectus Apr. 25](#)

#### *10.2.5 Increasing Share in Revenues from Open Access*

Under traditional subscription models, the users of journals and eBooks pay for access to content. In the case of eBooks, we in turn pay authors and editors for their contributions. Open access models inverse this model. Publications are made available online, typically free of charge, and authors generally pay us an APC to have their work published in one of our open access publications.

Springer Nature was one of the first academic publishers to actively embrace the opportunities offered by open access, which provides us additional opportunities to generate revenues, as open access publications are funded by authors and/or their funders or the relevant research institutions, not libraries. Accordingly, revenues stemming from APCs are in the short- to medium-term supplementary to the subscription business, not cannibalistic. Some of our journals are among the open access journals with the highest impact factor, providing us with the ability to charge higher APCs for these journals than for journals with average impact factors.

**12.2.2 Strong Leadership: Strategic Focus on Research, with a High-Quality Brand Portfolio, Global Scale and Favorable Positioning to Benefit from Strong Growth in the Open Access Publishing Market.**

Brand strength is becoming increasingly important, as market participants increasingly differentiate in the open access market with regard to APCs according to a journal's impact factor. Our open access portfolio includes a large number of leading brands, such as such as Nature Communications, Scientific Reports and Springer Open, and high impact factor publications, positioning us well to command premium APCs from authors.

Springer Prospectus Apr. 25

[decidete voi se stare al gioco,  
perché è un gioco molto sporco]

**Paul Thirion** @PaulThir · 3 h

May 6 2018

Should rename APC (Article Processing charges) to PPC (Profit Processing Charges)

**Bernard Rentier** @bernardrentier

Cynical and shameless. How long will the research community be manipulated like this ? [twitter.com/mnkrchrd/statu...](https://twitter.com/mnkrchrd/status...)

**Andre@s Ferus** @ferli90 · 19 h

May 6 2018

Scholarly publishers whose primary objective isn't to provide valuable services to promote an open #scholcomm ecosystem but to maximize their profits shouldn't be eligible for getting money out of public funds in the future!

**Jean-Sebastien Caux** @jscaux

The prospectus for the IPO of Springer Nature [proxy.dbagproject.de/mediacenter/re...](https://proxy.dbagproject.de/mediacenter/re...) should be compulsory reading for any funder/university/agency representative negotiating with publishers. You can then question whether you should support #SciPost and similar initiative...

[decidete voi se stare al gioco, perché è un gioco molto sporco]

**CAUTION**  
**Thieves operate**

Prospectus dated April 25, 2018

**SPRINGER NATURE**

Prospectus

for the public offering

### 12.3.1 *Capitalize on our Leading Position in Open Access.*

Springer Prospectus Apr. 25

We were one of the first academic publishers to actively embrace the opportunities offered by open access, making us a pioneer and the clear leader in the pure open access market and a leading force in the hybrid open access market. We intend to focus on initiatives that aim at increasing the number of submissions, the acceptance rate and APC.

In order to increase submissions, we intend to develop our open access title portfolio by selecting content for our publications that we believe will support the impact factor and increase the reputation of our existing journals and by launching new journals in areas we perceive to be underserved by open access publications. We also intend to enhance our hybrid offerings, *i.e.*, journals that contain both open access and subscription content. We also seek to increase the number of submissions through digital marketing and author communication initiatives that aim at further improving the brand recognition and usage of our journals.

We aim at achieving our target acceptance rate through a number of initiatives. These initiatives include increasing the speed and quality of our acceptance process and further enhancing our peer reviewer network and support system and more aggressively pursuing the transfer of articles submitted to, but not ideally suited for, other publications. We also aim at increasing APCs by increasing the value we offer to authors through improving the impact factor and reputation of our existing journals. Further, we intend to employ a price differentiation strategy by tailoring APCs to the discipline and impact factor of the relevant journal, taking advantage of the high number of journals in our portfolio with a high impact factor.

[decidete voi se stare al gioco, perché è un gioco molto sporco]



**Jean-Sebastien Caux**  
@jscaux

Following

The prospectus for the IPO of Springer Nature [proxy.dbagproject.de/mediacenter/re ...](https://proxy.dbagproject.de/mediacenter/re...) should be compulsory reading for any funder/university/agency representative negotiating with publishers. You can then question whether you should support [#SciPost](#) and similar initiatives, or can afford not to.

Traduci il Tweet

13:38 - 5 mag 2018

22 Retweet 28 Mi piace



**Peter Murray-Rust**  
@petermurrayrust

Following

In risposta a [@MsPhelps](#)

Outrage. The Matthew Principle: Rich get Richer. APC = extortion. This tells the Global South to get lost. Springer does not want to communicate science, it wants to tax it till it's dry. And the rich wets uses taxes to pay for personal vanity. Knowledge neo-colonialism.

Traduci il Tweet

12:14 - 5 mag 2018

7 Mi piace



**Bernard Rentier**  
@bernardrentier

Following

Cynical and shameless. How long will the research community be manipulated like this ?

... pance rate through a n stance process and furl ing the transfer of arti sing APCs by increas i of our existing jour o the discipline and i ur portfolio with a high

**Richard Menke** @mnkrchr

Strategy: Capitalize on our Leading Position in OA

Mostra questa discussione

Traduci il Tweet

[ardrentier/status/992883675393150976](#)

<https://twitter.com/petermurrayrust/status/992709020598325248>



# Linking impact factor to 'open access' charges creates more inequality in academic publishing

Simply adding an 'open access' option to the existing prestige-based journal system at ever increasing costs is not the fundamental change publishing needs, says Bosman

May 16, 2018

In the document, aimed at potential shareholders, the company outlines how it stands to profit from APC (article processing charge)-based gold open access in an otherwise traditional publishing system that remains focused on high-impact factor journals. From this perspective, a market with high barriers to entry for new players is a desirable situation. Any calls for transparency of contracts, legislation against exclusive ownership of content by publishers, public discussion on pricing models and a move towards broader assessment criteria - beyond impact factors - are all seen as a threat to the company's profits. Whether this position also benefits the global research community is a question worth asking.



Publishers split over how to tackle ResearchGate

READ MORE >

# Springer Nature is committed to being a part of the open-access movement

Institutions, research funding bodies and publishers must all work together to change the system in the interest of advancing research, says Steven Inchcoombe


May 18, 2018



The open access market is seen by SpringerNature as differentiated by impact factor, making it possible to charge much higher APCs for publishing open access in high impact factor journals. Quite revealing is that on page 99 of the prospectus, SpringerNature aims to exploit the situation to increase

prices: "We also aim at increasing APCs by increasing the value we offer to authors needed to fulfil our obligations. This has seen us stop using journal impact factors in isolation in our marketing (note: a prospectus is a legal

document aimed at potential investors, not a marketing tool for authors or librarians). In fact, for more than 10 years, long before DORA, *Nature* editorials have expressed concerns about the overuse



...la riprova che i prezzi non sono reali (non dipendono dai costi)

Prospectus dated April 25, 2018

**SPRINGER NATURE**

Prospectus

for the public offering

Compared to traditional publishers, open access publishers face lower barriers to entry. For example, pure open access market participants do not require a sizeable sales force. Furthermore, **the technical equipment required for open access publishing, such as hardware and software, is becoming less expensive.** While the offerings of new and smaller competitors may be of lower quality, an increase in these offerings may nevertheless lead to a reduction in demand for our subscription-based offerings. New competitors in the open access market may also gain market share, resulting in a weakening of our market position. Furthermore, **increased competition in the open access market could put downward pressure on the APCs, thereby adversely affecting margins we earn in the open access business.** If any of these risks were to materialize, our investments in the open access business model would not yield the expected returns, and our results could be materially adversely affected.

Springer Prospectus Apr. 25

... quindi, anche la crescita delle APC non fa altro che perpetuare la logica perversa degli abbonamenti...

Apr  
13

## WHY OPEN ACCESS BIG DEALS ARE WORSE THAN SUBSCRIPTIONS

In: Science Politics • Tags: [open access](#), [publishers](#)

Apr.13, 2018

Notwithstanding the barrage of criticisms and warnings from every corner of the scholarly community, various initiatives, mainly in the





## Who Gets to Read the Research We Pay For?

Aug. 21, 2018

Scientific journals' lock on new studies has ignited tension for years. When it comes to access for people with rare diseases, it becomes an ethical issue too.

laborious and time-consuming. Charles Oppenheim, formerly the head of the department of information science at Loughborough University, wrote to Slate, "In practice there are insuperable barriers for families that only true open access can resolve," pointing out that, for example, time and distance barriers often make it impractical for people—perhaps particularly people who have rare diseases—to travel to a library that has the appropriate subscriptions. Free databases like PubMed also do not always contain the latest information on uncommon diseases and often only make the abstracts available. "[Elsevier's] low-cost options are a joke and breadcrumbs from a rich man's table," Jon Tennant, a paleontologist and open science advocate, told Slate. "Paywalls to health research are an abomination. No one should have to spend \$30 each for 20 papers just to see if it has the information they want."

...la mancanza di accesso è particolarmente odiosa in medicina (e certi commenti arroganti non aiutano)



Ashley Farley @ashleydfarley · 13 ago

People shouldn't have to jump through additional hoops to access information because they aren't privileged enough to be associated with an institution that can (nowadays its barely) afford subscriptions.

Traduci il Tweet

5

29

455



mrgunn

@mrgunn

Segui

In risposta a @ashleydfarley e @dgmacarthur

Yes, everyone should have rainbows, unicorns, & puppies delivered to their doorstep by volunteers. Y'all keep wishing for that, I'll keep working on producing the best knowledge and distributing it as best we can.

Traduci il Tweet

03:16 - 13 ago 2018

Aug. 13, 2018

[decidete voi se stare al gioco, perché è un gioco molto sporco]


**Paywall: The Business of Scholarship (Full Movie)**  
 CC BY 4.0  
 from Paywall The Movie





# PAYWALL

The Business of Scholarship

1:04:48









<https://paywallthemovie.com/>

# MA... la comunicazione scientifica è un mercato?

"They take our free labour, package it, and sell it back to us for windfall profits. The result is that one of our core activities - sharing research - is largely governed by the drive to deliver shareholder value. It doesn't have to be that way."

Jefferson Pooley, Muhlenberg College



## Principles of the Self Journal of Science: bringing ethics and freedom to scientific publishing

VERSION 1 Released on 24 January 2015 under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Michaël Bon<sup>1</sup>

<http://www.sjscience.org/article?id=46>

### Inappropriateness

The dissemination of Science is organized as a free market, where publishers compete for reputation and scientists compete for limited number of slots in journals. The rationale of the free market economy is to have efficient exchanges of rare and substitutable goods (apples, mobile phones, money...) between those who own them and those who want them. Yet scientific knowledge, unlike money, is something its owners want to share. It is not a substitutable good. Scientists do want to be paid, but in a different currency – one that involves recognition and credit – whose amount on Earth is not limited. Therefore, the current system is deeply inappropriate to disseminate Science: it creates an artificial rarity that overrides the exchanges naturally underlying Science.



...non occorrerebbe  
forse  
**maggiore equilibrio  
di interessi**  
nella comunicazione  
scientifica?



Forse...

# Open Access negotiators prepare for a future without publishers

door Sicco de Knecht

4 mei 2018 | Berlin last Wednesday was the stage for a first ever international meeting of academic open access negotiators. At the invitation of Horst Hippler, chair of the German conference of university rectors and the Projekt DEAL initiatives, representatives from all over the world met to share their views and tales of the ongoing negotiations. As a special guest the newly appointed special envoy for open access of the EU, former DG Robert-Jan

## Universities are fed up

Judging the overall atmosphere of the meeting Meijer can safely conclude that there is a "high level of frustration amongst academic insitutes." After many rounds of negotiations many of the parties involved are left with the feeling that academic publishers are trying to squeeze every last drop out of the current business model. In

...e boycotted the largest publisher Elsevier since the beginning of the ...ion, but I expect many more countries to follow in Germany's

legation from the University of California.

- gli editori vogliono solo spremere soldi pubblici
- la pazienza ha un limite
- in futuro potremmo anche fare a meno di loro

- Importante condividere informazioni
- UNIRE LE FORZE A LIVELLO INTERNAZIONALE (cosa che Italia NON ha fatto)

# IMPOSSIBLE POSSIBLE

negotiations. "You have to understand that up until now the negotiators on the side of the academic publishers had the luxioury of constantly meeting new people at the negotiating table." Meijer believes that the lack of information on the side of the academic institutions has held back progress for too long. "Those days are over now we are sharing information and deciding on a common strategy at an international level."

from his eight years as DG. I have high expectations of him." Smits himself is determined but expects tough negotiations. "I think we're heading for a major clash, especially now universities are joining forces on a European level. However, I really hope to reach an agreement with all parties."

Smits will present his OA plans this Summer. In this plan for the European Commission he will have to indicate how the EU is going to meet the goal, set by the European ministers, of 100% OA in 2020. "If we keep moving at this pace, we'll never reach our goals," Meijer says, confirming that a future plan might not include the academic publishers whatsoever.



# Un abbraccio mortale



**Bernard Rentier**  
@bernardrentier

Following

The RELX Group (ex-Reed-Elsevier) reports >8.3 B€ revenue for 2017 (+4.5%) with >2.6 B€ profit (+6%), largely exceeding the annual budget of the Exploratory Research Program funded by the European Research Council (1.87 B€ yearly). With whose support? [relx.com/~media/Files/](https://relx.com/~media/Files/) ...

Traduci dalla lingua originale: inglese

10:11 - 18 feb 2018



**Bernard Rentier**  
@bernardrentier

Following

The accomplices are you and me, the researchers who pay to publish, the researchers who evaluate them, the researchers who review their articles graciously for the benefit of the publishers, the researchers who pay to read. All being afflicted with prestige-dependency syndrome.

Traduci dalla lingua originale: inglese

10:13 - 18 feb 2018



But let's not ignore the facts: the science system is in landslide transition from data-sparse to data-saturated. Meanwhile, scholarly communication, data management methodologies, reward systems and training curricula do not adapt quickly enough if at all to this revolution. **Researchers, funders and publishers (I always thought that meant making things public) keep each other hostage in a deadly embrace by continuing to conduct, publish, fund and judge science in the same way as in the past century.**

**So far, no-one seems to be able to break this deadlock.** Open Access articles are solve only a fraction of the problem. Neither 'open research data' alone will do. W



# In conclusione... comunicazione o competizione?

incentivi perversi +  
ipercompetizione =  
comportamenti scorretti/dati falsi

RISCHIO: PERDITA DI FIDUCIA  
NELLA SCIENZA



ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING SCIENCE

Mary Ann Liebert, Inc. publishers

Journals

Search

Alerts

[Environ Eng Sci](#) 2017 Jan 1; 34(1): 51–61.

Published online 2017 Jan 1. doi: [10.1089/ees.2016.0223](#)

PMCID: PMC5206685

Academic Research in the 21st Century: Maintaining Scientific Integrity in a Climate of Perverse Incentives and Hypercompetition

Marc A. Edwards<sup>1,†</sup> and Siddhartha Roy<sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

Go to:

Over the last 50 years, we argue that incentives for academic scientists have become increasingly perverse in terms of competition for research funding, development of quantitative metrics to measure performance, and a changing business model for higher education itself. Furthermore, decreased discretionary funding at the federal and state level is creating a hypercompetitive environment between government agencies (e.g., EPA, NIH, CDC), for scientists in these agencies, and for academics seeking funding from all sources—the combination of perverse incentives and decreased funding increases pressures that can lead to unethical behavior. If a critical mass of scientists become untrustworthy, a tipping point is possible in which the scientific enterprise itself becomes inherently corrupt and public trust is lost, risking a new dark age with devastating consequences to humanity. Academia and federal agencies should better support science as a public good, and incentivize altruistic and ethical outcomes, while de-emphasizing output.

# [siamo sulla strada sbagliata]

cord injury. First, there is increasing methodology. These range from neurological diseases, the lack of contamination of neural cell lines, poor reliability of published research (participant numbers are low), published research findings are commonly low in the biomedical literature. Surprisingly then, the rate of publication is slow and problematic [3]. Second, the number of papers retracted from the peer-reviewed literature is also increasing [4]. Third, there is an over-reliance on a scientist's publication metrics (numbers, journal impact factors, citation numbers) for progression, prizes, and research grants. Indeed, gaming the metrics of science is an occupational requirement for scientists, journal staff and university administrators. Publications now contain more spin (reliance on findings which are not justified by the statistics) and more liberal use of words such as 'novel' [5]. These trends are driven by an unhealthy culture in which it can be more important to publish a result than publish a correct result [6, 7]. The trends also expose deep flaws in the current systems of peer review.

This research culture can lead to cost- and corner-cutting, with hasty publication of irreproducible results and poor-quality work—it's an era in which scientists can fall prey to the temptation to do whatever they can get away with in order to publish. This leads to scientific misconduct, commonly defined as 'fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results'. A well-known recent case is Professor

- metodologia non solida
- risultati falsi, peer review debole
- enfasi sulla pretesa «novità»
- metriche onnipotenti, per cui truffare per gonfiarle è obbligo
- «PUBBLICARE UN RISULTATO»  
INVECE DI UN «RISULTATO  
CORRETTO»





*"Yes, the planet got destroyed. But for a beautiful moment  
in time we created a lot of value for shareholders."*

GN  
COLLECTION

©Tom Toro, <http://tomtoro.com/cartoons/#jp-carousel-135>



....cambiare panorama?