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PUBLIC LIBRARY OF SCIENCE (PLOS)

- 2014 PLOS ONE publishes its 100,000th Open Access article.
- 2012 PLoS capitalizes the ‘o’ to become PLOS
- 2006 PLoS ONE is launched
- 2004 PLoS Med is launched
- 2003 PLoS Biology is launched
- 2002 PLoS receives $9m seed capital from the Moore Foundation
- 2000 PLoS starts as an open letter
EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS IN PLOS
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WHAT ARE EDITORS THINKING?!

Is it new?

Is it true?

Does it matter?
COMMON PIT FALLS

Spin!
Poor presentation and imprecise language
More comprehensive and more sophisticated than the last review but the same finding
Empty or thin review
Systematic searches are out of date
Apples and oranges being compared
Descriptive operational data reported as hypothesis testing research
SUMMARY

Editors are, broadly speaking, interested in articles that are new, true and that matter.

It should always be possible to publish well reported sound research.
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WHY DO WE HAVE ACADEMIC JOURNALS?

Validation

Dissemination

Raising Awareness
WHAT COULD THE ACADEMIC PUBLISHING INDUSTRY DO BETTER?

Availability

Speed

Data
3.3 Three most effective ways to ensure that ‘best practices’ inform the design of disaster-related research to prove evidence of effectiveness

“Of the 66 people who responded to this question, the majority (76%) chose ‘ensuring that research-based evidence is available at no or minimal cost’ as one of the most effective ways to ensure that ‘best practices’ inform the design of disaster-related research to prove evidence of effectiveness.”

3.2 Engaging potential beneficiaries in research related to disaster planning and responses

“Most (39 of 40) respondents who answered this question suggested that other public employees and local non-governmental organizations ‘should be informed of the results in ways that are relevant to them.””

Figure 9  Percentage of freely available peer-reviewed papers as measured in April 2014, 1996–2013

Source: Computed by Science-Metrix using Scopus as well as DOAJ, ROAR, OpenDOAR, PubMedCentral, and numerous sources of freely downloadable papers.

FREE ACCESS ≠ OPEN ACCESS

The article/journal is free to read, but possibly after an embargo period
You may not reuse unless reuse rights are also granted
You may be charged if you copy large numbers of the article
The “free” rights may be withdrawn at any time
“I found that there is no one process to receive permission to translate. It is time consuming (up to 5 months and many emails) and sometimes there are fees. Frequently, when I tried to request permission through a third party, the option for translation wasn’t available and I have had to personally contact the publisher.”
Zika causality statement
7 September 2016

Zika virus infection: update on the evidence for a causal link to congenital brain abnormalities and Guillain-Barré syndrome

Update of WHO Statement published on 31 March 2016

Since 2013, an unexpected rise in the number of reported cases of the neurological disorder Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS) in French Polynesia, Brazil and other countries in the Americas led specialists to infer a link with an ongoing outbreak of Zika virus infection. Reports of unexpected increases in cases of microcephaly in north-eastern Brazil also led to the suggestion of a link to Zika virus infection in late...
Providing incentives to share data early in health emergencies: the role of journal editors Whitty et al. Lancet 2015

“The early response to the Ebola epidemic, however, was also accompanied by several examples of individuals and organisations being unwilling to share data in real time.”

Three disincentives were frequently mentioned:

• Data sharing would jeopardise subsequent publication

• Data sharing would allow pre-emptive use of data by others for their own publications

• Data sharing would breach confidentiality agreements
Developing Global Norms for Sharing Data and Results during Public Health Emergencies

Kayen McFarland, Vasie S. Moorthy, Pia Miller, Pierre-Sophane Guell, Cathy Roth, Maria-Paula Keiny

Published: January 5, 2016 • http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001935

Data Sharing as Part of the Normal Scientific Process: A View from the Pharmaceutical Industry

Patrick Valancie, Andrew Freeman, Murray Stewart

Published: January 5, 2016 • http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001936
The publishing industry and academic community has yet to fully embrace the opportunities that the internet has enabled... but we’re working on it.
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COULD OPEN PUBLISHING TOOLS HELP TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Open Access

Pre-prints

Data Sharing

Open-peer review
CONCLUSION
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