FROM THE EDITOR’S DESK

Collaboration versus competition

In the past six months I have heard about several instances of research misconduct including fraudulent data collection, plagiarism, and falsified reviews within the peer-review system that as editors and authors we hold up as the Gold Standard of scientific and research integrity. All journal editors should keep an eye on Retraction Watch from time to time to stay informed on the types of problems that are often caught well after papers have been published. Some of the recent instances of misconduct have been included in this issue of the ISAJE Newsletter. Not all the potential and actual ethical and research misconductions are black-and-white or a clear violation of code of conduct. The case studies regularly published by COPE provide some interesting insights into how issues such as authorship disputes or suspected fraud may be handled, although often the issues end up being passed on to institutions who fail to take strong actions against perpetrators. Many of the concerns that arise during the publication process appear to be driven by competition between researchers to publish based on demands for a greater quality and quantity of published outputs from research and
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granting institutions.

However, overall there have also been many positive developments in the editing and publishing fields, which reflect the increasing tendency for researchers, editors and organisations to collaborate. This issue of the ISAJE Newsletter contains many examples of such positive collaboration, including editors sharing details of developments within their own journals, such as the iPad application developments from the Journal of the American College of Cardiology, shared by the International Society of Managing and Technical Editors for the Newsletter. ISAJE President Kerstin Stenius has also contributed a further update on the progress of ICARA, which is the result of a network of addiction associations who recognize the benefits of working together to achieve both individual and common goals.

As the holiday season rapidly approaches, I prefer to reflect on these instances of cooperation and generous sharing between ISAJE members and all of our networks. Perhaps the most significant advantage and benefit of being an ISAJE member is the ability to access such a wide range of experts, as the networks and collaborations between our members and members’ networks is an invaluable resource. Therefore, I would encourage all members to share their expertise, experiences, insights, and challenges with ISAJE either through LinkedIn by posting links to relevant articles and stories, by writing articles for the Newsletter, and participating in committees or at the annual meeting (Santiago de Compostela, Spain, 25-27 September, 2013).

All the best to you and your families for a very happy and safe holiday and new year. □

- Sally Gainsbury
  Editor, ISAJE Newsletter
  Treasurer, ISAJE

ISAJE Annual Meeting in Lisbon
L to R: Richard Pates, Rebecca McKetin, Alan Cann (guest speaker), Dan Morgan
ICARA – now ready to become reality

ICARA – the International Confederation of ATOD Research Associations – is not a totally new acquaintance for the readers of this newsletter. A brief presentation of the idea was published after the first ICARA meeting in Hilton head. Here is a short repetition of the background: ICARA as an idea came about from discussions between Griffith Edwards and Thomas Babor, as part of their programmatic attempts to strengthen the global infrastructure of alcohol, drugs, tobacco and other addiction research. The two had mapped research centres and research associations internationally for a series published in *Addiction*. They could see that many associations did very important work and had done so for many years. Associations seemed often to be conservative. Some of them focused only on specific drugs or certain fields of research, some were clearly national, with established routines and little exchange with other national associations, and several experienced lack of or instability in resources. It was also true that in many countries with big or dramatically growing problems there were no research associations. The idea was born: if ISAJE had managed to become a real resource for small – and big – journals alike, as an organisation for mutual support and exchange of knowledge and experience, a similar forum could be helpful for research associations.

This idea gained increased strength with the insight that while governments cooperate in WHO, and the industries have international bodies of cooperation, the ATOD research field is not coordinated globally.

In September 2012, immediately after the ISAJE meeting and also in Lisbon, the ICARA group met for the second time. Representatives of sixteen different research associations, and some important funding bodies (EMCDDA, NIAAA and PAHO), from Europe, Africa, South and North America, and Australia had two days of inspiring and fruitful exchange. The associations present were national (APSAD, Australia; CPDD, USA; Socidrogalcohol, Spain; ABEAD, Brazil; AHTS, Finland; CRISA, Nigeria; SFA, France; RSA, USA), regional (EUFAS, Europe and SRNT- E, Europe) and international (KBS, ISBRA, SRNT, ISAJE, SALIS, ISSDP); some were very small, with less than 100 members, and others big, with several thousand individual members. Alcohol, drug and tobacco researchers were all represented – we missed, however, the presence of gambling research organisations.
At the meeting we exchanged information and experiences from our respective associations, discussed once again the rationale for ICARA, amended the draft bylaws, set up three workgroups and decided to start the process of registration of ICARA in Finland.

The bulk of the meeting was spent discussing topics that are of common interest for most associations. “The Successful Association” discussion asked: What does it take to keep a research association flourishing? What are the potential funding possibilities? How do you recruit and keep members? What services are most valued by members? This discussion was a good way of getting to know the different associations and start to focus on common interests. The second debate concerned how research associations handle industry presence and sponsorship, at meetings and in other activities. The tobacco research associations had a particularly valuable role in this discussion, within their long history of an increasingly controversial relationship with industry. The third topic for discussion concerned how ICARA could support research and research associations in developing countries.

During the second day of the meeting, and with increasing energy as the potential of ICARA seemed to take shape, it was agreed that three working groups be formed in preparation for next year’s meeting. The first one will finalize the by-laws, register ICARA in Finland, and prepare and organize the elections of the first board as well as the next meeting. The second group will develop a website and portal for dissemination of information on research funding, training materials for researchers, mentoring possibilities, and so forth. Robert West from Addiction promised to donate a model website for ICARA and for other associations to adopt. A third group will map and analyse existing guidelines and experiences of industry sponsorship of associations and meetings and will develop and present model guidelines for associations on these matters.

When the mission statement was discussed anew, it was agreed that ICARA should focus on information exchange and mutual support, especially on practical matters for research associations. Another task would be...
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“association and research ethics” and research development: to develop guidelines and disseminate information and educational material about ethical questions for research, to spread knowledge about funding opportunities and new developments in evidence-based policies, not least to countries and regions with few research resources. ICARA’s policy, it was agreed, is to support the use of evidence in policy, but not to take a stand on individual policy measures. To advocate both nationally and internationally for research funding will be a third important issue. ICARA will also promote inter-organizational research collaboration and hopes to be able to mentor new societies. There draft by-laws for ICARA were discussed and accepted, as well as the procedures for the election of the first board next spring. The goal is to arrange ICARA meetings every second year, in adjunction to other, bigger regional, national or international research meetings and to accomplish goals within working groups between these meetings.

The ICARA meeting in Lisbon was hosted by EMCDDA and received support from IOGT-NTO International in Sweden, the Finnish National Institute for Health and Welfare and the Nordic Centre for Welfare and Social Issues.

As we prepare for the first “real” meeting of ICARA, we realize that compared to ISAJE, ICARA will meet a somewhat different challenge. Research associations usually have a quick circulation of leadership, which means that the association’s representative in ICARA will have to be a new position in the board or leadership of an association. Associations may have other roles in relation to the public debate – sometimes more of advocacy—and to the professional and research community. Many important challenges are however the same, such as the globalization of addiction problems, addiction economy and addiction information, and the uneven distribution of resources to tackle the problems. It seems obvious that ISAJE can benefit from the new channels of cooperation that ICARA will offer.

- Kerstin Stenius
  President, ISAJE
Revisions to ICD & DSM diagnostic classifications – the impact on addiction journals

The two major psychiatric classification systems are currently under revision (the World Health Organization’s chapter in the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) and the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) of the American Psychiatric Association). At the 2012 ISAJE Annual Meeting, Tom Babor described the status and implications of these revisions from his perspective as a member of the ICD 11 Working Group on Substance-related and Addictive Disorders.

Classification systems such as ICD and DSM serve a variety of important functions in research and clinical practice, including: estimating prevalence; statistical reporting on a local, national and international level; understanding etiology; facilitating scientific communication; clinical decision-making; estimating likely course; and studying the biologic or psychogenic processes underlying the disorder. The purpose of the current revision process (for both systems) is to improve clinical utility and take account of recent advances in alcohol and drug research globally (ICD) and in the USA (DSM). The DSM revision process was initiated in 2008 and will conclude with the publication of a new DSM-V manual in 2013. The ICD revision process began in 2011 and is scheduled to conclude in 2015 with the publication of ICD 11.

Since the 1970’s, revisions in these diagnostic systems have been made through a complicated process that involves collaborating with appointed working groups, preparing comprehensive literature reviews, collecting empirical data, analyzing secondary data collected for other purposes, field-testing the advantages and disadvantages of different criteria sets, independent reviewing by outside groups, and ultimate expert consensus on the final set of diagnostic criteria. In their last iterations, there was close coordination between WHO and APA in the revision process for the substance use disorders sections of their respective diagnostic systems (i.e., DSM IV & ICD 10). This coordination resulted in very similar criteria sets and scoring algorithms, and permits a high degree of compatibility between the two systems. Coordination was primarily supported by a Cooperative Agreement between WHO and ADAMHA which supported expert meetings, instrument development and field tests of the two systems. Unfortunately, there has been
only minimal coordination of the revision process for DSM V and ICD 11, in part because the DSM revisions began several years before the ICD revision. Further complicating the coordination of these revisions is the different purposes of ICD and DSM. For example, DSM is primarily a clinical diagnostic tool designed for use by American psychiatrists, but it has been widely adopted by other clinical professions, and is used extensively in other countries and for research purposes internationally. ICD, on the other hand, is used both for clinical applications and statistical reporting worldwide. The aims of the 11th revision are to tighten the linkages between classification and emergency medicine applications, improve patient safety and clinical best practices, improve morbidity and mortality public health reporting, develop scientific consensus regarding high level clinical phenotypes, provide better patient data characterization for clinical and research applications, and improve linkages to primary care.

Given the pace of change in the two diagnostic systems, and the relative lack of coordination between the working groups appointed by WHO and APA, it is inevitable that there will be differences between the two systems, and these differences could have important implications for research, clinical practice and journal publishing.

The most important differences are in the “core syndrome” category formerly called “substance dependence” in both systems. The diagnostic criteria for “substance use disorder” in DSM-V now combine the 11 symptoms that were formerly used to define dependence and abuse in DSM-IV. The four-symptom abuse category has been eliminated in favor of a broader dimensional construct that will require only two symptoms to qualify for the disorder. In contrast, the proposed criteria for dependence and harmful use proposed in ICD 11 are similar to the current criteria in ICD 10, thus maintaining the clear distinction between harmful use and dependence.

Both classifications will now include substance use disorders and non-substance “behavioral addictions.” Gambling Disorder has been moved into this category.

The implications of these discrepancies for journal publishing can be described as 1) clinical (e.g., where is screening and brief intervention for hazardous and harmful alcohol use in DSM?), 2) scientific (e.g., is one system more reliable?); 3) conceptual/theoretical (e.g., what has become of the alcohol dependence syndrome concept in the two systems?); 4) terminological (e.g., how do the anticipated differences in terminology affect scientific communication and statistical reporting?); 5) epidemiological (e.g., how will comparability of prevalence estimates be achieved when
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There are different symptoms and cut-off points for diagnosis?); and 6) methodological (e.g., should one system be favored over the other in scientific communications?).

Field testing is just beginning for the proposed ICD 11 criteria. It is likely to include a comparison of the two diagnostic systems (e.g., clinical appraisal of criteria, test-retest of structured interview items with representative patients), so that some of these questions may be resolved by 2014 when the ICD criteria are scheduled to be finalized. □

- Tom Babor

Reaching New Audiences Using Blogs and Social Media

At the ISAJE meeting in Lisbon I talked about the role of an "Internet Consulting Editor" and the evolution of a social media policy for the Annals of Botany. Annals of Botany has a continuous publication record stretching back over a century. With the speed of change in publishing, my role as Internet Consulting Editor is try to ensure this continues for another hundred years, or, more to the point, another 10 years.

Working with a very small budget and limited staff time, Annals of Botany has set up a network of online properties to try to "be where the audience is". As a starting point, we set up a blog using the free WordPress platform. Apart from being free (did I mention we were working on a low budget?), WordPress is tremendously powerful and flexible. With the addition of simple WordPress plugins, we made our site look beautiful on mobile phones and tablets - without any additional work. We also installed plugins which dabbled in the dark arts of search engine optimisation (SEO), allowing us to control our "rich snippets". Don't know what a rich snippet is? It's the way the rest of the world see your website - something you want to control rather than leaving to chance. Another part of our strategy involves the development of web-specific "online only" content stream which will never appear in
print - the concept of overlapping but distinctive audiences. This includes the inevitable Twitter account, Facebook page, and a Google+ page. Our strategy is to be where the audience is rather than demanding that they must always come to us. The Google+ page is particularly significant, as not only has it achieved the fastest user growth over the past year, it allows us to claim our own space on the front page of a Google search return, controlling what people who search for our name get to see. In the last year, Google's social search shift ("Search plus Your World") has been a major change in the way search operates. This is a space that all publishers now need to be involved in.

Does such activity sell journal subscriptions? Possibly not, but Annals of Botany is an educational charity as well as a publisher, and reaching out to new audiences and new demographic groups who would not traditionally have read plant science journals is an important part of our mission. The days of big bundle journal publishing and impact factor-driven markets are coming to an end (see: The weakening relationship between the Impact Factor and papers' citations in the digital age, http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.4328). In some people's minds, the dust has settled after the shift to digital with the coming of the Internet. The truth is that new developments such as PLOS, eLife, and PeerJ mean that traditional publishing models and routes will continue to come under pressure for the foreseeable future as the pace of change in publishing speeds up rather than slows down. New developments, emerging under the banner of "altmetrics", mean that peer review itself is under challenge. Social filtering has always been the informal channel of wisdom for those in the know. Digital publishing and the increasing reach of social media into all spheres of life makes this approach accessible to a much wider audience.

The speed of change in academic publishing is accelerating, and it is the responsibility of academics to shape the future, to push towards “Marge World”, where academic innovate, and resist “Bart World”, where large organisations control research publication (see: Four futures for scientific and medical publishing. (2002) BMJ, 325(7378): 1472-1475, http://www.bmj.com/content/325/7378/1472). Whatever your feelings about social media, its impact on publishing makes it unwise to ignore these rapidly developing technologies. And in all field of personal and professional life, social media is hard to resist (see: Twitter is harder to resist than cigarettes and alcohol, The Guardian, 3 February 2012, http://bit.ly/w0U6mW).

- Alan Cann
  Dept. of Biology, University of Leicester
The EQUATOR Network

The EQUATOR Network is an international initiative that seeks to enhance reliability and value of medical research literature by promoting transparent and accurate reporting of research studies. This goal is being achieved through:

- raising awareness of the crucial importance of good reporting of research
- providing resources, education and training relating to the reporting of health research and use of reporting guidelines
- assisting in the development, dissemination and implementation of reporting guidelines
- monitoring the status of the quality of reporting across health research literature
- conducting research relating to the quality of reporting

The EQUATOR Network is an umbrella organisation that brings together researchers, medical journal editors, peer reviewers, developers of reporting guidelines, research funding bodies and other collaborators with mutual interest in improving the quality of research publications and of research itself.

The main funding for the EQUATOR Network was provided by the UK NHS National Knowledge Service, National Library for Health and National Institute for Health Research, UK Medical Research Council, Scottish Chief Scientist Office, Canadian Institutes of Health Research, and the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO).

The EQUATOR Newsletter can be accessed through here: http://bit.ly/cqRzQc. It is now available to read in 4 languages (Spanish, French, German, English).

Contribute to the ISAJE Newsletter

If you come across stories, news items, or topics that your ISAJE colleagues would be interested in, they belong in our Newsletter!

Contact:

Sally Gainsbury - sally.gainsbury@scu.edu.au
Daryl Boshart - daryl.boshart@camh.ca
This comprehensive, up-to-date book is about the addicted brain, the behavior of addicts and how to get treatment. Brain science such as brain imaging, behavior, and neurochemistry is used to explain why, how, and what happens when we become addicts. There is practical information about what treatment can be, and what you should look for in treatment. Why some people become addicts and why other’s don’t is discussed as well. The scientific parts, such as brain imaging, are well explained and put in the context of our everyday lives. If you are interested in addiction, because of a friend or relative, if you treat drug abusers, or if you are simply interested in the brain, then this book, written by a highly respected researcher in the field, belongs in your library. It’s been praised by drug users, parents and friends of users, treatment specialists, and workers in the legal field. Addiction to others things such as food, sex and the internet is discussed as well.

- Sally Gainsbury

DO YOU HAVE A BOOK, OR ANY OTHER MATERIAL, THAT YOU WANT TO PROMOTE?

SUBMIT IT TO THE ISAJE NEWSLETTER!
Using science to sniff out science that’s too good to be true

Recently, Discover Magazine featured an article that discusses how fraud can be detected in publications by examining results that appear conspicuously nice and neat. Fraud is one of the most serious concerns in science today. Every case of fraud undermines confidence amongst researchers and the public, threatens the careers of collaborators, and can represent millions of dollars in wasted funds. But now some scientists are fighting back against fraud—using the methods of science itself. The basic idea is very simple. Real data collected by scientists in experiments and observations is noisy; there’s always random variation and measurement error. When fraudsters decide to make up data, or to modify real data in a fraudulent way, they often create data which is just “too good”—with less variation than would be seen in reality. Using statistical methods, a number of researchers have successfully caught data fabrication by detecting data which is less random than real results.

The article describes several cases of fraudulent research (often spanning decades and many publications) being uncovered decades later by vigilant researchers (note – not always the editors or reviewers). It tells the story of the massive fraud of Dr Yoshitaka Fujii of Toho University, Japan, and the drug granisetron which is used to prevent nausea in patients after surgery. British researcher John Carlisle took 168 of Fujii’s clinical trials and observed that several key variables, such as numbers of side effects, were exactly the same in many of these trials. Assuming the data were real, you’d expect variation in these numbers, just by chance. Carlisle found extremely strong evidence that Fujii’s results were too consistent to be real. We now know that, indeed, they weren’t real and Fujii had made them up. As useful as these methods are, it’s important to remember that they can only suggest fraud, not prove it. On the other hand, though, the case of Fujii shows that these methods have a vital role to play in keeping science clean. See: http://bit.ly/12wQiFG.

-Sally Gainsbury
Why read about writing?

Prior to attending the ISAJE meeting in Lisbon, I was fortunate enough to be able to take a short guided tour in Greece. As I travelled around many ancient sites that had a rich and lengthy history of myths and actual events, I was struck by how well our guide explained these often detailed and lengthy stories. She was able to engage us all and keep our interest and attention, whilst explaining key details that would help us appreciate the sites that we were visiting. I’m not mentioning this to make any of those who were not able to travel this September envious, but just to point out that this led me to do some research about story telling. Often academics can become so caught up in our own interest in research that we may overlook the fact that others might need some assistance to interpret the salient points in articles. Therefore, story telling techniques might be a helpful guide to ‘hook’ readers and maintain their interest, whilst conveying research findings.

This point was also made by Pat Thomson, a Professor of Education at The University of Nottingham who has a regular blog Patter. Pat pointed out that writing is an art form, and can go well beyond the cognitive to provoke a wider range of senses and emotions. She described two lessons that she has learned from reading about ‘creative’ writing; the first is about vocabulary and is taken from Stephen King’s book *On writing: a memoir of a craft*:

“One of the really bad things you can do to your writing is to dress up the vocabulary, looking for long words because you’re maybe a little bit ashamed of your short ones. This is like dressing up a household pet in evening clothes. The pet is embarrassed and the person who committed this act of premeditated cuteness should be even more embarrassed. Make yourself a promise right now that you’ll never use ‘emolument’ when you mean ‘tip’… (p. 129).”

This is certainly a point that can be taken by many academic writers who can state something pretty straightforward in the most tortured terms imaginable. Pat’s second lesson comes from Anne Lamott, who wrote *Bird by bird, some instructions on writing and life*...
(1994). Anne discusses the potential pitfalls of perfectionism: “Perfectionism is the voice of the oppressor, the enemy of the people. It will keep you cramped and insane your whole life, and it is the main obstacle between you and a shitty first draft. …Besides, perfectionism will ruin your writing, blocking inventiveness and playfulness and life force (p. 28-29).”

I’m sure that Pat was not advocating that editors encourage authors to submit articles in draft form, nor that copywriters should stop paying attention to the correct use of punctuation and grammar. However, perhaps it is useful for editors to try and view “Clutter [as] wonderfully fertile ground”. This may reduce frustration when dealing with authors at least. For more see: http://bit.ly/Qz4x5N.

- Sally Gainsbury

Becoming a Journal Editor

A recent blog by Dr. Tseen-Ling Khoo on PhD2Published, a blog on academic advice for early career researchers, outlines some of the benefits of being an editor. She starts “There is no better way to fast-track your grasp of academic productivity and evaluation than becoming a journal editor… It’s not for everyone, and its rewards can be great.” A good read for all editors who are often over-worked and under-appreciated, Dr. Khoo outlines the benefits — consider which ones fall on your list of reasons for being an editor:

• Being an editor of a good journal repays you with prestige points, and you get to list it on your CV as an ‘esteem factor’
• You get to grow a field in your own image - you can often manage the content such that areas you feel are neglected get more love or, if you feel they’re overrepresented (over-saturated), these topics get ‘rested’
• If you’re lucky, you’ll get to work with a good, tight editorial team – or other colleagues, such as the great group that we have at ISAJE.
• Being a journal editor gives you a crash course in high level, on-the-job professionalism – i.e., your own work should improve as a result
• You get to see the seedy and noble sides of your colleagues – but hopefully don’t name names, at least before the first glass of wine, or caprihina, depending on your current location

Perhaps some of the senior ISAJE editors could add a few further points to this list. See the entire article at: http://bit.ly/S5OjRk.

- SG
Plagiarism in the News

iThenticate and Plagiarism Today publish a newsletter analysing misconduct incidents in the research community. Recent incidences that have been reported include:

- A University of Toronto researcher has been censured for “self-plagiarism” and “severe abuse of the scientific publishing system”. According to a retraction in the Journal of Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, Matthews and two colleagues at the university reused text from five other reports they had worked on in a 2005 paper they submitted to the journal. A representative for the university said the issue was detected by software used by the journal’s editors. The agencies and the university, however, are not commenting on whether they are treating the case as a matter of research misconduct. Self plagiarism and duplicative publication remain some of the more controversial and difficult aspects of academic misconduct. Because there is widespread debate about the ethics of self-plagiarism, with many believing it isn’t an issue at all, detection and enforcement of self-plagiarism is much more challenging.

- Allegations of widespread cheating in government class probed at Harvard - Officials there recently announced that they were investigating some 125 students for alleged collusion. The students, which made up nearly half of a class are accused of working together inappropriately on a take home test. Widespread collusion on a take home test may not be that uncommon, but what is unusual about it is first for it to happen at a school as prestigious as Harvard and for them to be this open about it, including being the ones to report the scandal to the media.

- A recent paper published in the Journal of Medical Ethics concluded that a large number of retraction notices are not wholly honest about misconduct. The study looked at 119 articles that were retracted or corrected. Of those, just handled the scandal differently, one being extremely transparent with its information, identifying the plagiarist, what they learned, when they learned it and how they reacted, while the other paper was much more opaque, hiding key facts. The case highlights the need for standard industry practices in this field and the need for publications to be prepared should such a case arise in their home.

- ASU Journalism Student Caught Plagiarizing at Two Papers – each paper
41.2% indicated that an ethical issue was the reason for the retraction or correction and only 32.8% specified the concern. However, the study did note that retractions and corrections were becoming more transparent over time and that the more recent statements mentioned ethics much more frequently than older ones. Though it’s good to see that transparency is improving in retraction notices, there’s clearly been a problem with this historically, and the problem continues today.

For each case the incident is outlined and a brief analysis of its significance is provided. Of interest for readers is the ability to vote in a poll for each incident – e.g., how should Harvard deal their students caught cheating? See more at: http://bit.ly/WkKZWN.

- Sally Gainsury

---

**Plagiarism...**

**Make your research count – publish ethically**

*Elsevier* has launched ‘Ethics in Research & Publication’, a program for early career researchers. Substantial ethical issues, including plagiarism, authorship disputes, and research fraud, can regularly confront researchers and early career researchers are often provided with little training and few resources to manage these issues. Students and young researchers may not be aware of what constitutes a breach and how just one transgression - even if done unintentionally and because of a lack of knowledge - can affect their career and society at large.

To address the growing issue of ethical misconduct in research and publishing, *Elsevier* have launched a new pro-
Ethical publication...

The panel will also be hosting live webinars for young researchers as the program rolls out.

The result of this collaboration is “Ethics in Research and Publication” (go to: http://bit.ly/QIgyZs). This is an interactive program that emphasizes the individual researcher's contribution to advancing science through integrity and good ethical standards. It also highlights the impact misconduct can have on the science community as a whole and on one's career. □

- Sally Gainsbury

How Did They Get My Email Address? The Accidental and Plentiful Supply of Academic and Scientific Contacts

Summarized here by Sally Gainsbury

A post on The Scholarly Kitchen by Kent Anderson discusses the ease with which email addresses can be ‘scraped’ from journal websites and used for spam messages. I’m sure all academics and editors, like myself, regularly receive email solicitations to submit journal articles, book chapters, conference abstracts, and the like to
Email addresses... continued

quasi-legitimate (if that) organisations that are attempting to turn academia into a commercial enterprise with little concern for scientific content. This post discusses how journal websites are easily searched for email addresses. To get around this, some publishers try to obfuscate addresses by removing ‘@’ from HTML, for example, using [at] instead. However, once a spammer knows the substitution pattern, they can modify their scripts accordingly.

Email addresses are the most common form of contact details used in publishing these days. They eliminate problems with mail delays, mail getting lost, and the costs of international postage. Kent points out that “email addresses can be used for even less savory reasons, perhaps even to provide a deceitful author with a mask to wear in front of editors. Two recent retractions described on Retraction Watch reveal how email addresses can be abused to get fraudulent papers through”.

In the first case of abuse, an author suggested non-existent reviewers (with fraudulent email addresses) for his paper, so that he could submit their own fabricated review in place of true reviews (see: http://bit.ly/NLxdr7). In the second case, a group of researchers essentially “tampered with email”, in order to (among other things) add authors to the manuscript that had no part in the research (http://bit.ly/9rBvXQ).

This article brings up many interesting issues. For example, as editors we often see corresponding authors provide email addresses for co-authors that are invalid, resulting in emails being returned. And how many editors ensure that they have correct contact details for all authors before accepting a manuscript? How many editors demand an institutional rather than personal (e.g., gmail) email address, which can be problematic for staff who have left or graduate students? Food for thought. □
Minding the Edges: Further Reflections on the iPad

This article was originally published in ISMTE’s EON Newsletter (June 2012 issue) and authored by Brittany Farmer, Managing Editor of JACC iPad edition. Thank you to ISMTE for allowing it to be republished here.

Glenn Collins’s article "The Cutting Edge is the Bleeding Edge" in the March issue of EON [and also published in our August 2012 ISAJE Newsletter. –Ed.] neatly summed up the challenges JACC has faced with its iPad Edition. Reading his article, I find myself "fondly" reminiscing about the early days when the terrain was frighteningly new and our energy was anxiously high. Though we’ve by no means mastered the media, we have since settled into a more comfortable routine. As Managing Editor for the JACC iPad Edition, I’ve built a steady workflow, collecting and modifying supplementary materials, coordinating with various editors and teams, and doing whatever else needs to be done to successfully build and publish the issues. Each week, my team and I work the system without even a hiccup (well, normally), but as Glenn suggested, things were not always so calm. Since I think it’s often better to learn from the trials of others (I know just as well as my brother that a grill top is hot, even though he had the third degree burns to prove it), I’d like to revisit some of the issues Glenn raised and offer some quick advice on how to mind the cutting edges.

My involvement with the JACC iPad Edition started around July 2010. At that point, the ACC had secured an app developer, negotiated with the publisher, and had asked the JACC office to start preparing preliminary materials. Then an editorial assistant, I was asked to collect editorial and masthead photos and bios. The project quickly escalated as we realized that the app developers could not accommodate our supplementary materials as easily as they thought. We not only needed to re-figure how to include our most important supplementary materials--slide sets, related articles, images, videos--but how to modify them to meet the app requirements, which grew more specific by the day. It became clear that for publication to run smoothly, we needed a managing editor, and in October 2010, I was fortunate enough to fill that position.

Pre-release, most of my time was spent creating templates, developing protocols, and hammering out workflows. As publishing on the iPad was a new venture for all involved, the course of action was not always clear. For example, as we drew closer to launching, we
needed to decide a publication timeline. Our online journal publishes on Mondays, one week and one day in advance of the print date. The app's content, however, is generated by ScienceDirect, which publishes the journal content on the following Tuesday. Should we publish the day the content is pulled? Or should we wait a week and publish on the actual issue date? We decided that the iPad Edition should publish as close to the online publication as possible, as a later publication date might discourage readers from using the app. Whether or not this is true, we're still not sure, but it seems a good bet anyway.

Of course, publishing on this timeline was easier said than done. At first, the app was very buggy. Sometimes it failed to pull content from ScienceDirect, and we would spend the day trying to remedy the problem. The fact that we were coordinating across at least three time zones (the app developer was in Sweden, the publishers were in New York and Pennsylvania, and I was in California) made coordination more difficult. On at least one occasion, our app developer conducted a teleconference at 2:00am. My advice to anyone using contractors across different time zones is to (1) figure out well ahead of time when is a reasonable time to meet, and (2) invest in the best webinar and teleconference software you can afford. Also, make sure all necessary people have access to and are trained on the software. For the most part, our teams used GotoMeeting, which works well enough, but not everyone was familiar with the platform.

Another unexpected challenge we faced was making time for the work. Since we didn't anticipate the labor involved (it's almost impossible to anticipate when you're working with new technologies), we had to scramble for hands and minds. Until a stable workflow was hammered out, everyone was asked to pitch in and tackle disparate tasks, which never failed to pop up at the end of an exhausting day. ("Wait, were you heading home?") Fortunately, the ACC is staffed with saints and all were willing to help out, despite their tight schedules. My advice for anyone else facing this situation: keep saints on staff.

After about four months of trial and error (and more trial and more error), the JACC iPad Edition was running smoothly. We spent the
next few months analyzing the readership reports and found that readership was steadily increasing, but several users complained that the content still took too long to download. As Glenn mentioned in his article, users were not shy about expressing their frustration--peruse the first comments in the iPad Store and you'll see. We took the feedback seriously and brainstormed various ways to increase download speeds, eventually developing a solution that involved a combination of reducing video file sizes (we now have a video streaming feature) and allowing users to choose to download just the issue or the issue with all supplementary materials. If the users choose to download just the issue, their content is ready in mere minutes, which is great if, say, they're being hounded by flight attendants to power down. While reading, users can choose to download supplement materials individually, as long as they are connected to WiFi. This feature, I think, is one of our best, and our users have responded very positively to it. I would highly recommend that any journal venturing into the app world offer multiple download options.

The most important thing I learned as Managing Editor of the JACC iPad Edition is that unexpected problems go hand in hand with new technologies. For this reason, I would advise anyone considering an iPad edition to keep things simple at first. The JACC team was rather ambitious in developing an app that offered more than the online or print edition. While I think a sophisticated app should be the ultimate goal, we would have done better to start small. A reliable, nicely designed reader (that doesn't take forever to download) with little or no additional content would have been easier to produce, and it seems this is what our readership wants. User data reports show that most of our readers do not view our related content. We are trying to better understand why this is, as readers often tell us they want more materials, but the reality remains. We will soon release iPad editions for our sister journals, and they will follow a much simpler format.

While the launch of the JACC iPad Edition was time-consuming, challenging, and often frustrating, the product we have now is worth the effort. In the early days, our mantra "the cutting edge is the bleeding edge" could not have been more true. We at JACC dared to venture into a strange new world of iPad publishing and, being more or less in the dark, sometimes nicked ourselves on corners we could not yet see. But with each drop of blood came another flame of insight, and after a year-and-a-half, we've got at least the initial terrain fairly well lit. □
Mapping research on substance use disorders worldwide: a bibliometric approach

by Gregorio González-Alcaide

- History of Science and Documentation Department, Univesity of Valencia, Spain

Note: this article is based on Dr. González-Alcaide's presentation at our 2012 Annual Meeting in Lisbon. We hope to hear more at our 2013 meeting in Spain.

Introduction: Substance Abuse as a public health problem

Substance abuse research cuts across diverse scientific disciplines, from sociology to neuroscience and psychiatry to public health, reflecting the complex nature of substance use disorders: pathologies rooted in both social and clinical determinants, and requiring both social and clinical solutions. Effective treatment and control strategies must draw from high-quality, multidisciplinary research; therefore it is important to understand how authors and journals produce scientific evidence. By studying research patterns, collaboration, and impact, journal editors and contributors can better understand how to increase high-quality outputs that inform evidence-based policy.

Study objectives and methodology

The objectives of the study “Mapping research on substance use disorders worldwide: a bibliometric approach” which was presented at the 2012 International Society of Addiction Journal Editors Annual Meeting were to use bibliometric indicators to analyze the distribution of scientific literature on each of the six main substances of abuse—tobacco, alcohol, opioids, marijuana, cocaine, and amphetamines—among indexed journals worldwide; and to identify by applying Social Network Analysis the existing research groups in the field and the principal investigators active in them.

The study was carried out in three phases: First, a bibliographic search was performed in the Medline and Scopus databases, using search terms relevant to the six main substances of abuse; Secondly, the data was introduced into a locally stored, relational database, in order to facilitate the harvesting of quantifiable indicators; Finally, bibliometric indicators were extracted from the data, exploring scientific production, and a Social Network Analysis was carried out in order to characterize the existing
collaboration structures for each of the analyzed substances and to identify the most influential researchers in the area of Substance Abuse. A research group was defined as the presence of at least two authors who were linked to one another by a number of co-authorships equal to or greater than 5. This threshold was applied to concentrate the analysis on the most intense links, thus enabling an appropriate visualization and representation of the networks.

**Illegal drugs: Scientific production and research groups**

Seven thousand and four documents that address the study of opioid abuse for the period comprising 2001 to 2010 were identified, whereas 4,592 documents focused on cocaine, 2,707 on marijuana, and 1,366 on amphetamines. The diachronic evolution of the papers per year of publication shows an upward trend that is especially significant between 2005 and 2008, after which the growth in the number of documents on cocaine, marijuana, and opioids slows noticeably (figure 1).

The journals that specialize in addiction, *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, Addiction, Addictive Behaviors*, and *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* lead the ranking in scientific production on illegal substance abuse, together with other journals in the same field. However, it is also worth

![Figure 1. Number of publications by year on illegal drug abuse](image-url)
noting that diverse journals specializing in fields such as Neuroscience, Psychiatry, Toxicology and Pharmacology are also among the most productive publications.

Only 31.76% of the papers that were published in substance abuse journals were included in the second edition of *Publishing addiction science: a guide for the perplexed*; studies focusing on marijuana abuse dominated dissemination in specialized journals (36%), while those dealing with cocaine were the least represented among these publications (table 1).

131 consolidated research groups were identified on the subject of opioids abuse. Cocaine abuse is addressed by 103 groups; marijuana abuse, by 55; and amphetamines, by 26.

**Legal drugs: Scientific production and research groups**

A total of 28,791 papers that study tobacco abuse (2006–2010) and 24,100 papers on alcohol (2005–2009) were identified, reflecting a sustained increase in scientific production in both areas of knowledge, with over 5,000 papers a year since 2009 (figure 2).

Studies on alcohol were published in 3,862 different journals, those specializing in alcohol abuse ranking among the most productive (for example, *Alcoholism,*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Non-Substance Abuse Journals</th>
<th>Substance Abuse Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Documents</td>
<td>N Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphetamines</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>1,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioids</td>
<td>7,004</td>
<td>2,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,669</td>
<td>4,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliometrics...

Clinical and Experimental Research, and Alcohol and Alcoholism), along with others on substance abuse. In connection with tobacco, studies are distributed among 2,992 journals, led by the journal specialized Nicotine & Tobacco Research. Among the most productive journals are several on substance abuse, as well as others from areas such as epidemiology, public health, oncology, and pulmonary medicine.

478 consolidated research groups were identified on tobacco, while 383 groups producing studies on alcohol abuse were found.

The tobacco network is very illustrative about the network structures and the role of outstanding authors. This network is dominated by a large group of researchers who regularly collaborate with each other. We can observe in the top of this largest group a research foci or a network sphere containing intense relationships between authors. There are also three outstanding authors who play an essential role as intermediaries in ensuring connectivity and communication between different parts of the group, preventing them from becoming isolated. These authors (cutpoints or articulation points) include Paolo Boffetta, Paul Brennan and Carlo LaVecchia.

Figure 2. Number of publications by year on tobacco and alcohol abuse
Discussion and conclusions

We found that substance abuse is a consolidated research area which is increasingly mature. There is significant research activity and a number of new journals, many specializing in different substances or aspects related to addiction.

The field is also strongly multidisciplinary. This conclusion is supported by the fact that at least two out of every three papers are published in journals from other areas of knowledge.

The Social Network Analysis shows considerable dispersion of groups and research areas. We also identified a group of prominent scientists with leading roles as intermediaries, allowing the integration and cohesion of the networks; as well as researcher hubs, characterized by intense interaction between authors. These researchers also maintain other significant collaborative relationships outside the hubs, and with a large number of sporadic collaborators. In both cases, the authors are characterized by their high degree of scientific production and citation, and they play a key role in promoting research and integrating new members into the research community.
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Collaboration between Universities and ISAJE: NETAD Project

by Dr. Michal Miovsky

Most ISAJE members are employees of academic institutions and have University backing. A relevant question for our organization, then, is what is the nature and extent of the collaboration between our society and the universities that our members work for? ISAJE and universities share some basic interests: notably, to produce high quality science, and publish first-class articles in prestigious journals. ISAJE and universities complete these services on limited, and often shrinking, budgets.

This lies in stark contrast to the budgets of the corporations that sell tobacco and alcohol, which are usually extensive. On the scholarly, research side of addiction, we find frustration, uphill battles, and limited budgets that are usually provided via public funding. ISAJE is in my personal perspective something like “gate-keeper” of quality, standards, ethics, and hard issues like the economic and political aspects in addiction science.

For universities, ISAJE is a logical partner, because our own individual universities cannot provide us with the types of support that we require. All of us have limits and responsibilities – my faculty, for instance, has in the “addictology” (addiction science) program alone nearly 300 students in BA and MA programs. There are real limits, such as clinical responsibilities, that prevent the cultivation of publishing skill. Further, addiction science publication is relatively new – how long have separate BA, MA or Ph.D programs in addiction science existed?

It has been nine years since my colleagues and I established the first “addictology” program in Prague, and I can say that we have only begun our work. We still ask ourselves – how can we be effective in giving our students (in MA, PHD, and post-doctoral programs) top quality clinical supervision and training in evidence-based practice? My original idea at our 2010 ISAJE meeting in Prague was to define a list of our possible joint interests...
with universities and try to do something concrete. The National Czech Project—NETAD—and the reactions of my ISAJE colleagues gave me the best opportunity to do this.

Results of the needs assessment on the Czech Republic and some specific consequences for wider context

ISAJE has taken up the task of training students and young researchers in effective publishing practice. The Publishing Addiction Science (PAS) book and the mentoring program are two ways we’ve gone about accomplishing this task. However, it is time to evaluate where our successes and failures to date come from. After a first needs assessment, it is clear that there is a dearth of practical recommendations, and a shortage of instructions on how to adopt general information into various contexts and situations.

Another weakness: all lectures and tutorials have a wonderful theoretical quality, but it seems that the assumption of our teachers is that we’re speaking to postdoctoral and doctoral students who already have a first publication experience. But we rarely give feedback on how to move and press students to get to their first experience. We need an easier and more practical guide for students on how to do the very preliminary first steps of publication: i.e., how to prepare an English-language manuscript. My ISAJE colleagues confirm this, and everybody supports the idea of using the existing system to make our resources available and friendlier to younger students and researchers with language and cultural barriers.

We all agree that language barriers are a problem for students from non-English speaking countries. Beyond “proper” English, which these students must master, there is an added wrinkle when it comes to a journal’s “language and culture”. For example, they are working in a language other than their mother tongue and they have the “social” position as an unknown author. We need more practical recommendations and examples on how to solve the practical troubles that non-English authors face when preparing manuscripts.

Both students and teachers have expressed a need for this focus on practical assistance. The e-learning lectures and PAS book we’ve developed need to become part of MA and PhD curricula, and we need to provide recommendations on how to fold
these into pre-existing curricula. We must prepare a model (based on the puzzle principle) of the subject “PAS in practice” for MA and PhD students, include recommended syllabuses and practical examples and provide these for free to universities, which will hopefully spur further collaboration and financial support.

Goals of the project and target population: first step as a case study

The context of addiction science within the Czech Republic is quite specific. In the past 10 years, we have created a system of education in addiction science called addictology. In our MA program we have more than 100 students, and we plan to finish and open a new separate MA study program in English for international students (planned for 2014). This means that publishing skills are part of the “top 5” needs we’ve identified. We’ve taken responsibility for an extensive national project “Networking in Addictology” (NETAD) for capacity-building and networking purposes. One branch of this project targets international collaboration, and supports training capacities and publishing practice. I designed this component according to feedback from a needs assessment, and prepared it as a “case study” of collaboration between ISAJE and universities according to the wider context of our discussions in ISAJE. The specific goals are:

- Structure a university course “Publishing Addiction Science I” that includes ECT credits and a formal description (for MA and/or PhD programs)
- Create a syllabus and small technical guide for teachers
- Identify and describe what is convenient/useful/necessary to add to our e-learning components
- Do a detailed assessment of the Prague “summer school” in 2013 (July or August) and publish these first experiences, and adapt correct final product.
- After adapting the program, finalize the set of materials and offer it to other universities. Use it to facilitate development of the PARINT program, and the activities of both working groups under ISAJE (non-English printing journals and Mentor scheme and Tutorial).
NETAD... continued

I expect discussion within the internal team of this subproject, and amongst other ISAJE members as well, and dialogue at our next meeting in 2013. We spoke about this idea at the last Lisbon meeting and it was quite clear that this can be a wonderful opportunity to initiate the preparatory phase of a new application form for joint projects, and entrance into the application process on NIDA, WHO, or other organizations.

The primary target populations of the first project are university teachers and researchers and departments oriented toward addiction science and with on-going or planning study programs (MA and PHD programs) in this field, and researchers that collaborate with universities and students. A secondary target population are students, and of course for the summer school, they are the primary target population.

Role of ISAJE in the project and timetable in the context of work our plan

ISAJE will be the main partner for the Czech project NETAD in this component (Publishing practice) and in January 2013 we will clarify the memorandum. In this context we expect that we will establish small joint working groups under the umbrella of the NETAD project and ISAJE. Hopefully, we can garner participation from another 2 or 3 ISAJE members with experience with PAS and in the training of students in this area. After discussions in Lisbon, we have the core of this group, and we are beginning to collaborate with other universities right now (e.g., Betsy Tom and her colleagues).

Funding for this stage of the project will be covered by the NETAD project in partnership with ISAJE (as a guarantor). We have a relatively limited budget but 2 of our key activities are creating convenient rules and frames for developing this kind of international collaboration and through these key activities we can support collaboration and practical tasks like these:

1. Structure a university course “Publishing addiction science I” – basic conception, recommended model for training/teaching (to be completed by February 2013)
2. Create syllabus: will be used as a recommended syllabus, universities can add or skip what they want/wish (to be completed by May 2013)
3. Create a small technical guide for teachers (basic version): short explanations on how to manage the
course, some examples and experiences from the Prague summer school, some practical advice and recommendations on how to use e-learning support.

4. Make adaptations to our PAS materials and e-learning support on ISAJE website (e.g., split some extensive lectures to shorter units, add transcripts, add practical examples). This e-learning support also needs more practical examples – for instance: “how to structure your manuscript according to your data and a journal’s specific rules”, “what are practical consequences if single authorship, and of multiple authorship”. (to be completed by June 2013)

5. Assess the Prague summer school in 2013, publish the results, and adapt the program to make it better. We expect an enrolment of primarily students from the Clinic of Addictology in Prague, but a few spots could be offered to other students (in negotiation is group leaded by prof. Faggiono). (to be completed by July or August 2013: has to by clarified)

6. Correct and finalize the set of all materials (points A-E): publish a paper about this activity and offer it to other universities (through our PARINT website and ISAJE). Give a presentation at our next Annual Meeting on our successes, failures, and next steps (to be completed by September 2013)

Special thanks to Tom Babor, Peter M. Miller, Stenius Kerstin, Richard Pates and Betsy Tom and ISAJE board members for their comments and suggestions.

Note: This project is co-financed by European social fund and by the government of the Czech Republic.