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Credit where credit is due

Liz Allen, Amy Brand, Jo Scott, Micah Altman and Marjorie Hlava are trialling digital taxonomies to help researchers to identify their contributions to collaborative projects.

Research today is rarely a one-person job. Original research papers with a single author are — particularly in the life sciences — a vanishing breed. Partly, the inflation of author numbers on papers has been driven by research assessment.

Through the endorsement of individuals’ contributions, researchers can start to move beyond ‘authorship’ as the dominant measure of esteem. For funding agencies, better information about the contributions of grant applicants would aid the decision-making process and could also enable journal articles to be classified using a 14-role taxonomy (see ‘Who did what?’). The survey was sent to 1,200 corresponding authors of work published in PLOS journals, Nature Publishing Group journals, Elsevier journals, Science and eLife. Corresponding authors were asked to indicate the contributions of each article according to the roles they had undertaken.
Author Contributions

The contributions of all authors must be described. PLOS has adopted the CRediT Taxonomy to describe each author’s individual contributions to the work. The submitting author is responsible for providing the contributions of all authors at submission. We expect that all authors will have reviewed, discussed, and agreed to their individual contributions ahead of this time. Contributions will be published with the final article, and they should accurately reflect contributions to the work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor Role</th>
<th>Role Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization</td>
<td>Ideas; formulation or evolution of overarching research goals and aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Curation</td>
<td>Management activities to annotate (produce metadata), scrub data and maintain research data (including software code, where it is necessary for interpreting the data itself) for initial use and later reuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Analysis</td>
<td>Application of statistical, mathematical, computational, or other formal techniques to analyze or synthesize study data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Acquisition</td>
<td>Acquisition of the financial support for the project leading to this publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Conducting a research and investigation process, specifically performing the experiments, or data/evidence collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Development or design of methodology; creation of models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>Management and coordination responsibility for the research activity planning and execution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Provision of study materials, reagents, materials, patients, laboratory samples, animals, instrumentation, computing resources, or other analysis tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Programming, software development; designing computer programs; implementation of the computer code and supporting algorithms; testing of existing code components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Oversight and leadership responsibility for the research activity planning and execution, including mentorship external to the core team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>Verification, whether as a part of the activity or separate, of the overall replication/reproducibility of results/experiments and other research outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically visualization/data presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing – Original Draft Preparation</td>
<td>Creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically writing the initial draft (including substantive translation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing – Review &amp; Editing</td>
<td>Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work by those from the original research group, specifically critical review, commentary or revision – including pre- or post-publication stages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 75 percent decline over 27 years in total flying insect biomass in protected areas

Caspar A. Hallmann, Martin Sorg, Eelke Jongejans, Henk Siepel, Nick Hofland, Heinz Schwan, Werner Steinmans, Andreas Müller, Hubert Sumser, Thomas Hörren, Dave Goulson, Hans de Kroon
Published: October 18, 2017 • https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185809
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The unique authority of scholarly publishing arises from the rigorous evaluation and assessment works must go through before they are published—known as the peer review process. Peer Review Transparency is an initiative of scholarly publishers, academic librarians, technology innovators, and thought leaders in scholarly communication, with support from the Open Society Foundations, to create agreed definitions of how peer review is conducted, and to develop and test efficient tools.
Appendix 2: A Proposed Form of Signaling

We present here a series of proposed icons corresponding to the definitions set out in Appendix 1 above. We show as well a conceptual notion of how these icons could be arranged so as to communicate simply and clearly to readers the process by which various scholarly objects comprising a publication had been reviewed.
Click here to download an interactive PDF version of the printed book. 
(Note: We recommend using a full featured PDF reader, like Adobe Acrobat, 
GhostView, or PDF Expert to take advantage of the features of this version.)

Click here to read the book online.

Click here to order a copy of the book.

Librarians: Cataloguing record at this link.

Exactly how is it we think the ends of justice are accomplished by sentencing someone to a term in prison? How do we relate a quantitative measure of time—months and years—to the objectives of deterring crime, punishing wrongdoers, and accomplishing justice for those touched by a criminal act? Linda Ross Meyer investigates these questions, examining the disconnect between our two basic modes of thinking about time—chronologically (seconds, minutes, hours), or phenomenologically (observing, taking note of, or being aware of the passing of time). In Sentencing in Time, Meyer asks whether—in overlooking the irreconcilability of these two modes of thinking about time—we are failing to accomplish the ends we believe the criminal...
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Blockchain for Peer Review

1. Data extraction from Journal Management System

2. Generation of a unique, anonymous id for the reviewer.

3. Augmentation of ORCID profile with review information.

4. Storage of the anonymised review information on the blockchain.

Not-for-profit initiative founded by:

- Springer Nature
- Digital Science
- Cambridge University Press
- ORCID
- Taylor & Francis Group
Blockchain for Peer Review

**Finding**: we can build better or support reviewer finding solutions by ensuring complete review profiles, including reviewer’s preferences and availability.

**Recognition**: information sent to e.g. ORCID, third party platforms, institutions.

**Validation**: review process can be independently verified & demonstrated.

**Phase 1 - POC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer: Dr. John Doe</th>
<th>Reviews done for Journal of Cell Biology:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews done total:
- 2018: 32
- 2017: 5
- 2016: 1
- 2015: 6

- Invitation accept rate: 80%
- Reviews delivered on time: 95%
- Currently available: Yes
- Currently engaged in review: No
“On a mission to democratise the value of online content”
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