Open Research Pilot Kick Off Meeting

Marta Teperek
27 January 2017
Informal !!!!
No one wants more admin burden

Introductions

Wellcome Trust Open Research Team

Robert Kiley
David Carr

Who are you?
What skills/expertise do you bring?
Why are you interested in the pilot?

Cambridge Open Research Team

Georgina Cronin
Lauren Cadwallader
Rosie Higman
Marta Teperek
Danny Kingsley (the boss)

* - images taken today in the morning, from the internet, without asking for permission
Introductions

From you!

- Who are you?
- What is your research about and what kind of data does your research generate?
- What motivated you to participate in the Pilot?
- What kind of outputs are you planning to share? Do you foresee any difficulties in sharing?
- Who will be the main contact point for our group?

* - didn’t take your photos from the internet
The rest of the day

• Aims and objectives of the project and support available
  – Presentation from Cambridge
  – Presentation from the Wellcome Trust

• Ways of working

• Next steps

• Q&A
Goals of the project:

- What is needed for researchers to share and get credit for **all outputs** of the research process?
  - non-positive results, protocols, source code, presentations
    (things beyond the remit of traditional publications)

- What are the barriers preventing researchers from sharing?
  - (including resource and time implications)

- What incentivises the process?
Commitment:

• Willingness to share!

• Nominated person (or more people!) will:
  – Meet with the facilitator monthly
  – Meet altogether (with the Wellcome) once every 6 months

• Engage with the Project by:
  – Contributing to writing blog posts every 6 months
  – Contributing to writing peer review papers about the Project
  – Share your feedback with us and the Wellcome Trust
    • influence and improve current systems and Open Research practice
What are the benefits of being involved?

- Visibility
- Recognition in the field for doing transparent research
- Promotion:
  - through the Wellcome Trust
  - Cambridge channels
  - conferences and publications in peer-reviewed journals
- Opportunity to drive development and influence Open Research policies
What support is available to me?

• Monthly meetings with Cambridge facilitator
  – Help identify research outputs suitable for sharing and decide on best ways of sharing these outputs
  – Preferential access to pilot projects and support services

• Wellcome Trust team will help answer any questions you have regarding publication of your research outputs.
  – Outputs published on the Wellcome Open Research platform will be directly funded by the Wellcome
Timeline

- **November 2016** – call opens
- **11 December** - call closes
- **December 2016** – selection of participating research groups
- **January 2017** – December 2018 – Pilot Project duration
  - Monthly meetings
  - Meetings altogether every 6 month and mini evaluations
- **January 2019** – Project evaluation
This is collaborative endeavour. Suggestions?
Open Research: an update from the Wellcome

Cambridge, 27th January

Robert Kiley – Lead, Open Research
r.kiley@wellcome.ac.uk;
Twitter@robertkiley;
ORCID: 0000-0003-4733-2558
Agenda

1. Update on Open Research
2. *Wellcome Open Research* publishing platform
3. Preprints
Open Research @ Wellcome

• *Roadmap* to enable Wellcome to take a leadership role in ensuring research outputs which arise from its funding are findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable (FAIR principles)

• Extending focus beyond publications to data and code
Key objective

To facilitate the sharing of research outputs – data, publications, code and materials – to help:

• accelerate new discoveries, to help improve health;
• support reproducibility;
• increase the efficiency of the research enterprise.
Challenges

• Costs and researcher burden
• Lack of infrastructures, tools and skills
• Incentives are not in place
• Evidence base is lacking
What are we proposing?
A two-pronged strategy

- **Policy-led initiatives**
  - Redefine OA strategy
  - Develop incentives programme
  - Central Service for Preprints

- **Infrastructure-led initiatives**
  - Extend CSDR for academic trials

- **Community-led initiatives**
  - “Responsible Research” Funding Scheme
  - Biomedical Resources Funding Scheme
  - Commissioned activities
    - Pioneers Programme (incl. LMIC)
    - Tools & services to facilitate data discovery and re-use
    - Discipline-based pilot

Open Research
What are we proposing?

Take forward existing activities
- Diversifying scholarly communications
- Providing a

Support cross-cutting community led initiatives
- Discipline specific pilots
- Centre based pilots

Reform our own policies and practices
- Incentivise open practices
- Develop model for funding and
Wellcome Open Research
Wellcome Open Research

A new publishing platform where Wellcome-funded researchers can publish *any* results they think are worth sharing.

One of a **number of activities** – along with paying APCs, **support for eLife** & preprints, etc. – Wellcome undertaking in this space.

http://wellcomeopenresearch.org
What problem were we seeking to solve?

• To improve the way research is communicated
• Make the process **faster**….  
• …more **transparent**
  • All reviews are signed and public; everything (one passed initial screening) is published
• …make it easier for researchers to provide information that supports **reproducibility**
  • all supporting data must be shared (or explanation provided how to access it)
• …And encourage the sharing of **all** research outputs
  • Address “file drawer” problem - by publishing negative and non-confirmatory results, as well as protocols, data notes, software notes, case studies etc etc
  • Remove the publication bias, where +tive results are more likely to be published
Publication bias – clinical trials

Source:
Selective Publication of Antidepressant Trials and Its Influence on Apparent Efficacy

Erick H. Turner, M.D., Annette M. Matthews, M.D., Eftihia Linardatos, B.S., Robert A. Tell, L.C.S.W., and Robert Rosenthal, Ph.D.

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMsa065779

http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJ Msa065779#t=article,
WOR: publication process

**SUBMISSION**
- Submit your article and data
- You suggest referees

**PUBLICATION**
- Tell your colleagues your article is published

**OPEN PEER REVIEW AND REVISION**
- Publish new article versions: linked and independently citable
- Check author-suggested expert referees for conflicts and invite. Publish referee reports
- Approved; ✓✓
- Approved with reservations; ??
- Not approved ✗✗

**DISSEMINATION**
- Pass peer review, get PubMed ID and wait for citations
- Index in bibliographic databases
Identifying genes required for respiratory growth of fission yeast [version 1; referees: 4 approved]
Michal Malecki, Jürg Bähler

FUNDER Wellcome Trust

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The LonDownS adult cognitive assessment to study cognitive abilities and decline in Down syndrome [version 1; referees: awaiting peer review]
Carla M. Startin, Sarah Hamburg, Rosalyn Hithersay, Amy Davies, Erin Rodger, Nidhi Aggarwal, Tamara Al-Janabi, André Strydom

FUNDERS Wellcome Trust | Baily Thomas Charitable Fund

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Free serum haemoglobin is associated with brain atrophy in secondary progressive multiple sclerosis [version 1; referees: 1 approved, 1 approved with reservations]
Alex Lewin, Shea Hamilton, Aviva Wiktovker, Paul Langford, Richard Nicholas, Jeremy Chataway, Charles R.M. Bangham

FUNDERS Hans Lassmann and Simon Hatemner, George Harauz and Vladimir V. Bammy

Open Peer Review

Referee Status: ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔

Invited Referees

Version(s) 1 2 3 4

Version 1 published 15 Nov 2016

1. Christopher Herbert, CEA, CNRS, University Paris-Sud, University Paris Saclay, France
2. Luis A. Rokeach, Université de Montréal, Canada
3. Jim Karagiannis, University of Western Ontario, Canada
4. Makoto Kawamukai, Shimane University, Japan

All reports (4)

Comments on

All comments (0)
Add a Comment
Open reviews: critical, helpful and honest

Comments on study design and data interpretation – Several points require clarification, in our view.

1. There were 140 patients, and 60 controls (3 groups of 20). So the total number is supposed to be 200 serum samples per time point. What are the other 276 samples? The question of sample numbers, both of patients and controls, arises again later when 138 patients are mentioned. Additionally, a valuable control could be a group of patients with another neurodegenerative disease characterised by brain atrophy.

2. The 6-month time point was not mentioned in the paragraph describing the study design, and there were no results reported for it.

3. For protein profiling by SELDI-TOF mass spectrometry, after the 1:10 serum dilution, one would expect signal

Referee Report 20 Jan 2017

Sophie Donnet, University of Paris-Saclay, Paris, France

Not Approved

In this paper, the authors claim that the conclusions of several studies would be modified if a statistical models taking into account the variability of the presented stimuli had been considered.

Although the problem is interesting, I am not completely convinced by the conclusions and the statistical tools used to assess the results.

First of all, the authors argue that, due to the complexity of the new model, the authors can not use the standard numerical tools to perform the statistical inference (R or SAS) and so will prefer a Bayesian inference, making this choice quite opportunist. However, besides the fact that they use a Bayesian inference (including prior distribution), they base their conclusions on frequentist arguments (comparing test statistics). To my point of view, this is quite confusing. If a Bayesian framework is considered, then the hypothesis testings should be performed using Bayes Factor or any other tools taking into account the prior distribution.
Some early data

- 51 submissions; published 39 articles, and some 78 peer review reports
- Of the 39 articles, 19 (49%) have passed peer review are in PubMed, PMC and Europe PMC
- Articles have enjoyed more than 15,000 views; 1700 downloads

Bottom line:
A fast way to publish your results & make them highly discoverable.

Articles available through PubMed Central, Europe PMC and PubMed
The ask?

To encourage you – Wellcome funded researchers and your collaborators – to consider publishing on this platform
Preprints
Supporting preprints

- Growing interest in using preprints
  - They provide researchers with a fast way to disseminate their work, establish priority of their discoveries, and obtain feedback.
- Researchers can cite preprints in their Wellcome grant applications and End-of-Grant reports
- A number of funders have agreed a common set of Principles that a Central Service for Preprints should adhere to
- ASAPbio issuing a Request for Application in early Feb 2017
Questions?
Ways of working

- Transparent!

- Honesty – blog posts about our experiences
  - Publications

- Shared google drive folder:
  - Send your gmail addresses to Marta

- Recording the extra time:
Welcome to the Unlocking Research blog

This blog is maintained by the Office of Scholarly Communication based in the University of Cambridge Library and the University Research Office. Blogs cover many topics: Scholarly communication, Open Research, Open Access, Research Data Management and Library & training matters.

Scholarly communication

- 2016 – That was the year that was - 17 January 2017
- Taking a principled stance - the Scholarly Commons - 22 September 2016
- Lifting the lid on peer review - 19 July 2016
- Watch this space - the first OSI workshop - 24 April 2016
- The value of embracing unknown unknowns - 11 March 2016
- It is all a bit of a mess! Observations from Researcher to Reader conference - 18 February 2016
- What does a researcher do all day? - 1 February 2016
- Could the HEFCE policy be a Trojan Horse for Gold OA? - 25 January 2016
- 2015 – That was the year that was - 11 January 2016
- Half-life is half the story – 16 October 2015
- Archiving webpages – securing the digital discourse – 3 October 2015
- What is research impact? In an interconnected world? – 25 September 2015

Open Research

- Could Open Research benefit Cambridge University researchers? – 3 August 2016
- The case for Open Research: solutions? – 2 August 2016
- The case for Open Research: does peer review work? – 19 July 2016
- The case for Open Research: replicability, retractions & retrospective hypotheses – 14 July 2016
- The case for Open Research: the authorship problem – 12 July 2016

https://unlockingresearch.blog.lib.cam.ac.uk/?page_id=2
Next steps

• February – meeting with your facilitator
  – Set up monthly meetings
  – Start sharing

• Marta: blog post from today (early February)
  – Anyone else would like to write a blog post?

• Blog post about your research group and your involvement in the pilot
Questions?