



How to foster research integrity on your journal

Lex Bouter, Professor of Methodology and Integrity, Vrije Universiteit

Filmed at the Amsterdam Scholarly Summit, 2 July 2019

What can you do? And it's, in a way, a summary of what I said before. And you're not the only stakeholder. You have the researchers, the research institute, the funders of research, and you also have the journals. And now I'm focusing on the journals. What you can do and what your publisher can do and most likely, you should do it together. Reinventing the wheel for every journal is not a good idea, of course.

Now, I said this already, follow the TOP guidelines. Register all the journals in the system with TOP guidelines and be ambitious in there because transparency is a good idea.

Demand registration or pre-registration, or even better, experiment with registered reports. I'm going to dwell on that on the next slide.

Use reporting guidelines. That is a trick from biomedical science, now broadening to other disciplines. There has been some good research showing that when you have sound reporting guidelines, reporting gets better and more complete. That is important.

Promote pre-prints. A wonderful idea that came from physics mainly, they're doing that for decades already and now, it's getting traction really rapidly in biomedicine and also in the social sciences. It is a good idea because your stuff is open in the air before even a reviewer looked at it and some colleagues might be interested and commend you and enable you to improve your manuscript. And that really happens.

What I like, personally, and there is some research, although not that solid so far, showing that this is true - having open peer review. The quality of open peer review is so much better. Don't rely on your reviewers and editors for everything.

Also, the editorial office should look for spin. There are some good automation tools for that nowadays. Experimental, but available. The way they reported study limitations, there are some tools for that as well nowadays. Automation, some text recycling, plagiarism detection was mentioned already, and what is now happening in many journals, that is, image manipulation and image replication. We need to look at that better and software is getting better because all these are boring tasks that make available all the tools for this type of activity.

And then, promote post-publication peer review. The story has not ended after publication. You can still improve the papers and I like it when you also allow updated versions and that can be done now because we are not working on paper anymore. We're working in the digital space and you can have all the stuff together in the digital space without confusion. And you can always make clear what is the most recent version and what are the changes between the versions. So five or ten years after publication, an updated version, when needed, should be possible, I believe. And that's happening now in many journals.