

The Royal Society of Biology Research Dissemination Committee  
**Research Communication Newsletter**

May 2017

## Publication policy and debate

### [The Future of Peer Review](#)

#### [The history of peer review, and looking forward to preprints in biomedicine](#)

The report from SpotOn, 'What might peer review look like in 2030?' has now been published. This blog contains a section on the history of peer review from Frank Norman.

#### [Peer review, from the perspective of a frustrated scientist](#)

The report from SpotOn, 'What might peer review look like in 2030?' has now been published. This blog contains a section on peer review perspectives from 'frustrated scientist' Elodie Chabrol.

#### [Peer review: should we let the robots take over?](#)

Technologist argues that artificial intelligence could make publishing decisions in milliseconds.

#### [Six questions about preprints](#)

2017 is shaping up to be the year that preprints in biomedical sciences go mainstream.

#### [It's time for academics to take back control of research journals](#)

The evolution into a highly-profitable industry was never planned. Academics must make the case for lower-cost journals.

### [Why has submitting a manuscript to a journal become so difficult? A call to simplify an overly complicated process](#)

It is widely acknowledged that submitting a paper to a journal is a fraught activity for authors. But why should this still be the case? James Hartley and Guillaume Cabanac argue that the process has always been complicated but can, with a few improvements, be less so.

### [Publish houses of brick, not mansions of straw](#)

Papers need to include fewer claims and more proof to make the scientific literature more reliable, warns William G. Kaelin Jr.

### [A number of freely available tools can help you improve your literature review routine and stay on top of published research](#)

The sheer proliferation of newly published research articles can make staying on top of the literature a daunting, time-consuming task. Moreover, not being a deadline-driven activity, it can also fall down lists of priorities and be difficult to integrate into the everyday routine.

### [Writing a peer review is a structured process that can be learned and improved – 12 steps to follow](#)

Peer review not only helps to maintain the quality and integrity of scientific literature but is also key to a researcher's development.

### [Who should speak for academics over the future of publishing?](#)

Learned societies used to be seen as the guardians of academic prestige. They should act on that moral authority and reclaim their oversight of peer review, says Aileen Fyfe.

## International publishing

### [Dutch lose access to OUP journals in subscription standoff](#)

Negotiators fail to reach a deal with Oxford University Press over transition to open access.

## Publication ethics

### [Science publishers try new tack to combat unauthorized paper sharing](#)

Rise in copyright breaches prompts industry to discuss ways to allow 'fair sharing' of articles.

### [Researchers correct statistical flaw in high-profile paper](#)

It's every scientist's worst nightmare: A simple mistake in a high-profile study results in a large statistical error that then becomes embarrassingly public.

**Royal Society of Biology**  
Science Policy Team  
Charles Darwin House  
12 Roger Street  
London  
WC1N 2JU  
[policy@rsb.org.uk](mailto:policy@rsb.org.uk)

Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Royal Society of Biology.

---

© Royal Society of Biology 2017. Registered Charity Number: 277981  
Charles Darwin House, 12 Roger Street, London WC1N 2JU