

New Scholarly Communication System: Minimum Conditions
Trond E. Jacobsen

ACRL Scholarly Communication Committee (2003) Principles and strategies for the reform of scholarly communication: Issues related to the formal system of scholarly communication. *C&RL News*, 64(8), 526-527, 547.

Alderson, A., Davidoff, F., Jefferson, T., & Wager, E. (2001). *Editorial peer review for improving the quality of reports of biomedical studies: A Cochrane review*. Fourth International Congress on Peer Review in Biomedical Publication, Barcelona, Spain, September, 2001.

Alonso, C., Davidson, C., Unsworth, J, & Withey, L. (2003). *Crises and opportunities: The futures of scholarly publishing*. ACLS Occasional Paper, No. 57. New York: American Council of Learned Societies.

Apt, K. (2001). Towards free access to scientific literature. *Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde*, 5, 251-255. Available: <http://www.math.leidenuniv.nl/~naw/serie5/deel02/sep2001/pdf/apt.pdf> [8 Apr 2005].

Arms, W.Y. (2002). What are the alternatives to peer review? Quality control in scholarly publishing on the web. *JEP: The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 8(1).

Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (1999). *What authors want: The ALPSP research study on the motivations and concerns of contributors to learned journals*. Worthing, West Sussex, England.

Association of Research Libraries (2000). *Principles for emerging systems of scholarly publishing* (Tempe Statement). Available: <http://www.arl.org/scomm/tempe.html> [13 Mar 2005].

Association of Research Libraries (2004). *Issues in scholarly communication: Open access*. ONLINE. 20 December 20, 2004. American Library Association. Available: http://www.arl.org/scomm/open_access/index.html [7 Mar 2005].

Association of Research Libraries (2004) *ARL Statistics*. Available: <http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/index.html> [13 Mar 2005].

Bence, V. & Oppenheim, C. (2004). The influence of peer review on the research assessment exercise. *Journal of Information Science*, 30(4), 347-368.

Bingham C.M., Higgins G, Coleman R, Van Der Weyden M.B. (1998). The Medical Journal of Australia Internet peer-review study. *Lancet*, 352, 441-445.

Björk, B.C. & Hedlund, T. (2004). A formalised model of the scientific publication process. *Online Information Review*, 28(1), 8-21.

Bohlin, I. (2004). Communication regimes in competition: The current trend in scholarly communication seen through the lens of the sociology of technology. *Social Studies of Science*, 34(3), 365-391.

Broad W. (1980). Imbroglia at Yale (1): Emergence of a fraud. *Science*, 210, 38-41.

Brown, G. & Irby, B.J. (2002). Fourteen lessons: Initiating and editing an online professional refereed journal. *JEP: The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 8(1). Available: <http://www.press.umich.edu/jep/08-01/irby.html> [2 Apr 2005].

New Scholarly Communication System: Minimum Conditions
Trond E. Jacobsen

Brown, T. (2004). *Peer review and the acceptance of new scientific ideas: Discussion paper from a Working Party on equipping the public with an understanding of Peer Review*. London: Sense About Science.

Buck, A.M., Flagan, R.C., & Coles, B. (1999). *Scholar's forum: A new model for scholarly communication*. California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, March 23, 1999. Available: <http://library.caltech.edu/publications/ScholarsForum/scholarsforum.pdf> [16 Mar 2005].

Campanario, J. M., (1998). Peer review for journals as it stands today – Part 1. *Science Communications*, 19, 181–211.

Campanario, J. M. (1998). Peer review for journals as it stands today – Part 2. *Science Communications*, 19, 277–306.

Canadian Association of Research Libraries (2005). *Integrated knowledge ecosystem: Canadian research strategy*. (January). Available: <http://www.kdstudy.ca/2005/finalreport.pdf> [17 Apr 2005].

Clark, A., Singleton-Jackson, J., & Newsom, R. (2000). Journal editing: Managing the peer review process for timely publication of articles. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 16(3), 62-71.

Committee on Institutional Cooperation (2005). Report from the CIC summit on scholarly communication: Access to journal literature. Chicago: CIC Reports. Available: <http://www.cic.uiuc.edu/groups/CICMembers/archive/Report/SCSreportJan2005.pdf> [16 Mar 2005].

Crow, R. (2002). *The Case for Repositories: A SPARC Position Paper*. Washington, D.C.: Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition, 1-37.

Delamothe, T. & Smith, R. (2004). Open access publishing takes off. *British Medical Journal*, 328. 3 January 2004, 1-3.

de Vries, J. (2001). Peer review: The Holy Cow of science. In Fredriksen, E.H., (ed.). *A century of science publishing*, (231-244). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Enserink, M. (2001). Peer review and quality: A dubious connection? *Science*, 293(21 September), 2187-2188.

Eysenbach, G. (2004). Peer review and publication of research protocols and proposals: A role for open access journals. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 6(3), Article e37. Available: <http://www.jmir.org/2004/3/e37> [29 Mar 2005].

Fredriksen, E.H., (ed.) (2001). *A century of science publishing*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Gallopin, G., Funtowicz, S., O'Connor, M., Ravetz, J. (2001). Science for the 21st Century: From social contract to the scientific core. [UNESCO] *International Journal of Social Science*, 168, 219-229.

Garvey, W.D. & Griffith, B.C. (1964). Scientific information exchange in psychology. *Science*, 146(3652), 1655-1659.

Garvey, W.D. & Griffith, B.C. (1972). Communication and information processing within scientific disciplines: Empirical findings for psychology. *Information Storage and Retrieval*, 8, 123-126.

New Scholarly Communication System: Minimum Conditions
Trond E. Jacobsen

Gass, S. (2001). Transforming scientific communication for the 21st Century. *Science & Technology Libraries*, 19(3/4), 3-18.

Gelfand, J. & King, J.L. (1998). Grey market science: Research libraries, grey literature, and the legitimization of scientific discourse in the internet age. In C.S. Nielson, (Ed.) *Proceedings -- 1998 Socioeconomic Dimensions of Electronic Publishing Workshop* (Santa Barbara, CA, April 23-25, 1998). Piscataway, NJ: IEEE.

Godlee F., Gale C.R., Martyn C.N. (1997). *The effect on the quality of peer review of blinding reviewers and asking them to sign their reports: a randomized controlled trial*. Presented at the International Congress on Biomedical Peer Review and Global Communications, Sept 17-21, 1997, Prague, Czech Republic.

Grove, L.K. (2003). In pursuit of constructive criticism. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 46(4), 257-264.

Goldenberg-Hart, D. (2004). Libraries and changing research practices: a report of the ARL/CNI forum on E-research and cyber-infrastructure. *ARL Bimonthly Report* 237, December, 1-2.

Gura, R. (2002). Peer review, unmasked. *Nature*, 416(21 March), 258-260.

Harnad, S. (1990). Scholarly Skywriting and the prepublication continuum of scientific inquiry. *Psychological Science*, 1, 342 - 343. Available:
<http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~harnad/Papers/Harnad/harnad90.skywriting.html> [1 Apr 2005]

Harnad, S. (1996). Implementing peer review on the net: Scientific quality control in Scholarly Electronic Journals. In R. Peek & Newby, G. (Eds.). *Scholarly Publication: The Electronic Frontier* (103-108). Cambridge MA: MIT Press. Available:
<http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~harnad/Papers/Harnad/harnad96.peer.review.html> [7 Apr 2005].

Harnad, S. (1997). *Learned Inquiry and the Net: the role of peer review, peer commentary and copyright*. Abridged paper of Keynote Address, "Learned Inquiry and the Net," delivered at Beyond Print: Symposium on Electronic Publishing and New Models of Scholarly Communication, Center for Instructional Technology, University of Toronto at Scarborough, September 26-27, 1997. Available:
<http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~harnad/Papers/Harnad/harnad97.antiquity.html> [7 Apr 2005]

Harnad, S. (2000). *The Invisible Hand of Peer Review*. Available:
<http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~harnad/nature2.html> [2 Apr 2005].

Harnad, S. (2001). Nature Debates: The self-archiving initiative. *Nature.com*, 26 April 2001. Available:
<http://www.nature.com/nature/debates/e-access/Articles/harnad.html> [11 April 2005]

Hars, A. (2003). *From publishing to knowledge networks: Reinventing online knowledge infrastructures*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Harter, S.P. (1998). Scholarly communication and electronic journals: An impact study. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 49(6), 507-516.

Horrobin, D. (1990). The philosophical basis of peer review and the suppression of innovation. *JAMA*, 263, 1438-41.

New Scholarly Communication System: Minimum Conditions
Trond E. Jacobsen

Hurd, J. (2000). The transformation of scientific communication: A model for 2020. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51(14), 1279-1283.

Jefferson, T., Wager, E., & Davidoff, F. (2002). Measuring the quality of editorial peer review. *JAMA*, 287(21), 2786-2789.

Jefferson, T.O., Alderson, P., Davidoff F., Wager, E. (2001). Editorial peer-review for improving the quality of reports of biomedical studies. *The Cochrane Database of Methodology Reviews*, 2001(3). (Art. No.: MR000016).

Jefferson, T., Alderson, , Wager, E., & Davidoff, F. (2002). Effects of editorial peer review: A systematic review. *JAMA*, 287(21), 2784-2786.

Kling, R. & McKim, G. (1999). Scholarly communication and the continuum of electronic publishing. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50(10), 890-906.

Kling, R. & McKim, G. (2000). Not just a matter of time: Field differences and the shaping of electronic media in supporting scientific communication. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51(14) 1306-1320.

Kling, R., Spector, K., & McKim, G. (2002). Locally controlled scholarly publishing via the Internet: The Guild Model. *JEP: Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 8(1), np.

Kyrillidou, M. (2004, June). Serials Trends Reflected in the ARL Statistics 2002-03. *ARL Bimonthly Report* 234.

Lesk, M. (2005). *Understanding Digital Libraries*. New York: Elsevier.

Lock, S.A. (1991). *Difficult Balance: Editorial Peer Review in Medicine*. London: BMJ Books.

Lougee, W.P. (2004). *Scholarly communication & libraries unbound: The opportunity of the commons*. Available: http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/archive/00001250/00/Commons_workshop_Lougee_rev_Mar29b.pdf [20 Mar 2005].

Lynch, C.A. (2003). Institutional repositories: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *ARL Bimonthly Report* 226, February. Available: <http://www.arl.org/newsltr/226/ir.html> [1 Apr 2005].

MacDonald, R. (2002). What are the factors that will shape peer review in e-journals? *Library Hi Tech News*, 19(6) (July), 14-16.

Manuel, K. (2001). The place of e-prints in the publication patterns of physical sciences. *Science & Technology Libraries*, 20(1), 59-85.

Meadows, A.J. (1998). *Communicating Research*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Meyers, G. (1990). *Writing biology: Texts in the social construction of scientific knowledge*. Madison: U. of Wisconsin Press, 53.

Mizzaro, S. (2003). Quality control in scholarly publishing: A new proposal. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 54(11), 989-1005.

New Scholarly Communication System: Minimum Conditions
Trond E. Jacobsen

Moran, G. (1998). *Silencing scientists and scholars in other fields: Paradigm controls, peer review, and scholarly communication*. Greenwich, CT: Ablex Publishing Co.

Nylenna, M., Riis, P, & Karlson, Y. (1994). Multiple blinded reviews of the same two manuscripts: Effects of referee characteristics and publication language. *JAMA*, 272, 149-51.

Ober, J. (2004). Reshaping scholarly communication. *Against the Grain*, 16(3), 1-7.

Odlyzko, A. M. (2000). The future of scientific communication. In P. Wouters and P. Schroeder, (Eds.), *Access to Publicly Financed Research: The Global Research Village III, Amsterdam 2000 (273-278)*. Amsterdam: Netherlands Institute for Scientific Information Services (NIWI).

Odlyzko, A.M. (2001, 18 September). The Public Library of Science and the ongoing revolution in scholarly communication. *Nature Web Forum: Future e-access to the primary literature*. ONLINE. Available: <http://www.nature.com/nature/debates/e-access/Articles/odlyzko.html> [10 Mar 2005].

Odlyzko, A. M. (2003). Peer and non-peer review. In F. Godlee & T. Jefferson, (Eds.), *Peer Review in Health Sciences*, 2nd edition, London: BMJ Books.

Office of Research Integrity (1998). *Office of Research Integrity Annual Report 1997*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health and Human Services.

Office of Research Integrity (1999). *Office of Research Integrity Annual Report 1998*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health and Human Services.

Office of Research Integrity (2000). *Office of Research Integrity Annual Report 1999*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health and Human Services.

O'Reilly, J. (2002). Risk, adventure and the tyranny of peer review. *Engineering Science and Education Journal*, 11(6), 251-253.

Peters, J. (1996). The Hundred Years War started today: An exploration of electronic peer review. *Management Decision*, 34(1), 54.

Peters, D.P, & Ceci, S.J. (1982). Peer review practices of psychological journals: The fate of published articles submitted again. *Behavioral and Brain Science*, 5, 187-195.

Pinfield, S., Gardner, & MacColl, J. (2002) Setting up an institutional e-print archive. *Ariadne*, 31, np. Available: <http://www.arl.org/arl/proceedings/133/phelps.html> [22 Apr 2005].

Pöschl, U. (2004). Interactive journal concept for improved scientific publishing and quality assurance. *Learned Publishing*, 17(4), 105-113.

Ramalho Correia, A.M & de Castro, M.N. (2002). The role of e-print archives in the access to, and dissemination of, scientific grey literature: LIZA - a case study by the National Library of Portugal. *Journal of Information Science*, (3), 231-241.

Ray, J. & Berkwits, M. & Davidoff, F. (2000). The fate of manuscripts rejected by a general medical journal. *American Journal of Medicine*, 109, 131-135.

New Scholarly Communication System: Minimum Conditions
Trond E. Jacobsen

Rennie, D. (1999). Misconduct and peer review. In F. Godlee & T. Jefferson, (Eds.), *Peer Review in Health Sciences*. London: BMJ Books.

Resh, V.H. (1998). Science and communication: An Author/Editor/User's perspective on the transition from paper to electronic publishing. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, No. 19, Summer, np.

Roosendaal, H., & Geurts, (1998). Forces and Functions in Scientific Communication: An Analysis of their Interplay. *Cooperative Research Information Systems in Physics*, August 31 – September 4, 1997, Oldenburg, Germany. Available: <http://www.physik.uni-oldenburg.de/conferences/crisp97/roosendaal.html> [6 Mar 2005].

Roosendaal H.E. & Geurts P.A.T.M. (1999). Scientific communication and its relevance to research policy. *Scientometrics*, 44(3), 507-519.

Rowlands, I., Nicholas, D., & Huntington, (2004). Scholarly communication in the digital environment: What do authors want? *Learned Publishing*, 17(4) (October), 261-273.

Rowlands, I., Nicholas, D., & Huntington, (2004). *Scholarly communication in the digital environment: What do authors want? Findings of an international survey of author opinion: Project report*. London: Centre for Information Behaviour and the Evaluation of Research, Department of Information Science City University, 1-37.

Schaffner, A.C. (1994). The future of scientific journals: Lessons from the past. *Information Technologies and Libraries*, 13(4), 239-248.

Schneider, D.S., & de Souza, J.M. (2003). Configurable Electronic Journal (CEJ): Towards Flexible Scientific Knowledge Infrastructures. *8th International Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work in Design Proceedings*, IEEE, 191-96.

Sharp, D.W. (1990). What can and should be done about publication bias? *JAMA*, 263, 1390-91.

Shulenburg, D. E. (2001). On scholarly evaluation and scholarly communication. *C&RL News*, 62(8), 808-811.

Smith, R. (1997). Peer review: Reform or revolution? *BMJ*, 315, 759-60.

Suber, (2004). Open Access Builds Momentum. *ARL Bimonthly Report* 232, February 2004.

Sullivan, D.L. (2000). Keeping the rhetoric orthodox: Forum control in science. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 9(2) (Spring), 125-46.

Thompson, L.A. (2001). Grey literature in engineering. *Science and Technologies Libraries*, 19(3/4), 57-73.

University of Buffalo Libraries (2004). *Final Report: Scholarly communication, research, and libraries: An updated environmental scan*. 26 October 2004. Available: http://libweb.lib.buffalo.edu/sw/stplan/envscans/scholcom04_sum.pdf [17 Apr 2004].

Van de Sompel, H., Payette, S., Erickson, J., Lagoze, C., & Warner, S. (2001). Rethinking scholarly communication: Building the system that scholars deserve. *D-Lib Magazine*, 10(9), September. Available: <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september04/vandesompel/09vandesompel.html> [22 Mar

2005].

Van de Sompel, H., et al (2004), Motivation, Inspiration and Innovation from Frustration. VALA 2004, 4th February 2004. Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Association for Library Automation.

Van de Sompel, H. (2003). Roadblocks. *NSF Post Digital Library Futures Workshop - Papers*, 15-17 June 2003. Chatham, MA. Available: http://www.sis.pitt.edu/~dlwshop/paper_sompel.pdf [5 Mar 2005].

Van House, N.A (2003). Digital libraries and collaborative knowledge construction. In A.Bishop, N.V. House, & B. Battenfield, (Eds.) *Digital Library Use: Social Practice in Design and Evaluation*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003, 271-295. Available: http://www.sims.berkeley.edu/~vanhouse/van_house_book_chapter.htm [10 Mar 2005].

van Rooyen, S. (2001). The evaluation of peer review quality. *Learned Publishing*, 14(2), 85-91.

Vickery, B. (2004). Recent developments in electronic access to the data of science. In W. Boyd Rayward & Mary Ellen Bowden, (Eds.) *The History and Heritage of Scientific and Technological Information Systems: Proceedings of the 2002 Conference*, (363-372). Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc., Medford, New Jersey, 2004. Available: <http://www.chemheritage.org/events/asist2002/30-vickery.pdf> [16 Apr 2005].

Vindenes Allen, A. & Vaughn Lees, G. (2004). TheScientificWorldJOURNAL: Sustainability through innovation. *Learned Publishing*, 17(3), 183-187.

von Foerster, T. (2001). The Future (?) of Peer Review. In S.R. Berry & A. Simon Moffat, (Eds.) *The Transition from Paper: Where Are We Going and How Will We Get There?* (Chapter 5). Cambridge (MA): American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Available: <http://www.amacad.org/publications/trans.aspx#toc> [26 April 2005].

Wager, E., Jefferson, T. (2001). Shortcomings of peer review in biomedical journals. *Learned Publishing*, 14(2), 257-263.

Ward, R., Michealis, D., et al., (2003). Widespread academic efforts address the scholarly communication crisis: The results of a survey of academic institutions. *C&RL News*, 64(6), June, 382-383, 389.

Webber, E.J., Katz, P., Waeckerle, J.F., & Callahan, M.L. (2002). Author perception of peer review: Impact of review quality and acceptance and satisfaction. *JAMA*, 287(21), 2790-2793.

Weller, A.C. (2000). Editorial peer review for electronic journals: Current issues and emerging models. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51(14), 1328-1333.

Weller, A.C. (2001). *Editorial peer review: Its strength and weaknesses*. ASIST Monograph Series. Medford, NJ: American Society for Information Science and Technology.

Weller, A.C. (2002). Qualitative and quantitative measures of indexed health sciences electronic journals. *JAMA*, 287(21), 2865-2866.

Willinsky, J. (2003). Scholarly associations and the economic viability of open access publishing. *Journal of Digital Information*, 4(2), Article No. 177, 9 April 2003. Available: <http://jodi.ecs.soton.ac.uk/Articles/v04/i02/Willinsky/> [20 Mar 2005].

New Scholarly Communication System: Minimum Conditions
Trond E. Jacobsen

Wolpert, A.J. (2002). The future of electronic data: Will universities' own electronic repositories affect traditional publishing? *Nature*, 420(7 November), 17-18.

Wood, M. & Roberts M. (2004). The reliability of peer reviews and papers on information systems. *Journal of Information Science*, 30(1), 2-11.

Ziman, J. (1968). *Public knowledge: An essay concerning the social dimensions of science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.