

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Copyright, Fair Use, Scholarly Communication,  
etc.

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

11-16-2021

## Open Research Toolkit List of References

Christopher Eaker

*University of Tennessee, Knoxville*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/scholcom>



Part of the [Intellectual Property Law Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

---

Eaker, Christopher, "Open Research Toolkit List of References" (2021). *Copyright, Fair Use, Scholarly Communication, etc.*. 214.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/scholcom/214>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Copyright, Fair Use, Scholarly Communication, etc. by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# Open Research Toolkit List of References

Christopher Eaker

Revised November 16, 2021

- Artifact Review and Badging*. (2020). Association for Computing Machinery. Retrieved June 10, 2021 from <https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/artifact-review-and-badging-current>
- Academy of Medical Sciences, BBSRC, Medical Research Council, & Wellcome Trust. (2015). *Reproducibility and Reliability of Biomedical Research: Improving Research Practice*. <https://acmedsci.ac.uk/viewFile/56314e40aac61.pdf>
- Baker, M. (2016). Reproducibility crisis. *Nature*, 533(26), 353-366.
- Barba, L. (2018). Terminologies for Reproducible Research. *ArXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.03311v1>.
- Bollen, K., Cacioppo, J., Kaplan, R., Krosnick, J., & Olds, J. (2015). *Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Perspectives on Robust and Reliable Science* (Report of the Subcommittee on Replicability in Science Advisory Committee to the National Science Foundation Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences), Issue. [https://www.nsf.gov/sbe/AC\\_Materials/SBE\\_Robust\\_and\\_Reliable\\_Research\\_Report.pdf](https://www.nsf.gov/sbe/AC_Materials/SBE_Robust_and_Reliable_Research_Report.pdf)
- Boos, D. D., & Stefanski, L. A. (2011). P-Value Precision and Reproducibility. *The American Statistician*, 65(4), 213-221. <https://doi.org/10.1198/tas.2011.10129>
- Borer, E. T., Seabloom, E. W., Jones, M. B., & Schildhauer, M. (2009). Some Simple Guidelines for Effective Data Management. *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, 90(2), 205-214. <https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9623-90.2.205>
- Borgman, C. L. (2012). The conundrum of sharing research data. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(6), 1059-1078. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22634>
- Bozeman, B., & Corley, E. (2004). Scientists' collaboration strategies: implications for scientific and technical human capital. *Research Policy*, 33(4), 599-616. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2004.01.008>
- Briney, K., Goben, A., & Zilinski, L. (2017). Institutional, Funder, and Journal Data Policies. In L. Johnston (Ed.), *Curating Research Data: Practical Strategies for Your Digital Repository*. Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Canadian Hospice Palliative Care Association. (2019). 8 Steps to Good Advocacy. [https://www.chpca.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/8\\_Steps\\_to\\_Good\\_Advocacy.pdf](https://www.chpca.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/8_Steps_to_Good_Advocacy.pdf)
- Candela, L., Castelli, D., & Pagano, P. (2013). Virtual Research Environments: An Overview and a Research Agenda. *Data Science Journal*, 12(0), GRDI75-GRDI81. <https://doi.org/10.2481/dsj.grdi-013>
- Christensen, G., Dafoe, A., Miguel, E., Moore, D. A., & Rose, A. K. (2019). A study of the impact of data sharing on article citations using journal policies as a natural experiment. *PLoS ONE*, 14(12), e0225883. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225883>
- Corti, L., Van den Eynden, V., Bishop, L., & Woollard, M. (2014). *Managing and Sharing Research Data: A Guide to Good Practice*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Creative Commons. *About CC Licenses*. Creative Commons. Retrieved September 7, 2021 from <https://creativecommons.org/about/ccllicenses/>
- Crow, M., & Tananbaum, G. (2020). We Must Tear Down the Barriers That Impede Scientific Progress [Opinion]. *Scientific American*. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/we-must-tear-down-the-barriers-that-impede-scientific-progress/>

- Dunning, A., De Smaele, M., & Böhmer, J. (1970). Are the fair data principles fair? *International Journal of Digital Curation*, 12(2), 177-195.
- European Citizen Science Association. Ten Principles of Citizen Science. Retrieved September 20, 2021, from [https://ecsa.citizen-science.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/ecsa\\_ten\\_principles\\_of\\_citizen\\_science.pdf](https://ecsa.citizen-science.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/ecsa_ten_principles_of_citizen_science.pdf)
- Fanelli, D. (2018). Opinion: Is science really facing a reproducibility crisis, and do we need it to? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2628-2631. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708272114>
- Fecher, B., & Friesike, S. (2013). Open Science: One Term, Five Schools of Thought. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2272036>
- FOSTER. (2018). *The Open Science Training Handbook* [https://github.com/Open-Science-Training-Handbook/Open-Science-Training-Handbook\\_EN](https://github.com/Open-Science-Training-Handbook/Open-Science-Training-Handbook_EN)
- Freedman, L. P., Cockburn, I. M., & Simcoe, T. S. (2015). The Economics of Reproducibility in Preclinical Research. *PLoS Biol*, 13(6), e1002165. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002165>
- Goodman, S. N., Fanelli, D., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2016). What does research reproducibility mean? *Science Translational Medicine*, 8(341), 341ps312. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.aaf5027>
- Gutteridge, C., & Dutton, A. *Concerns about opening up data, and responses which have proved effective*. Retrieved June 10, 2021 from [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nDtHpnIDTY\\_G32EMJniXaOGBufjHCck4VC9WGO7jK4/edit#](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nDtHpnIDTY_G32EMJniXaOGBufjHCck4VC9WGO7jK4/edit#)
- Haeussler, C. (2011). Information-sharing in academia and the industry: A comparative study. *Research Policy*, 40(1), 105-122. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.08.007>
- Hardwicke, T. E., Mathur, M. B., Macdonald, K., Nilsson, G., Banks, G. C., Kidwell, M. C., Hofelich Mohr, A., Clayton, E., Yoon, E. J., Henry Tessler, M., Lenne, R. L., Altman, S., Long, B., & Frank, M. C. (2018). Data availability, reusability, and analytic reproducibility: evaluating the impact of a mandatory open data policy at the journal *Cognition*. *Royal Society Open Science*, 5(8), 180448. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.180448>
- Hunter, L., & Leahey, E. (2008). Collaborative Research in Sociology: Trends and Contributing Factors. *The American Sociologist*, 39(4), 290-306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-008-9042-1>
- Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). Why Most Published Research Findings Are False. *PLoS Medicine*, 2(8), e124. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124>
- Kotter, J. (n.d.). *The 8-Step Process for Leading Change*. Retrieved September 16, 2021 from <https://www.kotterinc.com/8-steps-process-for-leading-change/>
- Masuzzo, P., & Martens, L. (2017). Do you speak open science? Resources and tips to learn the language. *PeerJ Preprints*, 5, e2689v2681. <https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.2689v1>
- Murray-Rust, P. (2008). Open Data in Science. *Serials Review*, 34(1), 52-64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2008.10765152>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, Medicine. (2018). *Open Science by Design: Realizing a Vision for 21st Century Research*. The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25116>
- National Academies of Sciences, E., Medicine. (2019). *Advancing Open Science Practices: Stakeholder Perspectives on Incentives and Disincentives: Proceedings of a Workshop-in Brief*. The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25725>
- Nielsen, M. A. (2012). *Reinventing discovery : the new era of networked science*. Princeton University Press.

- Piper, K. (2020). Science has been in a “replication crisis” for a decade. Have we learned anything? *Vox.com*. Retrieved August 18, 2021, from <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/21504366/science-replication-crisis-peer-review-statistics>
- Piwowar, H. A., & Vision, T. J. (2013). Data reuse and the open data citation advantage. *PeerJ*, 1, e175. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.175>
- Plessner, H. E. (2018). Reproducibility vs. Replicability: A Brief History of a Confused Terminology [Opinion]. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, 11(76). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fninf.2017.00076>
- Pontika, N., Knoth, P., Cancellieri, M., & Pearce, S. (2015). Fostering open science to research using a taxonomy and an eLearning portal.
- Ross-Hellauer, T. (2017). What is open peer review? A systematic review. *F1000Research*, 6, 588. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.11369.2>
- Ross-Hellauer, T., & Görögh, E. (2019). Guidelines for open peer review implementation. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0063-9>
- Schmidt, B., Ross-Hellauer, T., Van Edig, X., & Moylan, E. C. (2018). Ten considerations for open peer review. *F1000Research*, 7, 969. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.15334.1>
- Spier, R. (2002). The history of the peer-review process. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 20(8), 357-358. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-7799\(02\)01985-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-7799(02)01985-6)
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open Access*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9286.001.0001>
- Tacke, O. (2010). Open Science 2.0: How Research and Education Can Benefit from Open Innovation and Web 2.0. In *On Collective Intelligence* (pp. 37-48). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14481-3\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14481-3_4)
- Tacke, O. (2011, October 23, 2011). Raus aus dem Elfenbeinturm: Open Science.[Out of the Ivory Tower: Open Science] *Oliver Tacke's blog*. <https://www.olivertacke.de/2011/10/23/raus-aus-dem-elfenbeinturm-open-science/>
- Tananbaum, G. (n.d.). Open Policies 101. *Open Research Funders Group*. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5817749f8419c25c3b5b318d/t/5b75bfc1352f53d3f2e4409f/1534443459039/Grantee.pdf>
- Teixeira Da Silva, J. A. (2019). Challenges to open peer review. *Online Information Review*, 43(2), 197-200. <https://doi.org/10.1108/oir-04-2018-0139>
- Tennant, J. (2020). A Value Proposition for Open Science. *SocArXiv*. Retrieved July 2, 2021, from <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/k9qhv>
- U.S. General Services Administration. (2021). *Basic Steps for Your Project Planning*. Retrieved September 20, 2021 from <https://www.citizenscience.gov/toolkit/howto/#>
- United Nations Educational Science and Cultural Organization. (2021). *Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts (Category II) Related to a Draft UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science*. <https://en.unesco.org/science-sustainable-future/open-science/recommendation>
- Vasilevsky, N. A., Brush, M. H., Paddock, H., Ponting, L., Tripathy, S. J., LaRocca, G. M., & Haendel, M. A. (2013). On the reproducibility of science: unique identification of research resources in the biomedical literature. *PeerJ*, 1, e148. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.148>
- Vasilevsky, N. A., Minnier, J., Haendel, M. A., & Champieux, R. E. (2017). Reproducible and reusable research: are journal data sharing policies meeting the mark? *PeerJ*, 5, e3208. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.3208>
- Watson, M. (2015). When will ‘open science’ become simply ‘science’? *Genome Biology*, 16(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-015-0669-2>
- Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., Bourne, P. E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A. J., Clark, T., Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S., Evelo, C. T., Finkers, R., Gonzalez-Beltran, A., Gray, A. J. G., Groth, P., Goble, C., Grethe, J. S., Heringa, J., 't Hoen, P. A. C., Hooft, R., Kuhn, T., Kok, R., Kok, J.,

- Lusher, S. J., Martone, M. E., Mons, A., Packer, A. L., Persson, B., Rocca-Serra, P., Roos, M., van Schaik, R., Sansone, S.-A., Schultes, E., Sengstag, T., Slater, T., Strawn, G., Swertz, M. A., Thompson, M., van der Lei, J., van Mulligen, E., Velterop, J., Waagmeester, A., Wittenburg, P., Wolstencroft, K., Zhao, J., & Mons, B. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship [Comment]. *Scientific Data*, 3, 160018.  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>
- Wilkinson, M. D., Sansone, S.-A., Schultes, E., Doorn, P., Bonino da Silva Santos, L. O., & Dumontier, M. (2018). A design framework and exemplar metrics for FAIRness. *Scientific Data*, 5(1), 180118.  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2018.118>
- Yong, E. (2018). Psychology's Replication Crisis Is Running Out of Excuses. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved August 18, 2021, from <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2018/11/psychologys-replication-crisis-real/576223/>