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ALTMETRICS AT DIGITAL.CSIC

DIVERSIFYING VALUE ADDED SERVICES FOR CSIC RESEARCHERS
Impact indicators and other metrics in DIGITAL.CSIC

- DIGITAL.CSIC launched in January 2008. Circa 130,000 items, 62% open access
- Tasmania University usage statistics (2009-2015). Since 2012: Scopus, Web of Knowledge, PMC, Google Scholar and **Altmetric badge for institutional repositories (free!!!)**
- Impact and attention indicators (Scopus, WOK, Altmetric) cover primarily research outputs with a DOI
- Indicators promotion amongst researchers. Emphasis on resource types and disciplines with poor impact/attention coverage (reports, presentations, publications in local languages, journal articles with no DOIs, outputs in Humanities and Social Sciences..)
- No linkage between the repository and institutional assessment exercises (BUT a growing number of researchers make use of the data in the repository to enrich their CVs, grants applications, projects proposals, personal web sites..)

http://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/50535

Dedicated sections in DIGITAL.CSIC Annual reports and internal reports SEO monitoring (Majestic SEO account) to track outputs in the repository
Embedding Altmetric institutional repository badges in DIGITAL.CSIC

- Badges are freely available for academic repositories and individual researchers
- Straightforward process
- Badges are customisable
- Three steps: Altmetric has to track your repository, items must include the appropriate metadata and the repository adds the badge code to its pages
- Altmetric support a wide range of identifiers, including DOIs, PubMed Ids, ISBNs, Handles, arXiv Ids, ADS Ids, SSRN Ids, RePEc Ids, ClinicalTrials.gov records, URLs...so you can track attention gathered by items that have no DOI, if you like!
- IN DIGITAL.CSIC for the time being, Altmetric badge is associated with DOI identifier through the metadata: dc.identifier.doi
- But the badges support other identifiers metadata!!
- All the technical information you need is at http://bit.ly/1q4QAVD

http://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/133253
Let’s make an experiment..

https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/104456

How are scores calculated? http://bit.ly/28Os2ey

See information about mentions captured by Altmetric on the next slide..
1. This is the limited data that any end-user can access through the free Altmetric badge. The explanation is here: https://www.altmetric.com/details-page-access

2. And this is what librarians at academic institutions can see through a free basic version of Altmetric Explorer Account (upon request). See https://www.altmetric.com/products/free-tools/
Altmetrics for datasets

- DIGITAL.CSIC has started to assign DOIs to datasets in the repository through DataCite membership
- Retrospective DOI assignation underway
- Long awaited service by researchers

https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/133007
http://dx.doi.org/10.20350/digitalCSIC/200
More uses of the Altmetric Explorer Account for Academic Librarians (1/3)

Possibility to export data in JSON format

Export functionality
Tracking attention of outputs through the handle identifier (2/3)

http://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/132566
Aggregated data by ORCID (3/3)
What are CSIC researchers using altmetrics for?

- **Track reach and impact of their works**, mostly for those dated 2011 onwards
- Discover geographic distribution of attention received + types of end-users
- Find **evidence of broader value** (i.e, research results applied in practice, public engagement outside of academia..)
- Useful data for **early career researchers**
- Analysis of data helps tailor **more effective communications strategies** to make sure that research outputs get to the relevant audiences
- A quick means to see **which journals usually generate a lot of traffic**
- **Useful data for non traditional outputs** available in repositories like working documents, policy reports, bulletins and newsletters, datasets, software..[data in Social Sciences and Humanities](http://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/79877)
- **But not a mature metric to assess scientific excellence and evaluation purposes** because: need for specific definitions, strategies for improving data quality from providers, promoting use of persistent identifiers, transparent methods for calculating specific output types, and use cases for various stakeholder groups [http://crln.acrl.org/content/77/6/274](http://crln.acrl.org/content/77/6/274)
- **In Spain**, altmetrics may be suitable data to show evidence of broader engagement in the national standard CV template

“La diversidad de índices de impacto es buena, pero debemos ser conscientes de qué es lo que realmente mide cada uno. Algunos son oficiales, otros son empresariales, otros están asociados a distintas redes sociales [...] pero también creo que no deberíamos generar conocimiento únicamente por el índice de impacto que vamos a obtener; eso no es ciencia sino egolatría”

“Los nuevos índices asociados a redes sociales y similares creo que van a ser de utilidad para aumentar la visibilidad de nuestro trabajo fuera de los cauces y foros tradicionales, es decir, para salir de la endogamia entre científicos”
OPEN PEER REVIEW MODULE: AN OVERLAY SERVICE FOR REPOSITORIES

Implementation in DIGITAL.CSIC

OPEN PEER REVIEW module

are you an open reviewer?
Open Peer Review Module: promoting peer reviews that are open access, signed, non-selective, open in time

- Invitation’s module
- Reviews’ module
- Compute reputations
- Item’s view customization
- Author’s view customization

Open source software
- Code for DSpace v5 XMLUI
- Code for DSpace v4 JSPUI
- ARVO Consultores Wiki

http://www.openscholar.org.uk/institutional-repositories-start-to-offer-peer-review-services/
http://proyectos.bibliotecas.csic.es/digitalcsic/oprm/index_eng.html
OPRM Reputation Metrics for research objects, authors, reviewers and reviews

1. An aggregation of its reviews, weighted by the reputation of reviewers

2. An aggregation of her papers’ reputation, weighted by the number of authors

3. An aggregation of others opinions on our reviewer, weighted by the reputation of the reviewers

4. ARM: Reputation of a Review
   An aggregation of its judgements, weighted by the reputation of the judges/reviewers
Open peer review and open commentary: main characteristics of OPRM

- In the pilot phase, all DIGITAL.CSIC users (with log-in permissions) and administrators can send review invitations. Open commentaries are available for those users with DIGITAL.CSIC log-in permissions.
- Administration filter in place before publication in order to block spam/offensive/unappropriate inputs.
- Open reviews and commentaries generate their own items, with a specific set of metadata and associated with the original work and reviews, respectively.
- Reputation scores for authors, (CSIC) reviewers, reviewed works and reviews.
- Reputation scores for authors and (CSIC) reviewers visible at Dspace-CRIS profiles.

The work’s author sends a review invitation to one or more peers by email.
The reviewer must indicate her affiliation.

By default, all reviews and comments have a CC-BY license.

New resource types

Qualitative and quantitative peer review.
Open reviews and comments generate new items in the repositories

Open reviews records contain:
- Name of the reviewer and affiliation
- Links to the reviewed work
- Links to items with related open comments
- Individual quality rating of the reviewed work
- Weighed review reputation metrics
Records of the reviewed works link to their open reviews, individual quality ratings and overall reputation metrics.

Title: Towards a unified paradigm for sequence-based identification of fungi

Authors: Kõjaj, Urmass, Duellis, Margarita, Martin, Marie P., Telleris, M. Teresa, Larsson, Karl Henrik

Keywords: Bioinformatics, DNA barcoding, Ecological genomics, Fungi, Microbial diversity

Issue Date: 2013

Publisher: Wiley-Blackwell
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Abstract: The nuclear ribosomal internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region is the fungal barcode and in most cases the marker of choice for the exploration of fungal diversity in environmental samples. Two problems are particularly acute in the pursuit of satisfactory taxonomic assignment of newly generated ITS sequences: (i) the lack of an inclusive, reliable public reference data set and (ii) the lack of means to refer to fungal species, for which no Latin name is available in a standardized stable way. Here, we report on progress in these regards through further development of the UNITE database (http://unite.ut.ee) for molecular identification of fungi. All fungal species represented by at least two ITS sequences in the international nucleotide sequence databases are now given a unique, stable name of the accession number type (e.g. Hymenocystis pseudoschedius/G586904/SH133731.05F1), and their taxonomic and ecological annotations were corrected as far as possible through a distributed, third-party annotation effort. We introduce the term 'species hypothesis' (SH) for the taxa discovered in clustering on different similarity thresholds (37–99%). An automatically or manually designated species is chosen to represent such SH. These reference sequences are released (http://unite.ut.ee/repository.php) for use by the scientific community in, for example, local sequence similarity searches and in the DIVE pipeline. The system and the data will be updated automatically as the number of public fungal ITS sequences grows. We invite everybody in the position to improve the annotation or metadata associated with their particular fungal images of expertise to do so through the new Web-based sequence management system in UNITE.
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Item reputation: How scores are calculated?

Appears in Collections: (RJB) Articles

Related reviews: View review by Spouge, John L. View review by Schob, Conrad

https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/130958
Author/reviewer reputation metrics show in their personal page

http://digital.csic.es/cris/rp/rp00361
First feedback from researchers: issues to consider

- **Positive feedback** from most CSIC researchers contacted in the pilot phase (20 researchers across different areas, one source for identification being Publons)
- Opening the review processes guarantees expert and elaborated reviews and avoids subjectivity
- Major criticism relates to the current invitation-based workflow in order to start an open review
- Lack of time as the main reason in delayed responses
- Fears to make open reviews of preprint articles on the repository prevail
- Need to link open peer review practices to CV recognition and strong institutional support > no immediate incentives/rewards for researchers
More information about OPRM

• An Open Peer Review Module for Open Access Repositories, OR2016, June 15, 2016
  http://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/133952

• Official Launch, April 27, 2016,
  http://proyectos.bibliotecas.csic.es/digitalcsic/oprm/programa_eng.html

• http://www.openscholar.org.uk/open-peer-review-module-for-repositories/

• https://github.com/arvoConsultores/Open-Peer-Review-Module/wiki
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