

Open access to articles, data and research materials on RBMFC

Acesso aberto a artigos, dados e materiais de pesquisa na RBMFC

Acceso abierto a artículos, datos y materiales de investigación en RBMFC

Leonardo Ferreira Fontenelle¹, Thiago Dias Sarti¹

¹ Revista Brasileira de Medicina de Família e Comunidade (RBMFC) - Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil.

Abstract

Open access to research articles, data and materials are some key elements of open science, a plural movement that aims to transform the creation and communication of scientific knowledge. Thanks to the publication of articles in open access and the adoption of good editorial practices, RBMFC has its articles indexed in LILACS and, more recently, in DOAJ. RBMFC also adopts the Transparency and Openness Promotion guidelines from the Center for Open Science, and makes its references in CrossRef available in the public domain, thanks to which the journal was included in the OpenCitations citation index. With this, RBMFC hopes to make research in family and community medicine and primary health care more accessible, democratic and efficient

Keywords: Scholarly Communication; Editorial Policies; Open Access Publishing; Metadata; Peer Review, Research

Resumo

Acesso aberto aos artigos, dados e materiais de pesquisa são alguns elementos-chave da ciência aberta, um movimento plural que visa a transformar a criação e a comunicação do conhecimento científico. Graças à publicação de artigos em acesso aberto e à adoção de boas práticas editoriais, a RBMFC tem seus artigos indexados na LILACS e, mais recentemente, no DOAJ. A RBMFC também adota as diretrizes *Transparency and Openness Promotion* do *Center for Open Science*, e disponibiliza suas referências na CrossRef em domínio público, graças ao que a revista foi incluída no índice de citações *OpenCitations*. Com isso, a RBMFC espera tornar mais acessível, democrática e eficiente a pesquisa em medicina de família e comunidade e atenção primária à saúde.

Palavras-chave: Comunicação Acadêmica; Políticas Editoriais; Publicação de Acesso Aberto; Metadados; Revisão da Pesquisa por Pares

Cite as: Fontenelle LF, Sarti TD. Open access to articles, data and research materials on RBMFC. Rev Bras Med Fam Comunidade. 2020;15(42):2671. [https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc15\(42\)2671](https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc15(42)2671)

Corresponding author:

Leonardo Ferreira Fontenelle.

E-mail: leonardof@leonardof.med.br

Funding:

none declared.

Ethical approval:

not necessary.

Origin:

commissioned.

Peer review:

Internal.

Received: 08/11/2020.

Accepted: 08/11/2020.



Resumen

El acceso abierto a artículos, datos y materiales de investigación son algunos de los elementos clave de la ciencia abierta, un movimiento plural que tiene como objetivo transformar la creación y comunicación del conocimiento científico. Gracias a la publicación de artículos en acceso abierto y la adopción de buenas prácticas editoriales, RBMFC tiene sus artículos indexados en LILACS y, más recientemente, en DOAJ. RBMFC también adopta las directrices *Transparency and Openness Promotion* del *Center for Open Science*, y hace que sus referencias en CrossRef estén disponibles en el dominio público, gracias a lo cual la revista fue incluida en el índice de citas de *OpenCitations*. Con esto, RBMFC espera que la investigación en medicina familiar y comunitaria y atención primaria de salud sea más accesible, democrática y eficiente.

Palabras clave: Comunicación Académica; Políticas Editoriales; Publicación de Acceso Abierto; Metadatos; Revisión de la Investigación por Pares

The production and dissemination of knowledge go hand in hand. The creation of the first scholarly journals, for example, was associated with the scientific revolution of the 17th century, when the production of scientific knowledge was professionalized and institutionalized. With the advent of the Internet, scholarly journals and bibliographic indexes started to be accessed through the Web, but the changes did not stop there. Thanks to Web 2.0, the production of scientific knowledge is increasingly open, both among researchers and the general public.¹

Perhaps one of the most important aspects of open science is open access to research products, such as scientific articles, research data, research materials, and code for statistical analyses. The logic of open access is that it does not make sense to use public resources to acquire access to the research products, since these research its was financed with public resources. Opening access includes not only the irrevocable right to consult these research products, but also to redistribute and reuse them in other ways.²

Most scholarly articles are already published in open access.³ This is a worldwide phenomenon, with a greater emphasis on low-income countries and the Sub-Saharan Africa.⁴ In the United States and Europe, the advance of open access is owes much to research funding agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health in the United States and the organizations that now constitute cOALition S.⁵ In Latin America, the scarcity of resources to subscribe to scholarly journals has led to a model of scholarly communication led by researchers (instead of commercial publishers), in which scholarly journals are published for non-commercial purposes and open access was adopted early, as a way to increase the reach of local scientific production.⁶

Open access in the *Revista Brasileira de Medicina de Família e Comunidade* (RBMFC, Brazilian Journal of Family and Community Medicine) echoes its Latin American context to a great extent. When the journal was printed, its distribution was a benefit of the association with the Brazilian Society of Family and Community Medicine (SBMFC),⁷ but the subscription cost only R\$ 48 (US\$ 150) for non-members, and the authors did not need to give up copyright for publish your articles in the journal. As soon as RBMFC migrated to an online platform, the journal explicitly adopted a Creative Commons license for its articles.⁸

It was thanks to its publication in open access, and to its adoption of good editorial practices, that the RBMFC was indexed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)⁸ and, latter, in LILACS (Literatura Latino-Americana e do Caribe em Ciências da Saúde, Latin American and Caribbean Health Sciences Literature), which since August 2008 requires open access for the inclusion of journals. RBMFC even missed the registration deadline at DOAJ due to a management transition, but this year the journal again applied for inclusion and was accepted.

This new inclusion of RBMFC in DOAJ is even more significant than the first, for a number of reasons. First, this new inclusion signals that the journal meets the Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing,⁹ developed by DOAJ with COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics), OASPA (Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association) and WAME (World Association of Medical Editors). Secondly, this time RBMFC is being listed not merely with other journals, but at the article level (as in LILACS). Finally, this time RBMFC was certified with the DOAJ Seal of Approval for Open Access Journals, “a mark of certification for open access journals, awarded by DOAJ to journals that achieve a high level of openness, adhere to Best Practice and high publishing standards.” (<https://doaj.org/faq#seal>)

But open access to scholarly articles is only one facet of open science at RBMFC. Following the Transparency and Openness Promotion guidelines from the Center for Open Science,¹⁰ the journal encourages its authors to share anonymized data and research materials (such as questionnaires and analytic code),¹¹ and to cite them in their articles.¹² The journal also accepts submissions that are already available on preprint servers, effectively stimulating its authors to accelerate scholarly communication.

RBMFC itself makes its metadata, that is, the data about its articles, openly available. Any journal shares its articles' title, authorship and other metadata with bibliographic indexes, but RBMFC makes them available to anyone, following the OAI-PMH (Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting) protocol. In addition, this year RBMFC started including the list of the articles' references when depositing metadata with CrossRef to obtain the articles' DOI (digital object identifier). In open access, of course.

Depositing references in open access is essential for scholarly metrics to be based on open, non-proprietary data.^{13–15} With the notable exception of Elsevier (and the American Chemical Society, IEEE, Wolters Kluwer Health), major academic publishers already deposit their publications' metadata in CrossRef in open access, adhering to the Initiative for Open Citations (I4OC).^{14,16} While CAPES (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior, the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel) does not begin to take advantage of this data in its evaluations, the article references of RBMFC can already be consulted through the OpenCitations and Dimensions platforms, or through the VOSViewer bibliometrics application.

In open access or not, depositing references with CrossRef also enables RBMFC to use their “Cited-by” service.¹⁷ As soon as our electronic platform (OJS) allows, the journal should use this service to list in the articles' page a list of digital objects (articles, books etc) citing them.

In summary, RBMFC publishes in open access its articles and their metadata; it also promotes the deposit of data and research materials (preferably in open access) in data repositories such as the Open Science Framework (OSF) and Zenodo, as well as the citation of such data and materials in its articles. This results in greater visibility of the research published in the RBMFC, and in the improvement of the scientific process as a whole.

This editorial focused on open access and open data and research materials, which are an important part but not all of open science. We are always studying new ways to open up the production and dissemination of scientific knowledge, for example through open peer review. We are currently analyzing the data of a survey carried out with RBMFC stakeholders (readers, authors and reviewers, as well as SBMFC members).¹⁸ Soon the research data, questionnaire and analytical code <https://osf.io/u9p4n>, and the manuscript will be available in a preprint repository.

Conflicts of interest

The authors are editors-in-chief of RBMFC (Revista Brasileira de Medicina de Família e Comunidade).

References

1. Bartling S, Friesike S. Towards another scientific revolution. In: Bartling S, Friesike S, eds. *Opening science*. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2014. p. 3-15. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00026-8_1
2. Sitek D, Bertelmann R. Open access: a state of the art. In: Bartling S, Friesike S, eds. *Opening science*. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2014. p. 139-53. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00026-8_9
3. Hook D, Hahnel M, Calvert I. The ascent of open access. *Digital Science*. 2019 Jan. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.7618751.v2>
4. Iyandemye J, Thomas MP. Low income countries have the highest percentages of open access publication: a systematic computational analysis of the biomedical literature. *PLoS ONE*. 2019 Jul;14(7):e0220229. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0220229>
5. Wise A, Estelle L. How society publishers can accelerate their transition to open access and align with Plan S. *Learned Publishing*. 2020 Jan;33(1):14-27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1272>
6. Alperin JP. The public impact of Latin America's approach to open access [thesis]. Stanford, California: Stanford University; 2015.
7. Anderson MIP, Falk JW. Editorial. *Rev Bras Med Fam Comunidade*. 2004 Nov;1(1):1. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc1\(1\)1](https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc1(1)1)
8. Demarzo MMP, Milhomens DM. RBMFC em 2011: evolução e desafios. *Rev Bras Med Fam Comunidade*. 2011;6(21):227-9. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc6\(21\)499](https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc6(21)499)
9. Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Principles of transparency and best practice in scholarly publishing. Hampshire, UK: COPE; 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.12>
10. Nosek BA, Alter G, Banks GC, Borsboom D, Bowman SD, Breckler SJ, et al. Promoting an open research culture. *Science*. 2015 Jun;348(6242):1422-5. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab2374>
11. Fontenelle LF, Sarti TD. Pesquisar para quê?. *Rev Bras Med Fam Comunidade*. 2020 Jan;15(42):2319. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc15\(42\)2369](https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc15(42)2369)
12. Fontenelle LF, Sarti TD. Renovação das práticas editoriais e instruções aos autores da RBMFC a partir de 2019. *Rev Bras Med Fam Comunidade*. 2019 Jun;14(41):1963. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc14\(41\)1963](https://doi.org/10.5712/rbmfc14(41)1963)
13. Shotton D. Publishing: open citations. *Nature*. 2013 Oct;502(7471):295-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/502295a>
14. Shotton D. Funders should mandate open citations. *Nature*. 2018 Jan;553:129. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-00104-7>
15. Chawla DS. Now free: citation data from 14 million papers, and more might come. *Science*. 2017 Abr. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.aal1012>
16. Heibi I, Peroni S, Shotton D. Software review: COCI, the OpenCitations Index of Crossref open DOI-to-DOI citations. *Scientometrics*. 2019 Set;121(2):1213-28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03217-6>
17. Lammey R. CrossRef developments and initiatives: an update on services for the scholarly publishing community from CrossRef. *Sci Ed*. 2014;1(1):13-8. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6087/kcse.2014.1.13>
18. Fontenelle LF, Sarti TD. Attitudes to open peer review among stakeholders of RBMFC. OSF. 2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/MVC98>