Happy New Year! As we enter our new millennium’s second decade, on behalf of everyone at Elsevier, I offer Library Connect Newsletter readers best wishes for a year of opportunity and achievement.

Now, here’s an achievement I’d like to call to your attention: This issue marks the beginning of the eighth year of publication of the Library Connect Newsletter.

That may seem hard to believe, but here’s something even harder to believe: After centuries of development of scholarly publishing systems, we’re all still obsessed with how to define and identify “trusted content.” Why is this?

Blaming the Web for our continuing obsession with trusted content seems like an easy out, but there’s no way around identifying the Web as a force affecting whether we decide to trust particular sources of scholarly communication. With the advent of online communication, not only are we accessing more communication, but we’re dealing with more sources and more opportunity for exchange of truths and untruths. Considering scholarly publication, in particular, we’re taking what’s a challenging proposition to begin with, and magnifying the challenges by an order of magnitude.

Prior to online communication, scholarly publishing was what it remains today: A record of findings offering not absolute truths but rather knowledge to be trusted until superseded by superior knowledge. Given online communication, scholarly publishing has entered an exciting new state, when information professionals, researchers, scientists, authors and publishers are benefiting from more voices and collaboration; trying experiments to determine how best to harness the Web to improve scholarly publishing; and throughout seeking to continue to stamp “trusted content” where deserved.

So what are Elsevier and our partners doing, to help guide the evolution of trusted content? And how are information professionals and researchers addressing the issue of trust, as they cope with the avalanche of sources?

For answers to those questions, and for discussion of other aspects of “trusted content,” let’s turn to this issue’s contributors. Turn these pages, and you’ll hear from authors including:

- Clifford Lynch, talking about trustworthiness in the networked information system;
- Tracey Brown, talking about authors’ and reviewers’ views of peer review;
- Carol Anne Meyer, talking about the CrossRef initiatives CrossCheck and CrossMark;
- Peter Shepherd, talking about COUNTER and SUSHI; and
- Lotta Janson, talking about how information literacy instruction remains important.

Please join me in thanking all contributors to this issue. And now, happy reading!

Regards,
Martin Tanke
m.tanke@elsevier.com

IMLS awards grant to Government Information Quarterly colleagues

The US Institute of Museum and Library Services has awarded a grant of $770,943 to three colleagues affiliated with the Elsevier journal Government Information Quarterly: John Carlo Bertot, the journal’s editor-in-chief; John Shuler, an assistant editor with the journal; and Paul Jaeger, a member of the journal’s editorial board. The three-year grant will support expansion of graduate education regarding e-government policy environment, e-government service provision and the digital government information context.

The grant will provide graduate scholarships for 20 students to enroll in the University of Maryland’s master’s program with a concentration in e-government and will bring that program online. For students, a key component of the program, as developed via the grant, will be gaining e-government and information policy research skills through involvement with Government Information Quarterly. Specifically, participating students will gain exposure to how editorial production of a scholarly peer-reviewed journal works.

The first participating students will start the program in fall 2010. As the students progress through the program and start to offer feedback on skills they gain, Library Connect Newsletter will offer coverage of the impacts of the grant. LC
Understanding information trustworthiness in the networked information ecosystem

By Clifford A. Lynch, Director, Coalition for Networked Information, Washington, DC, USA

As readers are confronted with an ever-growing and ever more overwhelming set of content offerings, accessible through an ever-multiplying set of channels and services, one hears a great deal of concern about the ability to identify “trustworthy” information. It’s clear that a key critical skill for the 21st century is the ability to assess the “trustworthiness” of information. There is a great deal of discussion about the shifting roles of various players — notably, libraries and publishers — in establishing trustworthiness in the information ecosystem, and of new mechanisms such as social networking and filtering systems that can help in identifying and assessing information.

These concerns are not new. But the volume of information has grown enormously, and the number of contexts in which it can be provided has expanded more rapidly and more extensively than the volume itself. Further, the properties of the Internet and of discovery tools in common use such as search engines mean that information provided has expanded more rapidly and more extensively than the volume itself. The role of infrastructure

The term “trustworthiness” itself is complex, and conflates a number of related properties. Achieving a consensus on these properties, and trying to examine them more specifically, would be a major step forward; this brief piece is an attempt to do this, though I cannot say that I am entirely satisfied with my characterizations. Progress here would point towards an agenda of metadata standardization, and of discussions about how different participants within the overall ecosystem could better help readers to evaluate information resources available to them.

The role of infrastructure

One aspect of trustworthiness is really about stability and transparency; it’s primarily a property of the infrastructure that publishers and libraries have worked together to establish over the centuries, and one in which roles are now changing and where new players (such as subject repositories) are defining new roles. Here, I think that the key characteristics are the ability to cite or reference an information object persistently and reliably across time; the assurance that responsible provision has been made for the preservation of the information object and its access across time; and the assurance that the integrity of the information object will be managed in some transparent and formal way. Note that integrity does not necessarily mean that an information object will never change, but rather that changes are controlled and documented (for example, through versioning, where versions are clearly identified, preserved and linked one to the other, or through change logs or errata). Other than through empirical experience, it’s hard for a reader to tell if a specific delivery or access context is providing the desired levels of stability and transparency; these are properties that need to be evaluated over long periods of time, and often involve behind the scenes cooperation between multiple parties.

The role of metadata

There’s one additional aspect to infrastructural stability and transparency. Certain metadata should be attached to information objects, and readers want this metadata to be available and correct. Notably, this would include the date an object first entered the infrastructure (such as a submission date), and the dates of subsequent events (e.g., public accessibility, revisions). Such metadata would include the identity of the author or authors of the object; this is actually a highly complex matter because of the possible use of strong authentication, name authority control and related matters. (Who serves as guarantor of author identity, and why should we trust this guarantor?) And perhaps metadata should include some indication of the nature of the vetting or review processes, if any, that the information object has been subjected to; this might include one of various forms of peer review, editorial assessment, fact checking by a publisher or endorsement by one or more parties. Of course the reader may also want to know who takes responsibility for the rigor and neutrality of a peer-review process, or who takes responsibility for the editorial evaluation of a work. It’s interesting to note that virtually all of this metadata is established as a by-product of article publication in a traditional journal, though often much of the metadata is implicit in the sense that it’s part of the journal’s policies.

Correctness and importance

Whether a given information object is credible, that is, whether the statements and conclusions it makes are likely to be true, is a complex judgment that must rest with the reader. But having the metadata just discussed, and being able to make a separate judgment about confidence that this metadata is accurate, is a significant part of making the credibility judgment. Sometimes it may be enough: A reader may be prepared to put a very high level of faith in a specific author, or in the rigor of a specific review process. Other times, the metadata will be just one factor in judging credibility, along with the identification of corroborating or contradictory materials in other information objects, or other assessments such as reviews or ratings, of the information object in question.

Finally, I want to strongly distinguish between ideas like trustworthiness and credibility on one hand, and attention-worthiness on the other. In many situations, as we attempt to deal with the overwhelming amounts of information available, we are really more concerned with attention-worthiness or importance.

Trustworthiness and testimonies of credibility may or may not be prerequisites for attention-worthiness, depending on the context. We may be interested in rumors, in unsubstantiated reports; we may want to know about controversial results while their correctness is still
Tracey Brown talks about the value of peer review

Last year, the nonprofit organization Sense About Science staged the Peer Review Survey 2009, one of the largest-ever international surveys of authors and reviewers. Working closely with Adrian Mulligan, Elsevier's associate director of research and academic relations, and in consultation with many editors and publishers, Sense About Science staff wrote the survey. A grant from Elsevier helped cover the costs of administering it. Here Tracey Brown, the managing director of Sense About Science, shares some insights on the survey's preliminary findings.

— Ylann Schemm, Corporate Relations Manager, Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Ylann Schemm: How is Sense About Science involved with peer review?

Tracey Brown: Sense About Science promotes good science and evidence for the public. We began to stand up for science, and we work to equip the public — from community groups to media to policy makers — to make sense of science and evidence.

Over the last 4 years, Sense About Science has worked with publishers to demystify how the findings of scientific research are assessed and to popularize the concept of peer review. We have found that peer review can provide a window into how knowledge advances, helping people cut through claims about science and medicine.

What led to the launch of the 2009 survey?

It is striking — particularly to people outside the scientific community — that peer review is a system built on cooperation, critical scrutiny and judgment, but that its very structure makes the system potentially fragile. With rumblings that peer review is in crisis and concerns about getting the next generation of researchers to review in sufficient numbers and about maintaining the system’s integrity, we felt it was important to identify authors’ and reviewers’ attitudes to the system and its future.

How did you develop the survey?

For comparison, we included many questions from the Publishing Research Consortium Peer Review Survey 2007. The familiarity of Adrian and his team with that data was invaluable. The fact that the two studies turned out to yield some fairly consistent results was reassuring, in terms of survey integrity.

However, we broadened that 2007 survey so we could look more at the motivations for reviewing, at the impact of concerns about fraud and plagiarism and also at a new theme for this kind of investigation — whether researchers think the public understands peer review. Elsevier’s team was particularly interested in ways authors and reviewers think the system could improve, so we included some open-ended questions about that too.

Our biggest concern at Sense About Science was to find out whether all this free, independent scrutiny from the research community is sustainable and what the future of the peer-review system’s quality control is likely to be.

We sought feedback from journal editors on the questions and ran a trial before going live.

Who responded to the 2009 survey?

The email addresses to which the survey was sent were drawn from the ISI database of authors and reviewers. Over 4,000 authors and reviewers responded, making it one of the largest international surveys on peer review!

What were the survey’s most compelling findings?

The real knockout message of the preliminary findings was, “Crisis, what crisis?”

And, the public spiritedness of the system came across very clearly: 90% of respondents said they choose to review because they believe they are playing an active role in the community. Altruistic and professional reasons came consistently ahead of personal gain. When they did reject a request to review, over half (58%) of respondents said it was because the research was outside their area of expertise. Asking unsuitable reviewers slows the system down, and editors need to take note of this, particularly with the rapid growth of articles to be reviewed.

Concerns have been expressed about how to maintain this public spiritedness and securing enough new reviewers. When asked if they wanted some kind of incentive for reviewing, over half of the respondents wanted some kind of remuneration. A large minority (41%) wanted payment for reviewing, but this dropped to just 2.5% if they thought the authors would have to cover the cost. Reviewers also want anonymity: 58% would be less likely to review if their signed reports were published.

There are also concerns about how we train the next generation of reviewers: Over half (58%) of the respondents were concerned about this, and 67% thought formal training would help. Improved mentoring by senior scientists in research departments could play a valuable role, yet only 2% of respondents said the last paper they reviewed was with a junior colleague under their supervision.

Whilst it is not surprising that most researchers are satisfied with the peer-review system, the survey has focused the discussion on what really matters: how we improve the system.

"The real knockout message of the preliminary findings was, 'Crisis, what crisis!'"

Why has the survey drawn so much attention?

Before we staged the survey, rumblings about whether the peer-review system is in crisis had been going on for quite some time. The expansion of scholarly publishing year-on-year brings challenges for a peer-review system that emerged from a much smaller scholarly world. And while concerns about fraud and misconduct rise to the surface periodically, especially with high-profile cases, growing concerns about plagiarism and the pressure to publish have also been apparent.
ScienceDirect upgrades 600,000 Backfiles pages

By Ellen van Gijlswijk, Solutions Marketing Manager, and Ben Clark, Marketing Communications Manager, A&G Product Marketing, Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Initiated in 2000, the ScienceDirect Backfiles project was the largest digitization project of its kind in the world of scientific, technical, and medical literature. The initiative enabled researchers to access articles online going back from 1994 to, in most cases, volume 1, issue 1. The oldest backfile in the collection is The Lancet’s first issue, which was published in 1823.

Three years into the project, however, customers began drawing attention to poorly scanned images. At the time of the original scanning operation, scanning technology was fine for text but not optimal for images, which were limited to a resolution of 300 dpi in black and white. To include grayscale and color would have been impossible, because storage requirements for larger colored images were astronomical and because Internet speeds, then much slower than today, made rendering such images very slow for users.

As scanning technology had advanced considerably since the original Backfiles Project initiative was implemented, in 2006 the ScienceDirect team was able to start replacing poorly scanned images on a case-by-case basis. The rescanning resulted in images making full use of color and grayscale, and no longer compromising performance or storage requirements. However, the team soon realized that the problem was more widespread than originally thought, and a larger-scale solution was deemed necessary.

Needle in a haystack: Locating poorly scanned images is quite a challenge

When the project to replace poorly scanned images was first launched, there was no question that finding a minority of lower-quality images among the large volume of content available in the journal Backfiles would be too time-consuming as well as too costly via any method available. So ScienceDirect turned to Elsevier’s Advanced Technology Group and Principal Technology Manager David Greaves for a solution.

Greaves was able to devise a sophisticated algorithm that allowed for all the previously digitized pages to be analyzed automatically. Two dedicated servers ran the algorithm on a 24/7 basis for almost 2 years. According to Greaves, the problem boiled down to finding a method to locate bad images or figures in around 19 million “fax” pages, which are made up of nothing but small black dots without any structure, such as XML tags. He explained, saying, “I developed an algorithm and software system to analyze density distribution of all the small black dots on the pages, to determine which pages required updating, and to supply the relevant information in a simple, user-friendly way for further manual handling.” Greaves’ algorithm became a central focus for what became known as the ScienceDirect Backfiles Image Rescanning Project, or Rescanning Project for short.

Customer feedback recognizes the resulting success

Completed (99%) in early November 2009, the Rescanning Project analyzed 19 million pages and rescanned 600,000 pages containing poor-quality images. Remarkably, this was all done at no extra cost to customers and at a manageable rate for Elsevier.

Senior Product Manager Lindi Belfield, who led the original Backfiles Project and the Rescanning Project, commented, “The Rescanning Project has been an enormous commitment both in investment and as a unique service to our customers. David created an efficient operation that, while still very expensive, kept the actual costs down to a minimum, ensuring that ScienceDirect users would get the best possible quality in line with the platform’s reputation but at no additional cost to them. In total, 3% of the pages that were analyzed have been replaced. Also, in a few exceptional cases, we continue to search for high-quality images as poor (often old microfiche) or lacking source material prevents us from upgrading the quality of previously scanned images.”

Lura Joseph, an associate professor of library administration and a geology librarian at the University of Illinois, was among the first customers to recognize the value of the rescanning service. Joseph noted, “The Rescanning Project was very important for our users and our library. In the Earth Sciences, the photos, graphs and other illustrations are essential parts of articles. Patrons need to access the information 24/7, and excessive recall of material from our library high-density facility threatens turnaround time. We are very pleased that Elsevier listened and responded promptly to the need for high-quality graphics in the electronic Backfiles. Patrons and our library are benefiting greatly from the Rescanning Project.”

The Rescanning Project analyzed 19 million pages and rescanned 600,000 pages containing poor-quality images.

These images show how rescanning improved an image of a plasma cell in old rat lymph node. The image on the left is taken from a Backfiles article before the rescanning project, and the image on the right shows the same image after it was rescanned.

e.gijlswijk@elsevier.com
b.clark@elsevier.com
www.info.sciencedirect.com/content/backfiles
http://info.sciencedirect.com/techsupport/journals/bfrescanmissingsource.xls
Creating a library to serve patients and their partners: 
The UCSF Patient Health Library

By Gail Sorrough, Director, Medical Library Services, H.M. Fischbon Memorial Library, University of California San Francisco Medical Center at Mount Zion, USA

The UCSF Patient Health Library is a new library created in response to the demand from patients and their friends, family members and partners at UCSF Medical Center at Mount Zion who wanted access to medical information.

For years, patients had been visiting the medical staff library, seeking medical information and asking for help exploring the information jungle and finding trusted content. To meet the demand, a section of shelving was segregated in the reference room for lay health and medical texts and an Internet-accessible catalog for these texts was created. This situation sufficed for a while, but eventually it became evident that it was really not working and, in fact, it had given rise to problems that needed resolution.

The obvious problem was crowding. Priority use of the computers in the medical library was for faculty and staff, and often there were not enough computers to accommodate patients. Another issue was staffing. Providing reference support to patients, their family members and their partners was consuming too much staff time; an additional medical librarian dedicated to patients was required. And lastly was HIPAA compliance. Healthcare professionals using the library frequently discussed patients; this scenario created a potential conflict with HIPAA requirements for patient confidentiality. “HIPAA” stands for the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, which set forth strict guidelines regarding protection of patient confidentiality in the US.

Finding funding and space

The medical staff library is a nonrevenue-producing department within the UCSF Medical Center. So, asking in the current economic climate for more space (a premium at the medical center), funding for a remodel project and more budget for increased labor and nonlabor costs was not an option.

Fortunately for the library, its founders had the foresight to establish a fund for the library when Mount Zion was still a Jewish hospital, before it was merged with UCSF Medical Center. In the 20 years since the merger, the fund has continued to receive donations and has been carefully managed by a private, nonprofit agency. The fund covered the cost of the remodeling. In addition, a generous gift from a private donor provided support for a new part-time medical librarian.

The funding was resolved, but the space issue remained. No one was going to relinquish space, so we decided that the opportunity to create a new patient health library should also be an opportunity to enhance and evolve the medical staff library. The basic concept for both libraries was not based on how much was owned, but on how much access to resources was available. We realized that if we eliminated a good portion of the medical staff library’s print collection, we would have space. We formalized and submitted our plan to the Mount Zion administrative director. The plan received approval, and the project went forward.

Shrinking the collection

The first thing to do was shrink the collection. Because we are affiliated with a large university library, and we have access to significant online resources, it was easy to justify elimination of many of the medical staff library’s books and journals.

With a good number of books and journals gone, we were left with a large, empty room with an entrance off the main hospital hallway — perfect for easy access as a patient health library. At this point, the institution’s design and construction department was engaged to develop the official project, provide a cost estimate and timeline, and manage the contractor and vendors.

The project went forward over the summer of 2009, with only minor delays and minimal disruption to patrons. The medical staff library was reorganized for improved access to computers. The patient health library was created with a focus on providing computer access and a comfortable place to read. A new part-time (50%) medical librarian was hired to staff the patient library; current staff would accommodate the other 50% of the open hours.

Getting the word out

Our marketing activities are diverse, ongoing and critical to the success of the library. Importantly, we’ve formed a virtual ad hoc committee of nurse managers to allow nurses to provide input about patient care information needs and to connect the library to those who are directly involved with patients and their partners. Also, we’ve created a website for our new patient health library.

Getting trusted content into patients’ hands

Already, the new patient health library is attracting a steady stream of clients who want access to the latest medical findings from reputable providers and who want the assistance of a professional medical librarian with the expertise to find the appropriate resources. We’re confident that the new library will continue to be a busy place, appreciated by our clients, and a model of how a library contributes to the UCSF Medical Center’s mission of Caring, Healing, Teaching and Discovering. LC

http://mountzion.ucsfmedicalcenter.org

gail.sorrough@ucsfmedctr.org
COUNTER and SUSHI: Providing accessible usage statistics deserving your trust

By Peter Shepherd, Project Director, COUNTER, Edinburgh, UK

The question “What content can we trust?” has always been central to users of scholarly information and there is no simple answer to it.

Traditional indicators of trust have included the reputation of the author and the institute in which her or his research was done; the status of a journal in which an article appears; and the reputation of a particular publisher. More recently, citation data have become a popular, if overused, indicator, and now usage statistics have entered the frame.

In an era in which data is becoming ever more central to the decision-making process, it is inevitable that citation and usage data will become factors in the assessment of the impact, status, influence, value, utility and perhaps even the trustworthiness of content.

Improving and ensuring access to usage statistics

COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources) and SUSHI (Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative) are complementary initiatives designed to improve, respectively, the reliability and usability of online usage statistics. The role of COUNTER is to ensure that usage statistics are credible, compatible and consistent, while the role of SUSHI, which is sponsored by NISO (the National Information Standards Organization), is to ensure that they are easy to obtain.

Release 3 of the COUNTER Code of Practice for Journals and Databases succeeded Release 2 as the valid release in September 2009. The main objectives of Release 3 are to improve further the reliability of the COUNTER usage reports; to provide tools that will facilitate the consolidation, management and analysis of the COUNTER usage statistics; to improve the COUNTER usage reports for library consortia; and to improve the reporting of the usage of journal archives. For this reason, the SUSHI protocol has been incorporated as an integral feature of Release 3 and is central to it.

Prior to SUSHI, no mechanism existed for automatically retrieving, combining and storing COUNTER usage data from different sources. SUSHI provides a means to do just this via a standard model for machine-to-machine automation of statistics harvesting.

By October 2009, there were over 80 vendors compliant with Release 3 of the COUNTER Code of Practice. As a number of vendors including Elsevier are very close to compliance, it is anticipated that the number of compliant vendors will grow to over 100 by early 2010. This will bring to over 15,000 the number of fulltext journals for which COUNTER Release 3 online usage statistics are reliably and readily available.

COUNTER and SUSHI benefit libraries and publishers by facilitating access to and management of reliable usage statistics. The usage statistics thus made available are already being used by librarians to assess the utility and value of their collections of journals and databases, and by publishers to demonstrate the value of their collections of content. Metrics such as “Cost per download” and “Cost per FTE” (fulltext) are now widely used.

Successful outcomes of these two projects will add authors, research institutes and research funding agencies to the groups that find usage statistics a helpful tool.

Taking usage statistics to the next level

Reliable, easily accessible usage statistics also have the potential to be of greater benefit to authors and research institutions more broadly, and there are two current research projects in which COUNTER is involved that may help achieve this.

1. First, the Journal Usage Factor project, sponsored by the UK Serials Group, RIN and others, is investigating the development of a usage-based equivalent of the citation-based journal impact factor. A global usage-based metric would not only provide an alternative perspective to journal impact factors, but also the only quantitative comparable metric for the many journals not covered by impact factors.

2. Second, the PIRUS Project, funded by JISC (the Joint Information Systems Committee in the UK), is investigating the feasibility of creating a COUNTER-compliant standard for the recording and reporting of usage at the individual article level. This would allow researchers, as well as the organizations that fund and support them, to obtain a global overview of the usage of their articles.

Successful outcomes of these two projects will add authors, research institutes and research funding agencies to the groups that find usage statistics a helpful tool.

To revisit the original question, “What content can we trust?,“ usage data alone cannot tell the reader what content he or she can trust, but it has the potential, as a component in a matrix of other information, to provide a good indicator of content that is useful, reliable and probably worth having.

Peter Shepherd

pshepherd@projectCounter.org
www.projectCounter.org
www.niso.org/workrooms/sushi
http://tiny.cc/PIRUS
www.uksg.org/usagefactors
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Research tools for evaluating trustworthiness: CrossCheck Plagiarism Screening and CrossMark

By Carol Anne Meyer, Business Development and Marketing Manager, CrossRef, Lynnfield, MA, USA

Building on the authoritative scholarship of the past is a critical component of progress in academic study. How can researchers identify authoritative, trustworthy sources for their research?

CrossRef, the not-for-profit organization of publishers that makes reference linking in scholarly content possible, is creating tools to help researchers identify what content can be trusted. Two programs, CrossCheck Plagiarism Screening and the soon-to-be-piloted CrossMark program, address this need from different angles.

Comparing duplicate documents: The first step in plagiarism detection

CrossCheck, powered by iThenticate, protects scholarly authors from unauthorized copying and acts as a deterrent to those few authors submitting manuscripts that are not original. CrossCheck includes two major pieces:

1. A database of published scholarly content against which publishers can check submissions, and

2. A software system, created by the company behind Turnitin, that compares documents for similarity.

Since its launch in 2008, CrossCheck has grown to include more than 65 publishers, including Elsevier. The CrossCheck database now includes 24 million articles or other content items representing 40,000 journals, books and conference proceedings.

How does CrossCheck work?

First, the iThenticate crawler indexes published scholarly content from publishers’ websites. These articles are added to the CrossCheck database.

CrossCheck publishers may display a “CrossCheck Deposited” logo on their content indicating that it is deposited. This logo serves as a deterrent to would-be plagiarists.

When an author submits a manuscript for publication, the publisher can then run it through iThenticate, which compares the document against the CrossCheck database and against content from other major data providers and documents on the open Web. The publisher receives a report indicating what percentage of similarity to other documents has been detected and offering the option to view the fulltext of any matching documents.

CrossCheck alone cannot detect plagiarism, partially because plagiarism includes the concept of intent, which machines cannot reliably infer. Instead, CrossCheck allows publishers to efficiently screen submissions to identify manuscripts of concern. Participating publishers can then use their publication ethics guidelines and procedures to determine whether particular manuscripts raise concerns and whether subsequent investigations are necessary.

Identifying trustworthy research content: Ensuring research builds on authoritative scholarship of the past

Another problem facing scholars is the growing volume of literature, the dwindling reading time per article and the proliferation of multiple versions of scholarly content available on the Web. As information professionals well know, the major Internet search engines are often the first stop on a research quest. Search results may include uncorrected author preprints from an author’s website, an institutional repository, a government repository or a subject-specific archive. The same scholarly content may also be held in aggregated databases of articles as well as at publishers’ websites. How can researchers intelligently choose among these options and ensure that they are basing their research on accurate and current articles?

How will CrossMark work?

CrossRef is launching a pilot of CrossMark, which will provide researchers and librarians with information about the stewardship of a document. Users will see a CrossMark logo on the document or its abstract page. When they click on the logo, they will be taken to a screen where they can view metadata about that document from the publisher. This information will include information such as the NISO version of record status, the CrossRef DOI (the permanent URL) to the content, and an indication of its status (examples might be current, enhanced, corrected, retracted or withdrawn). CrossMark metadata might also include the information that a document has been deposited in CrossCheck.

CrossMark publishers may also choose to include publisher-specific metadata that is important to them and to their readers. That data might include information about the publisher’s peer-review process, organizations that funded the research, whether associated data has been deposited in an approved repository or other critical information.

The CrossMark pilot is launching in early 2010 with a small number of participants. The pilot will demonstrate how the linked logo described above would work in practice. CrossMark will work for material whether it is available by subscription or freely through open access. In both cases, researchers have a need to identify the most up-to-date versions of particular articles or other types of content.

Assuring the trustworthiness of the scholarly record

An important part of CrossRef’s mission is enabling easy identification and use of trustworthy electronic content. CrossCheck and CrossMark are both intended to help researchers and librarians easily identify and use trustworthy electronic content. We look forward to working with librarians in spreading the word about these important initiatives.

Resources

http://crossref.org/crosscheck.html
www.crossref.org/crosscheck/crosscheck_for_researchers.html
www.crossref.org/crosscheck.html
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Students of tomorrow need trusted content

By Lotta Janson, Librarian and Coordinator of Library Education and Information Literacy Courses, Karolinska Institutet University, Stockholm, Sweden

Like everybody else who has worked in a specific area for a while, I know many ways to find information that I need. On blogs, our library intranet and other places, my colleagues share their useful tips about what I should read. My colleagues are trustworthy and their advice is usually good, but this doesn't completely fulfill my information needs. I have to make complementary information searches. Given the proliferation of information sources, a database with trusted content is valuable.

When it comes to searching for information from credible sources, the difference between my situation and that of today's students boils down to education and experience.

Offering information literacy instruction remains important

Today's students at Karolinska Institutet are in most cases pretty computer literate, as in their preuniversity lives they became used to searching for information. However, it isn't any easier for them to find quality science with high impact or to think critically about sources than it was for students some years ago. In addition, the individual ability of the students to be able to critically evaluate sources varies greatly, especially at the start of their university experience. One can conclude that students today still need help to further develop their information literacy.

The more one knows about a subject, the easier it is to know which sources one can trust. This isn't obvious for new students. Earlier, students could go to the library and find a selection of trustworthy information which had been filtered by librarians. This isn't necessarily the situation today, with the library providing access to huge amounts of information electronically. It may be true that there are intelligent databases which help students perform their searches, but librarians are still needed to improve students' information retrieval and management skills as well as help develop their critical thinking. In the best case, this teaching should be embedded in a progressive way throughout the curriculum, thus ensuring that student information literacy is continuously and progressively developed throughout the whole of students' education.

Advancing through a career brings added skill in finding trusted content

For younger members in the academic community, as they struggle to understand the scientific approach and find out which information sources are reliable, the use of a database with trusted content is both valuable and time-saving. However, I believe that the need to find trusted content in a specific database becomes less later on, as young academics become increasingly aware of other indicators of quality. For a senior academic, it does not matter if he or she finds an article published in Cell by using Google or PubMed!

Using technology can help keep students engaged

Specific databases with trusted content need to be made simpler, faster and even more intelligent if they are to be attractive to students in the Google era. The development of Web 2.0 services allowing students to give each other tips and comment on content might also help to keep students engaged in deciding which information sources deserve to be seen as credible.

When doing research, how do you tell if a source can be trusted?

1. Does the information seem balanced and logical?
2. Does the information seem accurate and updated?
3. Does the source have a good reputation?

For serious scholars, it’s risky to depend on amateur people, journals, newspapers, blogs and websites. I prefer using reputable information sources, such as provided by Elsevier.

Three Elsevier Student Ambassadors (SAms) kindly collected and provided the following quotes regarding “trusted content.” Supported in part by Elsevier funding, these SAms work for their university libraries and help faculty, staff and students learn more about the libraries’ digital scholarly resources. Thanks go to these three SAms for their help in making this “Academics Speak Up” section possible: Sam Sung Ting (S.T. Sam) and Lee Jo May (J.M. Lee) from Universiti Sains Malaysia, in Penang, and Amila Abeynayaka from the Asian Institute of Technology in Bangkok, Thailand.

When doing research, how do you tell if a source can be trusted?

Y.Y. Looi & J.M. Lee, Postgraduates in Polymer Engineering, Universiti Sains Malaysia

“We cannot fully rely on others’ results, because they might be wrong.”

Salman A. Al-Shami, Candidate, PhD in Applied Entomology, School of Biological Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia

These criteria help me determine if I can rely on an information source:
1. Does the information seem balanced and logical?
2. Does the information seem accurate and updated?
3. Does the source have a good reputation?

In the applied sciences, it’s essential that information be updated. For instance, the taxonomy of species (plant or animal) is always being redescribed, revised and renamed.

For serious scholars, it’s risky to depend on amateur people, journals, newspapers, blogs and websites. I prefer using reputable information sources, such as provided by Elsevier.
How *The Lancet*'s editorial board ensures delivery of trusted content

**By Maja Zecevic, PhD, MPH, North American Senior Editor, The Lancet, New York, NY, USA**

*The Lancet*, which Elsevier has published since 1991, and which ranks as one of the oldest and most respected general medical journals, takes stringent measures to ensure the journal delivers trusted content. Its editorial board is committed to a high-quality peer-review process and adherence to proper reporting of clinical data. The journal, through its editors’ membership in international editorial organizations, has played a leading role in standardizing clinical data reporting. For example, the editors supported establishment of the so-called CONSORT guideline, which has made clinical trial registration a requirement and harmonized the conduct and reporting of clinical trial results.

**Publishing clinical research brings challenges**

*The Lancet*, though, has not been exempt from publishing fraudulent research. A preliminary and unexpected finding is often the discovery that has the greatest potential to change patients’ treatment and improve clinical outcomes. Thus, the most stunning results often require special editorial care because they are the most prone to misinterpretation. Not surprisingly, *The Lancet* has on very rare occasions published not only fabricated data but also plagiarized work.

In seeking to learn from past experience, and to enhance the validity and credibility of the journal’s published clinical research, *The Lancet* editors have implemented the following requirements at the manuscript submission stage:

1. All individuals who have made significant contributions to the research study reported in a paper — those who will publicly take responsibility for the study’s data acquisition, analysis and integrity — must sign a statement identifying their exact roles in the conception, design, execution and data interpretation of the study. The corresponding author must state that he or she had full access to the study’s raw data, and has approved the final manuscript and taken the decision to submit it for publication.

2. Authors are required to list all potential conflicts of interest, such as funding from companies, so that readers can judge for themselves whether the manuscript’s findings or interpretation may be biased by these relationships.

3. All sources of the study’s funding must be stated, as must any involvement of funders in the study’s design, data collection and data interpretation, as well as in the decision to publish the study. In this way, readers can assess whether there is a potential for funders to influence the conclusions of the study, and whether publication might bring financial incentives to a study’s sponsor.

**The Lancet helps ensure ethical clinical research**

Since clinical research involves human subjects, the safety and privacy of individuals is a priority and must be maintained. Along with each submitted manuscript, *The Lancet* requires a statement on how and when patients’ consent to the reported research was obtained, and whether the research was performed in compliance with institutional ethics committee requirements. In order to justify, ethically, scientifically and financially, research involving human subjects, each submission must also report a summary (e.g., a literature review or meta-analysis) of previous research of the topic addressed in the manuscript.

**Trusted content provides a building block for the future**

*The Lancet* editorial board provides clear and regularly updated instructions for authors and reviewers, and has an ombudsman to help resolve disputes regarding its editorial board decisions. Further, the journal promptly publishes any postpublication corrections that are needed.

Every article published in *The Lancet* must be credible, current and of the highest quality. As a result, each published piece offers not just an important scientific advancement but also a sound basis for further clinical research. LC

**CENTRAL POINTS**

- All individuals who have made significant contributions to the research study reported in a paper — those who will publicly take responsibility for the study’s data acquisition, analysis and integrity — must sign a statement identifying their exact roles in the conception, design, execution and data interpretation of the study.
- Every article published in *The Lancet* must be credible, current and of the highest quality.
- Determining whether to trust a source can be complex and difficult.

---

**Amila Abeynayaka, Research Associate in Environmental Engineering and Management, Asian Institute of Technology**

Determining whether to trust a source can be complex and difficult. Often we can go on our own knowledge and advisers’ opinions. Yet with rapidly developing new findings, it’s not always easy to verify the reliability of a source. Recognition plays a role. Well-recognized publishers have very good reviewing processes, and hence the content they provide can be trusted. Also numbers of citations, who has cited, and authors’ background and previous publications are excellent factors to look at, when judging the reliability of content. If a source is recently published, the background of the authors is important. If a source has been published for a reasonable time, for example 3 years or more, its citation pattern is a good indicator of trustworthiness.

✉️ amila@ait.ac.th  🌐 www.library.ait.ac.th

"Determining whether to trust a source can be complex and difficult."

---

**S.T. Sam & H.K. Tay, Postgraduates in Polymer Engineering, Universiti Sains Malaysia**

The reliability of articles depends on their citations and the impact factors of the journals in which the articles appear. It’s also important to consider who wrote the articles.

✉️ sam.sungting@gmail.com  🌐 friendlytay82@yahoo.com  🌐 www.lib.usm.my

---

**T.T. Law, Postgraduate, Polymer Engineering, Universiti Sains Malaysia**

I put my trust in the publishers who approve and accept papers.

✉️ island_theng@hotmail.com  🌐 www.lib.usm.my
Talking about best practices in training for information professionals in Vietnam

In 2007, the Vietnam Development Information Center in Hanoi received an Elsevier Foundation grant for $25,000 to jump-start the use of underutilized reference services within Vietnam’s science and technology universities. The foundation’s Innovative Libraries in Developing Countries program helps libraries so that, through training and education, digitization and preservation as well as infrastructure and information services, they can build their capacities in science, technology and medicine. Here Dr. Cecelia Brown, a professor at the School of Library and Information Studies at the University of Oklahoma, and Ms. Vu Thi Nha, a librarian at the Vietnam Development Information Center, share their thoughts on the impacts of the grant.

— David Ruth, Senior Vice President, Global Communications, Elsevier, New York, NY, USA

By Alicia Burns, Marketing Manager, Corporate, Elsevier, New York, NY, USA

Caterpillar is the world’s largest maker of construction and mining equipment, diesel and natural gas engines, and industrial gas turbines. In partnership with the company’s global dealer network, on every continent Caterpillar delivers products, services and technologies in three principal lines of business: machinery, engines and financial products. The company takes a leadership role in building the world’s infrastructure and enabling progress for millions of people around the globe.

To help maintain and grow its leadership, Caterpillar relies on its Technology Strategy and Intelligence Group. This research team helps the company confirm its technology strategy, identify trends and manage technology-related intellectual property. Within the group, the Caterpillar Technical Information Center plays a critical role.

The corporate library helps fuel lots of research

The Caterpillar Technical Information Center responds to research requests from engineers and PhDs across the company. These queries range from strategic open-ended requests such as identifying the top three technology trends in a particular area, to straightforward information searches such as identifying patents on a specific diesel-powered engine. The center also interacts with university researchers through Caterpillar’s relationships with academic institutions.

At Caterpillar, staff recognize that rapid access to the right information is vital for success. Until the late 1990s, Caterpillar researchers relied on information from databases burned onto CD-ROMs and installed monthly on stand-alone computers. Then the World Wide Web revolutionized research, opening up new ways to search, through tools such as Google, to anyone with Internet access. While useful, these new search tools often returned thousands of results, taking much time to sift and verify. And while more reliable, most of the specialized subscription-based research databases concentrated on a few core industries and so limited searching and didn’t allow for cross-industry pollination of relevant ideas. Caterpillar needed an expansive yet focused search tool, which could increase productivity and support the decision-making process from start to finish.

Turning to Engineering Village has helped boost productivity

So, in 2001, the Caterpillar Technical Information Center piloted the use of Engineering Village, a Web-based discovery platform from Elsevier. Engineering Village features powerful search tools,
What challenges did the workshop bring?

Dr. Cecelia Brown: The biggest issue for me was the language difference. Many participants were fluent in English but others were not, and I do not speak Vietnamese! This led to some miscommunications, but Nha was helpful in sorting things out quickly. Also, cultural differences in teaching and learning styles led to a bit of a slow start, but once we became accustomed to each other, it flowed well.

Ms. Vu Thi Nha: Participants have reported that after they developed action plans during the workshop, once they returned to their institutions, their library managers didn’t or couldn’t implement the plans. Maybe managers didn’t agree with the plans due to “political” issues. Also, it’s hard to persuade library managers to try new things. Another challenge has been librarians’ attitude towards doing new jobs; some librarians still have the attitude that if they implement a new plan, it means that they have to work more and want to be paid for that (in Vietnam, librarians get a low salary).

What benefits did the workshop bring?

Dr. Cecelia Brown: Participating in the workshop enabled me to gain an understanding of the issues of librarians in Vietnam and then in turn bring the issues back to my students in the US and discuss solutions. It was a wonderful learning experience for me and one I will never forget.

Ms. Vu Thi Nha: Workshop participants learned how to take advantage of diverse and invaluable S&T information resources and how to help users access these resources. Apart from gaining critical knowledge and skills, participants also shared useful experiences such as how to inform users about resources and how to use students to help other students use the library.

Are you using the workshop as a capacity-building model?

Ms. Vu Thi Nha: Actually, the workshop funded by Elsevier was not the first time we had held this kind of workshop in Vietnam. Prior to our 2008 workshop, I coordinated a similar workshop on information literacy training (IL) for Vietnamese librarians. Some participants then went back to their institutions and organized similar workshops such as IL for Vietnamese agro-forestry librarians at Hanoi Agriculture University and medical-information searching skills for medical-pharma university librarians. In Vietnam, we normally have foreign guest speakers at big conferences which doesn’t very well support learning. A small-size training workshop with a guest speaker better facilitates learning and sharing experiences. So, yes, we’re trying to structure our capacity building for Vietnamese librarians based on a model where they get together to learn from LIS experts from more developed countries and to discuss local experiences and challenges.

How has the Elsevier Foundation-funded project influenced your plans?

Ms. Vu Thi Nha: Following our 2008 workshop, participants expressed hope for similar trainings in other areas such as user education, marketing, library management, grant proposal writing and fundraising. Some have been looking for sources of funding for in-service training for their fellows. And I’m looking for additional grants as well.

Caterpillar has also used Engineering Village to find similar technologies in different industries and so solve specific problems.

something is an up-and-coming technology,” explained Melissa Allen, a technical information specialist at Caterpillar. “For example, we look to see if a lot of people are publishing more frequently on one topic, or did that particular technology go away.”

Real-life tasks show the power and usefulness of Engineering Village

In one recent challenge, the Caterpillar Technical Information Center was tasked with enabling Caterpillar to forecast the future of the mining industry in 5, 10 and 20 years. The project involved researching 12 technologies, identifying major players, and pinpointing emerging or declining trends. To quickly identify the most relevant information, the Technical Information Center team turned to Compendex. By leveraging key Engineering Village features, the team moved the project along rapidly while narrowing the field and finding the right information. The Ei Patents database helped identify intellectual property. In just 8 hours, the team identified results and produced graphs making it easy to share the results with Caterpillar management.
Talking with Adrian Mulligan about the research community’s access to trusted content

In 2009, the Publishing Research Consortium, a group of publishing societies and individual publishers which supports global research into scholarly communication, commissioned a survey to examine the opinions of sectors of the research community regarding their access to scholarly content. Here, Adrian Mulligan, Elsevier’s associate director of research and academic relations, and Mark Ware, of Mark Ware Consulting, who both worked on the project, discuss the survey’s findings.


Melanie Brown: How did the Publishing Research Consortium survey come about?
Adrian Mulligan: Despite recent efforts within the STM industry to improve dissemination of scholarly content, some in the UK still perceived the existence of access limitations in some sectors of the research community, particularly small and medium enterprises (SMEs). However, given the lack of quantification of access levels across sectors, research was needed. To provide insight, in 2009, the Publishing Research Consortium (PRC) commissioned a study in the UK to examine access levels across various organization types including SMEs, corporations, universities, and medical and government organizations.

How was Elsevier involved?
Adrian Mulligan: The Publishing Research Consortium commissioned and funded the survey. It was conducted by Mark Ware Consulting, with technical support and assistance provided by Elsevier’s Research & Academic Relations team.

What are the survey’s biggest findings?
Adrian Mulligan: From the 1,000 UK-based researchers surveyed, 85% feel that access to original research articles is easy. The survey also helped to put information needs in the context of other needs. Those surveyed showed only moderate concern with the current status of access to information when compared to other factors. It’s clear that, for some sectors (e.g., SMEs), there is less of an expectation for access to original research.

Whilst there are differences in the absolute levels of access amongst different sectors, most are in agreement that access to research articles has become easier over the last 5 years. This can be seen as a reflection of the progress publishers have made as an industry since the beginning of the digital revolution in STM publishing.

For Elsevier, what is the biggest takeaway from the survey?
Adrian Mulligan: This survey represents an important step towards understanding the differing information needs of researchers across sectors.

Understanding the nature of and reasons for access gaps helps us develop mechanisms to close these gaps. Following the insights gained from this survey, Elsevier will continue to work on developing sustainable mechanisms to close the remaining gaps and will continue to measure and communicate progress towards achieving universal sustainable access to published research.

The survey also helped to put information needs in the context of other needs. Those surveyed showed only moderate concern with the current status of access to information when compared to other factors. It’s clear that, for some sectors (e.g., SMEs), there is less of an expectation for access to original research.

How might the findings help improve the dissemination of scholarly content?
Mark Ware: This survey, together with additional qualitative interviewing I have conducted in support of this project, raises several suggestions around how publishers can help improve small and medium enterprises’ access to original research articles.

These suggestions include:

- Make pay-per-view access simpler, with more appropriate payment mechanisms for companies, and — above all — cheaper;
- Extend higher education institutions’ licenses so they provide online, rather than just walk-in, access (with appropriate safeguards) for local businesses; and
- Offer comprehensive, centrally administered national licenses for scholarly resources.

85% feel that access to original research articles is easy.

85% feel that access to original research articles is easy.

How might the findings help improve the dissemination of scholarly content?
Mark Ware: This survey, together with additional qualitative interviewing I have conducted in support of this project, raises several suggestions around how publishers can help improve small and medium enterprises’ access to original research articles.

These suggestions include:

- Make pay-per-view access simpler, with more appropriate payment mechanisms for companies, and — above all — cheaper;
- Extend higher education institutions’ licenses so they provide online, rather than just walk-in, access (with appropriate safeguards) for local businesses; and
- Offer comprehensive, centrally administered national licenses for scholarly resources.


Caterpillar has also used Engineering Village to find similar technologies or problems in different industries and so solve specific problems. In one instance, an engineer needed solutions to the issue of sand sticking to mining trucks. Using Engineering Village, the Technical Information Center team identified solutions sourced from the food processing industry.

Engineering Village has proven to be a valuable productivity tool for Caterpillar. Engineering Village saves researchers valuable search time through its ability to turn up abstracts and indexes of information that link directly to downloadable fulltext databases. Because Engineering Village offers an accessible interface, Caterpillar researchers now often conduct their own searches and the company’s technology information specialists can devote more time to other critical tasks that benefit particular Caterpillar projects and the company overall.

a.burns@elsevier.com
www.engineeringvillage.org
www.cat.com
Last year this time, I met the Reaxys product team and learned about this new chemistry information product. Prior to that meeting, I had already received several recommendations from my researchers and students about Reaxys. However, I was very skeptical. Why?

For me, the issue of CrossFire Commander, an Elsevier-provided chemistry product that USC Libraries licensed before licensing Reaxys, was never its content, but its interface and accessibility. As a former organic chemist, I used CrossFire Commander very often, and the more I used it, the more I hoped it could be more user-friendly.

As a science librarian teaching chemistry information to the Google generation, I have to admit that often I’ve felt powerless to attract users to CrossFire Commander, even when dealing with users clearly aware that it offers trusted content essential to their research and study. With the increase of high-quality chemical resources available on the Web, users today demand better and more user-friendly search interfaces as well as more powerful search features and analytical tools on top of the content. Otherwise, they will move away from subscription-based chemical resources regardless of how useful their content is, or how much institutions or libraries have paid for them.

In response to our users’ research needs, in particular our chemistry researchers’ demand for access to trusted content provided via highly regarded chemistry information databases, the USC Libraries became one of the early adopters subscribing to Reaxys. Now, after almost one year of searching and using Reaxys, my users and I just love it.

Here are my top three reasons why I love Reaxys.

1. The Web-based information search suite provides access to integrated and unified information from three trustworthy, well-regarded chemistry information databases. Getting information from a client-based (software-based) database is not convenient for most users, and, to some users, it is not “online” searching at all. I love Reaxys because it offers Web-based, unlimited access. With proxy server protection, my users can access it anytime and anywhere. There will be no software installations or upgrades, computer freezing or crashes, or technical questions relating to any such occurrences, anymore. Yeah!

2. The intuitive and user-friendly search interface offers many versatile analytical tools that help users get targeted results. Reaxys offers users easy-to-use, comprehensive and in-depth information search capabilities within one universal platform.

3. The streamlined information search design (e.g., the “synthesis planner” special feature) helps users find what they want more quickly. We imagine and work on streamlining many things in our life, so why can’t we streamline our information search for optimum results? Having a need, knowing a source, searching it and analyzing results, and finding exactly what we want — to some degree, this is exactly what Reaxys offers chemists. Especially noteworthy is Reaxys’ Synthesis Planner, which integrates reactions and substances, and provides literature search results, within one interface. Taking advantage of this feature can help users develop better search synthesis strategies.

Seeing is believing

As do my users, I welcome Reaxys to the chemistry information world. If you haven’t tried Reaxys, please give it a try. I hope, and I know, you will like it as well. To see a lot of reasons why you too will love it, please visit my Reaxys review at www.istl.org/09-summer/electronic.html.

Importantly, I also hope Reaxys will keep improving through user feedback, which comes from users’ search and use experience.

So, let’s Reaxys! Happy searching, everyone! LC

By Norah Xiao, Science Librarian, USC Libraries, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, USA

Norah Xiao

Leading US chemistry grad schools are licensing Reaxys

The University of Southern California, where 1994 Nobel Prize in Chemistry winner George Olah holds the positions of Distinguished Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering and Materials Science and Donald P. and Katherine B. Loker Chair in Organic Chemistry, was the first university to license Reaxys.

Since its beta launch in October 2008 and its launch in January 2009, six of the top 10 graduate schools in chemistry in the US have licensed Reaxys.

The six leading US graduate schools in chemistry that have licensed Reaxys are:

- Harvard University
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Northwestern University
- Scripps Research Institute
- Stanford University
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

The source of the list of the top 10 graduate schools in chemistry is the 2008 U.S. News & World Report.
Awards recognize top scientists around the world

By Noelle Gracy, Regional Customer Development Manager, and Arthur Eger, Customer Development Manager, Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Three recent award ceremonies brought together Elsevier colleagues and members of the scientific community in South Africa, the Netherlands and the UK.

In September, in Kempton Park, South Africa, the National Research Foundation (NRF) of South Africa celebrated its tenth anniversary and the International Year of Astronomy with the NRF President’s Awards event. Twenty-one awards acknowledged South African researchers rated as world leaders in their disciplines by their peers. Two Scopus Young Scientist Awards were presented by Herman van Campenhout, past CEO of Elsevier’s Science & Technology Division. One went to Stellenbosch University Professor Scarlett Cornelissen in recognition of her research on Africa’s political economy, foreign policy and development and the other to University of Pretoria Professor Bernard Slippers in recognition of his research on molecular ecology and evolution of insects and microorganisms affecting tree health.

In October, in London, at the fifth annual Times Higher Education Award Ceremony, Elsevier’s Director of Sales and Marketing, EMEA-APAC-Latin America, Phil Govaert presented the Outstanding Contribution to Innovation and Technology Award to Imperial College London for its work in biomedical engineering. The award was one of 18 given at an event known as the Academy Awards of the university world. Attendees included consortia heads, library directors, leading academics and institute directors.

In November, in The Hague, government officials honored top Dutch scientists at the tenth Evening of Science & Society. Held in the historic Ridderzaal, the building where Holland’s Queen Beatrix gives her annual State of the Union address, this year’s evening focused on the theme of “The Brain.” Dutch Prime Minister Professor Jan Peter Balkenende opened with a speech titled “Knowledge Is Power,” and, among other speakers, Herman van Campenhout spoke about the future of Dutch research and Elsevier’s initiatives in the scientific community. Elsevier served as a sponsor of the event.

Also in October, at Stockholm University and the University of Helsinki, Elsevier presented publishing seminars aimed at young scientists looking for guidance on how to get published and cited. In conjunction with the seminars, the universities’ libraries hosted workshops on how to market the university library. Preceded by a presentation on “Connecting with Young Researchers,” these workshops brought out interesting discussion about how academic libraries decide what to focus their marketing efforts on.

Nordic academics give high marks to Elsevier’s forum, publishing seminars and marketing workshops

By Chris James, Account Development Manager, and Sandra Grijzenhout, Account Manager Nordic Countries, Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Information professionals from all five Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden) participated in the Elsevier-sponsored 7th Nordic Librarian Forum, in Amsterdam in October. Robert Kiley, the acting head of the Wellcome Trust’s library, presented a funder’s perspective on Open Access as well as what publishers can do to support it. Gunnar Sivertsen from NIFU STEP (the Norwegian Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education) spoke about the Norwegian bibliometric model for performance-based funding of research institutions. Ian Rowlands, with the Centre for Information Behaviour and the Evaluation of Research group in London, discussed the Research Information Network’s recent report E-journals: Their Use, Value and Impact, which shows a strong correlation between fulltext article usage and scientific output, grant income and PhD awards.

Nordic information professionals and Elsevier colleagues get ready to enjoy a boat ride on an Amsterdam canal.

Elsevier supports young Polish scientists

By Agata Jablonka, Account Development Manager, Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

On November 25, 2009, in Warsaw, Elsevier and its partner Perspektywy recognized young Polish scientists for their outstanding achievements in research. Out of 10 nominees introduced during a press conference, three received Scopus Perspektywy Young Researcher Awards at a gala event in the center of the Polish capital. In addition to a monetary prize, each researcher who received an award is receiving the opportunity to attend an international conference of her or his choice. Now having been presented for two consecutive years, the Scopus Perspektywy Young Researcher Award enjoys increasing popularity. In 2009, the number of applicants — 300 — was six times higher than in 2008.

www.elsevier.com/libraryconnect
Follow these tips and help users gain trust in your library website

1. Adhere to common design standards (e.g., a link looks like a link; navigation and organization are simple).
2. Use clear messaging and accurate labeling. This is a way to promote users' understanding and enable them to predict the results of their behavior.
3. Use a design that's professional in appearance and tone. This is a way to emphasize care, attention to detail and consideration of users.

By Tom Noonan

4. Make sure that information, citations, references and links are up to date. This is a way to help increase users’ confidence in your site.

5. Avoid overly commercial elements that interfere with the purpose of the site. This doesn’t mean foregoing ads but ensuring ads are appropriate and feature a sensitive design.

6. Provide FAQs. These indicate that, rather than a fly-by-night operation, a trustworthy organization is behind the site.

7. Feature social design. By enabling users to communicate freely with each other and the site’s sponsoring organization, you contribute to the sense of openness and trust conveyed by the site (does anyone do this better than Amazon?).

Resources


Research4Life now offers Scopus to developing-world scientists

Scopus, the largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature and high-quality Web sources, is becoming available via Research4Life. Now, with freely available access to Scopus, scientists and scholars in the developing world will benefit from the Web-integrated literature research tool providing citation information, direct links to fulltext articles, library resources, patent searches and reference management software. Scopus contains abstracts and references from nearly 18,000 journals from more than 5,000 international publishers.

Research4Life is the collective name for HINARI, AGORA, OARE and aRDi, public-private partnerships offering health, agriculture, environmental and patent research for free or at very low cost to developing countries. Over 150 publishers, among them Elsevier, Springer, Wiley-Blackwell and Oxford University Press provide their journal content through the partnerships. LC

Want to write for LCN?
LCN 8:2 (April 2010), will address the theme “International & Interdisciplinary.” If you want to write an article for the issue, send a brief proposal to libraryconnect@elsevier.com.
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