<u>TH32F: Publishing Research Data: Peer Review, Data Center</u> <u>Accreditation, and Linking</u>

Peer REview for Publication & Accreditation of Research data in the Earth sciences (PREPARDE)

Jonathan Tedds (Leicester), Sarah Callaghan (BADC), Fiona Murphy (Wiley), Matt Mayernik (NCAR)

jat26@le.ac.uk

#PREPARDE



Data Publishing Issues & Workflows

- Why?
- What?
- Where?
- How?



Why publish data?

- Provide academic credit to scientists who create and mange data
 - -without diverting effort from their main work on ensuring data quality.
- Ensures that the dataset is uploaded to a trusted repository where it will be archived and curated properly.
- Peer-review process also reassures the funder that the published dataset is of good quality and that the experiment was carried out appropriately.
- Allows researchers outside the immediate field, to discover data and learn access conditions.
- Shows transparency in the scientific process, improving public accountability.





Geoscience Data Journal, Wiley Blackwell and the Royal Meteorological Society

- supported by NERC in particular the British Atmospheric Data Centre
- Partnership formed between **Royal Meteorological Society** and academic publishers **Wiley Blackwell** to develop a mechanism for the formal publication of data in the Open Access *Geoscience Data Journal*

Geoscience Data Journa

- **GDJ** publishes short data papers cross-linked to, and citing, datasets that have been deposited in approved data centres and awarded DOIs (or other permanent identifier).
- A data article describes a dataset, giving details of its collection, processing, software, file formats etc, without the requirement of novel analyses or ground breaking conclusions. It allows the reader to understand the when, how and why data was collected and what the data-product is.



JOURNAL TOOLS

det New Content Alerts

S Get RSS feed

Save to My Profile

Recommend to Your Librarian

JOURNAL MENU

FIND ISSUES Current Issue All Issues Virtual Issues

Journal Home

FIND ARTICLES

Early View Editors' Choice

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Author Guidelines Submit an Article

ABOUT THIS JOURNAL

Editorial Board News Overview Permissions Advertise Contact

SPECIAL FEATURES

Virtual Issue - Evolutionary Applications to Climate Change For Reviewers Cover Gallery Wiley Job Network Institutional and Funder Payments Wiley Open Access Open Access License and Copyright Article Publication Charges Virtual Special Issue -Geoengineering Virtual Issue - Editor's Choice papers L F Richardson Award Prize

Geoscience Data Journa

Winners

Editor in Chief Dr Rob Allan, Met Office, UK

 An earth science open access data journal



GBS (Global Broadcast Service), doi:10.1029/2007RS003793

Abstract

Jump to...

•

•

Time series analysis of the average rainfall over a target area in southern Amazon Basin showed a spectral peak at 11 day period. An objective method for defining the South Atlantic Convergence Zone (SACZ) is used to identify 28 episodes affecting southern Amazon Basin during the 10 summers in the period 1999–2010. The 28-episode composite precipitation anomalies show significant positive values over the target area. The convergence of moisture over the target area in the SACZ composites is about 35% stronger than the climatological value. Copyright © 2012 Royal Meteorological Society

1. Introduction

Jump to...

One of the regional scale meteorological systems that affect the weather over a major part of the South American tropics is the South Atlantic Convergence Zone (SACZ). This system somewhat plays the same role for the South American monsoon (Vera *et al.*, 2006; Carvalho *et al.*, 2010) as does the monsoon trough for the South Asian summer monsoon (Keshavamurty and Awade, <u>1970</u>). The cloud band associated with SACZ extends from the Amazon Basin (Amazonia) to the South Atlantic subtropics, over a stretch of 4000 km or more (Kodama, <u>1992</u>; Satyamurty *et al.*, <u>1998</u>) and affects many regions of Brazil with intense rainfall. Some SACZ events are especially intense over interior South American continent (Carvalho *et al.*, <u>2004</u>; Muza and Carvalho, <u>2006</u>), strongly affecting Amazonia.

Guidelines & Workflows

For Authors:

- Are there guidelines on how to structure a Data Paper?
- How can I submit a Data Paper to **Geoscience Data Journal**?
- What is a **Digital Object Identifier** (**DOI**) and why should datasets have them?
- What alternative permanent identifiers are allowable?

For Data Centers:

- How do data centers fit in to the **GDJ** ecosystem?
- What would my data center have to do to be approved by **GDJ**?
- Is the repository approval a lengthy process?
- Is there any support or guidance available from the journal? Whom do I contact to get my repository approved?.
- Once approved what then?
- What are the benefits of encouraging researchers to submit to GDJ?



PREPARDE:

Peer Review for Data Publication

- Technical
 - author guidelines for GDJ
 - NERC Data Value Checklist
 - implicit peer review of repository?
- Scientific
 - pre-publication?
 - post-publication? E.g. F1000R
 - guidelines on uncertainty e.g. IPCC
 - discipline specific?
 - EU Inspire spatial formatting
- Societal
 - contribution to human knowledge
 - reliability





Peer review process for GDJ

data description document (data paper)

- describes the experiment in a reader-friendly way
- may contain quick-look plots of the data
- should describe how the data were created
 - so that the quality of the scientific method can be examined
 - provide information on the importance, uniqueness and applicability to other purposes of the data.

metadata

• clearly identify and describe the data.

The data themselves

- Usability
- accessibility through the repository



Peer review process for GDJ

Review I – Data description document

- Is the method used to create the data of a high scientific standard?
- Is enough information provided (in metadata also) to enable the data to be re-used or the experiment to be repeated?
- Does the document provide a comprehensive description of all the data that is there?
- Does the data make an important and unique contribution to the geosciences?
- What range of applications to geosciences does it have?
- Are all contributors and existing work acknowledged?
- Does the Data Paper contain sufficient citation information of the dataset, eg dataset DOI, name of data centre etc. (see <u>http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/(ISSN)2049-</u> <u>6060/homepage/ForAuthors.html#reference_style</u> for necessary dataset citation details)



Peer review of data

- Survey of existing literature and journal data publication policies on-going
 - Discipline specific & general
- Workshop in UK early 2013
 - community input into suggested data review policy



What's out there already?

- IPCC guidelines on uncertainty
- NERC HINDAWI
- US Geological Survey
- EU Inspire
- RE3data.org
- ESSD
- Societal implications
 - Contribution to human knowledge vs reliability
- Pensoft
- Life sciences
 - o BMC medical
 - o F1000Research
 - o JOAD
 - o ELife





Citation best practises

 International CODATA Task Group on Data Citation Standards and Practices

<u>http://www.codata.org/taskgroups/TGdatacitation/index</u> <u>.html</u>

- White Paper on Current Practices in Data Citation (planned publication Dec 2012)
- SCOR/IODE/MBL WHOI Library Data Publication Working Group
- NERC data citation and publication project

• DataCite



Emerging Principles for Data Citation (1)

Derived from:

- Developing Data Attribution and Citation Practices and Standards workshop, Berkeley, California August 2011 <u>http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13564</u>
- *Data Citation Principles* workshop, IQSS, Harvard University, Massachusetts, May 16-17, 2011
- literature survey and interviews with members of stakeholder communities (researchers, funders, data repository managers).





Emerging Principles for Data Citation (2)

- 1. First Class Status
- 2. Persistence
- 3. Granularity
- 4. Resolvability
- 5. Attribution
- 6. Metadata Standards

Principles taken from: TG on Data Citation Report Outline Presentation to Roundtable Discussion Taipei, Taiwan October 2012













Example of (potential) steps/workflow required for a researcher to publish a data paper

- Items in orange refer to the areas of interest which will be investigated in PREPARDE
- Division of area of responsibilities between
 - repository controlled processes
 - *journal controlled* processes

Data repository workflows

- Data centre and journal workflows captured
- Work on comparisons and identification of crosslinking points is continuing.
- Workshop planned for 2013 if interested please email sarah.callaghan@stfc.ac.uk



Repository Accreditation & Workflows

- Repository certification procedures focus on repository "trustworthiness"
- Assessing trustworthiness requires assessing the entire repository workflow

The Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems **Recommendation for Space Data System Practices** AUDIT AND CERTIFICATION OF Contents: TRUSTWORTHY DIGITAL REPOSITORIES Introduction Establishing Audit and Certification Criteria Towards an International Audit & Certification Process Using this Checklist for Audit & Certification Applicability of Criteria Relevant Standards, Best Practices & Controls Terminology RECOMMENDED PRACTICE Audit and Certification Criteria Organizational Infrastructure Digital Object Management CCSDS 652.0-M-1 Technologies, Technical Infrastructure & Security Audit Checklist Glossary **Appendices** MAGENTA BOOK Version 1.0 September 2011 February 2007



REPORTMOSPHERIC SCIENCE INMENT RESEARCH COUNCIL FACULTY of 10000

T-PUBLICATION PEER REV





Repository Workflow – NCAR Comp. & Info. Systems Lab Research Data Archive (RDA)



Repository Workflow – NCAR Earth Observing Lab Data Management Group



INVersity of Leicester OF Leice

Diagram by Christopher Eaker

Workflows

- Data quality assessment processes take place throughout the workflow
- •Data publication is often not a one-time process
 - Data might be used in research publications before being made publicly available.
 - Data might be updated or fixed due to user feedback after being posted.



Repository Accreditation

- What makes a repository trustworthy?
 - -Many things: mission, processes, expertise, workflows, history, systems, documentation, ...
 - -Assessing trustworthiness is a complex and holistic task
- Peer review of data is implicitly peer review of repository
- •IDCC workshop #IDCC13 17 Jan 2013, Amsterdam —Report to follow



Discussion!

