



Revista de Administração Contemporânea

ISSN: 1415-6555

ISSN: 1982-7849

Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-graduação
em Administração

Mendes-Da-Silva, Wesley
Promoção de Transparência e Impacto da Pesquisa em Negócios
Revista de Administração Contemporânea, vol. 22, núm. 4, 2018, Julho-Agosto, pp. 639-649
Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-graduação em Administração

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2018180210>

Disponível em: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=84057862001>

- Como citar este artigo
- Número completo
- Mais informações do artigo
- Site da revista em redalyc.org

UABEM redalyc.org

Sistema de Informação Científica Redalyc
Rede de Revistas Científicas da América Latina e do Caribe, Espanha e Portugal
Sem fins lucrativos acadêmica projeto, desenvolvido no âmbito da iniciativa
acesso aberto

Editorial:



The Promotion of Transparency and the Impact of Research on Business



Wesley Mendes-Da-Silva
Fundação Getulio Vargas, Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil
Editor-in-chief

This is the first editorial that I'm writing as editor of *Revista de Administração Contemporânea* (RAC) (Journal of Contemporary Administration) under a voluntary mandate with a defined duration (2018-2021). I wish to take this opportunity to, first of all, thank ANPAD, the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Administration (Brazilian Academy of Management) for the confidence they have placed in me and the team that has administered RAC activities over the past few years under the competent management of Professor Herbert Kimura, who I am succeeding as editor.

RAC is recognized in Brazil as one of the principal scientific publications in the area of business administration. This is due to the work of all who have effectively collaborated with this journal, including its authors, reviewers, editors, members of the editorial board, service suppliers, and especially the efforts made by ANPAD, which has taken on the largest portion of the costs of running a journal of this size (ANPAD, 2017). I also wish to acknowledge collaboration with the federal government, which has partially financed this journal's activities. I hope that the commitment of people and organizations will continue to be one of the pillars that supports RAC.

In weighing the unmistakable success of RAC over more than 20 years, ever since its first issue in 1997, we may observe that there are a wide variety of challenges that present themselves for consideration. Like any other journal committed to the unrestricted dissemination of knowledge of the highest quality, RAC is aware of the need for investment to enable its growth and assure its consolidation. That is why, in this first editorial, I have decided to address two aspects of the journal: its impact and transparency, bearing in mind that together they represent a proxy of the broad array of aspects that are necessary to journal success and RAC in particular.

Impact and visibility

There's no doubt that a journal's central aspect is its impact. This has attracted more and more attention from the scientific community. Researchers, editors, and individuals who manage schools in various areas of knowledge, including business, have demonstrated a heightened interest in this topic (Chartered Association of Business Schools, 2018). As a consequence, we have witnessed a constant desire on the part of researchers to publish their articles in journals with greater impact (Saes, Mello, & Guimarães, 2017). Among the various specialties within the area of business, we may observe that certain domains have achieved greater impact factors. In this regard, Table 1 presents the average impact factor for journals listed in the Academic Journal Guide, maintained by the Chartered Association of Business Schools. Note that among the journals classified at the top of the Academic Journal Guide, nine of them in the area of general psychology present an average impact that is noticeably greater than the other 21 areas, even when all top journals are considered.

Table 1

Impact Factors by Area

Area	Agregated		4		4*	
	N	FI	N	FI	N	FI
Psychology (General)	9	7.460	8	7.684	1	5.667
General Mgmt, Ethics, Gender & Social Resp.	8	6.156	4	4.941	4	7.372
International Business and Area Studies	2	4.814	1	3.758	1	5.869
Sector Studies	5	4.616	5	4.616	-	-
Strategy	1	4.461	-	-	1	4.461
Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management	3	4.409	3	4.409	-	-
Operations Research and Management Science	5	4.195	3	5.457	2	2.301
Innovation	2	4.127	1	3.759	1	4.495
Marketing	8	3.719	2	2.774	6	4.035
Information Management	4	3.624	2	2.233	2	5.016
Operations and Technology Management	3	3.499	2	2.645	1	5.207
Social Sciences	9	3.450	6	3.027	3	4.297
Public Sector and Health Care	3	3.352	2	3.292	1	3.473
Psychology (Organisational)	7	3.275	6	3.133	1	4.130
Organisational Studies	5	3.259	4	3.402	1	2.691
Economics, Econometrics and Statistics	23	2.960	17	2.532	6	4.174
Finance	8	2.822	5	1.668	3	4.746
Accounting	6	2.554	2	2.013	4	2.825
Management Development and Education	1	2.426	1	2.426	-	-
Human Res. Management & Employment Studies	5	1.844	5	1.844	-	-
Regional Studies, Planning & Environment	2	1.710	2	1.710	-	-
Business and Economic History	2	0.829	2	0.829	-	-
Total	121	3.750	83	3.446	38	4.416

Note. The Chartered Association of Business Schools publishes the *Academic Journal Guide*, which is updated every 3 years, with its most recent edition being published in 2018. This publication lists scientific journals in the area of business, using a scale of 5 ratings, ranging from 1 (the most basic) to 4* (the highest). Average impact factors for journals classified by area of knowledge which are at the top of the list prepared by the Chartered Association of Business Schools. (2018). *The purpose of the Academic Journal Guide*. Retrieved 18 June, 2018, from <https://charteredabs.org/academic-journal-guide-2018/>
N = Number of journals with the highest ratings in the 2018 ABS list; IF = Impact Factor 2017.

Thus, we arrive at a frequently asked question: how can one increase the impact of a journal committed to publishing works of quality? The answer may not be as simple as the models used by indexers recognized by the scientific community. On the other hand, I understand that we (the scientific community in the area of business) can proceed in a manner that will help improve the impact of certain journals, without increasing the already tiring effort made in the business area as well as other areas of knowledge (Park, 2009). Before the appearance of the internet and its undeniable effects on communication, the most prominent agencies for the stimulation of science in Brazil were preoccupied with the role of players in the scientific community. During the last two decades, what have we done differently, given that we now have a significantly modified apparatus? How has communication taken place? Have its control and communication dissemination reflected advances in available technology? In respect to individual contributions, one aspect appears to be particularly important: the disposition to be concerned about being transparent in the way in which one's work has been developed, as well as actively using emerging means of publishing knowledge, especially through social media, increasing the visibility of one's research results (Gewin, 2016). In regard to increasing research visibility, Tripathy *et al.* (2017) indicate paths forward, as can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2

Increasing Research Visibility

#	Tips to increase research visibility
1	Expand your base of co-authors and include relevant stakeholders from the beginning of the research process, and do not forget that ideas travel through the internet and through relationships
2	Select a title that represents the main results obtained by the article, and be perceptive in the choice and use of keywords
3	Give preference to open access journals, and include your articles in repositories dedicated to open access: Researchgate, SSRN, and Econpapers, among others
4	Make effective use of social media: Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn
5	Create and share podcasts; research is not just text and figures. Seek to describe your research and consider sharing your podcast via YouTube or Vimeo. See, for example, the Washington University Channel on YouTube
6	Share your research results via SlideShare, Scribd, Data Dryad, Zenodo, and figshare
7	Disseminate your research via personal blogs: Tumblr, Wordpress, Research blogging
8	Obtain and use an author identifier ORCID to distinguish yourself from other researchers
9	Write and disseminate executive summaries that allow the lay public to understand what you have done, and use these documents as a tool to communicate your research results in an effective manner to the most relevant policy makers and stakeholders
10	Use other forms of dissemination: Kudos, ImpactStory, Google Scholar, and the inclusion of personal email subscriptions which contain links to the researchers' profiles on social networks
11	Find a Wikipedia page related to your research topic and add a link to your article

Note. Tips to increase the visibility and dissemination of research results. This table represents a non-exhaustive list of strategies to increase the dissemination of research results to facilitate the effective impact of published scientific works; issues related to works *per se* are not addressed in this table. To illustrate this: there are those who argue that more editing tends to lead to more citations, vis-a-vis unedited research articles. More than five thousand scientific articles are published daily, which is why it is necessary to make the greatest effort possible to obtain visibility. Even a small effort to promote our articles can make it easier for our research to be discovered. Source: Adapted from Tripathy, J. P., Bhatnagar, A., Shewade, H. D., Kumar, A. M. V., Zachariah, R., & Harries, A. D. (2017). Ten tips to improve the visibility and dissemination of research for policy makers and practitioners (p. 11). *Public Health Action*, 7(1), 10–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5588/pha.16.0090>

Cippà (2016) points out that it is justifiable that scientific journals, preoccupied with the impact of their publications on society, reflect this concern by employing editors dedicated to structuring communication strategies and policies that use social media, which is a view that represents the

cornerstone of the work by Kapp, Hensel, and Schonoring (2015). Cippà (2016) also mentions that more than 35% of researchers consult Twitter every day. This behavior is, at least in part, one of the drivers of new impact metrics focused on social media, such as *Altmetric* (Ortega, 2018; Piwowar, 2013; Scaratti, Galuppo, Gorli, Gozzoli, & Ripamonti, 2017). This view is shared by other researchers, such as Ortega (2017) and Pierro (2016), who in investigating the effect of the dissemination of articles on Twitter on the impact of research conclude that journals that have their own Twitter account get 46% more tweets, and 34% more citations, compared to journals that don't have their own social network accounts.

Van Noorden (2014) has conducted a study designed to identify how researchers have used social networks. The main results obtained point out that, in terms of social media, Twitter seems to be the main instrument employed by these researchers for disseminating knowledge, at least in countries where the use is permitted.

Transparency: reproducibility and validity

In various sectors, from the private to the public, ethical concerns have taken on a prominent role. While corporate transparency can bring benefits to management, in government the promotion of transparency can facilitate well-being for society as a whole. Within these two segments, corruption is the most frequent consequence of an absence of relevant information to ensure the transparency of activities. In an analogous manner, the scientific community has accelerated its demands for more transparency in research (Eisenman, 2016; Ellis & Leek, 2018; Gewin, 2016; Iqbal *et al.*, 2016).

The main reason for this is to ensure that researchers follow ethical procedures and as a result ensure the reliability of publications (Bustin & Nolan, 2016), with positive externalities, such as the reduction of the effort needed to develop new research (Park, 2009). In addition, the reproducibility and validity of published studies have immediate consequences, inhibiting fraud and carelessness in relation to the conduction of research procedures (Bohannon, 2016; Eisenman, 2016; Hauptman, 2016; Herndon, 2016). To address problems of this nature, journals should require authors to detail the methodological procedures they have adopted. It is assumed that scientific journals have a duty to help the scientific community through maintaining the reproducibility of their published studies, given that this is a crucial portion of the scientific method.

Unfortunately, inadequate behavior on the part of some researchers has been observed. This behavior ranges from ignoring outliers in order to manipulate data, to the pure invention of study results. This has triggered reactions from the scientific community (Bohannon, 2016; Eisenman, 2016; Eisner, 2018; Hauptman, 2016; Herndon, 2016; Wiwanitkit, 2016). Due to the gains made possible by an increase in research transparency, there have been frequent requests for authors to share the data upon which they have based their published research, especially when the data has been produced by studies supported by funding institutions. Not publishing this data is justified only in certain cases, and there are some journals that do not publish any works without their respective data files (Vasilevsky, Minnier, Haendel, & Champieux, 2017).

The sharing of research data has been the subject of intense debate in the medical area over the past decade (Alsheikh-Ali, Qureshi, Al-Mallah, & Ioannidis, 2011; Baggerly, 2010; Ioannidis, 2011; Iqbal *et al.*, 2016; Ellis & Leek, 2018), but it has been only in the last few years that we have begun to witness similar debates in the applied social sciences (Ferro & Silvello, 2017; Silvello, 2017, 2018; Silvello, Bordea, Ferro, Buitelaar, & Bogers, 2017). According to Baggerly (2010), after a lengthy investigation, three clinical trials at Duke University were suspended at the end of 2009 due to the determination that research procedures could not be reproduced for a project related to cancer therapies. Once again: journals have a duty to help the scientific community, maintaining reproducibility as a cornerstone of the scientific method.

To fight this problem, journals should request that authors present enough detail so that independent evaluations can be made of their work. It is therefore recommended that all data should be saved in a backup with adequate documentation and annotations related to the sample. In addition, all

data sources, such as access to databases, URL links, and software source code should be provided with the proper instructions and any details deemed necessary. Files containing this information can be stored as supplements by the journal, and as a result the quality of scientific production will benefit by defining these standards. As a community, we owe it to those who participate in our studies and society as a whole, to assume a commitment to assuring the validity of the research that we publish. This discussion presents a growing contribution to the field of business knowledge, and also bears in mind the increasing employment of experiments and procedures involving human beings in research (Haug, 2018), as part of the clear trend toward data-driven research.

This is why RAC, in order to contribute to the growth of research in business, is studying the possibility of systematically publishing the data used in our published research as supplements, except in cases in which the authors explain and justify why the data should not be made available. In addition, with the promotion of transparency in mind, RAC will consider identifying the works of authors who are willing to publish the data that they have used in their studies. Highly respected journals already do this (Baker, 2016), and this suggests that we have come to a point at which minds are as open as the data employed in research (Gewin, 2016).

Final Words

I would once again like to thank all the people who have volunteered their time to RAC activities. We know that this requires a sacrifice of time involved in ensuring that works of high quality are published for the scientific community. I honestly and sincerely hope that the submissions that we receive at RAC will be the product of the best efforts of the researchers interested in this journal, and that our colleagues who act as evaluators will continue to be selfless individuals. RAC's editorial office will make the greatest efforts to continue to increase the prominence of this journal.

In the future, RAC, the **Journal of Contemporary Administration**, will continue to adapt and oversee changes in order to fulfill its role of serving the community of business administration researchers, including the governance of this journal (Gasparyan, 2013). I would like to take this opportunity to invite the community to send their most relevant and provocative works to RAC and also serve as reviewers when invited to offer their opinions on the works submitted. Reviewer engagement is one of the pillars on which RAC's commitment to society rests. Finally, I would like to say that RAC remains open to suggestions and innovative and creative ideas that are of value to the community.

This issue includes 6 new articles, 1 technical article and 1 essay. In addition, we are including a special call for papers **Technology Perspectives and Innovative Scenarios Applied in the Amazon Region**, for which we have invited Emílio José Montero Arruda Filho (Unama, Belém/PA, Brazil), Aírton Cardoso Cançado (UFT, Brazil), Cristiane Fernandes De Muylder (FUMEC, Brazil), Ruby Roy Dholakia (University of Rhode Island College of Business, United States), and Angela Paladino (UNIMELB, Australia), to be guest editors and we thank them ahead of time for their ongoing work.

The first article, entitled *Eleições Parlamentares no Brasil: O Uso do Twitter na Busca por Votos* (**Parliamentary Elections in Brazil: The Use of Twitter in the Search for Votes**), by Marcelo Santos Amaral and José Antonio Gomes de Pinho, comes from Bahia in the Northeast of Brazil, and seeks to analyze the behavior of Brazilian politicians in the virtual environment before, during and after congressional elections, through data collected from Twitter. The politicians are compared according to their electoral aspirations and the positions they have taken on this social network. The results suggest that politicians make greater and more frequent use of these new technologies during the electoral campaign in the sense of constructing a political image within the electoral context. As a result, these politicians obtained greater attention from Twitter users, which is associated with the number of votes obtained in elections.

The second article, *Efeitos das Competências no Desempenho de Contratos de Serviços no Setor Público* (**Effects of Capabilities on the Performance of Public Sector Service Contracts**), by Francesco Bonelli and Sandro Cabral, also from Bahia, investigates the effects of technical competence on the cost and quality of third party contracts in the Brazilian federal public sector. The authors conclude that in an environment characterized by limited incentives and a low level of competition, the remuneration, education, and experience of public agents present null or contradictory effects on their performance in fulfilling contracts, especially in terms of cost indicators.

The third article, *Comportamento do Consumidor em Canais Cruzados: Modelo de Mediação-moderada nas Compras Online/Offline* (**Cross Channel Consumer Behavior: A Moderate-Mediation Model in Online/Offline Purchasing**), by Sionara Okada and Rafael Porto, from Brasília in the Center of Brazil, tests the mediation of Cross-Channel Behavior (CCB) in relation to its adoption for mobile devices with internet access and frequent online and off-line purchases. The authors conclude that the adoption of mobile technologies has stimulated CCB dimensions (simultaneous searches for information, product and price comparisons, interacting with the retailer/manufacturer) for non-durable goods to a greater extent.

The fourth article, *Motivos e Intenções para Expatriação de Voleibolistas* (**Reasons and Intentions for Expatriation of Volleyball Players**), by Ivan Wallan Tertuliano, *et al.*, comes from São Paulo, and examines the factors that lead a volleyball player to change the country that he or she represents over the course of his or her career as an athlete. The authors conclude that salary is the determining factor in accepting expatriation.

The fifth article, *Sistemas de Informação Estratégicos Habilitando Estratégia-como-prática na Incerteza Ambiental* (**Strategic Information Systems Enabling Strategy-as-practice Under Uncertain Environments**), by Adilson Carlos Yoshikuni and Alberto Luiz Albertin, which also comes from São Paulo, investigates how an information technology system can enable the effectiveness of strategic planning within the practical dimension under the influence of environmental uncertainty. It uses structural equations based on data from 139 companies. The obtained results suggest that information systems enable the effectiveness of strategic planning under the influence of various contingency levels of dynamism, heterogeneity and hostility.

The sixth and last new article is *Historicizando o Novo Consumerismo Global sob uma Perspectiva de Mundos Emergentes* (**Historicizing the New Global Consumerism from a Perspective of Emerging Worlds**), by Alexandre Faria and Marcus Wilcox Hemais, comes from Rio de Janeiro, and proposes a new historical perspective for analyzing the consumerism movement in the United States.

Completing this issue of RAC is the technical article *Governança em Cooperativas: Aplicação em uma Cooperativa Agropecuária* (**Governance in Cooperatives: Application in an Agricultural Cooperative**), by Ana Paula Blanke Maciel, *et al.*, which comes from Rio Grande do Sul; and the case study *Maracatu, Trabalho e Organizing* (**Maracatu, Work and Organizing**), by Elisabeth Cavalcante dos Santos and Diogo Henrique Helal, which comes from Pernambuco.

Finally, I'd like to underline that this issue features the first articles published by RAC that permit access to the data used to develop them. I suspect that RAC – with this initiative – will be a pioneer among journals edited in Brazil, at least among journals in the business area. For this reason, I would like to congratulate these authors for their willingness to follow this trend in promoting research transparency.

References

- Alsheikh-Ali, A. A., Qureshi, W., Al-Mallah, M. H., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2011). Public availability of published research data in high-impact journals. *Plos One*, 6(9), e24357. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0024357>

- Associação Nacional de Pós-graduação e Pesquisa em Administração. (2017). *Relatório de gestão 2015-2017*. Recuperado de http://www.anpad.org.br/~anpad/diversos/2017/Relatorio_Gestao_2015_2017.pdf
- Baggerly, K. (2010). Disclose all data in publications. *Nature*, 467, 401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/467401b>
- Baker, M. (2016). Digital badges motivate scientists to share data: A simple signal may incentivize researchers to make data and materials publicly available. *Nature*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature.2016.19907>
- Bohannon, J. (2016). Survey fraud test sparks battle: Pew Research Center challenges statistical test. *Science*, 351(6277), 1014. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.351.6277.1014>
- Bustin, S. A., & Nolan, T. (2016). Improving the reliability of peer-reviewed publications: We are all in it together. *Biomolecular Detection and Quantification*, 7, A1-A5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bdq.2015.11.002>
- Chartered Association of Business Schools. (2018). *The purpose of the Academic Journal Guide*. Retrieved June 18, 2018, from <https://charteredabs.org/academic-journal-guide-2018/>
- Cippà, P. E. (2016). Social media editor: What is it all about?. *Transplant International*, 29(4), 390-391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/tri.12762>
- Eisenman, R. (2016). Research fraud in science: What is going on?. *Journal of Information Ethics*, 25(1), 10-12.
- Eisner, D. A. (2018). Reproducibility of science: Fraud, impact factors and carelessness. *Journal of Molecular and Cellular Cardiology*, 114, 364-368. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.yjmcc.2017.10.009>
- Ellis, S. E., & Leek, J. T. (2018). How to share data for collaboration. *American Statistician*, 72(1), 53-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2017.1375987>
- Ferro, N., & Silvello, G. (2017). The road towards reproducibility in science: The case of data citation. *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 733, 20-31. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68130-6_2
- Gasparyan, A. Y. (2013). Selecting your editorial board: Maintaining standards. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 28(7), 972-973. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2013.28.7.972>
- Gewin, V. (2016). Data sharing: An open mind on open data. *Nature*, 529, 117-119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nj7584-117a>
- Haug, A. (2018). The use of experiments in business research. In P. Freytag & L. Young (Eds.), *Collaborative research design* (pp. 223-248). Singapore: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5008-4_10
- Hauptman, R. (2016). Faking science: A true story of academic Fraud. *Journal of Information Ethics*, 25(1), 175-177.
- Herndon, N. C. (2016). Research fraud and the publish or perish world of academia. *Journal of Marketing Channels*, 23(3), 91-96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1046669X.2016.1186469>
- Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2011). More time for research: Fund people not projects. *Nature*, 477(7366), 529-531. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/477529a>

- Iqbal, S. A., Wallach, J. D., Khoury, M. J., Schully, S. D., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2016). Reproducible research practices and transparency across the biomedical literature. *PLoS Biology*, 14(1), e1002333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002333>
- Kapp, J. M., Hensel, B., & Schonoring, K. T. (2015). Is Twitter a forum for disseminating research to health policy. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 25(12), 883-887. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2015.09.002>
- Ortega, J. L. (2017). The presence of academic journals on Twitter and its relationship with dissemination (tweets) and research impact (citations). *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 69(6), 674-687. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-02-2017-0055>
- Ortega, J. L. (2018). The life cycle of altmetric impact: A longitudinal study of six metrics from PlumX. *Journal of Informetrics*, 12(3), 579-589. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.06.001>
- Park, (2009). Publishing in the psychological sciences: Enhancing journal impact while decreasing author fatigue. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(1), 36-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01103.x>
- Pierro, B. (2016). Impacto além da academia. *Revista Pesquisa FAPESP*, 250, 38-41. Recuperado em 14 de junho, 2018, de <http://revistapesquisa.fapesp.br/2016/12/16/impacto-alem-da-academia/>
- Piwowar, H. (2013). Altmetrics: Value all research products. *Nature*, 493, 159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/493159a>
- Saes, M. S. M., Mello, A. M., & Guimarães, L. V. S. (2017). Revistas brasileiras em Administração: Relevância para quem?. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 57(5), 515-519. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0034-759020170509>
- Scaratti, G., Galuppo, L., Gorli, M., Gozzoli, C., & Ripamonti, S. (2017). The social relevance and social impact of knowledge and knowing. *Management Learning*, 48(1), 57-64.
- Silvello, G. (2017). Learning to cite framework: How to automatically construct citations for hierarchical data. *Journal Paper Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(6), 1505-1524. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.23774>
- Silvello, G. (2018). Theory and practice of data citation. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 69(1), 6-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.23917>
- Silvello, G., Bordea, G., Ferro, N., Buitelaar, P., & Bogers, T. (2017). Semantic representation and enrichment of information retrieval experimental data. *International Journal on Digital Libraries*, 18(2), 145-172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00799-016-0172-8>
- Tripathy, J. P., Bhatnagar, A., Shewade, H. D., Kumar, A. M. V., Zachariah, R., & Harries, A. D. (2017). Ten tips to improve the visibility and dissemination of research for policy makers and practitioners. *Public Health Action*, 7(1), 10-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5588/pha.16.0090>
- Van Noorden, R. (2014). Online collaboration: Scientists and the social network. *Nature*, 512(7513), 126-129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/512126a>
- Vasilevsky, N. A., Minnier, J., Haendel, M. A., & Champieux, R. E. (2017). Reproducible and reusable research: Are journal data sharing policies meeting the mark?. *PeerJ*, 5, e3208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.3208>
- Wiwanitkit, V. (2016). Research misconduct and data fraud in clinical trials. *International Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 21(6), 1196. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10147-016-0990>

Author's Profile

Wesley Mendes-Da-Silva

Rua Itapeva, 474, 8º andar, 01332-000, São Paulo, SP, Brazil. E-mail address: rac.wesley.mendes@gmail.com.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5500-4872>