alt-pub

Modalidades alternativas de publicação acadêmica.

Atualmente, o paradigma da publicação científica gira basicamente em torno de um modelo: o de publicações editoradas e revisadas por pares (https://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revis%C3%A3o_por_pares) . Dominado por algumas poucas empresas e instituições, este modelo baseia-se em periódicos científicos que publicam em meio impresso, na internet, ou ambos, trabalhos que passam por uma laboriosa seleção de qualidade. Inicialmente, um corpo editorial avalia a qualidade geral das submissões, sua adequação à linha editorial do periódico, sua aparente solidez científica, o desenho geral e o interesse para a audiência do periódico. Após este filtro altamente subjetivo, os manuscritos ainda não publicados são enviados para revisores técnicos, normalmente pessoas com profundo conhecimento da área sobre a qual a submissão trata. Pelo menos dois destes revisores são acionados pelos editores. Caso os dois aceitem a incubência e aprovem o manuscrito, o mesmo é encaminhado para publicação.

Uma série de problemas aflige o modelo de publicação de trabalhos revisados por pares. O viés imposto pela fase inicial de avaliação editorial é bem óbvio, porém grandemente negligenciado nas discussões sobre o assunto. Os editores de um periódico, via de regra, imprimem sua marca sobre a linha editorial do periódico, muitas vezes de forma notável, porém, nem sempre de forma imparcial. É realmente difícil de imaginar que, num cenário onde existem milhares de periódicos científicos disputando entre si um mercado grande, porém heterogêneo, a imparcialidade consiga ser mantida sistematicamente. A parcialidade nas publicações científicas tem uma denominação: viés de publicação (1). Ele é muitas vezes invocado quando pesquisadores de centros menos importantes ou periféricos não conseguem alcançar a via principal de publicações acadêmicas, baseada e girando quase que exclusivamente em torno de países desenvolvidos. No entanto, formas mais sutis de "viés de publicação" são ainda mais comuns, embora menos visíveis. Resultados negativos, por exemplo, raramente chegam às páginas de grandes periódicos de divulgação científica, ao contrário de "achados reveladores". A falta sistemática de publicação dos resultados negativos parece afetar de forma importante, por exemplo, as ciências da saúde. Ensaios clínicos que mostram resultados são mais fáceis de publicar do que aqueles que mostram ausência de efeito de algum tratamento (2). Embora um fenômeno complexo como o viés de publicação seja necessariamente multifatorial e envolva muito mais do que os editores de periódicos científicos, eles fazem parte da "informalidade" do julgamento de publicações revisadas por pares.

Um outro problema muitas vezes apontado é a falta de transparência nas revisões por pares. Normalmente, os revisores elencados pelos editores de publicações científicas prestam um serviço *ad hoc* e não integram um corpo fixo de consultores. Além disso, suas identidades são normalmente desconhecidas. Não existe, portanto, garantia de que os revisores escolhidos representem o campo de estudo do manuscrito julgado, ou que ao menos sejam versados na área específica de estudo em questão. Além disso, o sistema de revisão por pares é construído para avaliar metodologicamente e cientificamente o conteúdo de manuscritos, mas não para

detectar má fé. Tanto do ponto de vista dos autores, quanto dos revisores, existem dúvidas e desconfianças acerca da objetividade e honestidade de cada parte envolvida neste processo. Várias propostas tem sido criadas para tentar remediar este tipo de problema (3).

O modelo de revisão por pares é economicamente dominado por editoras e jornais que cobram assinaturas e recebem fomentos de agências governamentais e sociedades científicas (4). A quase totalidade dos mais importantes jornais científicos encontra-se em países desenvolvidos e publica exclusivamente em inglês, o que também é apontado como fonte de viés, afetando o que e como se vai publicar. Publicações em línguas nacionais de menor expressão, mesmo que estejam entre as mais faladas do planeta, são pouco lidas mesmo em seus países de origem, em contraste com as publicações científicas em inglês. Embora faça sentido para melhor comunicação internacional que haja uma língua universal, isto impõe um necessário obstáculo aos cientistas cuja língua nativa não é inglês. Uma alternativa recente ao modelo clássico de publicação científica mediante assinaturas é o **acesso aberto** (https://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Acesso_aberto) , modelo no qual as publicações estão disponíveis gratuitamente na internet para serem acessadas, e o custo de publicação é cobrado de autores ou instituições. A publicação científica em português no Brasil, por exemplo, é dominada pelos periódicos do Scielo (http://www.scielo.org/php/level.php?lang=pt&component=56&item=1) , um repositório de publicações científicas de acesso aberto, financiado por agências governamentais brasileiras. O modelo de acesso aberto tem recebido críticas constantes sobre a interferência na objetividade do processo de revisão pelo fato dos autores e instituições que financiam as pesquisas pagarem as publicações. Ataques recentes mostraram a fragilidade do processo de revisão por pares no modelo de acesso aberto (5).

Alternativas que não envolvem dilemas financeiros ou obstáculos à divulgação científica têm sido propostas cada vez mais frequentemente. Um conjunto de modalidades de publicação díspares pode ser agrupado no rótulo de **Via Verde** do acesso aberto, onde as publicações ficam disponíveis gratuitamente ao público na internet, mas os custos de publicação são diluídos por não haver um veículo "periódico", substituído por repositórios onde os próprios autores "publicam" ou depositam seu trabalho (auto-arquivamento (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-archiving)). Esses manuscritos (ou outras formas de trabalho acadêmico) não são revisadas por pares, nem passam pela avaliação de um corpo editorial. Tais repositórios são, em sua maioria, sediados em instituições universitárias, embora existam modelos híbridos onde uma empresa provê tanto serviços de acesso aberto pago pelos autores (também chamado de **Via Dourada**), quanto um repositório de auto-arquivamento. Uma série de modalidades diferentes de publicação acadêmica tem surgido, com maior ou menor participação de mediadores como instituições educacionais, governo e empresas. Um portal popular de publicação acadêmica alternativa tem como lema: "obtenha crédito por toda a sua pesquisa" e aceita submissões de qualquer tipo de material acadêmico. Alguns serviços de internet que recebem material apresentado em conferências ou outras formas de divulgação de informação fazem uma avaliação geral para determinar a qualidade do material postado. Alguns serviços somente publicam online o material após esta avaliação. Outros publicam de imediato qualquer material depositado e, somente após, realizam uma avaliação. Esta avaliação difere da análise editorial de um periódico científico, sendo realizada apenas para assegurar a natureza acadêmica do material depositado.

1. Loureiro, Luiz Victor Maia, Callegaro Filho, Donato, Rocha, Altieres de Arruda, Prado, Bernard Lobato, Mutão, Taciana Sousa, Donnarumma, Carlos del Cistia, & Giglio, Auro del. (2013). Existe viés de publicação para artigos brasileiros sobre câncer?. Einstein (São Paulo), 11(1), 15-22. https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1679-45082013000100005

(https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1679-45082013000100005)

2. Dickersin, K.; Chan, S.; Chalmers, T. C.; et al. (1987). "Publication bias and clinical trials". Controlled Clinical Trials 8 (4): 343–353. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456(87)90155-3 (https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456(87)90155-3)
3. Lee, K. & Bero, L. (2006). Increasing accountability. What authors, editors and reviewers should do to improve peer review. Nature https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05007 (https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05007)
4. Ware, M., & Mabe, M. (2015). The STM Report. http://www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf (http://www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf)
5. Bohannon, John (2013). "Who's Afraid of Peer Review?". Science 342 (6154): 60–65. https://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.342.6154.60 (https://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.342.6154.60)

Alternative types of academic publications.

Currently, the paradigm of scientific publication involves primarily the model of [peer-reviewed] (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peer_review (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peer_review)) publications. Dominated by a few companies and institutions, this model is based on scientific journals that publish in print, on the Internet, or both, works that go through a laborious selection of quality. Initially, an editorial board evaluates the overall quality of submissions, their suitability to the journal editorial line, its apparent scientific soundness, the general design and interest to the audience of the journal. After this highly subjective filter, the unpublished manuscripts are still sent to technical reviewers, usually people with deep knowledge about the area of the submission. At least two of these reviewers are commissioned by the editors. If both accept the task and approve the manuscript, it is submitted for publication.

A number of problems afflict the peer reviewed publishing model. The bias imposed by the initial editorial evaluation is pretty obvious, but largely overlooked in discussions on the subject. The editors of a journal, as a rule, print its brand on the editorial line of the journal, often remarkably, however, not always impartially. It's really hard to imagine that in a scenario where there are thousands of scientific journals disputing among themselves a big market impartiality can be maintained systematically. The bias in scientific publications has a name: publication bias (1). It is often invoked when researchers from less important or peripheral centers can not reach the mainstream of academic publications almost exclusively based in developed countries. However, more subtle forms of "publication bias" are even more common, though less visible. Negative results, for example, rarely reach the top journals, as opposed to "revealing findings." The systematic failure to publish negative results seem to affect significantly, for example, the health sciences. Clinical studies showing results are easier to publish than those showing no effect of any treatment (2). Although such a complex phenomenon as publication bias is necessarily multifactorial and involves much more than the scientific journal editors, the latter are part of the "subjectivity" of peer-reviewed publications.

Another problem often pointed out is the lack of transparency in peer reviews. Usually, reviewers of scientific publications provide an ad hoc service and are not part of a body

of consultant advisers. Moreover, their identities are usually unknown. There is, therefore, little guarantee that the chosen reviewers represent the field of the evaluated manuscript, let alone are well versed in that specific area of study. Furthermore, the peer review system is built to assess methodologically and scientifically the content of manuscripts, but not to detect fraud or misconduct. There are doubts and suspicions about the objectivity and honesty of each party involved in this process, both from the point of view of authors, and reviewers. Several proposals have been forwarded to try to remedy this problem (3).

*The peer review model is economically dominated by publishers and journals that charge subscriptions and receive funding from government agencies and scientific societies (4). Almost all of the most important scientific journals are in developed countries and are published exclusively in English, also pointed out as a source of bias, affecting what and how they will publish. Publications in non-english national languages, even if they are among the most spoken in the world, are little read even in their countries of origin, in contrast to scientific publications in English. Although it makes sense for better international communication that there is a universal language, it imposes a necessary obstacle to scientists whose native language is not English. A recent alternative to the classical model of scientific publication by subscription is the [**open access**] (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_access (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_access)) model in which the publications are available for free on the Internet to be accessed and the cost of publishing is charged from authors or institutions. Scientific publication in Portuguese in Brazil, for example, is dominated by [Scielo] (http://www.scielo.org/php/level.php?lang=en&component=42&item=1 (http://www.scielo.org/php/level.php?lang=en&component=42&item=1)), a repository of open access scientific publications, funded by Brazilian government agencies. The open access model has received constant criticism of interference in the objectivity of the review process because the authors and institutions pay for research publications. Recent attacks disclosed the fragility of the peer review process in the open access model (5).*

*Alternatives that do not involve financial dilemmas or barriers to science communication have been proposed. A set of disparate publication arrangements can be grouped on the label **green open access**, where publications are available free to the public on the Internet, but publishing costs are diluted because there is no journal vehicle, replaced by repositories where the authors themselves "publish" or deposit their work ([self-archiving] (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-archiving (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-archiving))). These manuscripts (or other forms of academic work) are not peer-reviewed, nor pass the evaluation of an editorial board. Such repositories are mostly based in universities, although there are hybrid models where a company provides both open access services paid by the authors (also called **golden open access**) as well as a self-archiving repository. A number of different academic publishing types have emerged, with greater or lesser participation of mediators such as educational institutions, government and business. A popular scholarly publishing portal has as its motto: "credit all your research" and accepts submissions of any kind of academic material. Some internet services perform a general assessment to determine the quality of the material posted. Some services only publish the material after this evaluation. Other publish immediately any material deposited and only after perform an evaluation. This review differs from the editorial analysis of a scientific journal, being performed only to ensure the academic nature of the deposited material.*

1. *Loureiro, Luiz Victor Maia, Callegaro Filho, Donato, Rocha, Altieres de Arruda, Prado, Bernard Lobato, Mutão, Taciana Sousa, Donnarumma, Carlos del Cistia, & Giglio, Auro del. (2013). Is there publication bias towards Brazilian articles on cancer?. Einstein (São Paulo), 11(1), 15-22. https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1679-45082013000100005* (https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1679-45082013000100005)
2. *Dickersin, K.; Chan, S.; Chalmers, T. C.; et al. (1987). "Publication bias and clinical trials". Controlled Clinical Trials 8 (4): 343–353. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456(87)90155-3* (https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456(87)90155-3)
3. *Lee, K. & Bero, L. (2006). Increasing accountability. What authors, editors and reviewers should do to improve peer review. Nature https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05007* (https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05007)
4. *Ware, M., & Mabe, M. (2015). The STM Report. http://www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf* (http://www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf)
5. *Bohannon, John (2013). "Who's Afraid of Peer Review?". Science 342 (6154): 60–65. https://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.342.6154.60* (https://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.342.6154.60)

Minhas publicações da via verde

My green open access publications

Pôsteres publicados em repositórios acadêmicos:

Conference posters deposited in repositories:

Magalhaes R, Felix J, Albuquerque J et al. Evaluation of the analgesic effect of venlafaxine, a serotonin and noradrenaline reuptake inhibitor [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1259 (poster) https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110985.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110985.1)

Fontenele J, Freire P, Santos K et al. Focal brainstem tumors: report of patients treated in a brazilian pediatric oncological center [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1363 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111076.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111076.1)

Felix F, Santos K, Freire P et al. Diffuse intrinsic pontine gliomas: report of patients treated in a brazilian pediatric oncological center [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1362 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111075.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111075.1)

Santos K, Lima R, Bastos MV et al. Retrospective evaluation of patients with recurrent brain tumors treated with vinblastine or temozolomide at the Albert Sabin Children's Hospital between 2007-2012 [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1256 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110982.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110982.1)

Felix F, Feitosa M, Bezerra MdC et al. Undifferentiated intracardiac tumor [v1; not peer

reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1358 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111073.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111073.1)

Felix F, Freire P, Santos K and Fontenele J. Predictors of survival in children with ependymoma from a single center: using random survival forests [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1209 (poster) https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110937.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110937.1)

Felix F, Mattos JP, Hirth C and Fontenele J. Everolimus for patients with tumors associated with tuberous sclerosis and neurofibromatosis [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1357 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111072.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111072.1)

Alves N, Aquino R, Veras I and Felix F. A case of medulloblastoma with late neurologic deterioration [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1343 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111060.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111060.1)

Felix F, Veras I, Nogueira C and Juvenia F. Nimotuzumab in a case of recurrent glioblastoma expressing a new EGFR mutation [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1303 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111020.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111020.1)

Felix F, Veras I, Bacalhau AF and Fontenele J. Nimotuzumab in patients with progressive diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1302 (poster) https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111019.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111019.1)

Felix F and Fontenele J. Chemoradiotherapy with etoposide, cisplatin, and ifosfamide associated with valproic acid for patients with diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1301 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111018.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111018.1)

Felix F, Araújo O, Trompieri N et al. Treatment of pediatric patients with recurrent brain tumors with vinblastine [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1300 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111017.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111017.1)

Felix F, Araújo O, Trompieri N et al. Treatment of pediatric patients with multiply recurrent brain tumors with temozolomide and valproic acid [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1299 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111016.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111016.1)

Barcelos P, Trindade V, Aguiar L et al. Ewing sarcoma in the skull of an infant: case report [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1258 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110984.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110984.1)

Trindade V, Barcelos P, Aguiar L et al. Intramedullary granulocytic sarcoma [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1257 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110983.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110983.1)

Freire P, Felix F, Santos K et al. Descriptive longitudinal study of pediatric patients with primary brain tumors: establishment of a hospital registry [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1370 (poster) [Portuguese]

https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111083.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111083.1)

Felix F, Azevedo JR, Feitosa M et al. Childhood pleuropulmonary blastoma [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1304 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111021.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1111021.1)

Felix F, Albuquerque J and Fontenele J. Subependymal Giant Cell Astrocytoma with good response to oral everolimus – a case report [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1233 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110960.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110960.1)

Felix F, Albuquerque J and Fontenele J. Survival analysis of pediatric patients with brain tumors using a machine learning method: decision tree analysis by recursive partitioning [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1223 (poster) [Portuguese] https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110950.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110950.1)

Felix F, Veras I, Nogueira C et al. Seizure prophylaxis with valproic acid in pediatric patients with brain tumors [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1210 (poster) https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110938.1 (https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110938.1)

Pré-publicações:

Preprints:

Sales M, Figueiredo KS, Fontenele JB, Viana GS, Felix FH. (2015) Sibutramine antinociceptive effect in female rodents is not dependent on catecholaminergic signaling. PeerJ PrePrints 3:e1544v2 https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.1544v2 (https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.1544v2)

Figueiredo KS, Sales ML, Fontenele JB, Viana GS, Felix FH. (2015) Valproate antinociceptive and anti-inflammatory effect in female rodents. PeerJ PrePrints 3:e1613v1 https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.1613v1 (https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.1613v1)

Apresentações acadêmicas (diapositivos):

Academic presentations (slides):

Felix F. Management of infantile hemangiomas [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1231 (slides) [Portuguese] https://dx.doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110958.1 (https://dx.doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110958.1)

Albuquerque J, Fontenele J and Felix F. Propranolol treatment for children with hemangiomas – final report [v1; not peer reviewed]. F1000Research 2015, 4:1232 (slides) [Portuguese] https://dx.doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110959.1 (https://dx.doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1110959.1)

Felix, Francisco (2015): Clinical treatment of malignant brain tumors in pediatric patients. figshare. https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2007588.v1 (https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2007588.v1)

Felix, Francisco (2015): Clinical treatment of low-grade gliomas in pediatric patients. figshare. https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2007543.v1 (https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2007543.v1)

Resumos publicados em anais de congressos e depositados em repositórios:

Abstracts published in proceedings and deposited in repositories:

Felix, Francisco (2016): Wilms tumor with cardiac extension - case report. [portuguese]. figshare. https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2059830.v1 (https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2059830.v1)

Artigos publicados em jornais acadêmicos locais e depositados em repositórios:

Articles published in local academic journals and deposited in repositories:

Bonavides de Castro, Patrícia; Santos Bruno, Débora; Rodrigues Filho, Filadelfo; Felix, Francisco; Roberto Lavor Porto, Paulo; Odorico de Moraes Filho, Manoel (2016): Evaluation of the Interference of Cyclosporin in the Development of Metastasis in a Low Malignant Murine Tumor [portuguese]. figshare. https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2059851.v1 (https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2059851.v1)

Felix, Francisco (2016): Treatment of hemangioma in pediatric patients. [portuguese]. figshare. https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2059821.v1 (https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2059821.v1)

Comentários autopublicados sobre artigos acadêmicos:

Selfpublished replies to academic publications:

Felix, Francisco; Fontenele, Juvenia Bezerra (2016): Statin effect in fibromyalgia syndrome patients may not be easily predictable. figshare. https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3179281.v1 (https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3179281.v1)

Felix, Francisco; Fontenele, Juvenia Bezerra (2016): Side effects of propranolol used for the treatment of hemangiomas of infancy. figshare. https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3175576.v1 (https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3175576.v1)

Projetos aprovados em comitês de ética em pesquisa:

Research projects approved by institutional review boards:

Felix, Francisco. (2016). Phase IIa (proof of concept) Trial of Valproic Acid with Chemotherapy and Radiotherapy for Patients with Diffuse Intrinsic Pontine Glioma in Childhood and Adolescence - VALQUIRIA. Zenodo. https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.44888 (https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.44888)

Felix, Francisco. (2016). Retrospective analysis of off-label treatment with beta-blockers in pediatric patients with hemangiomas diagnosed between January and December 2009 at Hospital Infantil Albert Sabin. Zenodo. https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.44890 (https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.44890)

Felix, Francisco. (2016). Longitudinal observational study of pediatric patients with primary brain tumors: establishment of a hospital-based registry. Zenodo.

https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.44885 (https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.44885)

Felix, Francisco. (2016). Treatment assessment of pediatric brain tumor patients in Hospital Infantil Albert Sabin between 2007-2008 (amended to 2007-2010). Zenodo. https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.44253 (https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.44253)

Monografias de trabalhos de conclusão de curso de alunos de graduação sob minha supervisão (rascunho):

Monographs of undergraduate students under my supervision (drafts):

Lima, Rayra A C et al.. (2016). Evaluation of adverse events of chemotherapy in patients with central nervous system tumors: a retrospective study - first major draft release. Zenodo. https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.45085 (https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.45085)

Manuscritos criados no Authorea, integrados com o Github e depositados no Zenodo:

Manuscripts drafted in Authorea, integrated with Github and deposited in Zenodo:

Francisco H C Felix. (2016). Modelo de anteprojeto para relato de caso. Zenodo. https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.49874 (https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.49874)

Macros e programas depositados publicamente:

Macros and scripts deposited in public repositories:

Francisco H C Felix. (2016). rapadura: ff macro para OOo. Zenodo. https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.46239 (https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.46239)

Comentários em Pubmed Commons (revisão pós-publicação):

Pubmed Commons comments (post-publication review):

Felix, F. (2014). Comment on "The response and survival of children with recurrent diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma based on phase II study of antineoplastons A10 and AS2-1 in patients with brainstem glioma." By Burzynski et al. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24718705#cm24718705_6838 (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24718705#cm24718705_6838)

Felix, F. (2014). Comment on "Inadvertent high-dose therapy with temozolomide in a child with recurrent pontine glioma followed by a rapid clinical response but deteriorated after substitution with low-dose therapy." By Wang et al. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24732058#cm24732058_7147 (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24732058#cm24732058_7147)

Revisão pré-publicação (arbitragem):

Pre-publication review (refereeing):

Francisco H C Felix. (2013). Pre-publication review of "Gajjar, S., Mazloom, A., Chintagumpala, M., Mahajan, A., C. Paulino, A. 2014. Secondary Glioblastoma Multiform in a Patient with CHARGE Syndrome and Prior Radiation Therapy for Medulloblastoma. Pediatric Hematology-Oncology, 31: 366". https://publons.com/review/227398/ (https://publons.com/review/227398/)

Francisco H C Felix. (2011). Pre-publication review of "Madhumita, N., Suhas K., G., Rakesh K., M., Supratim, D., Krishnendu, M. Infection associated hemophagocytic syndrome in childhood tuberculosis: A case report. Journal of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, 5: 91". https://publons.com/review/234534/ (https://publons.com/review/234534/)

Francisco H C Felix. (2010). Pre-publication review of "H. Solomon, D. 2010. The Comparative Safety of Analgesics in Older Adults With Arthritis. Archives of Internal Medicine, 170: 1968". https://publons.com/review/227448/ (https://publons.com/review/227448/)

Francisco H C Felix. (2009). Pre-publication review of "Collins, P., Baudo, F., Huth-Kühne, A., Ingerslev, J., M Kessler, C., Castellano, M., Shima, M., St-Louis, J., Lévesque, H. 2010. Consensus recommendations for the diagnosis and treatment of acquired hemophilia A. BMC Research Notes, 3: 161". https://publons.com/review/227451/ (https://publons.com/review/227451/)

Francisco H C Felix. (2009). Pre-publication review of "R. Meacham, L., A. Sklar, C., Li, S., Liu, Q., Gimpel, N., Yasui, Y., A. Whitton, J., Stovall, M., L. Robison, L., C. Oeffinger, K. 2009. Diabetes Mellitus in Long-term Survivors of Childhood Cancer. Archives of Internal Medicine, 169: 1381". https://publons.com/review/227452/ (https://publons.com/review/227452/)

Francisco H C Felix. (2009). Pre-publication review of "L. Cox, C., M. Hudson, M., Mertens, A., Oeffinger, K., Whitton, J., Montgomery, M., L. Robison, L. 2009. Medical Screening Participation in the Childhood Cancer Survivor Study. Archives of Internal Medicine, 169: 454". https://publons.com/review/227467/ (https://publons.com/review/227467/)

Citar esta página como (cite as): Francisco H C Felix. (2016). Alternative types of academic publications. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.49877

 (http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.49877)