

**Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research**

**Outline to be Followed for Research Protocols Submitted to the IRB**

Applications for IRB review must include elements **A through G** to be considered complete. Send one copy of your completed application to Research Integrity Services, Room 103, Service Building**. Allow a minimum of 10 working days for processing and initial review of your application**. Reviewers appreciate complete applications that follow the outline below.

1. **Request for IRB Review** (two-page form)
2. **Description of Project**, as outlined below. The narrative (items 1-6 below) should be succinct **(no more than two pages)** but provide sufficient detail for the IRB to conduct its review.

1. INTRODUCTION - Summarize the background, nature, rationale and significance of the proposed study.

2. SPECIFIC AIMS - In outline form, state clearly the objectives of the research.

3. RESEARCH PROTOCOL -

a. Setting: Describe the setting in which the study will be conducted. Indicate the source of subjects, how they will be recruited, and whether they will be compensated. (Note: While not a requirement for IRB review, researchers should check with their Business Service Center Director to ensure that compensation methods comply with federal tax regulations.) **Attach recruitment materials (e.g., fliers, emails, advertisements).**

1. Protocols: Describe the activities in which subjects will engage. **Attach sample instruments**.
2. Consent: Explain procedures for obtaining consent from adults. If applicable, explain how **assent** will be secured from children. **Attach copies of informed consent and assent documents/information**.
3. Study Personnel: For all individuals involved in conducting the study, provide their name, and explain their role(s) and experience with the proposed research paradigm. **For student protocols/research conducted by students, the IRB requires a letter from the faculty/project advisor indicating the student’s experience with the proposed research paradigm as well as the level of supervision the advisor will provide.**

4. DATA - Explain how data will be analyzed or studied (using quantitative or qualitative methodologies). Describe how the interpretation will address the research questions. Explain how data will be reported (e.g., aggregated, anonymity of participants, pseudonyms for participants). Describe where data will be stored and who will have access to them. Describe how data will be used (e.g., in presentations, thesis, publications). Where applicable, describe what will happen to video/audio recordings at the end of the study.

5. RISKS- List possible risks to subjects including physical, psychological, and economic (loss of employability). Also address issues of confidentiality and risks associated with a breach of confidence.  **Any project involving risk of physical injury, civil, financial or criminal liability, risk to a subject's employability, or instances where the research involves sensitive aspects of the subject's own behavior such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior, or use of alcohol, has the potential of involving more than minimal risk.**

6. BENEFITS - Discuss benefits of participating in the study **for participants**. If none, state this and then discuss benefits of the study at the community level, and in general. In studies involving risk, discuss the relationship between risks and benefits.

1. **References** - Attach source information for citations in the narrative.
2. **A copy of the certificate of completion of the** [**UNH Web-based training on the ethical use and treatment of human subjects in research**](http://www.unh.edu/rcr/HumSubj-Title.htm)**.** Effective 9/1/11, applications missing this certificate will not be processed.
3. **Copies of all recruitment materials** (e.g., fliers, emails, advertisements).
4. **Copies of all consent and assent documents/information**.
5. **Copies of questionnaires, guiding questions, survey instruments, tests, debriefing materials, etc.**
6. **Other pertinent documentation** (e.g., faculty/project advisor letter for student research, letters from collaborating sites).



**Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research**

**REQUEST FOR IRB REVIEW**

**General Information:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Daniel J. Hocking | | | | | Position | | Postdoctoral Researcher | | | | Today's Date | | August 14, 2013 |
| Dept/Center/Institute | | Natural Resources | | | | | Campus/Home Address | | | 114 James Hall | | | | |
| Email Address(es) | | | [dhocking@unh.edu](mailto:dhocking@unh.edu) | | | | | | | | Day Phone | | 603-978-7502 | |
| Research Project Title | | | | Comparing journal influence based on citation metrics and scholar perception | | | | | | | | | | |
| Anticipated Project Start Date\*\* | | | | | Upon Approval | | | | Anticipated End Date | | | | August 1, 2014 | |

***\*\* UNH Policy on the Use of Human Subjects in Research prohibits the start of any research activity (including canvassing and recruiting of subjects) that has not been reviewed by, and received written approval without contingency from, the IRB.***

**Project Status Information (please check one):**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| New Project | X | Modification to Existing Project  If Yes, provide IRB # |  |

**Project External Funding Information (for sponsored projects only):**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Has a proposal for funding been submitted to a sponsor? | | Yes |  | No | X | | If a proposal has been submitted, has the project been funded yet? | | | Yes |  | No |  |
| Sponsor | None | | | | | PI on proposal  if not IRB applicant | |  | | | | | |
| Is notification of IRB approval  required by the sponsor? Yes | | |  | No | X | | If yes, notification deadline | |  | | | | |
| By initialing this statement, the project director certifies that (s)he has read and understands UNH’s Policy on Financial Conflict of Interest in Research <http://usnholpm.unh.edu/UNH/VIII.Res/E.htm>; has made all required financial disclosures; as project director, has made every effort to ensure that all individuals responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of the research have submitted the required disclosures; and prior to the expenditure of award funds will have reached an agreement with UNH that provides for conditions or restrictions necessary to manage, reduce, or eliminate any conflicts of interest under UNH policy. \_\_DJH\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

(initials)

**Review by Non-UNH IRB(s) (if applicable):**

If this project has been submitted to a review board at another institution, provide the review date, and that board's recommendations. *Please attach relevant correspondence*.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Institution |  | Date of Review |  |

FOR IRB USE ONLY

PROTOCOL #\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ DATE RECEIVED\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Subject/Participant Information:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Minimum number of subjects/participants by age and, if applicable, by status (complete for all that apply to this study) | | | | | |
| #0 | Newborns/Infants | | | #0 | Institutionalized (e.g., nursing home residents) |
| #0 | Children aged 2-12 years of age | | | #0 | Incarcerated (i.e., prisoners) |
| #0 | Adolescents aged 13 - 17 years of age | | | #0 | Diagnosed with mental illness, cognitive impairment, or learning/language difficulty |
| #0 | Emancipated minors (minors living independently) | | | # | Other special populations (please specify below) |
| #30 | Adults (persons 18 years of age or older) | | |  | |
|  | | |  | | |
| Research site(s): State where project will take place | | | Ecological Society of America annual meeting, online, & UNH campus | | |
| Time commitment for each subject/participant | | 15-20 minutes | | | |
| Compensation: Indicate the amount and form of compensation, if any (i.e., cash, course credit, raffle, mileage, etc.) | | | | | |
| None | | | | | |

**Project Attributes (check all that apply):**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| X | Use of recruitment materials (i.e., flyers, emails, letters, advertisements) | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Observation |
| X | Questionnaires or surveys | X | In-person | |  | Phone |  | Mail |  | Email | X | Web | |  | Administration of tests, inventories, self reports, measuring instruments, etc. |
|  | Interviews |  | In-person | |  | Phone | | | | | | | |  | Photography, or audio/video recording |
|  | Focus groups | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Medical procedures |
|  | Other (please explain): | | |  | | | | | | | | |  | X | Use of existing/secondary data |

**Signatures:**

The undersigned accept(s) responsibility for the study, including adherence to DHHS and FDA regulations, New Hampshire law, and UNH policies relative to the protection of the rights and welfare of subjects/patients participating in this study. In the case of student applications, the Faculty Advisor and the student share responsibility for adherence.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DD Daniel J. Hocking | | | |  | | | | |
| Signature(s) of Project Director(s) | | | | | | | | |
|  | Faculty |  | Undergraduate Student | |  | Graduate Student | X  X | Staff |

By signing this form, the Faculty Advisor attests that (s)he has read the attached protocol submitted for IRB review, and agrees to provide appropriate education and supervision of the Advisee listed as *Project Director*, above, or as *other individual*, below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Faculty Advisor Signature (required for student projects) |  | PRINT Faculty Advisor's Name |
|  | | |
| Faculty Advisor's Department, Phone Number, and Email Address | | |

If an individual in addition to the *Project Director* will conduct the study, provide the individual's name, position, and contact information, as well as the individual's experience with the proposed paradigm, as indicated in the Outline to be Followed for Research Protocols Submitted to the IRB, item 3-b.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Name |  | Position |
|  | | |

Address, Phone Number, and Email Address

*Return this completed form with the research protocol and all pertinent information to the UNH Research Integrity Services (RIS), Room 103, Service Building. Direct questions to Julie Simpson at 603-862-2003 or* [*Julie.simpson@unh.edu*](mailto:Julie.simpson@unh.edu)*, or visit the IRB webpage at* [*http://unh.edu/research/human-subjects*](http://unh.edu/research/human-subjects)*.*

**Comparing Journal Influence through Citation Metrics and Scholar Perception**

Daniel J. Hocking

114 James Hall

Department of Natural Resources and the Environment

University of New Hampshire

**B. Description of Project**

1. Introduction

Citations serve as a link to previously published materials and provide credit for original ideas. Citation-based metrics can indicate the influence of ideas from particular papers and in aggregation act as a proxy for influence of specific scholars and journals (e.g. [Garfield 1955](#_ENREF_4); [Garfield 1972](#_ENREF_5); [Davis 2008](#_ENREF_2)). The competitive nature of academia and scientific publishing further increases the interest in metrics of influence, impact, and prestige. The perceived importance of journals, as indicated by citation metrics, can influence the choice of publication venue for scientists. Some researchers may even make submission decisions based on a cost-benefit analysis, where financial cost or journal rejection rate compared with the benefit of publishing in highly prestigious or influential journals ([Aarssen *et al.* 2008](#_ENREF_1)). In addition to the general interest in objective metrics of influence, these metrics are increasingly being used for hiring decisions and promotion and tenure evaluation, much to the chagrin of many researchers ([Hoppeler 2013](#_ENREF_6)). Metrics are also used by librarians to inform journal subscription decisions, which was one of the primary goals of early metric development. Use by librarians may become increasingly important with the rising number of journals and challenges of funding higher education. Publishers use metrics to promote their journals and understand their influence over time and in relation to other publishers. Citation-based metrics have even been extended to compare the productivity and influence of universities and departments ([Fogg 2007](#_ENREF_3)).

2. Specific Aims

I have collected data on 11 popular citation metrics for 110 ecology journals. I have already written about the strengthens and weaknesses of these metrics (manuscript submitted). My objective is to:

1. Determine the opinion of scholars with regards to journal influence and quality
2. Compare how the various citation metrics reflect the perception of scholars.

3. Research Protocol

a. Setting:

* Ecological Society of America Annual Meeting & Conference (03 – 09 August 2013 if approved in time, otherwise 2014 annual meeting): The primary target audience is academic and professional ecologists. At the conference (usually more an 1,500 participates at the conference) I will hand out surveys between sessions opportunistically. I will also hand out surveys at workshop and conference social events. If possible, I will also set up a table in the exhibition room where people can fill out and return the surveys. No compensation will be provided.
* I will make the surveys available online as well via my website [www.danieljhocking.wordpress.com](http://www.danieljhocking.wordpress.com). To draw attention of the desired audience to the online survey, I will email a link and description to the Ecolog List Serv, which 1000s of ecologists subscribe to.

b. Protocols

* Subjects will complete short paper or electronic surveys. There will be no specific identifying information recorded. The only personal information will be job and professional status (optional) to determine if opinions regarding journal influence is related to employment sector (e.g. academia, government, NGO) or field of study (e.g. ecology, conservation, evolution).
* The order of journals to rank will be randomized and there will be 5 versions with different orders of journals, to prevent bias. Subjects will haphazardly receive a version of the survey.
* I will use Qualtrics software for the Web-based survey. To ensure anonymity, I will not be collecting IP addresses. Since I will be using Qualtrics, I will use their system of confidentiality protection: "*Qualtrics* uses Transport Layer Security (TLS) *encryption* (also known as HTTPS) for all *transmitted data*. We also protect surveys with passwords and HTTP referrer checking. Our data is hosted by third party data centers that are SSAE-16 SOC II certified. All data at rest are encrypted, and data on deprecated hard drives are destroyed by U.S. DOD methods and delivered to a third-party data destruction service.” <http://www.qualtrics.com/security-statement/>

c. Consent

* Participants taking the paper survey will read the cover letter, detach and keep it, and if they agree to participate, they will complete the survey. No signature will be collected to protect anonymity.
* For the Web-based survey on Qualtrics, the initial screen will display the consent information and at the bottom of the screen will be a choice of two buttons. One button to click if the participant agrees to consent, which will take her to the first survey question, and a second button to click if she does not consent, which will take her out of the survey website. After reading the consent form, the participant will have the explicit choice of whether to participate or not.

d. Investigator Experience

* As a professional ecologist, I have experience with this audience of my peers and have attended this conference on multiple occasions. I have no previous experience with formal research surveys.

4. Data

I will analyze the data quantitatively. I will used mixed effects regression models to determine the correlation of journal influence for each metric with the opinion of scientists. I will be able to include job sector, highest degree, and publishing history as potential covariates describing how scientists rank and rate various ecology journals. Summary statistics will also be reported in aggregate (e.g. proportion of respondents picking *Ecology Letters* as the most influential journal). The results of these analyses will be presented in scientific publications in peer-reviewed journals. The data will be deposited in a public repository associated with the publishing journal. Rows of data from individual respondents will be given a random anonymous ID number.

5. Risks

There are minimal risks associated with this research. The surveys will be anonymous to prevent any retribution associated with opinions. I do not expect this survey to cause stress or psychological harm to the subjects. No sensitive subjects will be addressed in this survey.

6. Benefits

This survey will help us understand how various journal influence metrics based on citations reflect scientist perceptions and opinions. This will add to our understanding of publishing practices, citation relationships, and the submission choices of ecologists. Publishing this information will help inform scientists about the use of various citation-based metrics and the prestige of journals among colleagues. There are no anticipated benefits directly to survey participants.

**C. References**
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**D. Certificate of completion of ethical use and treatment of human subjects in research**

**Which best describes your current industry of employment:**

Thank you for certifying your completion of the Ethical Use and Treatment of Human Subjects module.

Name: Daniel Hocking Email: [dhocking@cisunix.unh.edu](mailto:dhocking@cisunix.unh.edu)

Institution: UNH

Position: Postdoctoral Research Associate

Reason: Institutional training requirement

Comments:

**E. Copies of all recruitment materials**

Email to Ecolog Listserv

Dear Ecologists,

I am a postdoctoral research associate at the University of New Hampshire. I am conducting a survey of ecologists related to perception of journal influence and prestige. I am recruiting ecologists to participate in a short survey <15 questions). The questions related to the quality and relative rank of ecology journals. The perception of ecologists will be compared with various citation-based metrics of journal influence and impact. The survey is anonymous and will be used for peer-reviewed publications. The survey is voluntary and no compensation will be provided for completion. You can access the survey at [www.danieljhocking.wordpress.com](http://www.danieljhocking.wordpress.com).

If you have any questions you can contact me at [dhocking@unh.edu](mailto:dhocking@unh.edu)

Thank you for your interest,

Daniel J. Hocking

**G. Copies of questionnaires (below)**

**Survey Relating to Ecological Journal Influence Metrics**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

You must check the following box for inclusion in this study. By checking this box you acknowledge that you are 18 years old or older, you have willingly chosen to participate in this study without coercion, and you are not receiving any financial or other incentive for your participation. Your answers will be anonymous and will not be traceable back to you. Data will be stored securely and reported in aggregate form.

**Survey**

**Indicate your highest degree acquired (select 1)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | MD or equivalent |
|  | PhD or equivalent |
|  | M.S., M.A. or equivalent |
|  | B.S., B.A. or equivalent |
|  | Associates Degree or equivalent |
|  | High School Degree or equivalent |
|  | Less than high school degree |

**Which best describes your current industry of employment (select 1):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Academia/Higher Education |
|  | Government |
|  | Private industry |
|  | Non-governmental organization (NGO) |
|  | K-12 Education |
|  | Unemployed |
|  | Other |

**Have you published original research in peer review in scientific journals?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

**Have you published original research in ecology journals?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

**Have you reviewed manuscripts for ecology journals?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

**Have you served as an editor or associate editor for an ecology journal (presently or in the past)?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

**Which best describes your primary field of study or expertise (Select 1):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Ecology |
|  | Evolution |
|  | Behavior |
|  | Conservation |
|  | Statistics |
|  | Library science |
|  | Other |

**Rank (1 – 9) the relative importance of each of the following when deciding to which journal a manuscript is submitted**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Overall “fit” including type of articles published, topics published, and intended audience |
|  | Journal Impact Factor |
|  | Reputation of journal among peers |
|  | Likelihood of article being read and cited in a particular journal |
|  | Open Access |
|  | Cost |
|  | Other Importance/Impact/Prestige metrics |
|  | Speed of review and publishing process |
|  | Past experience (positive or negative) with a journal or editor |

**Rank the following on a scale of 0 to 5 based on familiarity with each metric with 5 being highly familiar and 0 indicating that you have never heard of the metric**

0 – never heard of the metric

1 – Heard of the metric but don’t know much about it. Couldn’t supply a definition

2 – General idea of the metric but not the details

3 – Basic familiarity with the metric and basic definition but not how it differs from other metrics

4 – Understand the metric and could explain it to others but couldn’t list the strengths and weaknesses

5 – Know the definition, strengths, and weaknesses of the metric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Journal Impact Factor | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 year Journal Impact Factor | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Eigenfactor | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Article Importance | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h-index | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| hc-index | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g-index | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e-index | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| AR-index (alt: AW-Index) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Rank the following journals (1 – 20) based on the influence on the field of ecology (per article?)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences |
|  | Ecography |
|  | Ecological Monographs |
|  | Global Change Biology |
|  | Global Ecology and Biogeography |
|  | Ecology |
|  | Methods in Ecology and Evolution |
|  | Annual Review of Ecology |
|  | Conservation Biology |
|  | Ecological Applications |
|  | Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment |
|  | Trends in Ecology and Evolution |
|  | American Naturalist |
|  | ISME Journal |
|  | Journal of Applied Ecology |
|  | Journal of Ecology |
|  | Perspectives in Plant Ecology |
|  | Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History |
|  | Ecology Letters |
|  | Evolution |

**Rank the following journals (1 – 20) based on the influence on science as a whole**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences |
|  | Ecography |
|  | Ecological Monographs |
|  | Global Change Biology |
|  | Global Ecology and Biogeography |
|  | Ecology |
|  | Methods in Ecology and Evolution |
|  | Annual Review of Ecology |
|  | Conservation Biology |
|  | Ecological Applications |
|  | Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment |
|  | Trends in Ecology and Evolution |
|  | American Naturalist |
|  | ISME Journal |
|  | Journal of Applied Ecology |
|  | Journal of Ecology |
|  | Perspectives in Plant Ecology |
|  | Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History |
|  | Ecology Letters |
|  | Evolution |

**Rank the following journals (1 – 20) based on the quality of these journals**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences |
|  | Ecography |
|  | Ecological Monographs |
|  | Global Change Biology |
|  | Global Ecology and Biogeography |
|  | Ecology |
|  | Methods in Ecology and Evolution |
|  | Annual Review of Ecology |
|  | Conservation Biology |
|  | Ecological Applications |
|  | Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment |
|  | Trends in Ecology and Evolution |
|  | American Naturalist |
|  | ISME Journal |
|  | Journal of Applied Ecology |
|  | Journal of Ecology |
|  | Perspectives in Plant Ecology |
|  | Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History |
|  | Ecology Letters |
|  | Evolution |

**Rate each journal on a scale of 1-10 based on the influence (on scholarly thought and activity) of typical (average) articles in each journal**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Ecography | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Ecological Monographs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Global Change Biology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Global Ecology and Biogeography | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Ecology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Methods in Ecology and Evolution | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Annual Review of Ecology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Conservation Biology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Ecological Applications | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Trends in Ecology and Evolution | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| American Naturalist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| ISME Journal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Journal of Applied Ecology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Journal of Ecology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Perspectives in Plant Ecology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Ecology Letters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Evolution | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

**H. Other pertinent documentation**

None