

## References

- Begg, C., Cho, M., Eastwood, S., Horton, R., Moher, D., Olkin, I., Pitkin, R., Rennie, D., Schulz, K., Simel, D., et al. (1996). Improving the quality of reporting of randomized controlled trials. *JAMA: the journal of the American Medical Association*, 276(8):637.
- Bollen, J., Van de Sompel, H., Hagberg, A., and Chute, R. (2009). A principal component analysis of 39 scientific impact measures. *PLoS ONE*, 4(6):e6022.
- Brazma, A., Hingamp, P., Quackenbush, J., Sherlock, G., Spellman, P., Stoeckert, C., Aach, J., Ansorge, W., Ball, C., Causton, H., et al. (2001). Minimum information about a microarray experiment (miame) toward standards for microarray data. *Nature genetics*, 29(4):365–371.
- Butler, D. (2005). Electronic notebooks: A new leaf. *Nature*, 436(7047):20–21.
- Chang, G., Roth, C. B., Reyes, C. L., Pornillos, O., Chen, Y.-J., and Chen, A. P. (2006). Retraction. *Science*, 314(5807):1875.
- Cokol, M., Iossifov, I., Rodriguez-Esteban, R., and Rzhetsky, A. (2007). How many scientific papers should be retracted? *EMBO reports*, 8(5):422–423.
- Cokol, M., Ozbay, F., and Rodriguez-Esteban, R. (2008). Retraction rates are on the rise. *EMBO reports*, 9(1):2–2.
- Coombes, K., Wang, J., and Baggerly, K. (2007). Microarrays: retracing steps. *Nature medicine*, 13(11):1276–1277.
- Gallivan, M. (2001). Striking a balance between trust and control in a virtual organization: a content analysis of open source software case studies. *Information Systems Journal*, 11(4):277–304.
- Garfield, E. (1955). Citation indexes to science: a new dimension in documentation through association of ideas. *Science*, 122(3159):108–111.
- Grivell, L. (2006). Through a glass darkly: The present and the future of editorial peer review. *EMBO reports*, 7(6):567.
- Hirsch, J. (2005). An index to quantify an individual’s scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102(46):16569.
- Ioannidis, J. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Medicine*, 2(8):e124.
- Laine, C., Goodman, S., Griswold, M., and Sox, H. (2007). Reproducible research: moving toward research the public can really trust. *Annals of internal medicine*, 146(6):450.
- Nordlie, E., Gewaltig, M., and Plesser, H. (2009). Towards reproducible descriptions of neuronal network models. *PLoS Comput. Biol*, 5(8).
- Peng, R. (2009). Reproducible research and biostatistics. *Biostatistics*, 10(3):405.
- Poldrack, R., Fletcher, P., Henson, R., Worsley, K., Brett, M., and Nichols, T. (2008). Guidelines for reporting an fmri study. *Neuroimage*, 40(2):409–414.
- Pöschl, U. (2004). Interactive journal concept for improved scientific publishing and quality assurance. *Learned Publishing*, 17(2):105–113.
- Pöschl, U. and Koop, T. (2008). Interactive open access publishing and collaborative peer review for improved scientific communication and quality assurance. *Information Services and Use*, 28(2):105–107.
- Schwab, M., Karrenbach, N., and Claerbout, J. (2000). Making scientific computations reproducible. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 2(6):61–67.

- Smith, R. (2006). Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 99(4):178.
- Sollaci, L. and Pereira, M. (2004). The introduction, methods, results, and discussion (imrad) structure: a fifty-year survey. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 92(3):364.
- Spier, R. (2002). The history of the peer-review process. *Trends in biotechnology*, 20(8):357–358.
- Steen, R. (2011a). Misinformation in the medical literature: What role do error and fraud play? *Journal of Medical Ethics*.
- Steen, R. (2011b). Retractions in the scientific literature: is the incidence of research fraud increasing? *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 37(4):249.
- Stodden, V. (2009). Enabling reproducible research: Open licensing for scientific innovation. 1-55. *International Journal of Communications Law and Policy*, (13).
- Triggle, C. and Triggle, D. (2007). What is the future of peer review? Why is there fraud in science? Is plagiarism out of control? Why do scientists do bad things? Is it all a case of: All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing?. *Vascular health and risk management*, 3(1):39.
- Van de Sompel, H., Payette, S., Erickson, J., Lagoze, C., and Warner, S. (2004). Rethinking scholarly communication. *D-Lib Magazine*, 10(9):1082–9873.
- Van Horn, J., Grethe, J., Kostelec, P., Woodward, J., Aslam, J., Rus, D., Rockmore, D., and Gazzaniga, M. (2001). The Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Data Center (fMRIDC): the challenges and rewards of large-scale databasing of neuroimaging studies. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 356(1412):1323.
- Vannier, M. and Summers, R. (2003). Sharing Images1. *Radiology*, 228(1):23.