Recorder D115

Priority of discovery

There is a lack of training with regard to priority.

Must discuss priority in order for preprints to become a viable institution.

Biomedical community views it as a method for being scooped. 180 degrees from physics’ community.

Where are we now: what defines priority now in our community? Date of submission; date of publication, preprint? Priority is when a scientist is ready to disclose it.

Is physics’ community different than ours? Difference between theory and data. Multiple researchers may have the idea but unless they work in it and show it, is that priority?

A preprint is not just a proposal but validation that is being proposed for preprints.

Ability to build on preprint.

You could be first on the first but not first on the second piece…

Papers are a poor way to measure the productivity of a lab.

Many other ways to measure the productivity of an individual other than where they are on the author order.

Papers are on an episodic basis.

Need to be able to look at granular pieces to get better views of what people are doing.

Authorship order is not a fair system now.

Moving in direction of what people contribute is important.

Papers can be different after review by a journal.

Paper changes dramatically after it is written. Where does the priority come in? Which version do I read?

What version do you go to?

Worrying about details that will not matter in the end.

Searching Google scholar vs Google shows the problems…

Ability to update could provide incentives to be selective on what one posts as a preprint.

Could create an email notification system for updated preprints

Multiples are somewhat common

How will this switch affect the culture of science?

Question in lab: do you go for the “little stuff” or go for the bigger picture that the “little stuff” leads to? Are you allocating your time efficiently?

Will this lead to LPU’s?

We need diversification of what is being produced—some labs don’t have resources to do the “big story” but can do the “little story.”

Some papers are not digestible…

We want to change the culture.

Do we want “one story” or bits of the story?

Preprints could be a challenge for PI. Postdocs who say they have a need to get a preprint…

Manuscripts are already being used in job applications in terms of screening job applicants.

There is a big difference between a colleague sharing a manuscript vs. a colleague posting a manuscript for all to see.

Will this diminish quality of science overall?

Does this provide someone who does not share my standards a way to use a system to get ahead? (If so, this already exists).

At the end of the day, quality rules in our community.

But we already are not disclosing at meetings.

Preprints will give you a leg up on fending off those who might have “scooped” work and posted an *adhoc* preprint.

Smaller stories may not be the big stories…

This could feed into new ways of analyzing importance of a publication, contribution, or a person. New software to analyze contribution.

Objections about this are already occurring. Ability to rush to print. Ability to democratize the system.

Outside letters carry a lot of weight at tenure time.

Lots of short cuts now to evaluation. How to evaluate is not an issue of preprints…we need to do homework to evaluate people.

Lots of moving parts. Lots of pieces in system that need fixing. Need to jump in somewhere and fix something. Need other meetings on other topics that need fixing.

Need metrics of what individuals contribute.