Journal of Controlled Release 269 (2018) 439–440

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Controlled Release

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jconrel

# Editorial

The Journal of Controlled Release (JCR) has been serving the drug delivery field by providing a forum for researchers in different disciplines to discuss their findings and opinions. From 2018 there will be a few changes implemented in JCR, and this is an update of the changes.

## 1. Your Paper, Your Way

The authors of JCR, and other journals, know how time-consuming it is to prepare a manuscript conforming to the format specific to each journal and submitting individual components of the manuscript through the journal website. It is common to submit a manuscript more than once to different journals before publication. The time used to follow different technical and formatting requirements of each journal is the time that can be used for more productive activities. In 2011, one of the Elsevier journals, *Free Radical Biology and Medicine*, launched the Your Paper, Your Way (YPYW) program to make the submission process simpler [1]. The YPYW process eliminates the formatting issue, allowing the authors to focus on the quality of the science in the initial stage of submission.

YPYW is now extended to JCR. A manuscript to JCR can be submitted as a single Word or PDF file in any format or layout for the refereeing process. Embedding figures and tables in the proper places of the text makes it easier to review. Each manuscript will still require essential elements, including abstract, keywords, introduction, materials & methods, results, discussion, conclusions, figures and tables with captions. It goes without saying that the figures need to be of high enough quality for refereeing. References can also be any style or format, as long as the style is consistent with full information including author (s) name(s), journal title/book title, article title/book chapter title, volume & issue, page numbers, and year of publication. When a paper reaches the revision stage, authors will be requested to revise it into the JCR format and to deliver any items that are still required for publication, e.g., editable source files.

## 2. New Look

JCR website will also have a new design in its website. The ScienceDirect product team has been implementing a new, modern design, which was rolled out gradually in 2017. The new homepage is designed to show the key highlights from the journal and all the important links for the users. The issue page lists all the articles within a particular (special) volume or issue. The archive page shows an overview of all the volumes/issues published in the year, in order by year. The articles in press page lists all the accepted manuscripts that have not been assigned to a volume/issue yet.

The new JCR pages are designed to offer speed, ease of use, and journal identity. The past web pages took on average 12 seconds to load due to the complicated architecture that has built up over the past 18 years. The new page will usually load 10 times faster. The structure of the new pages has changed to make it easier to find what the readers are looking for, making browsing a more pleasant experience. The new design has JCR's own custom background color to communicate its unique identity. The new design is, of course, only the first step towards ever enhancing the journal page, and Elsevier will continue improving it into the future and add features that provide value to both readers and authors.

## 3. Transparency and openness

JCR has been at the forefront of ensuring that the information in published articles advances the field and all results are valid and reproducible. Despite the efforts by the reviewers and editors of JCR, some published articles turned out to be away from the scientific and ethical guidelines of the journal, and they had to be retracted. Fortunately, however, those incidences have been rare. We need to continue maintaining high standards of scientific conducts through transparency and openness.

### 3.1. Irreproducible results

Exchange of experimental results with correct interpretation constitutes the main part of the progress in science and technology. The means of exchange has been moved from printed documents to an electronic format. The internet age has brought a new era of literature search by a click of a mouse. This fast exchange of ideas, in turn, has led to reading a large number of articles by various researchers throughout the world, resulting in thorough analysis of the data presented in the articles. There comes a new problem of a "reproducibility crisis" [2] or "irreproducibility" of published data. Many high-profile research articles have been retracted. It may be that the problem of irreproducibility of published results have been existing, but in the Internet age, they can be spotted more easily.

The drug delivery field is not immune to the problem of irreproducible results. Jean-Christophe Leroux has pointed out that the current drug delivery systems are unnecessarily complex without enough reproducibility [3]. Many scientists do not publish their study showing the results opposite of many published data. Those scientists, even though they did their experiments correctly, often think that their data are negative, and thus, do not try to publish. Here, we need to clarify the term "negative" data. Negative data are not inaccurate data or

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2017.12.011

unpublishable data. Negative data are, in fact, new positive data showing that the understanding we have had previously on a certain topic is not accurate [4]. In that sense, the so-called 'negative" data are not negative at all. Rather, they are "different" data that can provide new, valuable information for others not to waste their time.

### 3.2. Reasons for irreproducible results

The cause of a irreproducibility crisis is often ascribed to two factors, pressure to publish and selective reporting [2]. The pressure to publish is real, and this is something each university or research institution can alleviate by not considering the number of publication as a metric of achievement [4]. The problem of selective reporting is, in part, a result of the pressure to publish, and there is much more to it, including the pressure of peer acceptance.

One common source of irreproducible data is simply incomplete description of the experimental approach. The small details which seem too trivial or routine in one laboratory may be essential for others who are trying to repeat the experiments. The details of experimental approaches need to be described for others to reproduce. Another source of irreproducibility is the lack of shared information used to reach conclusions in the published articles. If the details of experimental approaches are described and materials used in the study are shared, readers may be able to compare their results with the published ones and find out the sources of discrepancies.

### 3.3. Research Integrity: Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP)

Elsevier, in 2015, introduced the Research Data policy [5] which serves as an overall guidance for journals. It provides a set of options for journal data-sharing policies to allow for flexibility in implementation across different disciplines and journals. The options match with the data guidelines of the Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) guidelines by the Center for Open Science [6,7].

Transparency in science is back since it was abandoned in 1832 [8]. This is due to many reasons, including the politicization of science, conflict of interest in the published article, and irreproducibility of published data. Transparency and openness demands not only good authors, but also good reviewers who are in constant demand with insufficient time for referring many manuscripts. The question whether each published article should be accompanied by the reviewers' names and their critique is a matter of debate, but this leads to the roles of the editors. Editors are appointed because of their expertise in their own field and their broad knowledge in the research topics covered in each journal. With good reviews editors are able to render a decision on each manuscript. The editors' decisions may not be always right, but the editors usually avoid gross mistakes. The transparency for the editors is in the quality of the published articles.

### 3.4. What does all this mean to the authors, reviewers, and editors of JCR?

JCR believes that an "encouragement without mandate" policy is appropriate, one of the options described by the TOP guidelines. By encouraging rather than mandating data-sharing and transparency, this policy gives authors a few choices. First, if data sharing is not available at all, the authors should indicate the reasons during the manuscript submission process. The editors and reviewers will decide whether proper review is possible only with the disclosed information. Second, the authors can choose to share their research data, code or other research materials associated with the submission. In this case, the authors can share data through existing means, e.g., by linking to a community repository, Mendeley Data, or personal website. Editors and Reviewers will be provided with the information authors share. Third, the authors can simply indicate that the data sharing is available, if requested by the reviewers and editors during the review process and by the readers after publication.

JCR exists for the authors, reviewers, and readers. JCR aspires to be the journal of choice for all drug delivery scientists. The editors of JCR understand that there are many things to be improved. The JCR editors always try to be unbiased and render their decisions based on the merit of each manuscript. All JCR editors have a purpose of advancing the drug delivery field by publishing articles worthy of your time for reading. We value your suggestions, comments, and criticisms for continued improvement.

## References

[1] Elsevier. Your Paper, Your Way. 2011. ⟨https://www.elsevier.com/authors/journal-authors/your-paper-your-way⟩.
[2] M. Baker, Is there a reproducibility crisis? A nature survey lifts the lid on how researchers view the 'crisis' rocking science and what they think will help, Nature 533 (2016) 452–454.
[3] J.-C. Leroux, Drug delivery: Too much complexity, not enough reproducibility? Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 56 (2017) 15170–15171.
[4] K. Park, The drug delivery field at the inflection point: Time to fight its way out of the egg, J. Control. Release 267 (2017) 2–14.
[5] Elsevier. Research data. 2015. https://www.elsevier.com/about/our-business/policies/research-data#Principles.
[6] B.A. Nosek, G. Alter, G.C. Banks, D. Borsboom, S.D. Bowman, S.J. Breckler, S. Buck, C.D. Chambers, G. Chin, G. Christensen, M. Contestabile, A. Dafoe, E. Eich, J. Freese, R. Glennerster, D. Goroff, D.P. Green, B. Hesse, M. Humphreys, J. Ishiyama, D. Karlan, A. Kraut, A. Lupia, P. Mabry, T. Madon, N. Malhotra, E. Mayo-Wilson, M. McNutt, E. Miguel, E.L. Paluck, U. Simonsohn, C. Soderberg, B.A. Spellman ., J. Turitto, G. VandenBos, S. Vazire, E.J. Wagenmakers, R. Wilson, T. Yarkoni, Promoting an open research culture, Science 348 (2015) 1422–1425.
[7] Center for Open Science. The Transparency and Openness Promotion Guidelines are a community-driven effort to align scientific ideals with actual practices. 2015. https://cos.io/our-services/top-guidelines/, https://osf.io/4kdbm/?_ga=2.61673967.27748249.1500889705-1423307685.1484782617
[8] P. Hurst. Transparency in peer review. 2017. https://phys.org/news/2017-09-transparency-peer.html.

*Editor-in-Chief*
Kinam Park