



FAIR Scientific Literature Working Group

AgBioData Community Workshop 5/1/2023





FAIR Scientific Literature WG Goals

- Identify bottlenecks in the publication-curation pipeline.
- Identify sets of existing or desired tools or biocuration resources to increase literature curation throughput and accuracy.
- [Second year] publish recommendations and a roadmap for authors and publishers to increase the FAIRness of published research.





Members



Ruth Isaacson GSA



Leyla Cabugos Librarian, Cal Poly



Jenna Daenzer GSA



Leonore Reiser TAIR curator



Sook Jung Asst Research Professor. GDR





David Molik Computational Biologist, USDA ARS



Daniela Raciti Exec Editor, microPublication & Wormbase Curator



Jacqueline Campbell Geneticist, USDA ARS SoyBase curator



Adam Wright Software Engineer Wormbase.Reactome



Karen Yook Exec Editor, microPublication & Wormbase Curator



Daniel Morris , Professor (advisory)

Genetic, Genomic & Breeding (GGB)

COMMUNITY GGB CURATOR

(Make Data Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable)

AUTHOR Data Maker

Databases





AUTHOR Data Maker

High volume of data & not enough curation time



Databases





AUTHOR Data Maker

> Difficult to find which papers have relevant data

Databases

















Current publication-curation workflow



Aim for a BETTER workflow







Stakeholders involved w/ data management



Focus on Four Stakeholders

AUTHOR (Data Maker)



RESEARCH LIBRARIAN

(Archivist; Researcher support)



Four Stakeholder challenges & barriers

| Researcher | Not knowing where data should go Time consuming submission process Not knowing how to format data / metadata |
|------------|---|
| Publisher | Not knowing where data should go Lack of easy verification of data availability Authors often do not want data available before publication |
| Librarian | Not knowing where data should go Lack of familiarity with data Lack of engagement with researcher |
| Funder | Not knowing where data should go Different programs have different repositories Proposal reviews don't know how to evaluate |





Four Stakeholders Resources & incentives

| Researcher | Resources to determine where data should go Public rewards / recognition for data sharing Increased citations for future funding and job security |
|------------|---|
| Publisher | Increased impact factors when data is reused Better tools for tracking data reuse & sharing Resources to determine where data should go |
| Librarian | Increased engagement with other stakeholders Better tools for tracking data reuse & sharing Resources to determine where data should go |
| Funder | FAIR education for reviewers & awardees Better tools for tracking data reuse & sharing Ability to track FAIR data & having quantifiable metrics |





AgBioData can bridge the workflow

High volume of data & not enough curation time

AUTHOR

Data Maker



formatted data &





Questions for the community

- In person & virtual breakout room participants
 - If there was a tool or portal to help authors, publishers, and librarians determine where there data should go, what would it look like?





Questions for the community

• In person & virtual breakout room participants

- If there was a tool or portal to help authors, publishers, and librarians determine where there data should go, what would it look like?
- Thinking of the barriers and incentives to making published data FAIR, are there things we have missed?





Questions for the community

• In person & virtual breakout room participants

- If there was a tool or portal to help authors, publishers, and librarians determine where there data should go, what would it look like?
- Thinking of the barriers and incentives to making published data FAIR, are there things we have missed?
- What are the most important challenges to address?





Thank you



Ruth Isaacson GSA



Leyla Cabugos Librarian, Cal Poly



Jenna Daenzer GSA



Leonore Reiser TAIR curator



Sook Jung Asst Research Professor. GDR





David Molik Computational Biologist, USDA ARS



Daniela Raciti Exec Editor, microPublication & Wormbase Curator



Jacqueline Campbell Geneticist, USDA ARS SoyBase curator



Adam Wright Software Engineer Wormbase.Reactome



Karen Yook Exec Editor, microPublication & Wormbase Curator



Daniel Morris , Professor (advisory)

Supplemental Slides



Example Stakeholder Focus: Genetic, Genomic and Breeding Database Curator

Motivated By

Challenged By

Possible Incentives

Possible tools





Example Stakeholder Focus: Genetic, Genomic and Breeding Database Curator

Motivated By

Challenged By

Possible Incentives

Possible tools





Motivated By

- Desire to present comprehensive, integrated data to the user community
- Need to maintain a desired resources that community values





Challenged By

- Process data post-publication
- High volume of data & not enough curation time
- Data on request lack of response from authors
- Poorly / Incorrectly formatted data and metadata





Possible Incentives

- Increased community use
- Increased value by community
- Money for curation services





Possible tools

- Software that facilitates data submission & a professional curator review as part of the publication pipeline
- Resource for authors & journals to determine where data should go
- Better metadata





Focus on 'before or during' publication not afterwards (FAIR from the start)







FSLWG focus is on AgBioData community DBs

- Community databases host many different types of data from different sources
 - Common data types for a given species including those from other sources (e.g. sequences, RNA seq reads)
 - Unique datasets not found in other places (e.g G2P data, markers, mapping populations) or solely represented in supplemental data files.
- The value add for our user communities is
 - Streamlining the data finding and acquisition process
 - Curation and standardization
 - \circ Integration with other data types





Motivated By

- Professional rewards
- Recognition
- Moving science forward





Challenged By

- Not knowing:
 - Where data should go
 - How to properly format data/metadata
- Time consuming
- Unclear benefits of data sharting





Possible Incentives

- Public recognition for data sharing
- Increase citations for research





Possible tools

- Software that facilitates data submission
- Better tools for tracking data reuse and reporting
- Accessible resources that authors can use to determine where data should go





Motivated By

- Advancing science through thoughtful allocation of funds.
- Increasing US national competitiveness and food security





Challenged By

- Not knowing all the places data should go
- Different program areas have different specialist knowledge
- Rely on reviewers who do not have the specific knowledge to evaluate DMPs





Possible Incentives

- Ability to track FAIR OS/OSTP memo compliance
- Having quantifiable metric to access value of funded research





Possible tools

- Better tools for tracking data reuse and reporting on how often data is shared
- Publicly accessible resources that authors and journals an use to determine where the data should go
- FAIR OS education for researchers



