

Daniele Fanelli

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/8033394/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

34
papers

5,907
citations

304602

22
h-index

414303

32
g-index

39
all docs

39
docs citations

39
times ranked

6744
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	How Many Scientists Fabricate and Falsify Research? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Survey Data. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2009, 4, e5738.	1.1	1,242
2	Negative results are disappearing from most disciplines and countries. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2012, 90, 891-904.	1.6	850
3	What does research reproducibility mean?. <i>Science Translational Medicine</i> , 2016, 8, 341ps12.	5.8	804
4	Do Pressures to Publish Increase Scientists' Bias? An Empirical Support from US States Data. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2010, 5, e10271.	1.1	494
5	“Positive” Results Increase Down the Hierarchy of the Sciences. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2010, 5, e10068.	1.1	490
6	Is science really facing a reproducibility crisis, and do we need it to?. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America</i> , 2018, 115, 2628-2631.	3.3	275
7	Meta-assessment of bias in science. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America</i> , 2017, 114, 3714-3719.	3.3	238
8	Meta-research: Evaluation and Improvement of Research Methods and Practices. <i>PLoS Biology</i> , 2015, 13, e1002264.	2.6	202
9	Misconduct Policies, Academic Culture and Career Stage, Not Gender or Pressures to Publish, Affect Scientific Integrity. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2015, 10, e0127556.	1.1	164
10	Why Growing Retractions Are (Mostly) a Good Sign. <i>PLoS Medicine</i> , 2013, 10, e1001563.	3.9	162
11	Data sharing and reanalysis of randomized controlled trials in leading biomedical journals with a full data sharing policy: survey of studies published in <i>The BMJ</i> and <i>PLOS Medicine</i> . <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2018, 360, k400.	2.4	146
12	Researchers’ Individual Publication Rate Has Not Increased in a Century. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2016, 11, e0149504.	1.1	112
13	Bibliometric Evidence for a Hierarchy of the Sciences. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2013, 8, e66938.	1.1	109
14	US studies may overestimate effect sizes in softer research. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America</i> , 2013, 110, 15031-15036.	3.3	108
15	Scientists Admitting to Plagiarism: A Meta-analysis of Surveys. <i>Science and Engineering Ethics</i> , 2015, 21, 1331-1352.	1.7	85
16	Redefine misconduct as distorted reporting. <i>Nature</i> , 2013, 494, 149-149.	13.7	71
17	Positive results receive more citations, but only in some disciplines. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2013, 94, 701-709.	1.6	56
18	Reproductive constraints, direct fitness and indirect fitness benefits explain helping behaviour in the primitively eusocial wasp, <i>Polistes canadensis</i> . <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2010, 277, 1721-1728.	1.2	43

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Improving the integrity of published science: An expanded taxonomy of retractions and corrections. <i>European Journal of Clinical Investigation</i> , 2018, 48, e12898.	1.7	33
20	Conservative Tests under Satisficing Models of Publication Bias. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2016, 11, e0149590.	1.1	28
21	Doing the Right Thing: A Qualitative Investigation of Retractions Due to Unintentional Error. <i>Science and Engineering Ethics</i> , 2018, 24, 189-206.	1.7	28
22	Testing Hypotheses on Risk Factors for Scientific Misconduct via Matched-Control Analysis of Papers Containing Problematic Image Duplications. <i>Science and Engineering Ethics</i> , 2019, 25, 771-789.	1.7	27
23	Set up a "self-retraction"™ system for honest errors. <i>Nature</i> , 2016, 531, 415-415.	13.7	25
24	Any publicity is better than none: newspaper coverage increases citations, in the UK more than in Italy. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2013, 95, 1167-1177.	1.6	18
25	A theory and methodology to quantify knowledge. <i>Royal Society Open Science</i> , 2019, 6, 181055.	1.1	18
26	What difference might retractions make? An estimate of the potential epistemic cost of retractions on meta-analyses. <i>Accountability in Research</i> , 2022, 29, 442-459.	1.6	17
27	Lost Evidence From Registered Large Long-Unpublished Randomized Controlled Trials: A Survey. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2019, 171, 300.	2.0	14
28	Rise in retractions is a signal of integrity. <i>Nature</i> , 2014, 509, 33-33.	13.7	12
29	Meat is murder on the environment. <i>New Scientist</i> , 2007, 195, 15.	0.0	8
30	We need more research on causes and consequences, as well as on solutions. <i>Addiction</i> , 2015, 110, 11-13.	1.7	6
31	Do individual and institutional predictors of misconduct vary by country? Results of a matched-control analysis of problematic image duplications. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2022, 17, e0255334.	1.1	5
32	Reply to Nuijten et al.: Reanalyses actually confirm that US studies overestimate effects in softer research. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America</i> , 2014, 111, E714-5.	3.3	3
33	The lost. <i>New Scientist</i> , 2007, 196, 14-16.	0.0	0
34	Kinship doesn't matter " how insects are altruistic. <i>New Scientist</i> , 2008, 197, 6-7.	0.0	0