Daniele Fanelli

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

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	What difference might retractions make? An estimate of the potential epistemic cost of retractions on meta-analyses. Accountability in Research, 2022, 29, 442-459.	1.6	17
2	Do individual and institutional predictors of misconduct vary by country? Results of a matched-control analysis of problematic image duplications. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0255334.	1.1	5
3	A theory and methodology to quantify knowledge. Royal Society Open Science, 2019, 6, 181055.	1.1	18
4	Lost Evidence From Registered Large Long-Unpublished Randomized Controlled Trials: A Survey. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2019, 171, 300.	2.0	14
5	Testing Hypotheses on Risk Factors for Scientific Misconduct via Matched-Control Analysis of Papers Containing Problematic Image Duplications. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2019, 25, 771-789.	1.7	27
6	Improving the integrity of published science: An expanded taxonomy of retractions and corrections. European Journal of Clinical Investigation, 2018, 48, e12898.	1.7	33
7	Is science really facing a reproducibility crisis, and do we need it to?. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2018, 115, 2628-2631.	3.3	275
8	Doing the Right Thing: A Qualitative Investigation of Retractions Due to Unintentional Error. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2018, 24, 189-206.	1.7	28
9	Data sharing and reanalysis of randomized controlled trials in leading biomedical journals with a full data sharing policy: survey of studies published inThe BMJandPLOS Medicine. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2018, 360, k400.	2.4	146
10	Meta-assessment of bias in science. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2017, 114, 3714-3719.	3.3	238
11	Conservative Tests under Satisficing Models of Publication Bias. PLoS ONE, 2016, 11, e0149590.	1.1	28
12	Set up a â€˜self-retractionâ€™ system for honest errors. Nature, 2016, 531, 415-415.	13.7	25
13	What does research reproducibility mean?. Science Translational Medicine, 2016, 8, 341ps12.	5.8	804
14	Researchersâ€™ Individual Publication Rate Has Not Increased in a Century. PLoS ONE, 2016, 11, e0149504.	1.1	112
15	Meta-research: Evaluation and Improvement of Research Methods and Practices. PLoS Biology, 2015, 13, e1002264.	2.6	202
16	We need more research on causes and consequences, as well as on solutions. Addiction, 2015, 110, 11-13.	1.7	6
17	Scientists Admitting to Plagiarism: A Meta-analysis of Surveys. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2015, 21, 1331-1352.	1.7	85
18	Misconduct Policies, Academic Culture and Career Stage, Not Gender or Pressures to Publish, Affect Scientific Integrity. PLoS ONE, 2015, 10, e0127556.	1.1	164

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Reply to Nuijten et al.: Reanalyses actually confirm that US studies overestimate effects in softer research. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2014, 111, E714-5.	3.3	3
20	Rise in retractions is a signal of integrity. Nature, 2014, 509, 33-33.	13.7	12
21	Positive results receive more citations, but only in some disciplines. Scientometrics, 2013, 94, 701-709.	1.6	56
22	Any publicity is better than none: newspaper coverage increases citations, in the UK more than in Italy. Scientometrics, 2013, 95, 1167-1177.	1.6	18
23	Why Growing Retractions Are (Mostly) a Good Sign. PLoS Medicine, 2013, 10, e1001563.	3.9	162
24	US studies may overestimate effect sizes in softer research. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2013, 110, 15031-15036.	3.3	108
25	Redefine misconduct as distorted reporting. Nature, 2013, 494, 149-149.	13.7	71
26	Bibliometric Evidence for a Hierarchy of the Sciences. PLoS ONE, 2013, 8, e66938.	1.1	109
27	Negative results are disappearing from most disciplines and countries. Scientometrics, 2012, 90, 891-904.	1.6	850
28	Do Pressures to Publish Increase Scientists' Bias? An Empirical Support from US States Data. PLoS ONE, 2010, 5, e10271.	1.1	494
29	Reproductive constraints, direct fitness and indirect fitness benefits explain helping behaviour in the primitively eusocial wasp,Polistes canadensis. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2010, 277, 1721-1728.	1.2	43
30	â€œPositiveâ€•Results Increase Down the Hierarchy of the Sciences. PLoS ONE, 2010, 5, e10068.	1.1	490
31	How Many Scientists Fabricate and Falsify Research? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Survey Data. PLoS ONE, 2009, 4, e5738.	1.1	1,242
32	Kinship doesn't matter â€“ how insects are altruistic. New Scientist, 2008, 197, 6-7.	0.0	0
33	Meat is murder on the environment. New Scientist, 2007, 195, 15.	0.0	8
34	The lost. New Scientist, 2007, 196, 14-16.	0.0	0