

# Review of: "Investigating Invalid DOIs in COCI v1 (protocols.io.bt5xnq7n)"

Deniz Tural<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Bologna

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

## Introduction

*This is the review of my colleagues' research "Investigating Invalid DOIs in COCI" for the Open Science course. Through Protocol.io, the workflow has been objectively examined and no fatal flaws have been found. I congratulate my colleagues. The remaining minor and major errors are mentioned below.*

### Investigating Invalid DOIs in COCI ▼

Nooshin Shahidzadeh<sup>1</sup>, Alessia Cioffi<sup>1</sup>, Arianna Moretti<sup>1</sup>, Sara Coppini<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Bologna

In Development

dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bt5xnq7n

Open Science 2020/2021

## Minor flaws

The introduction gives a useful start into the workflow. Abstract and introduction clearly state the need and interest in this research. However, since this research is based on previous studies, the importance and necessity of this has not been adequately stated in the abstract. It is just as important to understand the significance and necessity of the research as it is for the reader to understand the research.

I found it successful and accurate while informing readers exactly what authors did to arrive at their results. They have written down what tools, methods, or datasets they are using. However, the language used to describe the COCI Rest API is a bit ambiguous. The reader wants to be sure whether this method is used precisely. On the other hand, we make sure that they are using the COCI Rest API towards the end of their workflow.

The direction given to future research in the section on value and originality of the research is quite appropriate. Overall, the methodology appropriately targets the main problem.

## Major flaws

Before coming to the first section, "Reading the CSV data" after the abstract, it would be a preliminary preparation for the reader to mention how the dataset was obtained and whether it is sufficient for this research.

In section 2 (Creating the output JSON file), the preferred steps are presented clearly and logically, but it is not clear why this method is preferred. It could be beneficial to be more descriptive for a reader who is unfamiliar with the topic.

## Lesser suggestions and conclusion

As a workflow, proper, truthful, and transparent language was used. My recommendations are; authors should clarify why they choose this approach and measures for those who are not familiar with the topic in a short statement. I see that the research is ongoing and the traceable results are updated from time to time. In general, no fatal errors were detected.

Again, I congratulate my colleagues.