

Testing the Upgraded SHERPA/RoMEO Interface

Peter Millington

Circulation: PUBLIC
20th July 2009

Introduction

The recent push on RoMEO development has extended RoMEO's search coverage, enhanced its functionality, and improved its displays. We now have a new version ready for testing, and this document outlines tests would like volunteers to undertake, and the feedback that would be helpful.

The RoMEO enhancements are available for testing at:

- <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/index32.php> - Upgraded home page
- <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo32/php> - Upgraded search page
- <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/browse.php> - New browse publishers page

New Features

The new features include:

Journal Searching

- Searching by journal title in the *DOAJ* and *Entrez* databases in addition to the existing *Zetoc* look-up.
- Searching by ESSN (electronic ISSN) in addition to print ISSN. ESSNs are looked up in *Entrez* and *DOAJ*.
- Searching by journal abbreviation (looked up in *Entrez*).

Publisher Data

- An extra RoMEO category for 'publisher's version/PDF'. Please note: this data is still undergoing quality control.
- New tabular view for browsing RoMEO publishers – displayable by initial letter and/or RoMEO colour – with click through to full records
- A similar tabular view where publisher searches find more than one result.
- Searching by publisher in *DOAJ* as well as RoMEO, where a research funder has been selected whose mandate accepts open access journals (see below).

Compliance with Funders' OA Mandates

- New options for displaying known compliance with funder mandates:
 - All funders' mandates
 - One funder – specified from a drop down list
 - No funders
- In tabular publisher views, a 'compliance' column can be added for a single funder.

Open Access Journals and RoMEO

DOAJ (<http://www.DOAJ.org/>) holds information for open access journals, which are out of scope for *Zetoc*. This means that articles are freely available to read, but does not necessarily mean that the publishers grant self-archiving or re-usage rights. We therefore display search results with suitable warnings, and do not assign them a RoMEO colour.

There are some open access publishers in RoMEO (e.g. *Public Library of Science*). Relevant *DOAJ* hits should automatically display their RoMEO self-archiving policies instead of the above *DOAJ* warnings. In these cases, the RoMEO colour *is* displayed.

There has been a lot of debate within the SHERPA Team about how, or even whether *DOAJ* results should be displayed. We have reached any firm conclusions, so your opinion as a practical user would be very helpful.

The *Entrez* Database

Entrez (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Entrez/citmatch_help.html#JournalLists) is managed by the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI). It is a surprisingly comprehensive listing, whose subject coverage goes well beyond the remit of its host organisation. It contains no information on publishers, but RoMEO uses it to find full journal titles and print ISSNs for journal abbreviations and ESSNs.

After initial look-ups, RoMEO journal title and ISSN searches process the journal databases in the following order of priority: *Zetoc* then *DOAJ* then *Entrez*. Some results will therefore come from *Entrez* without any publisher information. We think this is probably better than returning nothing at all, following the precedent of those *Zetoc* records that also lack publishers. We would be interested to know how helpful you feel this is.

Modus Operandi

We propose a two pronged approach to testing.

Firstly, we invite you explore all the new features listed above, and play with them to destruction. We do not underestimate your ability to find any remaining flaws that may be present.

Secondly, we would like you to use the test version RoMEO during your normal work in parallel with the existing version of RoMEO. In this way, you should be able to see where the new version is better or worse than the current version, and spot any problems.

Feedback Requested

- Opinions on the usefulness or otherwise of each of the new features listed above.
 - Result lists will tend to be larger than in the previous version. Is this good or bad?
- Reports of obvious bugs and malfunctions
- Detrimental differences *vis-à-vis* the existing version of RoMEO – e.g.
 - Missing information
 - Data errors
- Unexpected results
- Your views on the displays and wording used for *DOAJ* results. Are they clear, or confusing, or indeed unwanted?
- Your views on inclusion of *Entrez* search results.
- General likes and dislikes.
- Suggestions for improvements

Follow-up

We will be using more than one method to gather feedback. We would welcome free form feedback by email. However, in the case of bug and data error reports, it would be helpful if you could send one email per bug/error.

We will follow up with a sample of testers by phone. We are also considering using a brief questionnaire to gather feedback more generally in standardised form.

Thank you for your help.