

 Open access • Posted Content • DOI:10.1101/311068

High impact journals in ecology cover proportionally more statistically significant findings — [Source link](#)

[Silvia Ceaușu](#), [Luís Borda-de-Água](#), [Thomas Merckx](#), [Sossai E ...+3 more authors](#)

Institutions: [Aarhus University](#), [Université catholique de Louvain](#)

Published on: 30 Apr 2018 - [bioRxiv](#) (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory)

Topics: [Impact factor](#)

Related papers:

- [Evidence of heterogeneity of genetic effect in Iowa adoption studies.](#)
- [Lower variability in female students than male students at multiple timescales supports the use of sex as a biological variable in human studies](#)
- [Intermediate Disturbance Hypothesis in Ecology: A Literature Review](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/high-impact-journals-in-ecology-cover-proportionally-more-4lhstcou1u>

21 **Abstract**

22 Unbiased scientific reporting is crucial for data and research synthesis. Previous studies
23 suggest that statistically significant results are more likely to be published and more likely to
24 be submitted to high impact journals. However, the most recent research on statistical
25 significance in relation to journal impact factors in ecological research was published more
26 than two decades ago or addressed a small subset of the literature. Here, we extract p-values
27 from all articles published in 11 journals in 2012 and 2014 across a wide range of impact
28 factors with six journals sampled in both years. Our results indicate that the proportion of
29 statistically significant results increases with rising impact factor. Such a trend can have
30 important consequences for syntheses of ecological data and it highlights the importance of
31 covering a wide range of impact factors when identifying published studies for data
32 syntheses. This trend can also lead to a biased understanding of the probability of true effects
33 in ecology and conservation. We caution against the possible downplaying of non-significant
34 results by either journals or authors.

35

36 **Introduction**


37 Research synthesizing published data in ecology and biological sciences is growing (Newbold
38 et al., 2015) but the validity of its results depends on unbiased reporting of research, including
39 of statistically non-significant results. Incentives in academia that emphasize citations indices
40 and publications in high impact factor (IF) journals may undermine this requirement. For
41 instance, research suggests that statistically non-significant results are less likely to be
42 published in the case of clinical trial studies (2) and are submitted to lower IF journals in
43 ecology (Koricheva, 2003; Suñé, Suñé & Montoro, 2013). Such a bias in publication can
44 result in overestimating statistical significance and effect size in research synthesizing data to
45 estimate a particular effect or phenomenon. Moreover, statistically non-significant results can

46 be highly significant scientifically. Research on the effect of these behaviours on the overall
47 pattern of reported statistical significance in relation to IF has only been conducted on a small
48 subset of the literature (Koricheva, 2003), on a small range of IF (Jennions & Møller, 2003)
49 or has been published more than two decades ago (Csada, James & Espie, 1996). Here, we
50 update the research on the relationship between significance levels and IF in the ecology and
51 conservation literature within a wide range of IF.


52 **Methods**

53 We examined how the proportion of reported significant results, expressed as p-values,
54 changed with increasing IF. We divided the range of IF into three intervals: low ($IF < 4$),
55 medium ($4 \leq IF < 8$), and high ($IF \geq 8$) to ensure that we cover a broad range of IF. We then
56 randomly selected at least two journals for each IF interval for both 2012 and 2014 from
57 journals listed in the Science Citation Index Expanded ([http://mjl.clarivate.com/cgi-](http://mjl.clarivate.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=D)
58 [bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=D](http://mjl.clarivate.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=D)) under four subject categories: biodiversity conservation,
59 biology, ecology, and evolutionary biology. We examined 11 journals (table in S1 Table)
60 (lowest IF 0.36 to highest IF 17.95), six journals for both years, whilst we examined three for
61 2014 and two for 2012 alone. We collected all p-values reported in all articles using
62 Examine32 Text Search from Aquila Software. We extracted exact p-values and inexact p-
63 values (e.g. $p < 0.05$). All the inexact p-values were reassigned to six intervals in order to
64 harmonize all the reported values and calculate the proportion of significant results (Table A
65 in S1 Text). Due to the ubiquitous use of 0.05 as the alpha level in ecology, we considered p-
66 values below this level as significant. We calculated the proportion of significant results for
67 exact p-values and all (i.e. exact and inexact) p-values reported in each journal, for each year.
68 We fitted generalized linear mixed effects models (binomial distribution) to the proportion of
69 significant results with IF as fixed effect and journal as random effect. We used R (version
70 3.4.0) and the "lme4" and "arm" packages for model fitting and back-transformation of model
71 coefficients. We tested through a paired t-test the effect of year on the six journals that we

72 examined for both years. All data collected for this study are available at:
73 [https://figshare.com/projects/High_impact_journals_cover_proportionally_more_statistically_](https://figshare.com/projects/High_impact_journals_cover_proportionally_more_statistically_significant_findings/28284)
74 [significant_findings/28284](https://figshare.com/projects/High_impact_journals_cover_proportionally_more_statistically_significant_findings/28284). The R code of the data analysis is available at:
75 [https://github.com/SilviaCeausu/ImpactFactorsAndPvalues/blob/master/ImpactFactorPvaluec](https://github.com/SilviaCeausu/ImpactFactorsAndPvalues/blob/master/ImpactFactorPvaluecodeGitHub2.R)
76 [odeGitHub2.R](https://github.com/SilviaCeausu/ImpactFactorsAndPvalues/blob/master/ImpactFactorPvaluecodeGitHub2.R).



77



78

79 **Figure 1. Proportion of a) exact p-values and b) all p-values below 0.05 reported across**
80 **impact factors (IF).** The grey areas delimitate the 95% confidence intervals. The journals
81 considered and their impact factors are presented in S1 Table.

82

83 **Results and discussion**

84 The percentage of significant results—out of all published results within a journal— increased
85 with increasing IF (Figure 1). For exact p-values, the percentage of significant results
86 increased on average by 0.7% for each additional IF unit [95% CI: 0.3 - 1.2%]. For all p-
87 values (i.e. exact and inexact), the percentage increased by 1.2% for each additional IF unit
88 [95% CI: 0.9 - 1.5%] (Table S2). In 2012, the percentage of significant results was higher
89 than in 2014 (+3.3%, 95% CI: 0.2 – 6.4%) for the journals examined in both years.

90 Our result concurs with trends noticed in medical research (Jannot et al., 2013) but they
91 contradict results reported for behavioural ecology by (Jennions & Møller, 2003). The latter
92 study concluded that neither p-values nor statistical power varied significantly with IF but the
93 analysis was conducted on a much narrower range of IF (ca. 1 - 5) than our study.

94 Our result can arise if statistical significance influences submission or editorial decisions.
95 Analysing the output of doctoral dissertations in ecology, Koricheva (Koricheva, 2003) found
96 that the proportion of non-significant results in a study was negatively associated with IF,
97 although the rejection rates for non-significant results were not higher for higher IF journals.
98 In an article that examined clinical trials, Suñé et al (Suñé, Suñé & Montoro, 2013) found that
99 non-significant studies are less likely to be published and, if published, more time passes
100 between conducting the research and publication. However, the IF of the publishing journal
101 was not different for significant versus non-significant results (Suñé, Suñé & Montoro, 2013).

102 These studies suggest that authors invest less effort into the publication of their non-
103 significant results and submit them to lower IF journals.

104 Our outcome can also be an effect of higher impact journals selecting studies with higher
105 sample or effect sizes, or requesting stricter statistical reporting and shorter articles. In studies
106 of the relationships between IF, and sample and effects sizes results are mixed. For meta-
107 analyses in ecology Lortie et al (Lortie et al., 2013) did not find a relationship between IF and
108 effect size. Analyzing studies collected for four meta-analyses, Murtaugh found a positive
109 correlation between effect strength and IF in two of the four datasets (Murtaugh, 2002), and
110 Barto and Rillig (Barto & Rillig, 2012) found that high IF journal published the strongest
111 effects, although in the absence of correlations with data quality. Regarding statistical
112 reporting, Tressoldi et al (Tressoldi et al., 2013) suggest that higher IF journal do not
113 necessarily display better standards. Our data also show no indication that higher IF journals
114 publish more precise p-values than lower IF journals (figure in S1 Figure). The heterogeneity
115 of article length requirements across journals did not allow us to test whether article length
116 requirements play a role in our result (table in S1 Table). Moreover, we did not analyse
117 supplementary materials, which might include additional non-significant results considered
118 secondary by authors.

119 The large confidence intervals in our results suggest that other factors also have an influence
120 on publication. For example, the difference in percentage of significant results between years
121 suggests changes in the prominence of different research topics. However, we cannot exclude
122 an undervaluation of non-significant results, either by authors or by journals. This pattern may
123 make significant results more visible if they are published in higher IF journals than non-
124 significant findings, and may create an inaccurate perception of the probability of true effects
125 in ecology. This could lead to wasted efforts on approaches or interventions that could in
126 reality be far less effective than we assume (Meli et al., 2017). Publication biases could also
127 negatively impact our understanding of biodiversity change and its drivers if a higher

128 proportion of non-significant results remain unpublished compared with significant ones,
129 especially at a time when growing synthesis efforts are trying to shed light on important
130 biodiversity and ecology questions (Vellend et al., 2013; Dornelas et al., 2014; Newbold et
131 al., 2015). Moreover, statistically non-significant results can give rise to new theories or
132 amendments to old ones, as it is the case of the emerging debate on the importance of
133 isolation in fragmented landscapes (Collinge, 2000; Fahrig, 2013). Therefore, we advise
134 careful consideration of submission and publication decisions to ensure solid foundations for
135 our scientific understanding.

136 **Acknowledgments**

137 MS is funded by a PhD grant from Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT), Portugal
138 (ref. PD/BD/128349/2017).

139 **References**

- 140 Barto EK., Rillig MC. 2012. Dissemination biases in ecology: effect sizes matter more than
141 quality. *Oikos* 121:228–235. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19401.x.
- 142 Collinge SK. 2000. Effects of Grassland Fragmentation on Insect Species Loss, Colonization,
143 and Movement Patterns. *Ecology* 81:2211–2226. DOI: 10.2307/177109.
- 144 Csada RD., James PC., Espie RH. 1996. The "file drawer problem" of non-significant results:
145 does it apply to biological research? *Oikos*:591–593.
- 146 Dornelas M., Gotelli NJ., McGill B., Shimadzu H., Moyes F., Sievers C., Magurran AE.
147 2014. Assemblage Time Series Reveal Biodiversity Change but Not Systematic Loss.
148 *Science* 344:296–299.
- 149 Fahrig L. 2013. Rethinking patch size and isolation effects: the habitat amount hypothesis.
150 *Journal of Biogeography* 40:1649–1663. DOI: 10.1111/jbi.12130.
- 151 Jannot A-S., Agoritsas T., Gayet-Ageron A., Perneger TV. 2013. Citation bias favoring
152 statistically significant studies was present in medical research. *Journal of clinical*
153 *epidemiology* 66:296–301.

- 154 Jennions MD., Møller AP. 2003. A survey of the statistical power of research in behavioral
155 ecology and animal behavior. *Behavioral Ecology* 14:438–445.
- 156 Koricheva J. 2003. Non-significant results in ecology: a burden or a blessing in disguise?
157 *Oikos*:397–401.
- 158 Lortie CJ., Aarssen LW., Budden AE., Leimu R. 2013. Do citations and impact factors relate
159 to the real numbers in publications? A case study of citation rates, impact, and effect
160 sizes in ecology and evolutionary biology. *Scientometrics* 94:675–682.
- 161 Meli P., Holl KD., Benayas JMR., Jones HP., Jones PC., Montoya D., Mateos DM. 2017. A
162 global review of past land use, climate, and active vs. passive restoration effects on
163 forest recovery. *PloS one* 12:e0171368.
- 164 Murtaugh PA. 2002. Journal Quality, Effect Size, and Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis.
165 *Ecology* 83:1162–1166. DOI: 10.2307/3071921.
- 166 Newbold T., Hudson LN., Hill SL., Contu S., Lysenko I., Senior RA., Börger L., Bennett DJ.,
167 Choimes A., Collen B., others 2015. Global effects of land use on local terrestrial
168 biodiversity. *Nature* 520:45–50.
- 169 Suñé P., Suñé JM., Montoro JB. 2013. Positive outcomes influence the rate and time to
170 publication, but not the impact factor of publications of clinical trial results. *PloS one*
171 8:e54583.
- 172 Tressoldi PE., Giofré D., Sella F., Cumming G. 2013. High impact= high statistical
173 standards? Not necessarily so. *PloS one* 8:e56180.
- 174 Vellend M., Baeten L., Myers-Smith IH., Elmendorf SC., Beauséjour R., Brown CD., De
175 Frenne P., Verheyen K., Wipf S. 2013. Global meta-analysis reveals no net change in
176 local-scale plant biodiversity over time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
177 *Sciences* 110:19456–19459.

178

179

180 **Supporting information**

181 **Data collected for this study are available at:**

182 [https://figshare.com/projects/High_impact_journals_cover_proportionally_more_statistically_](https://figshare.com/projects/High_impact_journals_cover_proportionally_more_statistically_significant_findings/28284)
183 [significant_findings/28284.](https://figshare.com/projects/High_impact_journals_cover_proportionally_more_statistically_significant_findings/28284)

184 **R code of the data analysis is available at:**

185 [https://github.com/SilviaCeausu/ImpactFactorsAndPvalues/blob/master/ImpactFactorPvaluec](https://github.com/SilviaCeausu/ImpactFactorsAndPvalues/blob/master/ImpactFactorPvaluecodeGitHub2.R)
186 [odeGitHub2.R.](https://github.com/SilviaCeausu/ImpactFactorsAndPvalues/blob/master/ImpactFactorPvaluecodeGitHub2.R)

187 **S1 File. Data collection protocol (separate document)**

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200 **S1 Table. Information regarding the journals included in the analysis.** Journal title,
 201 publication year, the impact factor in the respective year, length limits for the main article
 202 type of the journal, total number of articles published by each journal during the respective
 203 year, total number of exact and inexact p-values identified. NL - no length limit specified in
 204 the author guidelines.

205

Journal Name	Year	Impact factor	Length limits	Number of total published articles	Number of exact p-values	Number of inexact p-values
Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment	2012	2.859	NL	268	1980	4050
	2014	3.402		269	2260	4050
Biochemical Systematics And Ecology	2014	0.967	NL	261	393	1132
Ecology Letters	2012	17.949	5000 words	167	1263	1177
	2014	10.689		157	1041	787
Global Change Biology	2014	8.044	8000	317	2589	4853
Global Ecology and Biogeography	2012	7.223	10 printed pages, ~ 5000 words	111	418	1599
	2014	6.531		133	660	1193
Journal of Animal Ecology	2012	4.841	8500 words	150	1308	892
	2014	4.504		137	1726	1304
Journal of Ecology	2014	5.521	12 typeset pages; ~ 9500 words	155	2435	2829
Journal of Evolutionary Biology	2012	3.479	6-10 printed pages	237	4184	2418
	2014	3.232		256	4412	2828
PLOS Biology	2012	12.69	NL	153	689	520
	2014	9.343		223	560	702
Northeastern Naturalist	2012	0.362	NL	51	347	216
Wildlife Biology	2012	1.102	40000 characters	43	232	147

206

207

208

209

210 **S2 Table. Model coefficients and selection.** We tested the model used for Figure1 (main
 211 text) against alternative random effects structures and null models. A model with both random
 212 slope and intercept was not possible due to the low number of data points. We compared the
 213 models according to theoretic information criteria: Akaikes' Information Criterion (AIC) and
 214 Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). We used the same models for both exact p-values and
 215 all p-values. We rounded up all values to three decimal places.

Model	Coefficients (95% CI)		AIC	BIC
Exact p-values	Intercept	IF		
Final model %significant ~IF + (1 journal)	-0.364 (-0.599, -0.129)	0.032 (0.013, 0.051)	206.30	208.80
Null model - journal %significant ~ 1 + (1 journal)	-0.187 (-0.412, 0.039)	-	214.75	216.41
Random intercept - journal %significant ~ IF + (IF - 1 journal)	-0.38 (-0.581, -0.188)	0.069 (-0.118, 0.261)	231.75	234.25
All p-values				
Final model %significant ~ IF + (1 journal)	0.076 (-0.11, 0.245)	0.055 (0.04, 0.071)	286.27	288.77
Random slope - journal %significant ~IF + (IF - 1 journal)	0.027 (-0.139, 0.18)	0.121 (0.012, 0.263)	317.52	320.02
Null model - journal %significant ~1 + (1 journal)	0.383 (0.242, 0.523)	-	339.72	341.38

216


217

218


219

220 **S1 Figure. Proportion of exact p-values below 0.05 reported in a) 2012 and b) 2014**

221 **across the range of impact factors (IF).**




222



223

224

225 **S2 Figure. Proportion of inexact p-values out of the total reported values across the**
226 **range of impact factors (IF).**



227

228

229

230