

Preprintanje: predrasude, predbaccivanja, prednosti, predviđanja

Jan Homolak




Rounds of drafting
& informal feedback

Preprint

Work in progress
Submitted version

Can always be shared in
a green OA repository at
any time




Submitted to journal
Peer review
Author corrections

Postprint

Author-accepted
manuscript (AAM)

Can always be shared in
a green OA repository
after accepted by
journal (sometimes
after embargo)



Copy-edited
Typeset
Formatted

Published

Version of record
PDF / HTML / XML
DOI from journal

Can usually only be
shared if published by a
gold OA or hybrid
journal



bioRxiv

THE PREPRINT SERVER FOR BIOLOGY



[Advanced Search](#)

COVID-19 SARS-CoV-2 preprints from medRxiv and bioRxiv

Subject Areas

[All Articles](#)

[Animal Behavior and Cognition](#)

[Ecology](#)

[Paleontology](#)

[Biochemistry](#)

[Epidemiology*](#)

[Pathology](#)

Predrasude


Novo

Nepouzvano

Neozbiljno

Nesigurno (avtorska prava, novelty, ...)

Nekonvencionalno



The Information Exchange Group -- an
Experiment in Communication

by

Errett C. Albritton

Presented before
The Institute on Advances in Biomedical Communication
American Univ. and George Washington Univ.

The Seven Information Exchange Groups
as of March 1, 1965

	<u>Scientific Area</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Chairman; Co-Chairman</u>
IEG #1	Oxidative Phosphorylation & Terminal Electron Transport	4.0 yr	David E. Green
IEG #2	Hemostasis	1.0 yr	Theodore Spaet
IEG #3	Computer Simulation of Biological Systems	0.8 yr	Homer Warner
IEG #4	Molecular Basis of Muscle Contraction	0.4 yr	John Gergely
IEG #5	Immunopathology	0.4 yr	William Dameshek G.V.T. Nossal
IEG #6	Interferon	0.3 yr	Alick Isaacs Samuel Baron
IEG #7	Nucleic Acid & the Genetic Code	1 mo	James D. Watson Marshall Nirenberg

Information exchange groups to be discontinued

E A Confrey

PMID: 6003532(●) IF: 63.714 Q1 DOI: 10.1126/science.154.3751.843(●) IF: 63.714 Q1

No abstract available



Q1

IF: 63.714

Cited by: 1

[Sci-Hub Link](#)

[PDF\(Full Text\)](#)

[Citation](#)

[Collect](#)

There are two primary reasons for taking this action. First, the original purpose of the experiment has been achieved. The IEG concept *is* workable, if the chosen research area is focused to an easily described and identifiable research phenomenon or problem around which the group can be built.

Second, the rapid growth of IEG in the last two years has now reached the threshold limit for the NIH facilities to accommodate. Further, once the original concept has been tested, it does not appear equitable to all research areas to continue IEG services to a few groups on a service basis alone. If IEG cannot continue the present course, it must either expand to a larger number of areas or be suspended. We have decided to conclude and assess the experiment.

Predrasude

Novo

Nepouzvano

Neozbiljno

Nesigurno (avtorska prava, novelty, ...)

Nekonvencionalno

Do we need journal peer review?

Changes between 121 epidemiology preprints and their subsequent journal publications

Mario Malički,^{1*} Ana Jerončić,² Gerben ter Riet,³ Lex M. Bouter,⁴ IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg,⁵ John P.A. Ioannidis,¹ Steven N. Goodman^{1,6}

Affiliations:

¹ Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

² Department of Research in Biomedicine and Health, University of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia

³ Urban Vitality Centre of Expertise, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

⁴ Amsterdam University Medical Centers, Vrije Universiteit, Department of Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

⁵ Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

⁶ Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

Funding:

Elsevier funding was awarded to Stanford University for a METRICS postdoctoral position that supported Mario Malički's work on the project.

Project details:

<https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/zrtfry5fsd/4>

*Corresponding author:

Mario Malički, MD, MA, PhD

Postdoc at METRICS Stanford

<https://metrics.stanford.edu/>

Co-Editor-in-Chief of Research Integrity and Peer

Review

<https://researchintegrityjournal.biomedcentral.com/>

ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0698-1930>



Objective

To identify changes between epidemiology preprints posted on bioRxiv and their subsequent journal publications.

Methods

Till 31 December 2019 there were 1,538 epidemiology preprints posted on bioRxiv. On 5 January 2021, 844 (55%) of those were subsequently published as journal articles, of which 622 (74%) had only one preprint version. Based on our sample size calculation for representative sampling with 8% margin of error estimates, we randomly sampled 121 of those 622 preprints and compared them to their journal versions of record using quantitative and qualitative analyses. Statistical analyses were performed using MedCalc version 19.6.4. [Preliminary results](#) (study is ongoing) [are presented below](#).

121 bioRxiv
Preprints

Published in
73 journals
(Median IF 4)

27% submitted
≥10 days before
posting of the preprint

34% submitted
9 days around
posting of the preprint

39% submitted
≥10 days after
posting of the preprint

Results

121 Preprints 121 Publications

Section (Md words, Md difference)

How many changed?

But...what changed?

One (biased) example (additions in red)

Title (15, 0)

31 (26%)

26 titles changed less than 3 words

toward to towards

Authors (Md n=6, 0)

8 (7%)

5 removed, 2 added, and 1 reordered authors

Consortium name removed

Abstract (250, +2)

107 (88%)

53 add. or rem. results, 23 copyedited only

'the' added before Congo

Introduction (505, +31)

106 (88%)

67 expanded literature, 37 altered objectives

which exhibits sensitive population dynamics to the water level, e.g., rainfall, flooded agricultural activities

Methods (941, +135)

120 (99%)

37 listed additional analyses, 9 ↑or↓ sample size

added **data availability statement**

Results (804, +79)

115 (95%)

82 ↑or↓ no. of reported results, 19 copied. only

To estimate the clinical relevance of our findings, the ORs for being diagnosed with pancreatic cancer within the follow-up time was calculated

^a

Discussion (1,119, +180)

116 (96%)




37 changed first (outcome) sentence of discussion, 65 added limitations

clinical implications section added


References (Md n=36, +6)

Questions (instead of conclusions) to those looking at the poster: What changes do you feel prove the value or need for peer review? Would the lack of any (significant) change imply that the review provided a seal of approval for a study well done? How do we measure the effect of introduced changes on the scientific community? Or that those changes were indeed needed? Or that without them these studies would've been perceived to have lower quality or impact?


Recommendations: To increase transparency and provide evidence for the value and need of peer review, journals and review platforms should describe changes that occurred to manuscripts due to peer review. And they should list all (quality) checks that were conducted during manuscript evaluation.

A**B****C**

A



B



Predrasude

Novo

Nepouzvano

Neozbiljno


Nesigurno (avtorska prava, novelty, ...)

Nekonvencionalno

Protection of Priority: This matter of priority was understandably one of prime concern to prospective members when the first IEG was being organized; for in venturing to reveal to a hundred or two or three hundred other scientists in his research area the findings he had written up for publication, the scientist was aware he was stepping onto untested terrain. What was to prevent some other scientist from hurriedly gathering a few observations and publishing them in a journal that has a very short lag time between receiving a paper and publishing it? Scientists trust colleagues they know personally, and in

It may seem a paradox, but I believe I am safe in saying that this venture beyond the priority barrier has strengthened rather than weakened the **security** of priority. All the leading scientists in each research area, worldwide, are members of the IEG for that area.

Hardy indeed would be the individual who would attempt to claim credit for another man's discovery, with a jury of up to two or three hundred of his peers frowning down upon him.



BLOCK CHAIN

Predrasude

Novo


Nepouzvano

Neozbiljno


Nesigurno (avtorska prava, novelty, ...)


Nekonvencionalno

Prednosti



Feedback


Three hand-drawn faces are arranged horizontally below the word 'Feedback'. The first face on the left has a downward-curving mouth, representing a sad or negative feedback. The middle face has a straight horizontal line for a mouth, representing a neutral or average feedback. The third face on the right has an upward-curving mouth, representing a happy or positive feedback.



COVID 19

NOT COVID-19,
12/19 – 4/2020

12/18 – 4/19






About this article



Check for updates

Cite this article

Maier, L., Goemans, C.V., Wirbel, J. *et al.* Unravelling the collateral damage of antibiotics on gut bacteria. *Nature* **599**, 120–124 (2021).

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03986-2>  IF: 69.504 Q1

[Download citation](#) 

Received

06 November 2019

Accepted

01 September 2021


Published

13 October 2021


Issue Date

04 November 2021



DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03986-2>  IF: 69.504 Q1

Prednosti



Feedback

Three hand-drawn faces are arranged horizontally below the word 'Feedback'. The first face on the left has a downward-curving mouth, representing a sad or negative feedback. The middle face has a straight horizontal line for a mouth, representing a neutral or average feedback. The third face on the right has an upward-curving mouth, representing a happy or positive feedback.



New Results

[View current version of this article](#)

[Follow this preprint](#)

Publishing of COVID-19 Preprints in Peer-reviewed Journals, Preprinting Trends, Public Discussion and Quality Issues

[Ivan Kodvanj](#), [Jan Homolak](#), [Davor Virag](#), [Vladimir Trkulja](#)

doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.23.394577>

Now published in *Scientometrics* doi: [10.1007/s11192-021-04249-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04249-7) **IF: 3.801** **Q2**



[Abstract](#) [Full Text](#) [Info/History](#) [Metrics](#) [Preview PDF](#)

ABSTRACT

Introduction COVID-19-related (vs. non-related) articles appear to be more expeditiously processed and published in peer-reviewed journals. We aimed to evaluate: (i) whether COVID-19-related preprints were favoured for publication, (ii) preprinting trends and public discussion of the preprints and (iii) relationship between the publication topic (COVID-19-related or not) and quality issues.

Methods Manuscripts deposited at bioRxiv and medRxiv between January 1 and October 21 were assessed for the probability of publishing in peer-reviewed journals, and those published were evaluated for submission-to-acceptance time. The extent of public discussion was assessed based on Altmetric and Disqus data. The Retraction Watch database and PubMed were used to explore the retraction of COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 articles and preprints.

Results With adjustment for the preprinting server and number of deposited versions, COVID-19-related preprints were more likely to be published within 120 days since the deposition of the first version (OR=2.41, 95%CI 2.17-2.69) as well as over the entire observed period (OR=1.77, 95%CI 1.65-1.91). Submission-to-acceptance was by 38.57 days (95%CI 34.76-42.39) shorter for COVID-19 articles. Public discussion of preprints was modest and COVID-19 articles were overrepresented in the pool of retracted articles in 2020.

Evaluation/discussion of this paper

X

[Comments](#) ² [TRIP](#) ⁰ [Community](#) ¹ [Automated](#) ⁰ [Blogs/Media](#) ¹ [Video](#) ⁰ [Tweets](#) ¹⁹



Clarissa F. D. Carneiro

3 years ago

The article is well written and of interest to all stakeholders involved in fast dissemination of knowledge. I have only a few notes on readability and presentation of the data. Please note that I did not review the data itself or data analysis at this moment.

- Overall, I missed more interaction with the current literature both in the introduction and in the discussion sections. Although some of it is cited, the goals and results presented here are not well contextualized.

- On the other hand, the introduction is quite extensive about history of preprints, but the data presented is not proportionally focused on their usage or acceptance in the scientific community. While it is well-written, I do not see it as essential.

- One important issue for me that is lacking in the discussion is: if there is a favoring of publication of COVID-related research, are other diseases being neglected or are they still being published at the same quantities and speed? In other words, is the speed of COVID publication impacting the natural speed of other fields in biomedical sciences or is it a proof-of-concept that we can do better? If you think answering these questions is outside the scope of the current project, maybe these points can be raised and discussed at least based on the available literature.

- Supplementary materials are only referred to in the discussion section, but I believe they should also be described in the results section.

- I did not understand the use of colors on figures 1 and 2. If they should represent a particular distinction, it should be mentioned in the figures' legends.

- Color codes are representing different things in different figures and panels. While there is a legend for all of them, I'd suggest reviewing the figures so that the variables used for different colors, bars and subpanels are constant.

- Would it be possible to also separate the data presented on fig 3B by COVID and non-COVID (as in fig 3A)? I think there could be useful information lost and highly recommend this change.

- Lastly, I'd recommend shifting each figure so that they appear closer to (ideally immediately after) its first mention in the text.

[Like](#) 0 [Reply](#) 0 [Share](#)



Preprint

File available

The Effect of a Color Tattoo on the Local Skin Redox Regulatory Network: An N-of-1 Study

May 2020

DOI: [10.20944/preprints202006.0166.v2](https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202006.0166.v2)

License · [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Published version · [The effect of a color tattoo on the local skin redox regulatory network: an N-of-1 study](#)

Jan Homolak



[Yolanda Hedberg](#)

added a comment

Jun 30, 2020

Interesting! Do you know whether the samples included traces of the tattoo ink itself? Do you know which pigment(s) the blue tattoo consisted of? These might also contribute to the redox chemistry.

[Recommended](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)

1 Reply · 1 Recommendation



[Ines Schreiver](#)

added a comment

Jul 14, 2020

Dear Jan,

thank you for sharing this interesting study!

Since the ORP measurements are conducted on the skin surface, they might be influenced by the microorganisms on the skin. My question would be how old the tattoo was and if you used a special creme / sunblocker for this area?



The redox measurements with capillary fluid came as a surprise to me. The pigments are enclosed in skin cells and therefore likely not in direct contact to the fluid. It is currently discussed that the tattoo pigments may protect cells in the lower dermis from sun induced damage. Have you been in the sun (even for a short time) a few days before the measurements? If you extend your study, it would be interesting to protect the skin from light or opposite.

for the color: the lighter parts of your tattoo may also consist of titanium dioxide (white pigment) mixed with Cu-Phthalocyanine to generate light-blue ink


kind regards, Ines

[Recommended](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)

2 Recommendations



Prednosti



Feedback



Three hand-drawn faces are arranged horizontally below the word 'Feedback'. From left to right: a sad face with a downward-curving mouth, a neutral face with a straight horizontal line for a mouth, and a happy face with an upward-curving smile.



Figure 1: The most common approach taken by journals, in which only those experiments yielding positive results end up as publication material.



Figure 2: A more neutral approach, in which all results are published, as long as they are generated by well-carried out experiments based on sound hypotheses.



New Negatives in Plant Science

Open access

Articles & Issues ▾

🔍 Search in this journal

Latest issue

Volumes 3–4

August–December 2016

About the journal

Title discontinued as of 2017;


Journal of Articles in Support of the Null Hypothesis



[INDEX](#) [ABOUT](#) [MANUSCRIPT
SUBMISSION](#) [REVIEWER
SUBMISSION](#) [EDITORIAL
BOARD](#) [CONTACT](#)

Welcome to the *Journal of Articles in Support of the Null Hypothesis*. In the past other journals and reviewers have exhibited a bias against articles that did not reject the null hypothesis. We seek to change that by offering an outlet for experiments that do not reach the traditional significance levels ($p < .05$). Thus, reducing the file drawer problem, and reducing the bias in psychological literature. Without such a resource researchers could be wasting their time examining empirical questions that have already been examined. We collect these articles and provide them to the scientific community free of cost.

Predviđanja



communication: No one means supplies all the needs; each has its excellences and its shortcomings in comparison with each of the others. If there is a heierarchy or pecking-order of indispensableness, journals are at the top.

Admittedly, journals do not provide either the speed or the medium for back and forth discussion that IEG memos do, but journals have always had and still have the option of doing so. They recognize that speed is desirable and seek to increase it, but not at the expense of scientific standards. They recognize the desirability of

Magazine | Editorial

Peer Review: Implementing a "publish, then review" model of publishing

From July 2021 eLife will only review manuscripts already published as preprints, and will focus its editorial process on producing public reviews to be posted alongside the preprints.

[Home](#) » [Browse](#) » [Effect of in-office bleaching agent on the surface roughness and microhardness...](#)

Check for updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE

REVISED

Effect of in-office bleaching agent on the surface roughness and microhardness of nanofilled and nanohybrid composite resins [version 2; peer review: 1 approved, 1 approved with reservations]

Previous title 'Effect of vital bleaching on surface roughness and microhardness of nanofilled and nanohybrid composite resins'

Anindita Chakraborty¹, Tina Purayil ¹, Kishore Ginjupalli², Kalyana-Chakravarthy Pentapati ³, Neetha Shenoy¹

[Author details](#)



This article is included in the [Manipal Academy of Higher Education gateway](#).

Abstract

Background: To compare the surface roughness and microhardness of Ceram.x® SphereTEC™ one and Filtek Z350 XT after in-office bleaching with Pola office.

Methods: Twenty samples each of (10 mm diameter and 2 mm height) Ceram.x® SphereTEC™ one and Filtek Z350 XT were prepared. The samples were subjected to three bleaching sessions with 35% hydrogen peroxide (Pola office) with a seven-day interval between each session. Surface roughness and microhardness of the prepared samples prior to and after the bleaching regimen were measured using a profilometer and Vickers hardness tester, respectively.

Results: A significant reduction ($p < 0.001$) in the surface hardness of Filtek Z350 XT from 27.67 ± 2.10 to 17.83 ± 1.36 Vickers hardness number (VHN) was observed after the bleaching whereas no significant reduction in surface hardness was observed with Ceram.x® SphereTEC™ one. The adjusted mean (estimated marginal mean) microhardness after

ALL METRICS

306

VIEWS

29

DOWNLOADS

Get PDF

Get XML

Cite

Export

Track

Share

Open Peer Review

Reviewer Status



Reviewer Reports

	Invited Reviewers	
	1	2
Version 2 (revision) 18 May 23	 read	
Version 1 02 Feb 23	 read	 read

1. **Rama Krishna Alla** , Vishnu Dental College, Bhimavaram, India
2. **Osiro Olivia Millicent Awino** , University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya








Comments on this article

All Comments (0)

[Add a comment](#)

The Effect of Acute Oral Galactose Administration on the Redox System of the Rat Small Intestine

Antioxidants **2022**, *11*(1), 37; <https://doi.org/10.3390/antiox11010037> **IF: 7.675 Q1**

by Jan Homolak ^{1,2,*} , Ana Babic Perhoc ^{1,2} , Ana Knezovic ^{1,2} , Jelena Osmanovic Barilar ^{1,2} , Davor Virag ^{1,2} , Mihovil Joja ^{1,2}  and Melita Salkovic-Petrisic ^{1,2} 

Reviewer 1: Anonymous

Reviewer 2: Anonymous

Antioxidants **2022**, *11*(1), 37; <https://doi.org/10.3390/antiox11010037> **IF: 7.675 Q1**

Received: 20 November 2021 / Revised: 22 December 2021 / Accepted: 22 December 2021 / Published: 24 December 2021
(This article belongs to the Special Issue Efficacy of Dietary Molecules in the Modulation of Redox Homeostasis of Rodent Models)

Round 1

Reviewer 1 Report

The subject of the manuscript is very interesting and is within the scope of the Journal. There is a strong need to understand the mechanism of action of galactose towards free radicals generation, and to reveal differences in the biological effects between parenteral and oral administration of that substance. Below are my recommendations to improve the manuscript:


1. The Introduction part is too long and should be shortened. Moreover, sometimes it is hard to understand in what conditions galactose acts as OS stimulant, and when it provides beneficial effects to cognitive functions. It must be clearly stated (like in the Abstract), that chronic parenteral galactose administration triggers OS, and oral administration provides beneficial effects to the body.
2. Did the Authors obtain the approval of the appropriate ethic committee?
3. The Authors wrote that studies on the role of galactose in animals are biased and their scientific value may be low. But, going through the manuscript I do not see any information how many repetitions of each measurement were performed. How can we be sure that these results are reliable and reproducible?
4. line 633 - "The intestine is the primary organ for food digestion, absorption, and metabolism". Rather, the first organ involved in digestion is the stomach, not the intestine.
5. In general, both parts Results and also Discussion, are too extensive, and it is difficult to understand what the research actually shows. Please make it more concise and provide only the most important information resulting from the conducted research.



Jan Homolak ✓

University of Zagreb

 Edit

 Web of Science ResearcherID:
M-5668-2015

Other Identifiers

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1508-3243>

Documents

Peer Review

 Manage

Verified peer reviews

- 2 [International Journal of Molecular Sciences](#)
- 1 [Applied Computing and Informatics](#)
- 1 [Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences](#)
- 1 [Drug Research](#)
- 1 [Journal of Clinical Medicine](#)

VIEWING 5 COMBINED AUTHOR RECORDS

Homolak, Jan This is an algorithmically generated author record ⓘ

University of Zagreb

Sch Med

ZAGREB, CROATIA

Published names	Homolak, Jan	Homolak, J.	Homoalak, Jan
Published Organizations	University of Zagreb, Sch Med		
Subject Categories	Neurosciences & Neurology; Biochemistry & Molecular Biology; Pharmacology & Pharmacy; Computer Science; Endocrinology & Metabolism		

 Web of Science ResearcherID: DUL-5236-2022

Documents

Author Impact Beamplot

51 Documents

Verify your Author Record

Get your own verified author record. Enter your name in Author Search, then click "Claim My Record" on your author record page.

[Go to author search](#)

Metrics

Profile summary

51	Total documents
37	Web of Science Core Collection publications
14	Preprints

Web of Science Core Collection metrics



7	37
H-Index	Total Publications
218	186
Sum of Times Cited	Citing Articles



[View citation report](#)

Home / Publications

Unexpected detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in the prepandemic period in Italy

Tumori Journal (2021) - 9 Comments

doi: 10.1177/0300891620974755  IF: 2.149  issn: 0300-8916 issn: 2038-2529 pubmed: 33176598

Giovanni Apolone , Emanuele Montomoli, Alessandro Manenti, Mattia Boeri, Federica Sabia, Inesa Hyseni, Livia Mazzini, Donata Martinuzzi, Laura Cantone, Gianluca Milanese, Stefano Sestini, Paola Suatoni, Alfonso Marchianò, Valentina Bollati, Gabriella Sozzi , Ugo Pastorino

 Go to article

 Get alerts for new activity

 Authors emails

#3 Jan Homolak commented November 2020

The conclusions are based on the results obtained by means of RBD-based ELISA developed in-house. Authors state "In our preliminary study, an excellent correlation between the neutralization titer and the IgG, IgM, and immunoglobulin A ELISA response against the RBD of the S-protein was observed,4 confirming that the RBD-based ELISA can be used as a valid surrogate for neutralization". However, reference [4] is their non-peer review article published on bioRxiv. A cursory look at the preprinted manuscript reveals serious potential flaws. E.g. cross-reactivity with other coronaviruses has not been evaluated [?]. Furthermore, insufficient details related to the methodology are provided ("data not shown"). On top of that, even (most likely) unrealistic data related to the sensitivity and specificity of the assay, when used in the setting described in the original article (retrospective analysis of samples from before the pandemic) with prevalence not set to ~10% as shown in the article would yield erroneous results. Even a very unrealistic assumption of 1% disease prevalence gives the positive predictive value of 31,45% [CI 6,04 - 76,60%]. Although the idea of the manuscript is interesting, severe methodological flaws are evident, and the fact that authors based their conclusions on the presented data is unscientific at best, especially considering the consequences of communicating such highly uncertain findings with the wider audience.

 report  permalink

Reply



> Tumori. 2021 Oct;107(5):446-451. doi: 10.1177/0300891620974755^(*) IF: 2.149 Q4 .

Epub 2020 Nov 11.

Unexpected detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in the prepandemic period in Italy

Giovanni Apolone ¹, Emanuele Montomoli ^{2 3}, Alessandro Manenti ^{3 4}, Mattia Boeri ¹,
Federica Sabia ¹, Inesa Hyseni ⁴, Livia Mazzini ^{2 4}, Donata Martinuzzi ⁴, Laura Cantone ⁵,
Gianluca Milanese ⁶, Stefano Sestini ¹, Paola Suatoni ¹, Alfonso Marchianò ¹, Valentina Bollati ⁵,
Gabriella Sozzi ¹, Ugo Pastorino ¹

Affiliations + expand

PMID: 33176598^(*) IF: 2.149 Q4



This article has an expression of concern and there are 9 comments on PubPeer (by: Hebeloma Saliciphilum, Fridtjof Lund-Johansen, Jan Homolak, Marin, Grevillea Oleoides, Gymnosporangium Ellisii, Luyue Zhao)

PMCID: PMC8529295^(*) IF: 2.149 Q4 DOI: 10.1177/0300891620974755^(*) IF: 2.149 Q4

[Free PMC article](#)

Abstract

There are no robust data on the real onset of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection and spread in the prepandemic period worldwide. We investigated the presence of

FULL TEXT LINKS

Sage Journals
Open access full text

FREE Full text 

ACTIONS

 **Cite**

 **Collections**

SHARE



PAGE NAVIGATION

< Title & authors

Abstract

Preprintanje: predrasude, predbacivanja, prednosti, predviđanja

Jan Homolak

homolakjan@gmail.com | @JanHomolak

