If you are reading this newsletter for the first time, please visit the ABOUT section on the WIKISTIM home page. This section describes WIKISTIM’s unique resources and is accessible without registration.

NEW FEATURE
In our effort to increase the depth of the content on WIKISTIM, we have begun to add data that we collected from SCS reports for evidence tables created before WIKISTIM datasheets were available. These tables were not as comprehensive as the WIKISTIM datasheets but nevertheless provide valuable information that we can present without waiting until we have the time to hyper-abstract the articles in question completely. To see which datasheets are partially completed, click on “Status” on the right-hand side of the heading of the list of SCS searchable papers. “Partial” will appear, followed by “Completed.”

INVITED TALKS
Medical Device Innovation Consortium
On January 8th, we were invited to present WIKISTIM to the MDIC Neurostimulation Group meeting at the FDA. One of the questions we fielded was about copyrights and plagiarism. We pointed out that the data we include in our datasheets from published reports are the same types of data that have long been published in evidence tables in review articles. We are careful to indicate direct quotes appropriately, and by its nature, all of our work is properly cited. All of this falls within permitted educational use of published information.

North American Neuromodulation Society and Neural Interfaces Conference Joint Meeting
We are pleased to report that we will present a session on “Maximizing the Value of Neural Interface Data” at the NANS2/NIC conference in June in our hometown, Baltimore.

The goal of the session will be to explain how the way something is reported predicts what will be reported and to demonstrate that by presenting a better way to conduct studies and publish data, WIKISTIM will be a positive influence on the quality of the data that will be published as well as on the way these data are analyzed in relation to the findings of other neural interface studies.

We plan to address the following:
- What shortcomings exist with current peer-reviewed publication and meta-analysis paradigms;
• How the neural interface research community can work collaboratively using WIKISTIM to improve 1) study design (resulting in more rigorous, useful, and robust methods of gathering data) and 2) the research reports that present these data (resulting in more thorough reporting);

• How WIKISTIM can extend the useful life of neural interface research data and make these findings immediately accessible and easy to analyze and visualize in light of other reported data (that is, shape research findings to enhance them, preserve them, and make them more widely and easily evident and accessible); and

• Why the neural interface research community is uniquely positioned to benefit from and shape the future of the WIKISTIM model

INTERESTING IDEAS ABOUT THE FUTURE OF ACADEMIC PUBLISHING

In Academic Journals: The Most Profitable Obsolete Technology in History, Jason Schmitt of SAS Confidential claims that

A better approach to academic publishing is to cut out the whole notion of publishing. We don’t really need journals as traditionally conceived. The primary role of traditional journals is to provide peer review and for that you don’t need a physical journal—you just need an editorial board and an editorial process.

In her synopsis (published in The Guardian on 4 April 2015) of a roundtable debate (After 350 Years of Academic Journals It’s Time to Shake Things Up), Anna Gielas noted Stuart Taylor, the Publishing Director at the Royal Society, raised a more fundamental question about what we expect scientific authors to do. ‘Authors still create journals in prose-style — do we really need to produce all that text?’ Taylor wondered if the traditional formats were still appropriate for presenting scientific results in the internet age. Taylor’s suggestion that the standard structure of a scientific article might be out-of-date met with some approval — and some scepticism. Could researchers sustain a coherent argument without prose?

In an Op-Ed entitled, In the Digital Age, Science Publishing Needs an Upgrade, Daniel Marovitz, CEO of Faculty of 1000, made these comments:

...many perfectly sound articles are rejected, articles take too long to be published, and most articles are published with conclusions, but without the data that supports them. Enough data should be shared by authors to ensure that anyone can replicate their research efforts and achieve similar results...

Science is different. Many journals check not only whether they think the work is well executed, but also if they think it is interesting or important. Whether it is interesting is necessarily a subjective judgment based on the editor's own (sometimes quirky or narrow) interests, and it is almost impossible to know immediately how important a new discovery really is. . . .

Journals and editors should simply determine whether something is legitimate science, and if so, it should hit the website immediately, serving the interests of science, scientists and the public at large. Journals should disseminate all the science they can and let the scientific community openly debate and discuss it — let them sort the wheat from the chaff over time.
After a meeting on *The Future of Scientific Publishing in the Electronic Age*, published in Science Editor, 25(5):155, 2002, Debra A. Wong noted that Michael Mabe, of Elsevier Science... introduced a behavioral-functional model that may be used as a predictive tool for developing journals and their functions—registration, dissemination, archiving information, and certification... [Mabe went on to argue that] ‘Authors wish to publish more, increase dissemination, and have access to competitive networks; readers want to read less but also want to obtain high-quality information.’

**CURRENT STATUS**
Our 4 new subscribers in January increased our total to 307. Please continue to encourage your colleagues to register for access to our free resource.

January 1st numbers (These numbers might not add up from month to month as we delete duplicates. See appendix below for list of new citations.)

- 307 subscribers (4 new)
- SCS citations 1864 (16 new)
- DBS citations 1671 (26 new)
- SNS citations 753 (8 new)
- PNS citations 26 (list remains preliminary)
- DRG citations 31 (0 new)
- GES citations 469 (0 new)

**CONTINUING PLANS FOR THE FUTURE**

- Encourage people to earn CME credits by filling in datasheets
- Transform our datasheets into forms that can be completed online easily
- Include additional sections, with VNS next in line
- Optimize performance on various platforms (screen sizes, browser types, etc.)
- Create forms for online data submission, with easy checkboxes when applicable
- Link data fields to additional information (e.g., descriptions and preferred uses of study designs and outcome criteria, authors’ CVs, etc.)
- Incorporate cutting edge data visualization graphics that will update immediately as data are extrapolated from papers and uploaded
- Offer a dynamic user experience, including the ability to save searches and customize the way the site behaves
- Secure continued funding
- Continue to make quality improvements

**HOW THE NEUROSTIMULATION COMMUNITY CAN HELP**

- Submit extracted data from published reports of your choice, or use our datasheets as a guide when you plan your study and write your paper, and then submit the datasheet to us upon journal acceptance.
- Notify us about any reports we might have missed that contain primary data on SCS, SNS, DRG, PNS, GES, DBS/OCD, DBS/Epilepsy, or reports you would like to see added for DBS/PD.
- Suggest website improvements (and thanks to those who have done this—we have incorporated your suggestions to the best of our ability).

**FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR 2015 to 2016**
(Listed alphabetically by first name):
• B. Todd Sitzman, MD, MPH
• Greatbatch
• Medtronic
• The NANS Foundation (3-year grant commitment started 2014)
• NEVRO
• Richard B. North, MD
• Thomas Abell, MD

Ongoing in-kind support:
• The International Neuromodulation Society (publicity and conference registration)
• The Neuromodulation Foundation (parent non-profit, overhead and development)
• The North American Neuromodulation Society (publicity and conference registration)

EDITORIAL BOARD
Editor-in-chief
Richard B. North, MD

Section editors
Thomas Abell, MD, Gastric Electrical Stimulation
Tracy Cameron, PhD, Peripheral Nerve Stimulation
Roger Dmochowski, MD, Sacral Nerve Stimulation
Robert Foreman, MD, PhD, Co-editor Experimental Studies
Elliot Krames, MD, Dorsal Root Ganglion Stimulation
Bengt Linderoth, MD, PhD, Co-editor Experimental Studies
Richard B. North, MD, Spinal Cord Stimulation
B. Todd Sitzman, MD, MPH, At Large
Konstantin Slavin, MD, Deep Brain Stimulation
Kristl Vonck, MD, PhD, Section on DBS for Epilepsy
To be determined, Vagus Nerve Stimulation

Managing editor
Jane Shipley

Disclosure
WIKISTIM includes citations for indications that are or might be considered off-label in the United States.

Contact
The Neuromodulation Foundation, Inc.
117 East 25th Street
Baltimore, MD 21218
wikistim@gmail.com
wikistim.org
neuromodfound.org

Appendix: Citations added January 28, 2016

DBS-PD (we continue to add older DBS citations that we passed over in our initial list)
17. Senova S, Hosomi K, Guruchag JM, Gouello G, Quercetani N, Beaugendre Y, Lepetit H,


DBS OCD

DBS Epilepsy

2. Sobayo T, Mogul DJ. Should stimulation parameters be individualized to stop seizures: evidence in support of this approach. Epilepsia 2016 57(1):131-140 PUBMED


SCS

2. Buonocore M, Demartini L. Inhibition of somatosensory evoked potentials during different modalities of spinal cord stimulation: a case report. Neuromodulation 2016 epub PUBMED


2. Marinkovic SP, Miller B, Hughes S, Marinkovic C, Gillen L. Successful bilateral pudendal neuromodulation to treat male detrusor areflexia following severe pubic symphysis fracture, a case report. BMC Urol 2015 epub PUBMED