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What a spectacular year for ISMTE! Let’s take a look at the numbers: our membership for 2014 was 473 members, including 178 international members. Over 200 members participated in our North American and European conferences. Four new local groups became active in 2014 in Chicago, Boston, Washington, D.C., and Philadelphia. And ISMTE has launched a new initiative to have three meetings on three continents in three years! But enough with the numbers—we’re better with words, right?

Were you unable to attend the European conference this year? Read Mariel Radlwimmer’s conference summary to find out what you missed.

Richard Wynne and Alison O’Connell from Aries Systems discuss the challenges publishers have when disseminating information to end users in “Standards and the Scholarly Publishing Ecosystem.” This article presents several examples of how standards can be used to solve these problems.

It’s not too early to start thinking about submitting a poster for the 2015 conferences! Proposals can be submitted online before March 1, 2015. The ISMTE membership approved the 2015 slate for Board officers and directors. Find this year’s ISMTE Leadership list on page two. Congratulations to all!

Diana Epstein reports on a workshop session held at the European conference on overuse of reviewers and finding new reviewers. Read on to learn what questions were asked, how they were answered, and take home some tips for retaining reviewers.

The influx of digital offerings seems never-ending, but how can you determine what is most useful to your Editorial Office and your readership? Kerry O'Rourke writes about the October Doody’s Digital
Workshop where experts shared best practices for how to connect end users with the content they need in the format they want.

Finally, Mel Wincott tells her story of how she ended up in academic publishing.

I hope this issue encourages you to reflect on the great strides the ISMTE has made in such a short time and gets you off to a great start for 2015. Happy reading!

The ISMTE would also like to welcome new members to our Industry Advisory Board!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Alves</td>
<td>Director of Product Management, Aries Systems Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Binfield, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Co-Founder and Publisher, PeerJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morna Conway, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Morna Conway, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Hames, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Editorial and Publishing Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Monturano</td>
<td>Publisher, Elsevier Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Trowbridge</td>
<td>Publications Division, American Chemical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Waters</td>
<td>Global Journal Content Management Director, Wiley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Musser</td>
<td>Journal Sales Representative at The Sheridan Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Samulack</td>
<td>President, U.S. Operations at Cactus Communications, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Spurlock</td>
<td>Research Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ISMTE membership voted to approve the slate of directors and officers of the Board for 2015. Congratulations to both newly elected and returning members!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Kristie Overstreet</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President-Elect</td>
<td>Michael Willis</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Julie Nash</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Sally Gainsbury</td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Deborah Bowman</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Jan Higgins</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Alice Ellingham</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Meg Wiest</td>
<td>2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Diana Epstein</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Sherryl Sundell</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Meghan McDevitt</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Mentor (ad hoc; non-voting)</td>
<td>Elizabeth Blalock</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What a get-together! Lively, informative, very well organized and all that in the setting of exciting London! Let me extend a big Thank You! to the organizers, as well as the speakers, who offered a chance to learn, network, and enjoy ourselves so much. In the following article I attempt to share the abundance of information and convivial communication offered to the participants.

On Tuesday, 14th October 2014, the 7th European ISMTE Meeting took place at Charles Darwin House in Bloomingdale, London. It boasted the highest ISMTE European meeting attendance so far: 86 participants from all over the world came to Britain’s capital to talk shop, discuss new developments in the editing business, exchange thoughts on new and old ideas, and overall enjoy networking. Many of these attendees also participated in the half-day COPE mini symposium the day before. This was an important meeting, since an editor’s work is informed by ethical guidelines that shape our daily decisions and work procedures and we often look to COPE for guidance.

In the COPE mini symposium, Chris Graf, treasurer with COPE, pointed out in his opening talk on Monday, 13th October, that as the scientific world keeps changing, COPE keeps fine-tuning its work accordingly. Thus, new technologies and their consequences regarding different options within peer-review and publishing compel us to take fresh looks into working procedures and ethical questions, especially if one does not only want to adjust to symptoms but also to the changes’ roots and causes. The declared goal of COPE is to share and crystallize the debate around causes and symptoms of the (n)ever-changing relationship of science and publishing. Thus, ethical questions regarding authorship, peer-review concepts, disclosures, retractions, etc., will keep the community busy. White papers shall focus on particularly urgent subjects. Newly established, monthly “ask COPE meetings” (dates and times on COPE’s webpage under “events”) are available to COPE members where Council members will reply to publication ethics related questions in real time via their webinar facility.

Invited guest speaker Josh Brown (Communications Manager, ORCID EU) picked one of these timely subjects and made his case for the advantages of the persistent, disambiguating identifier ORCID for authors and reviewers. In the two years since its launch, nearly one million IDs were issued and form a straightforward basis for valuable data governance. Ideally, this form of data integration connects publisher DOIs, professional associations, employers, scientific institutions, funders, and repositories, thus rendering all these data useful. And since ORCID is a non-profit venture, registry is free and stored data are safe and cannot be bought by industry. For editors and publishers, a multitude of touch points offer themselves to encourage the use of ORCID as an attempt to counteract, e.g. the freestyling of authors’ names, thus avoiding much confusion.

After tea break, the group split into three breakout sessions which offered the detailed and elaborate discussion of applied cases. Every participant could step into the moccasins of a COPE Council member and attempt an ethical solution to knotty decisions editors had to face.

At the Monday night dinner, between mouth-watering hors d’oeuvres (beef Bresaola, spicy mussels, pecorino cheese), a delicious main course (I picked the pan-fried salmon, perfect!) and the sweet Marsala tiramisu, we had the pleasure to listen to Marc Carden’s (from Naughton Consulting and Mosaic Search and Selection, UK) very entertaining talk about Time is Money: why scholarly communication can never be free. Provocatively
worded: Publishers receive the text, as well as the reviews for free, then why should readers pay money to the publisher for a scientific article? The answer to this was spiced with many jokes and anecdotes; however, the message was clear. The gap existing in scientific publishing (between what is perceived as costing money: Time or Things) can only be bridged if we talk about “value” instead of “cost.” Then, suddenly all becomes clear: the time employees need to do their magic on an article produces added value: availability, readability, maintaining content, attracting content, receiving and evaluating and thus validating content, delivering authority and stability. And that, of course, is why scholarly communication can never be free.

After a warm welcome by Sherryl Sundell (International Journal of Cancer, Germany, European meeting committee chair and ISMTE Board member) the ISMTE meeting was opened on Tuesday morning, 14th October 2014 with the debate, The Impact Factor: Are you for it or against it? Prof. Juan Aréchaga (Department of Cell Biology, The University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Vizcaya, Spain) made the point in favor of the IF. Admitting that the IF can cause severe blunders and is misused at times, he argues that its benefits still outweigh the pitfalls. The scientific community still needs a reliable evaluation factor for sound and timely research publications. Predatory Open Access models water this factor down. If being “technically sound” is enough for a research paper to be published, each reader has to reinvent the wheel, sifting through good and bad science, fighting data overload. However, due to the digitalization of scientific publishing, the focus seems to move from the journal to the individual article, and we are forced to rethink the entire landscape of assessing the quality of publications. In this light Dr. Jason Hoyt argued against the use of an IF. Coming from the Open Access publisher PeerJ, UK, he stresses that the exclusive use of the IF profoundly affects the scientific community as a whole, causing delay in disseminating knowledge, thus taking an economic toll both on further research and the application of these results. Shouldn’t we rather support the speedy publication of high-quality manuscripts, making them accessible for all scientists? And of course, the credibility of a journal (Open Access or not) demands high quality standards in spite of all the hype. However, even after a lively Q&A session, common ground was only found in stressing the importance of thorough and rigorous peer review.

Showing that The Business of Editing is not for the faint of heart, Wendy Moore (Journal Editorial Services, UK) then took us into the world of becoming a senior partner in your own company. She walked out of the shadow of big companies, with sound knowledge of a most diverse market and armed with multiple skills. The combination of a comprehensive business plan (what does your start-up have to offer to the world of publishing, are you abreast of the trends in this business, how do you plan to translate that into real life), a functioning social network, and the stout will to learn and adapt, she mastered the bumps on the road to her own, very successful, company.

After a short break for beverages and very tasty bite-sized pastries, the remaining part of the morning was spent attending concurrent sessions. Since these were repeated twice it was possible to attend two of the five options.

In the first breakout session, Ashmita Das (strategy advisor with Editage, UK) invited us into the world of Managing Content. Since a lot of novel, ground-breaking, and exciting scientific work happens in countries where English is not the native tongue, Editage aims, on one hand, to ease these authors’ (language-related) workload and add value to their work in the English-speaking scientific community. On the other hand, a well-edited manuscript also decreases the workload for the journal and its reviewers. Authors usually submit their manuscript either prior to submission to a journal or after a reject decision. (At what point is editing the most effective? This question was found to make a great research topic and should be explored.) Editage uses COEs (centers of excellence) to distribute the documents to suitable editors (subject matter experts and/or language experts). The focus is on consistently high-quality edits, which is assured not only by standardization for structure, semantics, and flow of text, but also through communication between author and editor, as well as a subsequent rating of the editor. Language editing services promote an efficient,
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interlocked workflow between authors, the editing service provider, and journals with the aim to advance and promote speedy scientific publishing.

Elaborating on the topic from the last plenary session, Lou Whelan from The Journal Office, UK, offered insights into **Contracting**, or how to be a successful freelancer in the world of scientific publishing. Make time for the kids, walking the dog any time of the day, working from Nice or in your PJs, are but some of the perks when working out of your own home. Drawbacks, however, threaten this peaceful image. How to not get lonely and, even more crucial, how to stay competitive when working in your home’s isolation? How to not be discouraged by looming taxes, and always being on call for everything? The answers include putting the focus on developing a network, embracing the benefits, setting priorities (customer service first, outsource what you can) and keep expanding your business world.

In the third very interesting session, Kristie Overstreet (senior partner of Origin Editorial, USA, and the current president of ISMTE) shared her insights about **Working in the Cloud** professionally. Due to technological advances it is no longer necessary to be in the same place in order to work together. So, if you belong to the group of people who do not necessarily need the physical presence of colleagues, recruiting or joining a virtual team for editorial work has many advantages (We remember J: working in PJs, be there for the kids, walking the dog during the day). However, two major risk zones need to be recognized, and to keep an eye on both is definitely worth your while. First, data safety: how to safely share your files often containing confidential information? Fortunately, the internet offers a multitude of options. However, you have to rigorously search for the product best fitting your own needs (from clouds to Dropbox, etc.) and test it! Second, team spirit: even though you work from your own home (or a sunny beach somewhere) you work within a team. Time and effort has to go into finding and training team members, keeping your team on the same page, and making sure all team members feel as an appreciated part of the team. The magic words are “communicate, communicate, and communicate!” Touch base regularly via email, phone, video conference, instant messaging, skype, or perhaps even a group-internal newsletter. Don’t feel shy to use the word “team” for emphasis. Foster the team spirit by providing regular opportunities for discussion and offering further education. Also, share responsibilities with team members regarding *e.g.*, reporting statistics to the editor or publisher to boost the sense of “ownership.” To have fun together also creates a sense of belonging, be creative and come up with ideas for virtual parties or games. Above all, enjoy and make use of the diversity of your team.

Even for the most effective editorial team (virtual or physically in one space), the retraction of published articles is not just cumbersome but also harmful to the credibility of the involved scientists and reliability of the involved journals, as well as potentially endangering the public well-being. Counteracting the rising number of retractions gains evermore importance. How then do we
approach issues such as COI problems, plagiarism (text), and image manipulation? The title of Michael Willis’ (from Wiley, UK, and President-Elect of ISMTE) presentation states the obvious: Prevention is Better Than Retraction. The principal answer for every journal involves developing and implementing clear policies on the subject. Ask (and answer) some key questions: What do you deem to be a conflict of interest, what should the authors disclose? Which parts of this disclosure do you publish? When and how do you check for plagiarism or image manipulation? What are the consequences if authors don’t declare a conflict of interest (even though they should have) or commit plagiarism? Support for finding answers can be had through numerous venues, among them the COPE guidelines (http://publication-ethics.org/), and websites showing examples of editorial policies (http://exchanges.wiley.com/ethicsguidelines; www.plosone.org/static/editorial; www.icmje.org/conflicts-of-interest; www.crossref.org/). The developed policies then will have to be communicated to the authors/scientific community effectively. How do we educate authors in these matters? There is always room to improve.

In the last, but not least small group session before lunch, Leighton Chipperfield (Director of Publishing at the Society for General Microbiology, UK) explored the comprehensive field of Managing Change. New technological options, involvement of social media and competition drive economic, political and legal changes. Even though change is cumbersome and work intense, freely adapting “Change is difficult. Not changing is fatal,” he stresses the necessity of using change as a motivator to create progress. Two successful case studies served as examples: 1. SGM established external Editorial Office support and 2. implemented an online submission system. Since then submissions are up, just as the Impact Factor and the Reject rates. But it is not all numbers: more positive upshots are the continuity of service through partnerships, improved communication with the authors, and eventually the launching of another journal. In summary, when change looks your way, create a plan; play your own strengths, outsource the rest; think hard about unintended consequences, identify the risks and plan for them; determine how to measure success, and de-brief the team. All the while remember the goal, maintain continuity and communicate.

Lunch then offered a welcome break to rest the brain and fill the stomach from a plethora of tempting sandwiches: appetizing, triangular, and for all tastes. For desert we enjoyed colorful and sweet skewered fruit kabobs.
After everybody was well fed, Kristie Overstreet gave us a Society Update. ISMTE’s mission to enhance the professionalism of Editorial Office staff and giving practical and applicable information remains unchanged; its success is visible in the high international attendance rate at this meeting and the growing number of members (433 and rising). Corporate support and sponsoring translates into members enjoying many benefits. Collaborations with EASE, COPE, the EQUATOR network, and Advocacy Chicago Collaboration enrich and supplement the society. The community of Editorial Office professionals connects through many channels, among them Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, local groups, and of course with the help of EON. In the conference packet, the attendees were presented with a printed version of EON containing a collection of selected articles from past EON newsletters.

What’s new at ISMTE? We have a new interactive website, a new management company, APEX, weekly update emails to members, EON Collection in print which was exhibited at the CSE conference, a vice president role, a board structure that has been renewed, a new strategic plan for three meetings on three continents in three years, COI policy, new meeting locations (Philadelphia, London; the location for the 2015 European meeting is still to be chosen), and an awards committee.

The call goes out to anyone who is not yet a member — do sign up, get involved through Twitter, mention ISMTE on your Facebook page, present at future meetings, write for EON, volunteer for a committee or participate in the discussion forum.

During breaks, coffee or tea in hand, the attendees had the opportunity to check out the 10 submissions to the poster session. You can view this year’s posters online at www.ismte.org/?page=2014Posters&hhSearchTerms=%22poster%22.

Julie Nash (Senior Partner, J&J Editorial, USA and Vice President of ISMTE) presented the winning poster 2015 “Reformatting Submission Questions Increases the Accuracy of Author-Supplied Information: A Case Study” on behalf of Heather Blasco and Sara Welliver (both Senior Managing Editors from J&J Editorial, USA). Sometimes, as in this case, simple changes can have major impact on your daily work load. Changing the order of provided options for answers to authors’ permission questions produced a drastic decrease in incorrect replies. So it is definitely worth every Editorial Office’s while to carefully consider author and referee communications.

In the next plenary session Michaela Torkar (from F1000, UK) invited us into the world of
Emerging Models of Peer Review. The call for Open Access resounds throughout the scientific world. But of course OA is not necessarily linked to a particular kind of peer-review. However, journals that have adopted an online-only publishing model have in many cases also sought to rethink peer review and make it more transparent. Toeholds are different levels of transparency (double-blinded, single-blinded, or entirely open peer review), the timing of the review process (traditional review before publication, cascading rejected papers with their reviews, or reviewing a manuscript in a public forum after publication, thereby separating the check for novelty/interest and scientific soundness), and changes to the review process itself. If you hold with Nobel laureate Robert Horvitz who says “what is in the paper is fundamentally the responsibility of the authors, not of the reviewers” [from: J Biol 2009; 8:1], it opens the door for creative attempts to revolutionize the peer reviewing landscape. Dr. Torkar presented many examples of how different journals handle the review process in a more open manner. Traditional reviewing ways are, however, poles apart from the peer review process practiced at F1000. As Dr. Torkar states, “here articles are published within days following a basic quality check and peer review (by invited experts) takes place openly after publication.” In her slide show she demonstrated the details how the reviewing process can be followed on-line, showing the reviewers’ names and their reports and showing the different versions of the article up to its final approval. This results in a “living article” “which can be updated as new findings become available, and a rapid publishing process that follows the pace with which new data and results are generated.”

At the heart of scientific publishing lies the peer-review system. Consequently, all six afternoon sessions dealt with peer review from one angle or the other.

Jigisha Patel (from BioMed Central, UK) talked about Openness. Making the publishing process more transparent has two viable avenues: open peer review (single- or double-blinded) and Open Access to the published article. Regardless of whether you grant Open Access to an article or not, however, the process of assessing and judging a manuscript should be transparent, full credit should go to the referees for their effort, and consequently, reviewers as well as editors are more accountable for decisions made. This kind of openness enhances visibility and reusability of scientific articles, makes all stakeholders accountable for their actions and builds trust in solid science. This is the theory so far. After the presentation four scenarios looking at possible pitfalls and trouble spots were debated. For example: How to handle reviews coming back with non-ethical comments; what to do when a referee does not want to have his comments published after all (s/he might have overlooked the small print about open peer review); what to do when a reader found that a referee should have declared a COI; or, what happens if the authors claim that the poor review is from a fierce competitor? And since such cases are as individual as people, no standard response could be given.

In another breakout session, Cate Livingstone (from Wiley-VCH, Germany) spoke about Cascading. The formal transfer of a manuscript submitted to journal A (after a Reject or ed reject decision) to journal B comes in all different forms: as subscription or Open Access cascade, within the same publisher or within a consortium across publishers, with or without reviewers’ reports, with or without standardized scorecards, but always author driven. From supporter journals roughly a third of all rejected manuscripts get referred. Of these only 15% of the authors will accept this offer and request to transfer their paper to the Open Access journal. Across the Wiley Open Access program only half of these transferred papers will eventually get published. Even though transfer across submission systems might be technologically difficult, and some reviewers do not agree to have their reviews transferred or made public, and editors might still ask for additional reviews, overall, the cascading process streamlines the review process, reduces the burden on referees and shortens the time to publication.

All editors working with referees have had the sad experience that not all reviews are created equal encumbering our decision on a submitted manuscript. The lesser problems include reports being incomplete, ignorant, or simply useless. In worse cases we deal with insulting or incriminating reviews. Consequently, we will have to find
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answers to questions regarding who controls what the journal will consider, the process schedule, the reviewer selection, process management, review quality, and publishing decision. Janne-Tuomas Seppänen (from Peerage of Science, Finland) proposes in his talk Score Sheets & Ratings or Is Your Peer Review a Lottery? a new way to handle this problem. A peer-reviewed peer review ensuring quality control, as well as authors who have a say in the final decision on the paper are key to the solution. From the company’s webpage we learn how it works: Authors submit their manuscript to Peerage of Science before submitting to any journal. The submitting author determines the deadlines for the four stages of the process, which are thereafter automatically enforced. Once submitted, any qualified non-affiliated Peer can engage to review the manuscript. Peer reviews are themselves peer reviewed, increasing and quantifying the quality of peer review. The peer-review process is available concurrently to all subscribing journals, with automated event tracking. Authors may accept a direct publishing offer from a subscribing journal or choose to export the peer reviews to any journal of their choice.

Peter Hall from the Journal of Pathology (Belfast, UK) opened his session Handling Author Suggestions (ethical implications) to the forum with questions. Should we encourage authors to have preferences regarding preferred or non-preferred referees? And if so, what caveats and provisions do we need to take into account? Perhaps one should ask authors to give reasons for their choices. And perhaps this requirement should be anchored in the author guidelines that also state the obvious: to not choose as preferred referee someone who has an obvious conflict of interest (such as being from the same institute or a previous co-worker or even supervisor). Paradoxically, preferred reviewers can submit the harshest reviews, while non-preferred referees can be very supportive. Each journal will have to find a way to monitor this since using suggested referees (even non-preferred) can of course be very helpful.

Diana Epstein from Di-Ep Biomedical Editorial Services Ltd (Glasgow, UK) took a closer look at the referees themselves and spoke about
the Overuse of Reviewers and Finding New Ones. Since peer reviewers can have an enormous influence on the careers of researchers in regards to jobs, promotion, and funding, we have to pay close attention to how we handle review issues. The pool of experts is limited. And the flood of submissions leads to a flood of reviewer invitations. To counteract acute reviewer-fatigue a couple of things can be considered. Editors should be aware of the reasons scientists review and of their loyalty to the process since they are also peers, experts, and authors. Reviewers want to be appreciated for their effort and work. This does not necessarily mean they want to be paid. Acknowledgement, however, is indispensable. Different journals try out different models for peer review: traditional peer-review with a closed or open pool or new concepts that promise more transparency of the process. All review processes, however, share the need for a database with reliable information where updates are tantamount. When thanking your reviewer also ask for an update of their keywords and classifications. When entering a new reviewer into their database journals need to run checks such as: suitability and expertise as reviewer; possible conflicts of interest. Are the contact details legitimate, do these individuals even exist? As one option to search for appropriate referees, Ms. Epstein introduced the website http://www.biosemantics.org/jane/ (JANE – Journal Author Name Estimator). The bottom line, however, remains: Do not overload your reviewers!

In her talk, System Possibilities for Different Peer Review Models, Anna Jester from eJournalPress (USA) explained all different kinds of options for peer review as used today. Foremost we find the traditional versions of single blind or double blind peer review (some journals offer authors the option to choose between single- and double-blind). Many journals ask authors to suggest editors and/or reviewers (preferred and non-preferred). Certain fields in science call for statistical reviews. New technologies allow reviewers all over the world to participate in consulting sessions, providing feedback about the decision letter. Triaging helps to reduce the load of papers to go out for review by identifying those papers that will be directly rejected because they do not fit the scope of the journal they were submitted to. Transferring and cascading also represent attempts to streamline the reviewing process. More transparency is being called for and many young journals and editing businesses set out to use open or transparent review strategies. This means readers have access to the article, including its evaluation in the form of reviews, sometimes also the decision letter and other pertinent comments. Some journals also publish the referee’s name alongside the reviews; some don’t, thus keeping the principle of anonymity of the referee. Ms. Jester also presented the concept of Rubriq peer review, an author-pays model with standardized score cards offering visible pre-publication history. Overall, the landscape of peer review shows huge diversity, evolving around varying degrees of transparency, in order to provide fair and speedy evaluation of scientific research.

In summary, the day was chockfull of information about the business of editing, old and new ways to handle peer review, and enjoyable networking. I am much looking forward to the next meeting in 2015 and hope to see many of you there again.
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By Richard Wynne (http://orcid.org/0000-002-9217-0407) and Alison O’Connell (http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9032-3983)
Aries Systems

Well, that’s probably the world’s most boring title for an article—maybe I should have entitled it “Five things you need to know about sex and food that can keep you healthy while watching sports on TV”! But, if you’re still reading, I’m impressed, and I hope that you’re rewarded with some useful insights, even if I stick to the subject of standards in publishing.

The Scholarly Publishing Ecosystem
A couple of months ago, I was invited to give a presentation at a workshop attended by librarians. One of my slides illustrated the main steps in manuscript workflows, including the use of vendors to create structured XML from author manuscript files and compose first page proofs. One of the librarians, in all sincerity, asked me, “What is that, and why do publishers want to do that?” Naturally, I explained, and the librarian was enlightened and grateful.

I tell this story because it illustrates how ignorant most journal users and buyers are about the supply chain that delivers the manuscript to their eyeballs. It takes a global ecosystem of organizations and services to create the final product. Kent Anderson of the Scholarly Kitchen publishes and updates a useful list of functions publishers perform.¹ Many of these steps are complex and require coordination between multiple independent organizations and systems, each with a particular specialty.

But here’s the problem: while the scholarly publishing ecosystem thrives with pockets of rich innovation, it is hugely inefficient when it comes to the transfer of data and content. Frequently, data has to be rekeyed, time is lost by incompatible transfers, and users (including authors) become frustrated because they are bounced between different systems. There is way too much friction.

One solution to the problem might be to build one big publishing system that everyone uses. Believe it or not, there are several organizations that actually plan to do this. To them, I say: good luck.

Personally, I prefer a vision for the future where multiple independent organizations compete and innovate in specialized areas, but where they are nevertheless able to efficiently cooperate to serve authors and readers. Agreeing upon data standards makes this integration possible and removes the friction.

Fortunately for us, we are working at a time when viable data standards have emerged and are about to transform the scholarly publishing industry. As publishing professionals, we should understand and ride this wave.

To help illustrate the impact and potential of standards, I discuss three use cases that show how standards are being used to solve real-life pain points.

Use Case 1: Account Maintenance and Single Sign-On
Ever since the first publishing systems were launched, users have complained about the need to register for and log into different systems. Solving this problem has been a structural challenge because organizations naturally do not wish to cede user credentialing to competitors. While some companies have tried to build in-house solutions, such parochial approaches miss the key user need—the ability for users to sign in to multiple independent publisher systems.

The ORCID identifier (ORCiD) is principally promoted as a solution for contributor disambiguation. However, the ORCID API (application programming interface) also allows this

identifier to be used by systems like Editorial Manager (EM) as an independent authentication system. For example, several publishers, including Maney Publishing, Cambridge University Press, Wiley VCH, DeGruyter, and the American Psychological Association, have all activated ORCiD single sign-on for EM. This means that authors can sign into EM deployments for all these publishers using the same credentials. I expect many additional publishers to activate this capability in EM, and other systems, in the near future.

As other vendors and other applications (e.g., membership management systems) activate the ORCID API, this will further accelerate the benefits delivered to end users.

Use Case 2: Manuscript Transfer and Editing Services
Authors complain about having to resubmit rejected manuscripts. Reviewers are also frustrated about re-reviewing manuscripts that were rejected elsewhere. The obvious solution to these problems is to implement seamless manuscript transfer so that authors don’t have to resubmit, and prior reviews can be passed along to recipient journals. In theory, this sounds easy; in practice, implementing seamless manuscript transfer involves many details. For example, did you ask the reviewers for permission to transfer their review? Does the editor recommend one or more journals for the author? How do you match disparate submission data elements?

However, the emergence of standards has begun to simplify this problem. JATS (the Journal Article Technology Standards) initiative has introduced a standardized format for manuscripts that can be easily transferred between systems. This standard provides a common language for exchanging review comments and decision letters, making it easier to implement the seamless manuscript transfer process.

Figure 1: ORCiD login option for EM

Figure 2: Ingest services for EM
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Tag Suite from the National Library of Medicine) provides a standardized XML format that can be shared between journals. The use of ORCiDs ensures that authors and reviewers can be identified with greater fidelity in the transfer process.

A similar problem exists for manuscript language editing services (e.g., Cactus, Editage) or collaborative authoring platforms (e.g., Overleaf). These services already store manuscript data and author information that could potentially be used to streamline submission. The emergence of standards such as JATS and ORCiD now makes this possible. For this reason companies like Aries have launched “ingest” services so that third parties can directly submit manuscript data and files in standardized formats.

Use Case 3: Open Access Payment Processing
The societal and political demand for Open Access (OA) has resulted in the emergence of new business models to support the cost of article publication. Initially it was thought that a single APC (article publication charge) paid by the author would be the dominant model. However, it has become increasingly apparent that processing single APCs is inefficient from the point of view of the payer, payee, and indeed the entire system.

The reality is that most APCs are actually paid by institutions or research funding organizations. Using the author as an administrative intermediary in this commercial transaction introduces unnecessary friction and is a waste of the author’s precious time. Some publishers have identified this as an opportunity and implemented new models. For example, the Royal Society of Chemistry’s “Gold-for-Gold” initiative offers free APCs to institutions with subscriptions; and BioMed Central offers APC discounts to member libraries.

As OA business models proliferate, the back office “plumbing” needed to administer fees needs to be flexible and efficient. That’s where data standards become so important. With standardized metadata it becomes possible to administer and change business models with minimum disruption to workflow.

For example, by integrating the Ringgold institutional identifier into manuscript submission, the APC terms can be modified based on the institution(s) of the author(s). Thus, if the principal author is from MIT and the OA publisher has a membership arrangement with MIT, then the APC can reflect the terms of that membership.

Similarly, by capturing the FundRef identifiers during manuscript submission, the payment processing system can notify authors of any license limitations imposed by research funders such as Wellcome Trust.

EM is the first peer-review system to have collaborated with the Copyright Clearance Center’s RightsLink to leverage peer-review metadata in this way. Several publishers now process APCs through RightsLink with standardized data via FundRef, Ringgold, and ORCID passed out of EM through a standard API.

Conclusion
The scholarly publishing ecosystem is large and teeming with innovation, but the impact of innovation is frequently muted because of an inability to connect the dots. Emerging data standards (along with routine software mechanisms such as APIs) enable greater collaboration and integration to better serve authors and readers.

I hope that I’ve communicated the immediacy of the transition that is taking place right now. Both understanding and leveraging this transition offer significant career opportunities to ISMTE members.
The ISMTE Board of Directors and Poster Committee are proud to announce that the poster submission site for the 2015 ISMTE conferences*, is now open. Previous poster sessions have been an enormous success and have enabled attendees to share their unique Editorial Office experiences in a fun and engaging format. Poster topics from the 2014 conferences included, among others:

- metrics for monitoring editorial office workload,
- implementation of ORCID, and
- ethics in scholarly literature.

First-place winners Heather Blasco and Sara Welliver, both senior Managing Editors at J&J Editorial, presented their poster “Reformatting Submission Questions Increases the Accuracy of Author-Supplied Information: A Case Study” to North American meeting attendees in August 2014, illustrating how the organization of submission questions can significantly impact how authors answer them. Heather and Sara found that participating in the poster session was a valuable experience. They state: “Participating in the ISMTE poster contest was beneficial for the ASTM journals as well as our professional development. It compelled us to commit the time to focusing on a problem area for our journal processes, to come up with a solution, and then quantify the results of making the change, which was clearly beneficial. The process of clarifying permissions has become a much smaller part of our workflow for the journals and definitely was worth the time invested.”

Submission
Are you interested in presenting a poster at next year’s annual conferences? The first step is to submit a proposal that includes your poster’s title, objectives (three things someone will learn from your poster) and an abstract of 200 words or less (abstracts can be structured or unstructured). New this year, mentors are available to help you develop your proposal and poster. Authors interested in this opportunity can state as such on the proposal submission site and you will be contacted by one of our mentors. Submit your proposal online at www.ismte.org/?page=2015Posters by March 1, 2015.

Review
The ISMTE Poster Committee will review and judge your poster proposal based on three criteria: originality; significance and relevance to the field; and practicality and applicability. If your proposal meets the bar for acceptance, the chair of the Poster Committee will contact you with instructions by the end of March for how to prepare and submit your poster for the conference presentation. When all posters are received, the committee will determine the winners of the awards.

Presentation at Conferences
ISMTE will provide you with templates to help you design your poster.
Although not mandatory, we encourage that you attend either the North American or European conference so you can talk about your poster with other attendees during the afternoon receptions.

Prize Money
Posters that receive the first- and second-highest scores will win cash prizes of $300 and $200 (US dollars), respectively. Also, the first-place winner will have the opportunity to summarize his or her poster for a short article in Editorial Office News (EON). All posters will be published in an online supplement to the August 2015 issues of EON.

For questions, please contact Erin Dubnansky at edubnansky@gastro.org.

Don’t delay! Submit your proposal now!

*Please note that “conferences” refers to both North American and European conferences. Accepted posters will be displayed at both conferences.
At the 2014 ISMTE European conference, expertly organized by meeting chair Sherryl Sundell and her conference committee, I had the privilege of moderating a workshop session on overuse of reviewers and finding new reviewers. Participants included Sean MacRae (who kindly took the notes on which this report is based), Stephanie Sacharov, Naomi Connelly, Piers Allen, Lou Whelan, Helen Pinfield-Wells, Mark Hester, Vicki Donald, Rosemary Dickin, Anna Jester, Nick Rushby, Ian Potter, Anna Sharman, Mary Miskin, and Seb Atay.

To start the workshop, I presented a slide set (prepared with the much-appreciated support and advice of Jason Roberts) that set the stage by discussing the increase in the number of submissions to journals, especially the dramatic growth in manuscripts from countries such as China, Korea, Taiwan, and Iran. This trend, combined with a limited pool of experts, has led to a lack of qualified reviewers to cover the amount of submissions. As a consequence, review requests rise, reviewers are overused, and, ultimately, reviewer fatigue sets in. Inevitably, the journal’s response is to send out more invitations (Figure 1).

In the presentation, I also discussed reviewer loyalty and the importance of engaging reviewers effectively in the journal (which has also been the topic of a previous EON article). In addition, my slides covered how reviewers see themselves, who is an “average” reviewer, various models of peer review, tips and tricks on maintaining an up-to-date reviewer database, and finding reviewers. During and after the presentation, a number of points were discussed in detail and are summarized in the following.

**Finding and Allocating Reviewers**

A good source of help with finding reviewers is JANE (Journal Author Name Estimator [www.biosemantics.org/jane/]; Figure 2). Once a submission’s title and abstract are copied and pasted into the JANE search box, the system queries MEDLINE for published articles that are similar. By looking more closely at the authors of the retrieved articles, Editors could use this tool to identify new reviewers.

A question from the floor was if JANE would function for social science journals. I checked this on one of the social science journals we manage and was able to pull a list; however, the system needs to be tested on various social sciences journals to get a good idea if it works. Among workshop participants involved in management

---

of nonmedical journals, no one was aware of any other similar tool.

Reviewer Retention
A tip for reviewer retention and engagement was that a little personalisation goes a long way in keeping the reviewers feeling appreciated. Journals were urged to customise invitations and other routine communications with personal notes.

Maintaining and Updating the Reviewer Database
A question from the group concerned how journals deal with dead accounts, for instance, reviewers who haven’t been used for a year or more. The consensus was that it is important to ensure that the reviewer database is up to date, but that this is easier said than done. If possible, every two to three years a batch email should be sent to reviewers via the journal’s online peer-review system. The message needs to be carefully worded but should contain:

- a thank you to reviewers for their work;
- an explanation that the Editorial Office is updating its reviewer database;
- an agreement that, in principle, the reviewer wishes to continue to review for the journal; and
- a request to the reviewer to check and update personal details, affiliations, and field or area of expertise as required.

The group concurred that this can be a time-consuming task, may take up to six months depending on the size of the reviewer database, and will need to be carried out in between regular work.

Rating Reviewers
Another question dealt with how an Editorial Office can get Editors to rate reviewers, as it only takes one Associate Editor failing to do this to potentially invalidate results. The group had no specific answer but agreed that this is a potential problem that Editorial Offices need to be aware of.

Reviewer Incentives
There was a discussion in regard to reviewer incentives. An annual thank you list, CME credits, an honorarium, and a pathway to join the Editorial Board were mentioned. In addition the group suggested:

- for active reviewers who exceed a particular threshold, a free online subscription to the journal;
- for Taiwan/China-based reviewers who are postgraduate students, a review could be count-
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...ed towards their doctorate (as an alternative to having two publications in indexed journals, which can be very difficult to achieve); and

• a reviewer development programme—one member of the group was involved with such a programme, and reported it was highly regarded by the reviewers.

Credit for Reviews

There was a question from the floor in regard to Publons. Very few participants were familiar with this company, which aims to provide, based a number of sources, an overview of reviews by a particular person. For example a publication can notify Publons once a review has taken place. Further information can be found in a post on the ALPSP (Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers) blog and a slide set available at the ALPSP site. Together with CASRAI (Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information), ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) is also working on a system for review citation.

---

3 Publons. Available at www.alpsp.org/Ebusiness/Libraries/1409AIC_Media/Parallel_2c_-_Andrew_Preston.sflb.ashx.
4 L. Haak. ORCID and CASRAI Acknowledging Peer-Review Activities. Available at http://orcid.org/blog/2014/04/08/orcid-and-casrai-acknowledging-peer-review-activities.
Connecting Readers to Your Content: Ideas from a Digital Workshop

By Kerry O’Rourke
Senior Managing Editor
Kaufman Wills Fusting Editorial Services

The digital world offers seemingly endless ways to connect with readers but underneath all the bells and whistles, it is still important to know what information they need and how they will use it in their day-to-day work.

Three experts shared their insights on best practices for connecting members or readers with the content they need in a format they will use. As we move into a new year, you may find you can incorporate some of their ideas as you consider new initiatives.

They spoke on Oct. 1 in Chicago during Doody’s Digital Workshop, a two-day session for society executives.

**Observe in the Workplace**

To determine what information your readers need, watch them at work, said Bonnie Gruber, a publishing consultant based in the Philadelphia area. Take a page from the anthropologist’s playbook and sit with your customers as they work. This ethnographic research can provide insight into how customers access and use specific content in the context of an actual workday.

Corporations such as Microsoft Corp., IBM, and the Lego Group have used this technique to evaluate current products and discover the need for new ones, she said. The market researcher does not interview customers but observes them in order to learn how they accomplish their work using different processes, systems, or content.

Before starting this type of project, she recommended clearly identifying your goal and segmenting your customers into one or more groups on which to focus. The observation sessions typically last two hours; the number of sessions you conduct can range from eight to 35, she noted. After collecting the information, the team comes together to compare notes, interpret the findings, and develop ideas for new products.

Gruber is a partner and practice director at Delta Think, Inc. The company works with clients to plan and conduct ethnographic research as well as on other strategic projects.

**Rethink the Online Article**

At Cell Press, Keith Wollman said they set out to determine what scientists wanted in the online journal article of the future. He and his colleagues wanted to make it easier for readers to find what they needed and to explain concepts in different ways. They brought members of the scientific community into the process of developing and refining the idea.

Their article of the future included a hierarchical way of presenting text and figures so that readers could drill down to access content at a level matching their subject expertise or interest. This eliminated endless scrolling and made it easier for readers to specifically find what they wanted. The publisher also wanted to offer different ways to convey the article’s core content by integrating audio, video, and animation.

They created graphical abstracts in which the article’s main points were depicted in a drawing and video abstracts in which one or two of the authors explained their findings in a short video. Hiring an illustrator or designer can help change the way you display content, he noted.

Readers were enthusiastic about the changes and usage increased at a higher rate than in other journals that had not implemented the prototype, said Wollman, who is vice president of operations. The project also inspired other initiatives such as 3D neuroimaging and the virtual microscope. They also found that the graphical and video abstracts could be used to increase awareness about journal content in social media.
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On the flip side, he said, the new prototype did not result in a major shift in usage from the article PDF to the HTML version and the project lost momentum after the initial releases.

Cell Press also wanted to find ways to personalize science for readers. For the journal Cell’s 40th anniversary, they created a “40 Under 40” community and invited 40 scientists from around the world, all under the age of 40, to talk about their research and share information about their lives outside of the workplace. They refer to this type as “editorial engagement content,” Wollman said. One goal was to convey a sense of excitement about science.

Cell Press is owned by Elsevier, Inc., and is based in Cambridge, Mass.

Develop Workplace Tools

Another way to connect with readers is through online tools designed to help make their jobs easier. At Digital Science, the goal is to create software and apps that help scientists manage information at work as easily as other online tools handle their personal music and photos, said Betsy Donohue, vice president of publisher business development.

She highlighted three tools:

- **FigShare** is an online repository where users can make any data — no matter the format — available so that they can be cited and shared publicly. This includes individual figures, data sets, posters, and papers. Each piece of data is given a DOI and is shared under the most liberal Creative Commons license. The tool was created by a PhD student who wanted to share more data than a traditional journal article allowed.
- **ReadCube** is an app that allows users to download and organize papers in a way that makes sense to them. It includes a citation tool and allows users to view the article in an interactive PDF where they can highlight and make notes. A benefit for publishers is that the tool can track how readers are using a PDF even after the file has been downloaded from a journal site.
- **Altmetric** tracks online mentions of an article from sources such as newspaper stories, blogs, or tweets. It allows a publisher to measure the reach of an article and provides article-level metrics. The results are displayed in a colorful circular icon that is placed on the article page. Publishers such as BioMedCentral, Nature Publishing Group, and Springer are displaying Altmetric icons on some journal articles.

Digital Science is a division of Macmillan Publishers Ltd. and has offices in New York, Boston, London, and Tokyo.

Other Workshop Topics

The fall workshop also included a presentation on publishing investment opportunities, a discussion about retraining the workforce for digital publishing, and input from three customers about their information and workflow tool needs.

In 2015, Doody Enterprises will conduct three Doody’s Digital Workshops, the first aimed at publishing staff in the Baltimore/Washington area, on Jan. 21, in Arlington, VA. For more information, visit www.ddw.doody.com/01252015/.
Tweeting at an Annual Meeting: Make it Worth the Time

Publishing professionals attending the fall Doody’s Digital Workshop participated in several small group exercises in which they brainstormed solutions to potentially challenging situations. This one is called “Tweeting for Dollars,” and may have relevance for your organization.

The Director of Intellectual Property Ventures (IPV) at the National Organization of Zoologists (NOZ) reported recently to the Executive Director about a successful venture to develop a social media presence for the NOZ Annual Meeting, which took place two weeks earlier in Austin, Texas.

In the weeks leading up to the annual meeting, with the aid of NOZ members from the University of Texas, staff recruited a dozen graduate students. These students were given free access to the meeting. Each was assigned to attend specific sessions and to tweet interesting findings through the main NOZ Twitter account. (These students had also received advance copies of speakers’ PowerPoint files so they could attach graphics to their tweets.)

Although the scheme was conceptually simple, planning and implementation was challenging. IPV staff members first canvassed a large number of NOZ staff people to identify responsive members affiliated with the University of Texas. Following multiple email and telephone efforts with faculty, IPV staff had a list of well-vetted graduate students. A webinar training session attracted nine of the 12 students; the other three were trained individually in separate webinars.

A day before the meeting opened, one student Skyped that she was stranded by snow in Peru; on the second day of the meeting, another student came down with the flu. Staff scrambled to locate and train replacements at the last minute, and fortunately only two small poster sessions were ultimately overlooked. In all, IPV staff devoted 40 to 50 hours to organizing, facilitating, and managing the Twitter effort.

Twitter analytics were modest but promising. Most tweets were retweeted, and there was significant numbers of mentions on several of the tweets. A sequence of tweets from a debate between two eminent evolutionary theorists briefly moved #NOZAnnualMeeting into Twitter’s top 200 trending topics.

The Executive Director, not a Twitter user herself, had little to say, but her final remark was clear: “Fifty hours of staff time is worth about $2,500. If you do this again next year, please generate at least $5,000 in revenue.”

How can you monetize the tweets from next year’s meeting?

*Courtesy of Doody Enterprises, Inc. Copyright 2014.*
The Winding Path

How I Ended Up in Academic Publishing

By Melanie Wincott
Senior Journals Manager
Editorial Office Ltd.

It all started from a leaflet dropped in my daughter’s school book bag back in 2009. Editorial Office Ltd., a local company in Overton, Hampshire, was recruiting for new freelance Editorial Assistants and I was intrigued.

The timing was perfect. I had two young children and was in the process of closing down the toy shop I had set up in the same village with one of the local mums after it became clear that the business was only capable of supporting one of us. The leaflet seemed too good to be true. It was offering home-based, flexible hours, a great rate of pay, and the work actually sounded very interesting. Was it possible that what they were offering was for real? Could I have found a stimulating job that would allow me to raise my young family and earn a decent amount of money?

I attended the open evening advertised, I was offered an Editorial Assistant position, and from then on I was hooked and haven’t looked back! In just over a year, I went from a freelance Editorial Assistant working four hours a day to a full-time staff member at Editorial Office Ltd.

The first peer-review system I experienced was AllenTrack, while working on PLOS ONE. After the initial period of learning all the new terminology associated with academic publishing, it soon became very familiar. However, the journal outgrew this platform and migrated across to Editorial Manager. This presented an opportunity of road testing the new system before it came into use. That was great—I love pressing buttons to see what they can do! I was one of five freelancers working on PLOS ONE at the time for Editorial Office Ltd., but over the past five years that quickly progressed to a freelance base of 65+.

Prechildren, my background was in accountancy and I feel that has helped in certain aspects of my new career in academic publishing. The work requires attention to detail and sound analytical and problem-solving skills and I have definitely transferred these to this role. It may be that we have to decipher authors’ requests, if English isn’t their first language, or find where a paper has disappeared to in the black hole of the system.

My current role is that of Senior Journal Manager for Editorial Office Ltd. and my team consists of four full-time Editorial Assistants and a sizable number of freelancers across a variety of journals and peer-review systems—Editorial Manager, AllenTrack, ScholarOne Manuscripts, and Bench>Press. I now not only work on PLOS ONE, but also help manage a wide range of society journals for which Editorial Office Ltd. provides editorial assistance. The variety of journals is both challenging and very rewarding. We deal with various sizes of journals and among the aspects I find most rewarding are the relationships that are built with the Editors. The challenges can be in ensuring the process is as seamless as possible.

The flexibility of the role and the variety of work is still very stimulating and each new day brings its own challenges. Learning a new peer-review system is still very exciting and, as I have mentioned before, I like pressing buttons to see what they do…
Calendar of Events

Webinar: Project Management in 2015
January 22, 2015
www.alpsp.org

ALA Midwinter Meeting
January 30-February 3, 2015
Chicago, IL
www.ala.org

ISMTE Local Group—North Carolina – Research Triangle Park Area
February 2, 2015
Location TBD
www.ismte.org

ISMTE Local Group—Chicagoland
February 4, 2015
Chicago, IL
www.ismte.org

Journal Development 1: Practical Plans for Improving Journal Success
February 10, 2015
London, England
www.alpsp.org

COPE Forum
March 10, 2015
www.publicationethics.org/

Developing Open Access and Hybrid Journals
March 10, 2015
London, England
www.alpsp.org

UKSG 38th Annual Conference
March 30-April 1, 2015
Glasgow, UK
http://www.uksg.org/event/conference15

2015 CSE Annual Meeting
May 15-18, 2015
Philadelphia, PA
http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/

SSP 37th Annual Meeting
May 27-29, 2015
Arlington, VA
http://www.sspnet.org/
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