

IN THIS ISSUE

ARTICLES

- **Spring into Summer** 1
Meghan McDevitt
 - **Keeping it Real: A University Press Perspective** 2
Michael Magoulias
 - **Only Good Surprises: A Checklist When Working with a New Vendor** 5
Connie Arkus
 - **ISMTE Awards** 8
Alice Ellingham
 - **Escaping the Publishing Catch-22** 9
Peg Sandkam
 - **The Winding Path** 10
Betsy L. Barr
- #### MISCELLANEOUS
- **Calendar** 13



Spring into Summer

By Meghan McDevitt

Editorial Assistant

GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Can it be June already? The long days of summer stretch ahead of us, filled with barbecues, reading by the poolside, and anxiously counting down the days until our Journal Impact Factors are released. Early summer is a great time to start projects or new ventures and maybe cross off some tasks on your to-do list, like reading all the great articles in this month's *EON*!

EON has featured a number of pieces on the topic of Open Access. In this issue, read about the OA movement from a university press perspective. Michael Magoulias, Director of Journals at the University of Chicago Press, gives an overview of OA's expansion into university presses and its impact on the tenure system, libraries, and the future of academic publishing.

Connie Arkus, Managing Editor of *ASGE Connection*[®], shares her experience with launching a new member magazine and provides some useful tips to avoid surprises when working with a new vendor.

Looking for a volunteer opportunity with ISMTE? Board

Member Alice Ellingham heads up the new Awards Committee and is looking for committee members to help develop and implement awards to recognize ISMTE members.

What types of certification are out there for Editors? Maybe you've been meaning to take classes or gain certification through the American Medical Writers Association (AMWA) or Board of Editors in the Life Sciences (BELS). Peg Sandkam, a recent graduate, is pursuing her editing certificate in the hopes of gaining the experience and background she needs to launch a career in editing.

Finally, Betsy Barr reflects on how her interest in science and nature as well as language led to her career in medical editing in this month's Winding Path article.

Whatever the summer brings, I hope you think of *EON* and the ISMTE as your go-to resources for practical advice, publishing trends, and best practices in the Editorial Office. Do you have ideas for topics or want to write your own article? Drop me a line at mmcdevitt@asmte.org.



Keeping It Real: A University Press Perspective

By Michael Magoulias
Director, Journals
University of Chicago Press

The future of the university press will be determined by the future of the university. In some cases—Open Access (OA) is one—disruption or attempted disruption of university press publishing may prefigure similar movements that attempt to disrupt higher education overall. The claim that subscription journals are too expensive for the value they provide, and therefore should be replaced with a “free” digital model, has been echoed in the past couple of years by the claim that the costs of college tuition are prohibitive, not worth it in the eyes of employers, and ripe for replacement by MOOCs (massive open online courses).

All scholarly publishing activities, and university presses in particular, survive thanks to the tenure system. To get tenure and continue to advance as a career academic takes a bibliography. The trends in the United States and the rest of the world have been such that the number of PhDs across disciplines has grown significantly, while the number of full-time jobs has not. Since publication (often judged more on a quantitative basis than a qualitative one), prestige (also quantified by Impact Factor), and the venue of publication have become the determining factors in assessment, a large, diverse, and fragmented industry has grown to manage the growing quantity of scholarly research.

It is important to emphasize the fundamentally *service* nature of this kind of publishing. All scholarly publishers evolved to support the research and professional requirements of higher education with a specialized set of services. Commercial firms (and some nonprofits whose behaviors are indistinguishable from the commercials) have become dominant players in this arena, and have been very publicly castigated for exploiting their position by behaving monopolistically. Should the tenure process at some point change so that publication becomes less critical for career advance-

ment, then the operations of all scholarly publishers will dramatically decrease.

Similarly, the future survival of libraries might also entail their shrinkage. The total costs of maintaining a first-class research library are in the hundreds of millions annually. I have heard the idea raised that maybe there should only be four or five of such major libraries in the United States, supporting the entire research community digitally, and thereby saving colleges and universities all the costs associated with maintaining their own libraries with largely duplicative holdings. Since academic libraries form almost the entire market for publishers focusing on humanities, social sciences, and many of the sciences that don't have an obvious instrumental value, this vision of the future would also result in the consolidation of academic publishers to a very small number of players.

These may sound like farfetched possibilities and unlikely to happen within the span of 15 or 20 years. However, OA is already a reality for many disciplines in the sciences, and most major journals in the humanities and social sciences are already offering some kind of “hybrid” option for authors who want to or are required to publish in an OA manner. If governments elsewhere in the world follow the United Kingdom in mandating OA across disciplines, then the ability of journal publishers and academic societies dependent on journal revenues to continue operations will be compromised, possibly beyond repair.

Since the number of university presses that publish journals is quite small, OA has not been a major topic till now. Most publishers, including the University of Chicago Press, think that OA is an interesting model that should be tested as an option. Few think that shifting the financial responsibility for publishing from libraries to individual authors is realistic for the vast majority of

disciplines, and even fewer feel imposing OA as the only model for scholarly research would lead to net benefits for either authors or readers.

Chicago itself recently launched a completely OA journal (free at the point of use and free for authors) called *Signs and Society*. It is funded in large part by a humanities grant from the South Korean government. With this model, nothing has changed from a traditional journal except for the lack of a subscription fee. Similarly, we have recently become the publisher of a medical journal, *Pulmonary Circulation*, in which the costs of publication are borne by the sponsoring medical society (the Pulmonary Vascular Research Institute).

The peer-review process for both of these journals, crucially, is the same as that for established journals. By this I mean several key activities. The editors are publishing the articles that they deem to be the ones that make the greatest contributions to their respective fields. They are working with the authors to improve their articles wherever that would result in a better outcome for readers and the research community. They are striving to be as quick with their turnaround times as they can, while also making every effort to achieve quality and accuracy. As I will discuss below, these are not the accepted editorial values of many of the leading OA publishers.

OA as a movement is about 15 years old. It is worth noting that the problems it was supposedly created to solve—declining library budgets, the control of scientific publishing within a small number of commercial firms, excessive profits earned by these firms—have not improved. If anything, OA has been a gift to the large corporate publishers, since they have domesticated this new model and used it to monetize a vast number of submissions that they would have previously rejected and ceded to their competitors.

The past 15 years have also seen the conversation surrounding OA become more heated and ideological. It has also become more of a monologue in which the parties For and Against preach almost exclusively to the already converted. Rhetorically, the For party has sought to universalize its cause by endeavoring to occupy a moral high ground in which OA publishing is seen as in some way as contributing to the democratic project and the overall

welfare of humanity. The governing (and unsubstantiated) assumptions here seem to be that the more that free content is posted on the Web, the better educated the citizenry will become, and thus the more that medical research is posted freely, the greater the number of lives that will be saved and improved. I can't dwell too much on these assumptions, except to observe that they reveal a naïveté about how human beings actually operate as extreme as any of the utopian systems of thought that have caused such havoc over the past 100 years.

It is very difficult to predict the future of OA, but I like to think that there will be a swing of the pendulum back to traditional editorial values. There are a few signs that this may be taking place already. The Impact Factor for *PLOS ONE* slipped last year for the first time, and it looks like year-to-date submissions have fallen a bit too. Certainly the academic community, particularly in Britain, has become more vocal against a mandatory approach to OA, now that this has come into effect as of April 2013. More of this is necessary, and it needs to come from academics. Too many people view all publishers, including university presses, as essentially smaller versions of Elsevier (which is itself cast as the “evil empire”). What we need are more informed responses from professional scholars and researchers, especially since a number of universities (Harvard, University of California, MIT) have instituted policies requiring their faculty make the products of their research freely available.

The long-term financial pressures on university presses could become even more corrosive than OA. There are only three presses that regularly cover their costs or do better than that: Oxford, Cambridge, and Chicago. The others consistently operate in the red and survive because of subsidies from their institutions. Two years ago, the University of Missouri Press was about to be closed by University authorities until a well-organized public outcry saved the situation. The goal had been to apply its annual subsidy of \$400,000 to a supposedly more fruitful area. This same model, but without the Hollywood ending, might well become the norm.

In the eyes of many observers of the academic publishing scene, if massive disruption is going to take place, it is unlikely to happen within the next

20 years. It is also unlikely that if this disruption does arrive, the largest players would suddenly disappear from the environment. The major university presses bring a lot of international prestige to their parent institutions, and these institutions are in many cases supported by endowments valued in the billions of dollars.

This is not to say, however, that a few oases of independent publishing will be enough to improve

a landscape overrun with mediocre research created and paid for by authors motivated by their own career advancement and little else. OA has been presented as yet one more gift of the Internet Age, like the selfie and universal literacy on the subject of twerking. One wonders whether a Tacitus of the future will look back on these years and chide us for creating a wasteland and calling it “innovative publishing.”

Save the Date!



7th Annual North American ISMTE Conference
 August 14-15, 2014
 Hyatt Regency
 Philadelphia at Penn's Landing
 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
 COPE to have a full day meeting on August 13



7th Annual ISMTE European Conference
 October 14, 2014
 Charles Darwin House
 London, England
 COPE to have a half day meeting on October 13

Only Good Surprises: A Checklist When Working with a New Vendor

By Connie Arkus
carkus@asge.org
Managing Editor
ASGE Connection®

When developing a new magazine with a new design and production company, the primary goal, obviously, is to produce a first-class publication. Just as important, however, is to keep the bad “surprises,” such as unexpected costs or delays during the development process, at a minimum.

In the February issue of *EON*, Anne Brownsey talked about the strategy behind the magazine redesign of ASGE Connection®, the member magazine of the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ASGE). Here’s a quick recap of the article: A long-time publication that once was provided in print only moved to a digital-only format but still looked like a print magazine and had limited digital functionality; it was retired in 2012. Last year, a new publication was launched, ASGE Connection, both in digital and print formats. The results were stellar! Although we had some production kinks to work out along the way, we are very pleased with the new vendor.

Overall, we did a good job of anticipating lots of unknown challenges—we generally don’t assume very much. We thought we had covered all of our bases and mostly we did; however, as with starting any project with a new vendor, we had some surprises that we’d like to help you avoid.

Here are our “Top 9” tips for working with new vendors:

1. Ask how much experience they’ve had with your type of project. A month into the project, we found out that the firm typically took a client’s already-prepared PDF and “made it digital.” This was the process we used with our previous magazine. Our new magazine would require the vendor to develop a completely new design for digital viewing (horizontal format) and a new, but standard design for the 8½ by 11 print (vertical) version. While the vendor knew this going in and had pitched us several innovative design solutions,

we didn’t know that the team hadn’t created from scratch the exact type of designs we needed. There were a few hiccups, but they were so minor that we can’t even recall what they were. However, it goes back to, “don’t assume anything.” Fortunately, we couldn’t have been happier with the final digital and print products.

2. Find out if the initial point person will change after the launch, so you’re prepared, and ask for specifics about the role of the project manager. We weren’t surprised that after the initial issue, our primary contact would change for subsequent issues, but we had hoped that we’d get a second magazine published before the change. Fortunately, the initial point person brought in the new project manager for a debriefing conference call after the first issue, so the project manager didn’t start the project without a frame of reference.

Having said that, however, we recommend a follow-up conversation with the new project manager for clarification of the role. Find out early exactly what the project manager is supposed to do. She or he may not be fully aware of your expectations, and the role may have changed from a senior-level staffer to a junior team member.

3. Find out if you will have contact with the designer(s). Every vendor is different. For our previous magazine, we worked with an independent graphic designer—someone with whom we had frequent contact throughout the design process. With the new vendor, a large design firm, its process is to have the project manager communicate client concerns to the designers. Since we had been used to direct contact with our previous designer, we didn’t think that our only contact with our new designers would be through the project manager, virtual yellow notes on the proofs, and

debriefing calls *after* the magazine was finalized. Debriefing calls after each issue has helped to address design concerns (more on debriefing calls later).

4. Discuss turnaround times. Our previous designer made our edits within the same day, while the previous vendor, who digitalized the retired magazine, had the staging version ready within 24 to 48 hours. In our new production world, each set of edits takes three days, and the final digital staging-link version of the magazine takes five. It's important to understand that if your publication is in a new format, it may require additional design and production time (in our case, we are producing a digital version that is very different in format to our print publication) and that the new vendor may have a set of standard turnaround times that are different than your previous vendor. We've been able to work within those timeframes and advise that you ask the new vendor at the beginning for its turnaround times for design, proofing, and staging.

To the credit of our new team members, they realized that we needed separate designers for the digital and print versions in order for the print version to be mailed in a timely manner. This was done at no additional charge and speeded up the design time.

5. Find out if the project manager proofs the PDFs before they're uploaded. We noticed that a few edits on previous proofs were not checked to make sure that they had been corrected. We asked the project manager if she or the designers proofed their work. This was not originally part of the new vendor's process, as the team typically took a client's already-prepared PDF and made it digital, whereas for us, the team is designing each issue from scratch. To address our concerns, the vendor has since added one day on the timeline for internal proofing.

6. Ask about extra fees and approval to spend money. Our vendor has been upfront from the start about additional fees. Most of these were discussed in the initial stages of production, and we always ask, "Is there an additional charge?" if a

new element is suggested. For example, we knew that with our new vendor, we would receive two proofs before there would be additional charges for more proofs. While this may be standard, it took some getting used to, especially when we were accustomed to bouncing ideas off our previous designer and rearranging graphics or articles to enhance the layout without being charged for extra proofs.

That said, you can never stress enough that any new costs must be approved by you before proceeding. This matter recently came up with our magazine. We know that our project manager wanted to be helpful and expedite the production process, but the person proceeded without alerting us that we would be charged for the new element. When we expressed our concern about the charge, the vendor waived the fee and apologized for moving ahead without getting approval first. Side note: Don't pay for what you didn't approve.

7. Request debriefing sessions. Our new vendor suggested that we have postpublication debriefing sessions by conference call with the project manager and, at our request, both designers. This is a great idea! We prepare a list of points to address ahead of time and ask for their feedback on us, as well. The debriefing sessions are a good way to keep communication open and address the strengths and weaknesses in the production process after each issue. It has helped both sides to come up with new solutions that have enhanced both the process and the magazine design. For example, after the first issue's debriefing call, it was recommended that we fill out a detailed production form. While this takes a great deal of upfront work, it certainly has helped to better convey what we want to achieve with each issue.

8. Ask if the new vendor provides native files at no charge. Our printer—a different vendor from the design/production team—prefers to work from native print files if changes need to be made at the last minute. In the past, we've worked with designers who provide native files at no charge and others who are reluctant to do so. If you need the native files for your publication,

please be sure to ask the project manager how she or he handles them, and if a fee is charged. Our new vendor does not typically provide native files to its clients, but made an exception for us.

9. How you can help your new vendor. Discuss expectations, keep communications frequent, have an open mind, and don't assume anything. Be prepared by providing all the materials and information that the project manager and designers need to do their jobs. Be patient and understanding—

this is new for everyone involved. Being flexible helps, too. The staff of our new vendor prides themselves on customer service, and they deliver with enthusiasm and timely responses.

We can't compliment our design and production team enough. Society members really like the magazine, in both versions, and so do we. You may want to use our checklist as a starting point when you consider changing vendors so that you only have good surprises when you receive the final product.

ISMTE Member Corner
Welcome to our newest members!

Karen Obas
Origin Editorial

Beverly Lindeen
Allen Press, Inc.

Diane Cushman
National Council on Family Relations (NCFR)

Susan Reid
NPS MedicineWise

Dianne King-McGavin
The American Society for Pharmacology
and Experimental Therapeutics





ISMTE Awards

By Alice Ellingham
Director, Editorial Office Ltd

As a new member of the ISMTE Board, I have accepted the challenge of developing and instigating a formal ISMTE Awards scheme. This is an incredibly exciting opportunity to help shape the future of our Society, and I am really looking forward to the challenge...but I will need some help!

In the past, there have been several *ad hoc* awards presented at our meetings to those who have helped with the formation and development of the Society. These have been to both Society members and supporters from the industry. To build on these awards, the ISMTE would like to develop an annual range of awards available to all members of the society, so that our members can both nominate and receive awards that recognize their role in our industry.

If you would be interested in joining me on this journey, we would be working towards:

- Recognising the excellence within our membership
- Promoting membership by making people aware of the ISMTE
- Encouraging the development of our members

To achieve these aims, we would:

- Develop a programme of awards
- Promote the awards on the website, in *EON*, and at meetings
- Encourage our membership to become involved in awards
- Create an historical archive to record award presentations and winners

The first step is to gather together three or four enthusiastic members of the ISMTE to form an Awards Committee and drive this project forward. We would like to have the 2014/15 awards ready to announce at this year's meetings in North America and Europe. So, if you have an interest in promoting and encouraging the skills and excellence of others, then please get in contact at alice.ellingham@editorialoffice.co.uk. Even if you don't want to be part of the Committee but you have ideas that you would like to add to the discussion, I would be very interested to hear from you. For other ways to get involved, check out all our volunteer opportunities on the Focus Areas section on the ISMTE website.



Escaping the Publishing Catch-22

By Peg Sandkam

If you're like me, you enjoy editing, but lack the experience publishers are looking for. I'm constantly asking myself, "How can I get experience if no one will hire me to get any experience?!"

The University of Chicago Graham School of Continuing Liberal and Professional Studies has an answer to that paralyzing question: an editing certificate. This program features a sequence of courses focused on *The Chicago Manual of Style* designed to prepare individuals for employment in the publishing industry.

I enrolled after deciding that being certified in editing certainly wouldn't *hurt* my chances of getting hired somewhere. The application requirements are easy: you must hold a BA, have a desire to contribute to the publishing field, and submit the one-page application provided on the website, a 250-word statement of purpose, a \$40 application fee, and a current professional résumé.

After being accepted, you select your five courses: Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced Manuscript Editing; Editing Electronically; and one elective. The range of electives includes Introduction to Developmental Editing, Essentials of Grammar for Professionals, Introduction to Acquisition Editing, and Introduction to eBook Formatting. The required classes are offered two to four times a year, while the electives are only held once each year. The prices per class range from \$950 to \$1,100, depending on the course. All the instructors work for the University of Chicago Press or similar reputable publishing entities, so the price is worth it!

Most classes are in a three-day intensive seminar format (Thursday through Saturday, 9 am–4:30 pm). While all classes are offered in downtown Chicago at the Gleacher Center, a few classes are starting to be held online (these courses are four to six weeks, with one-hour synchronous sessions each week). A majority of the classes have a

preclass assignment—usually a short piece to read or a brief editing exercise—and all have a take-home assignment once the class is over. Sometimes there are even quizzes during the day. But don't worry: all classes are pass/fail, so as long as you enjoy what you're doing, you'll do well!

Since being accepted last September, I have taken Basic and Intermediate Manuscript Editing, Editing Electronically, Essentials of Grammar for Professionals, and Introduction to Acquisition Editing. From the perspective of someone who has only taken in-person classes, I cannot imagine online classes producing the same results: we students learn from and work off each other in a way that wouldn't be possible online.

I knew editing was what I really want to be doing when a seven-and-a-half hour day of strictly copyediting just flew by! Every professor I have had is knowledgeable, friendly, and wants us to succeed as professionals. Applications are accepted on an ongoing basis, so go ahead—become a part of the program that opened my eyes and helped me get the experience I so desperately need. Although I don't have the job of my dreams quite yet, I know this program will be the tipping point when it comes along.

Location of Courses

The University of Chicago Gleacher Center
450 N. Cityfront Plaza Drive
Chicago, IL 60611

Contact Information

Amber Neff
Program Coordinator
773-702-1682
aneff@uchicago.edu
<http://grahamschool.uchicago.edu/noncredit/certificates/editing/index>



How I Got There from Here

By Betsy L. Barr
Administrative Editor
Transplant Infectious Disease

I never really knew what I wanted to be when I grew up (I still don't!). I entertained and discarded early career choices of veterinarian, actress, singer, writer, poet, etc. I have always loved science and nature—I was the kid catching frogs and grasshoppers, and collecting rocks, shells, and butterflies while growing up in Maine—as well as language (a beloved grade school teacher had us learn poetry), so medical editing was a natural fit for me, although I didn't know that at first and came to it by a series of happy accidents.

Studying some Latin (and German) in high school set me on a good course for my future of dealing with medical terms and organism names, and the prescient decision to insist on learning touch typing in high school in Altoona, Pennsylvania (instead of taking physics), even though it was a “secretarial” course and not for people in the college program, sent me forward toward a lifetime in front of different keyboards. I took an Advanced Placement class in microbiology at Penn State through the high school, and loved the agar plates and organism names.

At Wellesley College I studied English and biology, but my weakness in math, my disastrous grade in genetics, and the cut-throat competitiveness of the pre-med students discouraged me from the career in medicine I had been considering. A college vacation job involved keypunching data into cardboard computer punch cards for my chemistry professor's research project.

My first job after college also was thanks to that typing class: a job with a typesetting company—the company that happened to typeset the *New England Journal of Medicine*! At the time, we typed on a machine with a tiny one-line screen that spewed out rolls of perforated tape, which were then fed into a big typesetting/printing ma-

chine. At that job, I also helped with proofreading the galley proofs for end-of-line hyphenations/word breaks that the machines could not do correctly, and I have had an eye for that ever since! I enjoyed typing (and reading) the articles, but I was restless to format and edit them as well.

My next job was in the editorial department of Lahey Clinic in Boston. The Lahey Clinic was modeled after the Mayo Clinic, including their publication department through which all manuscript submissions must pass, and which handled publications, proofreading, reprint requests, etc. My boss there, Polly Zorolow, liked to say, “We are strict grammarians here, girls!” We edited and typed on the latest device, a Selectric typewriter that used magnetic cards to record the manuscripts (and expensive interchangeable type balls that had a tendency to break; our boss would admonish us to “Be more careful, girls!”). We also travelled to the medical library and physically looked up all article references and verified them, and proofread papers aloud in pairs! From there I went briefly to the Retina Foundation editorial department, where I worked with many foreign researchers on their papers and grants, good training for the international authors I would work with at my current job, and then back to Lahey Clinic for a while.

Then, I got off the career track to marry and have my son (and Lahey Clinic left Boston for the northern suburb of Burlington), although I did a little freelance editing at home for Little, Brown and Company for a couple of their medical journals, until my son stopped taking naps! I went back to work part-time while pregnant with my daughter as a typesetter for an English-language Armenian newspaper. When the kids were bigger, I worked part-time for a desktop publisher, and did medical typing 10 hours a week evenings/

weekends for a pair of husband and wife doctors at Mass General Hospital in Boston for 12 years (progressing from eight-inch disks, to floppy disk, to CDs). For eight and a half years (partially overlapping with the Mass General job), I worked in the word processing department of Mount Auburn Hospital in Cambridge transcribing x-ray reports and doctor's notes. During that time I took and passed the Certified Medical Transcriptionist exam, just to satisfy myself that I could do it, and also gave myself a touch of carpal tunnel.

My bosses at Mass General wanted me back full-time, and the husband-doctor, Dr. Rubin, was thinking of starting a medical journal in his

field of expertise, and asked me to work on that, even though he had no idea of my background in medical editing and publishing! Thus, in 1998, *Transplant Infectious Disease* was born, and I have worked on it for 16 years, from a single Editor and myself and four issues a year, to two Senior Editors and four Associate Editors and six issues a year—from getting typed manuscripts on floppy disk in the mail, and mailing forms back and forth with reviewers, to faxes and emails and ManuscriptCentral/ScholarOne in 2005, and the journal becoming online only in 2014.

Editing is a solitary business and it's very nice to have the resources of the ISMTE!

What's Driving them Crazy!

Usually EON is filled to the brim with practical suggestions about improving the work of editorial offices. That's not the case here. Instead, this list of pet peeves takes a step back and looks at the things that drive authors and reviewers nuts in their interactions with editorial offices. It's not especially pleasant reading, but the hope is that knowing what our "customers" really think (but usually don't say) can help all of us improve our game.

Comments are based on paraphrases from conversations, or, when indicated with quotation marks, are verbatim from emailed responses. Respondents were researchers from a variety of fields, including clinical medicine, physics, engineering/computer science, and computational biology, and ranged from graduate students to tenured professors.

Authors

- "Better way to handle 'silly things' like formats for references. In CS [computer science], folks use BibTeX and there's never any 'please change your periods to commas and remove the periods after the first initial' crap because it's all in the sty file (you just upload the raw fields). I don't know how you get non-CS people to that point, but formatting stuff like the references is an annoying waste of time."
- "Sending a paper back for 2 separate reviews. If the paper cannot be accepted on first revision then if the editor asks for a second review there should be a high probability of acceptance or else the paper should just be rejected after the first review."

Reviewers

- Sometimes I'm asked to review papers that are so bad I have a hard time figuring out why on earth it was even sent out for peer review.
- It seems that editors aren't very engaged and are no longer synthesizing the comments of the reviewers and telling the authors what's vital and what's not. When I get a paper to rereview and the authors have ignored my concerns, I'm often not sure whether the editor wants me to restate my critique, or if the very fact that the editor is reconsidering it means that s/he thinks my concerns weren't do-or-die. Basically, I'm given no guidance on how I'm supposed to reappraise the paper, and what the journal's criteria are.

*Collected by Liz Bury, Emily Fay, and Nijsje Dorman from the
AJKD Editorial Office*



Calendar of Events

ALPSP Training Course: Fundamentals of Journals Finance

June 26, 2014
London, England
www.alpsp.org

ALPSP Training Course: Managing Quality from Outsourced Services

July 9, 2014
London, England
www.alpsp.org

ALPSP Training Course: Effective Journals Marketing

July 16, 2014
London, England
www.alpsp.org

COPE North American seminar

August 13, 2014
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
<http://publicationethics.org/>

ISMTE North American Conference

August 14-15, 2014
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
www.ismte.org

ACES Editing Boot Camp, Chicago

August 22, 2014
Chicago, Illinois
www.copydesk.org/

ACES Editing Boot Camp, Nashville

September 4, 2014
Nashville, Tennessee
www.copydesk.org/

ALPSP International Conference 2014

September 10-12, 2014
London, England
www.alpsp.org

6th Conference on Open Access Scholarly Publishing

September 17-19, 2014
Paris, France
<http://oaspa.org/>

ISMTE European Conference

October 13-14, 2014
London, England
www.ismte.org

JUNE 2014

Thank You

to our Corporate Sponsors!

Platinum Supporter

Wiley-Blackwell

Silver Supporters

ACS Publications
American Institute of Physics
Origin Editorial
Wolters Kluwer Health

Bronze Supporters

Editage, eJournalPress, J & J Editorial, LLC,
Thomson Reuters

Interested in supporting ISMTE?
Please visit <http://www.ismte.org/?page=CorporateMembership>

ISMTE Editorial Office News

Editorial Office News (*EON*) is the official newsletter of the International Society of Managing and Technical Editors (ISMTE) and is published monthly. The contents and opinions expressed by the authors do not necessarily represent those of the Society, the Board of Directors, or *EON* Editors, nor does the publication of an article constitute an endorsement on the part of ISMTE of the authors' organizations or companies. Submissions are welcome and can be sent to the Editor at the address below. Submissions may be edited for style and format without the author's permission. Authors must seek permission to reprint any copyrighted material and provide this permission to the Editor.

EON's content belongs to the members of ISMTE. Users may view and download *EON* articles for personal, non-commercial use. Use beyond that allowed by the "Fair Use" limitations (sections 107 and 108) of the US Copyright law requires written permission from the *EON* Editor.

Editor:

Meghan McDevitt
mmcdevitt@asge.org

Associate Editor:

Nijsje Dorman
nijsje@gmail.com

Editorial Advisor:

Deborah Bowman
dbowman@asge.org

Editorial Intern:

Anna Demmitt
anna.demmitt@gmail.com

Section Editors:

Ethics: Ira Salkin
Irasalkin@aol.com

Taming Technology: Lindsey Brounstein
lbrounstein@gastro.org

The Winding Path: Kimberly Rosenfield
rosenfield.k@gmail.com

A note on English: ISMTE aims to be a truly international society. English will represent our lingua franca, but we would like to stress that, in materials published in EON or online, variations in idiomatic usage and spelling should reflect the origins of the author. No one version of English is preferred over the other.

ISMTE Executive Office:

310 W. Lake Street, Suite 111 Elmhurst, Illinois 60126 USA
ISMTE new phone number: (+1) 630-433-4513
ISMTE new email address: info@ismte.org

Thank You to our Corporate Sponsors!

Platinum



Silver Level



Bronze Level

