ISMTE North American Conference 2014

This year marked a number of firsts for the ISMTE North American Conference. The meeting was held at a new location—the Hyatt Regency Philadelphia at Penn’s Landing; ISMTE partnered with the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) to include a COPE Seminar the day before the ISMTE conference; and three vendors displayed exhibits for the first time. In total, there were 140 attendees, including 59 first-time attendees and six international attendees.

If you weren’t able to attend the meeting or couldn’t hit up all the breakout sessions, we hope this conference summary will help you catch up on what you missed!

COPE North American Seminar 2014

Reported by Meghan McDevitt, Editor, EON

COPE’s North American Seminar was held Wednesday, August 13 and covered the theme of new technologies and behaviors for identifying publication ethics issues. After a brief introduction and history of COPE, Laurel L. Haak from ORCID (http://orcid.org) spoke about the benefits of using persistent identifiers throughout the publication process. Next, Michael Carroll from Creative Commons discussed mobile platforms and copyright issues including available Creative Commons licenses. Mark Seely from Elsevier talked about the influences of Open Access in terms of copyright from a publisher’s perspective. Jason Roberts, Dmitri Khodjakov, and Charon Pierson participated in a panel discussion on plagiarism detection software including products like iThenticate and CrossCheck.

After lunch, participants broke into groups for case discussions and to hear from others about various types of ethical misconduct experienced. The final presentation was given by Charon Pierson, COPE council member, who shared information about COPE Discussion Documents where specific topics are posted on the COPE website prior to the quarterly forum for feedback and comments.

Slides and presentations from the COPE Seminar are available here: http://publicationethics.org/resources/seminars.
ISMTE North American Conference 2014
Thursday, August 14

Keynote Address: State of the Art and Profession—An Editorial Office Update

Reported by Nijsje Dorman, Managing Editor, American Journal of Kidney Diseases

Jason Roberts, founding President of ISMTE and Executive Editor of Headache and the Journal of Sexual Medicine, shared his perspective on change and challenges facing Editorial Offices, particularly in terms of peer-review management. Noting his own observations of journals dropping below a 50% reviewer conversion rate (the proportion of invitees who complete reviews), Roberts asked the audience to consider whether it was time to restore a personal touch to editorial workflows now dominated by template reviewer invitations and automated reminders. He reminded listeners that reviewers are overwhelmed and argued that journals must foster a sense of community within their reviewer pool. Possible strategies include recognizing stellar reviews with personal correspondence from an Editor and flagging skilled reviewers as possible editorialists. Roberts also described how one of his journals instituted a reviewer training program targeted to physicians completing their medical specialty fellowships. Without such efforts, reviewers typically are provided with no guidance whatsoever on expectations and etiquette.

Roberts’ talk also emphasized the importance of making data-driven decisions. He pointed out that many Editorial Offices do not take advantage of the scheduled reports available in manuscript-handling software, which can help staff take a proactive approach to problems. Similarly, staff members may be timing reviewer reminders based on hunches, when they could instead optimize timing of these communications by analyzing a histogram of reviews completed as a function of time after the invitation is accepted. As another example, trouble identifying potential reviewers might be evidence of out-of-date keywords in the reviewer database. Valuable hints about optimizing processes or instructions might also be gained by systematically analyzing reasons why papers are rejected.

Looking ahead, Roberts spoke of his hope for greater data integration, for instance being able to combine Editorial Office databases with marketing, article usage, and citation data. He also exhorted the ISMTE community to delve deeper into the data at its fingertips, with the goal of finding ways to predict behaviors and problems before they occur.

Kent Anderson, recently named as the incoming Publisher of the Science family of journals, gave attendees an overview of legal challenges facing Publishers and Editorial Offices. He explained that the expanding number of journals and articles means more liability, but argued that the level of risk has increased as well, thanks to a blame culture, punitive attitudes, and social media (through which an issue can quickly spin out of control). Anderson described publication and research ethics as the biggest legal challenge in scholarly publishing, noting that allegations of misconduct and retractions are on the rise. To illustrate the complexity of the issues publishers are now facing, he described the controversy surrounding a study conducted by Facebook. The company argued that users’ acceptance of Facebook’s terms of use and privacy policies constituted informed consent. While this would never be acceptable for a study conducted with government funding, since private companies are not subject to policies governing federal grants, Facebook’s level of obligation was less strictly defined (nevertheless the journal opted to publish an editorial expression of concern).

Anderson went on to remind listeners of the importance of copyright, defamation, brand, and
trademark. He pointed out the increasing complexity in obtaining copyright, the still-changing laws governing it, and the problems of monitoring and protection that arise when authors hold copyright. He observed that accusations of defamation can occur when an author is accused of misconduct, or might become relevant for journals that allow commenting on articles housed on their platforms. Anderson then argued journals need to be more proactive about protecting brand, which is the reason authors submit manuscripts to a particular journal. This is relevant to trademark, since infringement may be occurring without journals being aware of it. For instance, a Chinese character might translate to a word that has little to do with a journal’s trademark, but the physical appearance of that character may constitute infringement. For this reason, Anderson advised having someone with knowledge of character-based languages monitor the issue, and asking Editors to be on the lookout for possible trademark infringement when they are traveling. He closed by urging journals to develop contingency plans and budgets for dealing with legal issues, to use tools that can help combat fraud (e.g., implementing plagiarism detection software and ORCiDs), and educating staff and Editors about legal pitfalls.

Matt Giampoala, Executive Journals Editor at Wiley, focused attention on the postpublication life of journal articles. Services to enrich journal content include commenting and in-line annotation, links to other resources (such as raw data or visualizations of data), article-level metrics, tools for social media marketing, content clustering (e.g., collecting related articles into virtual issues), and enhanced viewing platforms (such as ReadCube and Utopia Documents for PDF viewing, and the Journal of Cell Biology’s DataViewer for facilitating image analysis).

Ideally, published articles become a foundation for future research, but a challenge is that information may not be presented unambiguously enough to be useful. As Giampoala described, this situation has inspired efforts such as the Research Resource Identification Initiative (a pilot program of Force11, a group dedicated to semantically enhanced media-rich digital publishing), which asks authors publishing in select neuroscience journals to tag antibodies, software, and model organisms mentioned in their papers with accession numbers that uniquely identify the particular reagent or tool used. The hope is that such metadata will make it easier to reproduce key experimental findings, and will assist text mining. Giampoala also pointed out that more funders are now requiring data management plans, which should facilitate sharing of data associated with scientific publications.

Thursday Morning Breakouts

Session A: Handling Appeals: Challenges and Best Practices

Reported by Shari Leventhal, Managing Editor, Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology

George Woodward, a Publisher at Elsevier, discussed how journals manage their appeals process. Sample policies, author motivation, and best practices for authors and Editorial Offices were discussed. Mr. Woodward provided sample appeals policies from PLOS One, American Psychological Association (APA), and The BMJ. Appeals policies are helpful to Editorial Offices since they can outline the process authors should follow if they wish to appeal a decision. The APA policy, in particular, clearly outlines that an appeal should first be sent to the Editor, followed by the APA Chief Editorial Advisor, if the author continues to have concerns about the decision, and lastly the Publications and Communications (P&C) Board. Authors have several reasons for wanting to appeal a manuscript, including a strong desire to pub-
lish in a particular journal and a lack of interest in undergoing the time-consuming process of submission to another journal. Mr. Woodward provided guidance to authors about when to consider an appeal, and advised them how to respectfully word an appeal to Editors. He offered some questions for Editorial Offices to help consider appeals and a potential flow chart to help Editorial Offices with process. Mr. Woodward’s presentation met his objectives, including providing best practices for both authors and Editorial Offices. The reporter herself is currently in the process of adding an appeals workflow to her peer-review process.

**Session B: For All the Tea in China: A Primer of the Publication Landscape in China—The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly**

*Reported by Deborah Bowman, MFA, Managing Editor, GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

This session was unique in two ways: first, two-thirds of the presenters were off-site and seen only by video, and second, the session gave an interesting insight to the publishing terrain in China. **Donald Samulack**, President of US Operations for Cactus Communications, explained publication practices in China. The country has a 5-year plan to become a force in publishing, especially in English. Their authors essentially want to do what is right and want to know our journals’ ethical guidelines, but they need to be educated. As Editors, we should understand that they are under tremendous pressure to publish. I was surprised to learn that their ideas of plagiarism are different; they look upon plagiarizing their mentors as a form of flattery. Chinese authors are particularly susceptible to predatory journals because they don’t have access to information about them.

**Jing Duan**, Managing Editor of *Ecosystem Health and Sustainability* from the Ecological Society of China, talked about China’s rapid growth in STM publishing. Reform began in China’s Science and Technology system in 1985. Bibliometrics were introduced in 1987, and Nanjing University began using bibliometrics in 1989. In the late 1990s, the Impact Factor became important to them, and the national strategy became, “Revitalizing the country through science and education.” Now they have approximately 5,000 STM journals, with 239 in English, but they face such challenges as a lack of high-quality papers and production quality issues. Now they are attempting to work with non-Chinese publishers, such as Elsevier.

**Sue Silver**, Editor-in-Chief of *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* from the Ecological Society of America, talked about the workshop she participated in in Beijing with the intent of helping authors learn how to get published in English-language journals. Through their workshops, they help authors understand such issues as how to write a cover letter, how to select the correct journal for submission, who should be an author, ethical issues in publishing, and trends in publishing. Now they are working to create a new journal that will be a partnership between two scientific societies, one American and one Chinese.

This was a very interesting session to me; my journal is getting increasing numbers of submissions from Chinese authors, and this session provided an important insight into the issues and obstacles that Chinese authors face. Despite these obstacles, we can forge a good partnership with Chinese authors when we make the attempt to understand each other.

**Session C: Large or Small: EIC Transition is a Big Deal for Journals of Any Size**

*Reported by Meghan McDevitt*

**Erin Dubnansky**, Vice President of Publications at the American Gastroenterological Association, presented 10 keys to success for transitioning to a new Editor-in-Chief. Her presentation included
tips like being involved from the beginning starting with the selection process (update the request for applications [RFA] so that it reflects your current circumstances) and promoting the open position to ensure that you receive a greater number of applicants. Work with the selection or publications committee to develop a selection process, keeping in mind transparency and fair judgment. Additionally, establish a detailed timeline for the transition consisting of milestones from the initial release of the RFA to the day when the new EIC starts handling all assignments. Plan an orientation meeting (preferably in person) so that the new EIC can share his/her expectations and strategic plan, the team can meet each other, and specific policies and processes can be reviewed and modified. Introduce the new EIC when the time comes by alerting readers, authors, and reviewers. Finally, remember to be flexible and supportive of your new EIC, which helps to build his/her confidence in the new role.

Next up, Glenn Collins, Director of Business Development/Managing Editor at Origin Editorial, echoed much of the same advice for EIC transitions. He remarked that it is key that Managing Editors be involved during the transition process since they have intimate knowledge of the day-to-day process and workflow of running the Editorial Office. EIC transitions are a good time to look at various areas, such as workflow, submission system site, manuscript types, or other new initiatives, to see if modifications can be made. Perhaps your new EIC wants to increase the journal’s social media presence, add more online media, or switch submission systems entirely. Think about the consequences of the change in Editorship; how will your authors, reviewers, and readers be impacted by a new EIC? Above all, stay flexible during the transition and the initial months of your new EIC’s tenure as he/she learns the ropes.

Thursday Afternoon Sessions

Session A: Panel Discussion on Journals in Transition: Making Informed Decisions

Reported by Nijsje Dorman

Shawn Morton, Publishing Director for US health sciences journals at Wiley, described the rationale and process for “flipping” from a subscriber-based model to an article processing charge–funded Open Access (OA) journal or launching an OA journal. Flipping might make sense when the number of readers is far larger than the number of subscribers; Morton gave the example of *EMBO Molecular Medicine*, a highly regarded journal that launched in 2009 but struggled to sell subscriptions. After flipping in 2012, it was able to maintain its selectivity while becoming more financially viable. An OA launch is more likely to succeed when there are strong feeder streams (a journal or family of journals with a strong brand that can encourage authors of rejected papers to redirect them to the related OA publication). However, using the *Journal of the American Heart Association (JAHA)* as a case study, Morton counseled expecting the unexpected in OA. *JAHA* had been conceived as a cascade journal that would benefit from the thousands of manuscripts rejected by established AHA journals such as *Circulation* and *Hypertension*; however, the majority of the articles published in *JAHA* actually ended up coming via direct submission. Morton also identified often-heard rationales for launching an OA journal that presage disaster: imagining that an OA journal would be good for clinical content or authors from underserved regions (where’s the revenue?) or that an OA journal should be spun off from an established journal to improve the latter’s Impact Factor (not a viable strategy for the success of the former).

Kerry O’Rourke, Senior Managing Editor at Kaufman Wills Fusting & Company Editorial Services, spoke on transitioning from joint print/
online publication to online only. She emphasized that the factors to consider in the decision to drop print differ for each journal. For instance, medical journals will be slower to dispense with print because of the revenue from pharmaceutical advertising. Also, society journals may see the print journal as a member benefit. She cautioned that the cost savings of abandoning print might be counterbalanced by increased costs for more online features, and noted that online-only journals may still need some print copies, for instance to fulfill multi-year subscriptions or to have an issue to give away at the annual meeting. On the plus side, O’Rourke pointed out that online-only journals are able to track all reader behavior.

For those committed to the change, O’Rourke urged planning at least a year in advance so as to be able to notify subscribers before they renew. The time also allows for coordination with fulfillment, customer service, marketing, advertising sales, and production. To publicize the change, O’Rourke suggested running house ads, sending member communications, and including a mention at the journal’s manuscript submission site.

O’Rourke emphasized planning for every detail, such as designating the online journal as the version of record (the version to be indexed by MEDLINE and other such services) and updating the process for registering copyright, if this has been handled by sending print copies. Other considerations O’Rourke discussed include checking to make sure that there is no journal content that has been print only (continuing medical education content, an annual list acknowledging peer reviewers, etc.), developing an archiving plan, and figuring out new nomenclature for terms such as “paper in press” or “epub ahead of print,” which no longer make sense in an online-only environment. In addition, O’Rourke suggested including the journal logo and publisher’s name on every PDF, as articles will no longer be viewed in the context of a print issue. It may also be necessary to think about how to organize content if issue numbers are no longer used. Post-transition, O’Rourke suggested preparing an informational card styled like a journal cover, to have a tangible takeaway available at the journal booth.

Margot Puerta, Executive Editor of Molecular Medicine and Bioelectronic Medicine, discussed strategies for launching a new journal. Questions to be addressed include determining what will be unique about the new journal and articulating five-year goals. To explore whether there is sufficient need for a new journal and who will constitute the audience, Puerta suggested keyword searches on Web of Science and stakeholder surveys. Also important to consider is how the proposed journal will fit into the publisher’s existing holdings (is there potential for cannibalism of content?). Competitor analysis, including price points and estimated page budgets of competing titles, is also critical. Once a viable revenue model is developed and the decision to proceed is made, the most difficult challenge is content. Thus, it is necessary to decide whether there will be commissioned content, and if so, whether it will be paid. Puerta also described the importance of overseas support networks to assist in international development of the new publication. Operations considerations also abound, and include acquiring Web domains, arranging logo design, creating policies, and preparing traditional and social marketing strategies.

Session B: Reporting on Science in the Media: An Interactive Q&A With Robert Bazell

Reported by Meghan McDevitt

Attendees had the opportunity to attend an open Q&A session with former NBC News Chief Science Correspondent, Robert Bazell. Bazell opened the session by asking what people in the scientific publishing community wanted to know from someone on the scientific media side. He explained that a topic will receive media atten-
tion for two reasons: if it informs and/or if it entertains. The rapid change in journalism and the speedy pace of media can also affect what topics are picked up and reported.

Bazell encouraged those in scientific publishing to cast a wide net when trying to get information out about a specific article. Consider forming relationships with reporters, working with your public relations colleagues, and using social media, especially blogs. Today, stories, news items, articles, and posts are permanently stuck on the Internet and will always be searchable no matter how out-dated they become. Science changes so rapidly that society has a hard time keeping up with and accepting new findings; however, it is more likely that the public would believe a trusted source (information from the Mayo Clinic or NIH).

Finally, Bazell spoke of the positive results of the recent changes in scientific reporting, namely increased awareness in the realm of public health. Public awareness campaigns like those to deter smoking, battle heart disease, and wear seat belts have decreased the number of American deaths from these causes, thus showing the impact that scientific reporting can have on society.

**Thursday Afternoon Breakouts**

**Session A: How to Conduct Research for Editorial Office Professionals**

*Reported by Meghan McDevitt*

Attendees of this session were treated to an excellent overview of scientific research methodology and statistics. Larissa Shamseer, MSc (Clin Epi), PhD Candidate at the University of Ottawa, summarized various research methods, including descriptive versus analytical approaches to studying data. She explained that it is necessary to have a systematic approach when conducting research in order to produce evidence-based results. Data collected from databases can be analyzed in two ways. Descriptive epidemiology summarizes and describes the collected information while analytical epidemiology attempts to understand the “why” behind the descriptive data so that researchers can compare the information and make predictions.

Shamseer described the different types of analytical study designs: randomized controlled trial, cohort study, case-control study, and cross-sectional study, discussing the benefits and disadvantages of each. She next provided an example of how to create a research question related to the Editorial Office using the acronym PICO (Population, Intervention/exposure, Comparator/control/non-exposure, Outcome of interest), which constitutes the essential elements of a research question. Shamseer concluded the session by mentioning the importance of endorsing reporting guidelines (CONSORT, STROBE) for your journal and encouraging authors to follow these guidelines when conducting their studies.

**Session B: Working with the Production Office: What They Need and How This Affects the Editorial Office**

*Reported by Deborah Bowman*

This session was led by Nancy Devaux, Process Improvement Manager of Dartmouth Journal Services. Dartmouth is what my journal commonly calls the “Compositor,” and Nancy’s intent was to help us understand what we can do to make the Compositor’s final product the best that it can be. Since their final product is our journal, it is certainly in our best interest to help them achieve this goal.

Nancy went through the steps of production workflow, or what I think of as “the life of an article,” from the time an article is accepted, through manuscript preparation, copyediting, composition, corrections, approval, and finally issue production and publication.

The big question is, “What can we do to help make the process go more smoothly?” One essen-
tional component is that the articles we send need to be complete. Don’t send articles until they are ready for production, and send all of the parts at the same time. Understanding the major workflow components will help you appreciate the problems they face, so don’t be afraid to ask questions. Make sure the directions you send with each article are complete so that the Production Vendor doesn’t have to read your mind. It is a good idea to submit the color figures as RGB for optimal color quality.

Another crucial component is that you should give the Production Vendor as much advance notice as possible when anything unusual is approaching. Examples of this are if your journal is planning a special issue, if you are starting a new article type, getting new Editors, or planning a style change or journal redesign. Also let them know if you have a difficult author or if you are expecting a late article that has to go into a particular issue.

Thinking of the Production Vendor as the enemy is counterproductive. Our biggest goal as Managing Editors is to create the best possible journals, and cooperating with the people who work in Production will help us to accomplish that goal.

Session C: Navigating Policy—Mandates and New Initiatives

Reported by Nijsje Dorman

Keynote panel member Kent Anderson returned to the podium to discuss OA publishing mandates. Although Anderson acknowledged that this is a very political area with strong vested interests, he argued that controversy should not interfere with informing authors about the mandates to which they are subject. Two important sources of mandates are institutions and government funding bodies. In the Commonwealth, institutional OA mandates are indeed essentially mandatory, and in the United Kingdom, Research Council UK (RCUK) has taken a strong stance in preferring Gold OA for government-funded research. Anderson said that there has been a major furor regarding the RCUK’s position, with particularly strong backlash from professional societies, and he noted that the primary advocate recently resigned his post. Anderson characterized the RCUK’s emphasis on Gold OA as looking increasingly out of step with the rest of the world.

In the United States, academic freedom means that authors are generally free to opt out of institutional mandates. In terms of trends in government funder mandates, Anderson observed that for the past several months, NIH has increased efforts to ensure compliance with its public access policy. Upcoming developments in public access to federally funded research have to do implementation of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) guidelines, which require science funding agencies such as NSF and CDC to develop public access policies for publications and data arising from research they fund. Anderson explained that a central debate in the run-up to the OSTP memo concerned whether access policies should require storing publications or simply linking to them. There had been a lot of advocacy for PubMed Central being the solution (i.e., a storage approach), but the publisher-supported initiative CHORUS advocated linking (so as not to poach traffic from publisher sites). In a move that Anderson characterized as publicly responsible and “publishing responsible,” the OSTP memo did not require deposit in a repository, making CHORUS a viable solution. In early August, the Department of Energy (DOE) became the first agency to release a plan for implementation of the OSTP guidelines. The key features, according to Anderson, are that the plan is not retroactive (it applies to grants awarded October 2014 and beyond), it maintains publishers’ copyrights, and will involve collaboration with CHORUS. Anderson argued that the latter is significant because it allows publishers to do the work of depositing metadata for authors. In response to a
question, Anderson said that although it is unclear what other agencies will do, there is a sense that they will look to DOE’s plan as precedent.

Summing up, Anderson described mandate compliance as a new burden and source of confusion for authors. However, he noted that there seemed to be a trend to increase flexibility for compliance. In particular, although some mandates include licensing requirements, he noted that surveys have not found any evidence that authors are moving to embracing more open licensing. However, Anderson advised journals to survey authors to determine which licenses they prefer.

Poster Session and Speed Networking

Eleven posters were submitted this year and were displayed during the conference. Congratulations to Heather Blasco and Sara Welliver of J&J Editorial on receiving First Place for their poster “Reformatting Submission Questions Increases the Accuracy of Author-Supplied Information: A Case Study.”

You can view this year’s posters online at www.ismte.org/?page=2014ISMTEConf.

The speed networking session was held once again, providing a great opportunity to meet other conference attendees and get to know one another better.

Friday, August 15

Friday Morning Breakouts

Session A: Excel Workshop: Preparing Annual Editorial Reports

Tom McClung, MIS Analyst at ACE Private Risk Services, presented basic applications of Excel and discussed how to use the tool for editorial reporting. He provided tips on organizing data and using formulas to increase reporting capabilities.

Session B: Becoming a Freelance Editorial Office Professional

Reported by Nijsje Dorman

Arlene Furman and Jack Nestor, Managing Director and Senior Editor, respectively, at Technica Editorial Services (a company they cofounded in 1989) provided an in-depth look at freelance editorial opportunities. They strongly advocated performing a detailed self-inventory of goals and personality traits before contemplating a switch. Motivations should be positive (professional enhancement) rather than negative (hating one’s boss) and the prospective freelancer needs to have a high risk threshold, a willingness to take full responsibility, a flexible attitude, and a strong work ethic. Part-time freelancing can be appropriate for those looking to supplement income, broaden contacts, and gain experience. For those considering full-time freelancing, Furman and Nestor urged being cautious about burnout. One reason for the high failure rate of small businesses is exhaustion (a testament to the toll of no paid vacation or sick days, long hours and erratic schedules, and being responsible for one’s own health care coverage).

For those determined to set up a business, the speakers advised hiring a Certified Public Accountant (CPA) and a lawyer to decide on the appropriate business type and to stay abreast of regulatory compliance, liability, and tax issues. The business plan should cover sustainable growth strategies and ways to handle inconsistent revenue, and should include an analysis of market forces (new technologies, globalization, competition, economic fluctuations, etc.) along with contingency plans. The pair emphasized how different their business looks now compared to when they first established it, in part because the work they used to do for large commercial publishers has now been almost completely offshored.

Furman and Nestor went on to provide advice about running an effective business. A business owner must always be a salesperson, so they felt strongly that it is worth spending money
to travel to meetings to network. In their view, trust is a company’s biggest asset. It is vital that one’s expertise and experience should be apparent, that work is reliable and timely, and that discretion and respect is afforded to clients. In terms of pricing, they cautioned that being competitive should not mean trying to be the cheapest (there will always be someone cheaper), but acknowledged that it is difficult to know when starting out what constitutes a competitive price. To tackle that problem, they suggested following up to find out why a bid wasn’t successful. They advised that usually jobs will be more complicated than anticipated at the outset, but emphasized that businesses should stand by their estimates: if there are unexpected costs, they should not be passed along to the client (but the business should learn from mistakes and anticipate such additional costs in future contracts).

As a business grows, new challenges accompany the opportunities. Many business owners shy away from expansion, as it is a big jump to join forces with a partner or to start hiring people (with the attendant complexities of payroll, human resources, and renting office space). As with the initial decision to start a business, Furman and Nestor advocate careful planning and professional advice to determine whether to transition from sole proprietorship to partnership or incorporation.

Session C: Publishing 101: What We Wish We’d Known, and How to Find Out More

Reported by Deborah Bowman

This session was the perfect answer to attendees of past conferences who commented that they wanted a session to help neophyte Managing Editors learn some basics of their job. Julie Nash, Senior Partner at J&J Editorial, LLC, showed us an animated video from YouTube entitled “Peer Review in 3 Minutes,” which demonstrated the entire peer review process. Julie then talked about the relationships we have with co-workers, including other Managing Editors, doctors, publishers, and society co-workers.

As we work with our authors, it is important that we handle their questions quickly and that we are understanding, assuring them that we are there to help. It is also important that we take responsibility whenever we make a mistake.

Nash defined some important publishing terms, such as Impact Factor, Open Access, iThenticate, TOC, ORCID, and single- and double-blinded peer review. She pointed us toward the ISMTE glossary on our website and explained some trends in peer review, like open peer review, in which the reviewers’ names and comments are included on the online version of the article. A number of resources for professional development were listed, such as COPE, Scholarly Kitchen, Retraction Watch, CSE and their job bank, SSP, Facebook, Twitter, and of course the ISMTE.

Finally, Julie addressed the question of whether this job is just a stepping stone to some other job or whether it can be a career. The answer is a resounding yes—it can be a worthwhile and fulfilling career. To that end, every Managing Editor should do everything he or she can do to understand scholarly publishing and should keep learning throughout his or her career.

Vendor Session Breakouts

Breakout sessions were held Friday morning for eJournalPress, ScholarOne, and Editorial Manager covering new and upcoming features across editorial systems.

More Than Just Metrics: PRE-val and Social Cite

Reported by Deborah Bowman

This session was led by Adam Etkin, Founder and Managing Director of PRE. PRE stands for Peer Review Evaluation, and PRE-val is designed to recognize those who work hard at peer review. PRE-val collects publisher meta-data related to peer review and provides independent validation of a particular journal’s review process.

First, Etkin said, we need to define what peer review is supposed to do (improve the article) and what it is NOT supposed to do (detect fraud or reward or punish scholars). Publishing is changing rapidly, and many people have a “Publishing is a button” attitude. When an article undergoes peer review, it gains value. We have to recognize, though, that a number of kinds of peer review exist, and as long as honesty, professional respon-
sibility, and good behavior take place during the process, one type of peer review is not necessarily better than the others. PRE-val supports a number of approaches.

Peer review has come under fire recently, and much of the criticism is unfair. The process is not perfect, but it can work well when it is conducted properly. The overwhelming majority of those who work in the research community value peer review and think it is a necessity. PRE-val is designed to recognize those journals that take the time to conduct their peer review process in a conscientious way. The Editors of some journals claim to conduct peer review when in fact their process is flawed or weak; PRE-val will validate the level of peer review used so that everyone can see and appreciate the true type of peer review that a particular journal uses.

More information is published than ever, and yet we have less time to read; last year, 28,000 journals were published. PRE-val is designed to recognize those who work hard at peer review. Similarly, Social Cite counts citations and also sheds light on their quality. Adam said the company hopes to incorporate Social Cite into submission systems so that Editors can see upon submission how valuable an article’s citations will be.

PRE-val tools are available at both the article level and the journal level. They may prove to be a valuable asset to those of us who strive to keep our journal’s peer review process honest and pure.

Exchange Forum/Wrap-up

The conference concluded with the annual Exchange Forum, an opportunity for attendees to ask questions, share experiences, and discuss important topics related to the Editorial Office and scholarly publishing.

Congratulations to Sarah Bidgood and the rest of the conference planning committee, Diane Drexler, Dr. Sally Gainsbury, Julie Nash, Steve Musser, Kimberly Rosenfield, and Sherryl Sundell for the excellent planning and execution of another great ISMTE North American Conference.


View handouts and photos from the meeting online at www.ismte.org/?page=2014ISMTEConf.

Be sure to check the ISMTE website for updated information regarding the 2015 North American Conference. Dates to be determined soon!
Thank You to our Conference Sponsors
A popular meme in discussions of innovation in scholarly publishing is that if Henry Ford had listened to his customers, he would have learned to breed faster horses rather than invent the automobile. Putting aside the fact that Ford almost certainly never said it, the argument goes that it’s better to lead the market by understanding the customer’s real needs and pain points, creating potential solutions, and then testing them, rather than asking them what they would like you to invent. Put simply, people don’t know what they want until you show it to them.

It is true that there are plenty of examples of technologies that consumers didn’t understand until they got their hands on them. These include the oft-cited iPhone and iPad, cloud storage, and streaming video services, and older examples like television, electricity, and of course, the automobile.

The problem that we face in STM publishing is that researcher needs are challenging to predict and meet. Many publishers struggle to find new ways to encourage various end users such as academic and industry researchers, physicians, students, and members of the interested public to better engage with their content. Publishers have invested significant sums and effort to improve user experience on their platforms, only to see users continue to go directly to the PDF download button. Despite our best efforts, we still need to do more work on understanding what the real needs of our end users are, so that we can better serve them online.

Many publishers already engage in outreach to the academic community, particularly on the editorial side. Author training days are one example, where editorial staff help early-career-stage researchers understand how to select an appropriate journal for their work and write in ways that will get their work reviewed, accepted, and cited. Some publishers, such as Nature Publishing Group, conduct online journal clubs through Google Hangouts, and visit researchers on their campuses to learn more about their issues and needs. While this approach has much to recommend it, it remains challenging to translate those reported needs into new products and services that end users will value.

An alternative approach is to harness the inventiveness of the end users themselves. After all, our users include scientists, engineers, inventors, informaticians, and a whole range of thinkers and doers from every academic discipline. Not only do they understand their own problems, but they’re very well placed to solve them and some of them have an inclination to do so. Some publishers have tried to tap this resource. Elsevier, for example, has organized hackathons to challenge gifted young people to come up with solutions to problems in scholarly communication, which can then be integrated into the company’s SciVerse platform.

The company that I work for, Digital Science, has taken this approach even further and has put these researcher/entrepreneurs firmly in the innovation driving seat (although—at the risk of wearing out the metaphor—we go along for the ride, helping with route planning and navigation). Through a series of grants and investments, Digital Science incubates small companies founded by former researchers. What the companies have in common is that they have all developed technologies that aim to accelerate the progress of science by supporting publishers, institutions, librarians, or the researchers themselves (Figure 1).

Altmetric (www.altmetric.com), figshare (www.figshare.com), and ReadCube (www.readcube.com) are three examples of Digital Science portfolio companies. Each one was founded by former researchers who grew so frustrated with an aspect of scholarly communication, that they started com-
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Figure 1. Digital Science has invested in a portfolio of companies and developed software tools to solve problems at every stage of the research cycle.

Figure 1. Digital Science has invested in a portfolio of companies and developed software tools to solve problems at every stage of the research cycle.

more of what they do. Many journals have tried to cater to this by hosting and allowing readers to download limited types of supplementary information files. figshare provides a solution that visualizes not only figures, videos, and large data sets, but virtually any research output from software code to chemical structures, all without any need for publishers to create expensive infrastructure. Originally an open science portal, figshare now also offers a viewer that works to visualize data either in front of or behind a publisher’s paywall, with an optional publicly accessible, publisher-branded portal that drives traffic to the publisher’s platform through search engine optimization.

The last example is ReadCube, which started off life as a tool for organizing research literature. The central idea that inspired the technology was to make it easy for users to find, consume and organize their own personal libraries. A key part of the ReadCube concept is to incorporate the benefits of full-text HTML pages—clickable reference and author names, recommended articles, a figure viewer, and tabbed supplementary information—into the typeset reading environment of the PDF. The approach has proven incredibly popular with researchers, with over 10 million pages read in ReadCube every month. ReadCube has built on that connection with readers to offer a suite of publisher products that keep end users online and allow publishers to maintain engagement onto the desktop and mobile environments. This engagement can be harnessed in ways that satisfy real business needs, for instance, to make content more discoverable, learn more about user’s behaviours and preferences, support sales efforts, and generate new revenue streams.

What all these products have in common is that the core technologies and products were designed by researchers themselves, to solve problems that they themselves faced. In collaboration with Digital Science, these products have been refined to meet the needs of the scholarly communication marketplace. Finally, to satisfy our publishing customers and for continued success, Digital Science believes rather than merely consulting the academic community, we must directly involve them in publishing innovation.
In today’s publishing landscape, authors have moved beyond an obsession with Impact Factor as the only gauge of their work’s academic success. They’ve turned an eye toward the benefits of social media and altmetrics to ensure their article gets noticed. If a colleague hasn’t asked you to retweet, favorite, or share a thought, link, or idea—it won’t be long now. If you’re not using Facebook or Twitter, it may be time to give it another look.

In this digital age, authors, editors, and journals must concern themselves with the societal impact of an article (e.g., How many likes did I get? Was it retweeted? Did the media notice it?). This form of alternative metrics has been dubbed “altmetrics” and offers authors the ability to rapidly assess how the community is reacting (or not) to their research and publications. Altmetrics may be considered a modern-day complement to the Impact Factor score; it calculates every tweet, like, knowledge base hit, blog, and mass media mention.1

What’s the key element to success in all of this? You. Your time and personal investment in setting up social media sites, attending to them regularly, sharing not just your own content but other valuable ideas and links with your community, and engaging users so they are inclined to reciprocate.

I recently wrote about the relationship between altmetrics and Impact Factor1 and that article has a current Altmetric score of 20 (Figure 1). These scores are churned out by an algorithm developed by Altmetric LLC, a London-based company. The score is assessed by the level of social media, national media, blogs, and other Internet “attention” it receives. The forms of media are weighted differently. Authors can identify their own Altmetric score for articles published in peer-reviewed journals by downloading the bookmarklet from www.altmetric.com/bookmarklet.php, opening their article, and clicking “Altmetric it.”

As a point of reference, Altmetric evaluated their top-ranked articles last year and the number one article had a score of 7,840 as of September 2014. It appeared in Scientific Reports, an Open Access journal from Nature Publishing Group, and its score was dominated by Twitter and Facebook activity, most notably garnering over 9,400 tweets (Figure 2).

Some have wondered: is there a direct relationship between altmetrics and Impact Factor or are they two forms of metrics at odds? I’ve argued

---

they are supplementary to one another. Despite criticisms about alleged calculation flaws and obsolescence, the Impact Factor has remained the gold standard by which academic articles, and by extension journals and even authors, are measured. Promotions are often aided by prolific publication in high-impact journals. Will altmetrics surpass Impact Factor over the next 60 years? I’m sure a case can be made in both camps, but for now, the prudent path for authors might be to continue the usual efforts to publish highly citable work while endeavoring to promote it via social media channels that offer additional and more global exposure.

I serve as the Executive Editor of the Aesthetic Surgery Journal, an official publication of the American Society for Aesthetic Plastic Surgery. We support and encourage our authors and editorial board to become active participants and advocates of social media. We expend resources to promote the work of our authors via Facebook, Twitter, and national press coverage to improve exposure. When we highlight an article on Facebook, for example, we tag the author so it also appears on her wall and her followers can share it forward. (Our Facebook page is www.facebook.com/asj.journal for anyone who may wish to take a look.) We’re pleased to report that our efforts on Twitter have been very positive and our handle (@ASJrnl) receives many retweets and favorites. In five short months since inception, we’ve garnered 935 followers. If the journal you manage or in which you plan to publish an article is associated with a society, there are even greater opportunities for sharing and promotion and reciprocity.

In a similar vein, the demand for video is high in our visually oriented field and the Aesthetic Surgery Journal responds by offering a video Issue Highlight and Article Highlight associated with every issue. The Issue Highlight features the Editor-in-Chief, Dr. Foad Nahai, who provides his selections for must-read articles. For the Article Highlight, we select one author to shoot a brief video overview of his work (an example is available at http://goo.gl/HixYk7). We share the videos and links to the article abstracts with our social media networks from our YouTube page and encourage authors to do the same, in the hopes that we will contribute to the field of aesthetic plastic surgery and ultimately improve patient care and outcomes. Secondarily, we believe these efforts will increase the attention articles receive, which should improve citations.

In aesthetics, the trainees (residents and fellows) are generally considered to be part of the millennial generation who are adept at most forms of social media. They’re comfortable with e-books, working on the fly or earning continuing medical education credits via their cell phones, and showing patients results on iPads. This is a generation at ease with technology. So their learning curve isn’t as great as older generations, and therein lies the educational gap that many academic journals and institutions are endeavoring to close.

A large segment of aesthetic plastic surgeons are in private practice, operating several days each week. Many have opted to hire a social media team to head up their efforts to promote their practice and research. Seeking expert assistance is always a
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practical option for the busy surgeon, since these efforts need regular (if not daily) nurturing to be successful.

It may be daunting to take the plunge and dive into the world of social media and altmetrics, but it’s likely you’ll see measurable results in short time that will hopefully encourage you to persist. If this is already the world in which you live, congratulations and keep up the efforts. It would be interesting to perform a retrospective analysis a decade from now when brand new technologies have been introduced—that will offer a true measure of the success and longevity of social media and its impact on academic publishing. I invite you to contact me at phaedra@surgery.org with questions or to chat about your ideas and successes.
Recap—What is OneNote?
In the last Taming Technology column we talked about OneNote basics, but that was a while back (sorry for the delay!), so let’s recap.

“Microsoft OneNote is an all-purpose note-taking tool designed to store everything related to a topic (text, Web clips, links, multimedia files) in one location. OneNote can help organize just about any aspect of life—from work projects, to home improvement plans, to your favorite recipes, or books you keep meaning to read” (from “OneNote Basics,” EON, Volume 7, Issue 1.)

In the previous article, we looked at OneNote’s structure, the basics of how you can set up your notebooks, what you can save there, and we also reviewed the OneNote ribbon for an overview of some of the available functions. If you want to reread the article on the basics before moving on to the more advanced features, logon to the ISMTE website and download the February 2014 issue of EON.

Special Features
OneNote is full of special features and advanced functionality that allows you to fully customize your organizational experience. Here, I’ll discuss what I consider to be the most useful features of OneNote from a project organization or project management perspective. Keep in mind, these are just a handful of the things you can do with OneNote.

Search
Now that you know how to set up your OneNote notebook, how do you find what you need? At first this may seem like a silly question, but if you’re like me and use OneNote as your one-stop-shop for all work-related information, your notebook can quickly amass sections, pages, and lots and lots of content. Thankfully, OneNote has a powerful search feature built in. The search bar always appears in the top right corner of your OneNote window. When you start to type in the search bar, OneNote brings up matching results from section titles, page titles, and actual page content across all notebooks.

Templates
Templates allow you to quickly create pages for use in different situations (i.e. taking meeting minutes, making a to-do list, or working out an in-depth project plan). On the right side of the OneNote window is the listing of the pages in your current section. At the top, where it lets you add a new page, you can browse all of the available page templates (or create your own) by hitting the dropdown menu and selecting “Page Templates...”
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There are a lot of templates that come standard in OneNote, but you also have the option to browse Office.com for user-generated templates, or make your own by saving your current page as a template. At the bottom of this window, you can also tell OneNote to use a particular template by default for any new pages opened in a certain section. For example, if you have a section that is where you keep all of your to-do lists from week to week, you can set one of the to-do list templates to be used by default whenever you create a new page.

If you choose to copy it to the clipboard, you can then simply paste (right click > Paste, or Ctrl + V) the image into any document that you want (Word document, email, etc.). This is by far the simplest way that I have ever found for doing screenshots. In fact, this is how I take all of my screenshots for these Taming Technology articles. However, please forgive my lack of screenshots in this particular section. OneNote does not allow you to take screenshots of its screenshot process.

Docking

You can dock your OneNote window to the side of your screen by going to the View Tab and selecting “Dock to Desktop” or by hitting Ctrl+Alt+D. There is also a small “Dock to Desktop” icon in the quick tools ribbon, which should appear at the top left of your window by default.

When you dock your OneNote window, it moves to the far right side of your primary monitor (in case you have more than one) and causes any other windows you have open to automatically adjust so that OneNote is always visible. This particular configuration is great for taking notes while looking at Web pages, or keeping your to-do list in sight but out of the way.

Screenshots Made Easy

Probably my favorite feature, OneNote makes taking, saving, and sharing screenshots incredibly easy. As long as you have OneNote installed on your machine and have opened it at least once to do the initial setup, simply hit the windows key plus “s”. This will cause your screen to look washed-out and your mouse to appear as a cross-hairs. From there, simply click and drag to select the part of your screen that you want to capture. A window will pop-up asking you where you would like to save the screenshot—you can select any section in any of your OneNote notebooks, or you can simply copy it to the clipboard.
Send to OneNote
This particular OneNote feature is actually accessed from Microsoft Outlook. If you use Outlook for your email, you may have noticed a number of “send to” or “link to” buttons in various locations, such as the ribbon at the top of the main Outlook window, the ribbon at the top of open email messages, or the ribbon at the top of a meeting invitation.

Linked Notes
A natural spin-off from docking your OneNote window is the ability to take linked notes. If OneNote is docked, it will automatically include a link to whatever other window you have open as you’re typing. For example, if I open Internet Explorer and navigate to ISMTE.org, then start typing notes about the Web page in my docked OneNote window, OneNote will include an active link to ISMTE.org with that note, making it incredibly easy to find where the information came from.

Once you select the desired location, your Outlook email or meeting will have its own home in OneNote where you can store the information for future use, or take notes from a meeting.

This feature will work with Microsoft products such as Internet Explorer, Word, and Excel. For Word or Excel documents, OneNote will include a link to the document’s save location on your computer, network drive, or SharePoint site.
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Send as Email or Attachment
Similar to saving OneNote pages as other file types, OneNote also allows you to send pages directly to other people as attachments, PDFs, or email messages. To send a OneNote page, click on the File tab and select “Send.” Once there, select the method by which you want to send your OneNote page.

Save to Word or PDF
It seems that Microsoft may have understood that not everyone would be familiar with files created in OneNote, so they made it very simple to save pages, sections, or even whole notebooks into other file formats. When you go to the File menu and select “Save As,” you will see options for saving your current page, section, or notebook as Word documents, PDF files, or even older versions of OneNote.

I have found that it is very convenient to format text nicely in OneNote (especially if it’s something that I’m going to want to save there later, like an article I wrote, or a checklist that I’ll need to save) and then send it directly to someone through an email message rather than as an attachment. Another benefit of sending a OneNote page as an email instead of an attachment is that it’s fully editable from the body of the email in Outlook.
Conclusion
As you can see, OneNote is an incredibly powerful, versatile tool which can make your work life more organized and streamlined. We’ve been through a lot of information in these two articles, but the real trick to taming OneNote and using it to the fullest is to just start using it. OneNote is so vast and feature-rich that it can be intimidating at first, but it’s important to remember that there’s no “right way” to use OneNote. You don’t have to use all of its many, many features for it to be helpful. As long as you the features you want in the way that makes sense for you, that’s what’s important. Start by taking some notes… Linking a meeting… Taking a screenshot… Before you know it, you’ll hit your stride with OneNote and there will be no looking back.
“It’s sensitive,” the Publishing Managers told me. “The outgoing editors….” And then no one ever finished the sentence. The journal was getting a new EIC, and the society wanted us to take on peer-review management at the same time. (The current journal administrators were the outgoing editors’ assistants at the hospitals where they worked, and they were not staying on.) There were hints the co-EICs had been asked to retire. They had been in their positions for over 15 years.

So, I asked, when should I get this transition underway? Who should I reach out to?

Well, they said, it’s sensitive. And then no one answered my questions, because no one knew.

Transitioning editors is hard.

As a Managing Editor working for a large publisher, I manage a portfolio of titles, and expect that my list can change at any time. In practice, however, I had a stable list of five small proprietary journals, and for three years there had been no EIC changes. Then, in April, I was informed a medium-sized society journal was going into my portfolio. The incoming EIC was eager and full of ideas; the outgoing EICs were a mystery. It was sensitive.

Yes, I nodded, I get it. Use all my people skills. But, this transition is happening, and I have no idea how. There are nuts and bolts that need attention, and they do not care if anyone involved is sensitive. What are the outgoing EICs planning? What are the transition dates? Is there any existing workflow documentation? Should I contact the outgoing EICs directly, or wait to be introduced? Who will introduce me?

Nothing. The nuts and bolts are not the Publishing Manager’s concern. Relationship management is their focus. No one wanted to put a foot wrong and risk disrupting the society relationship. There was no best practice model for a concurrent EIC and Managing Editor transition, no one to tell me “this is how you do it.”

My other titles transitioned to a team of Editorial Assistants. I would now manage them while they managed the journals. My whole job was changing. My head was spinning. I created packet after packet of workflow documents, trained the Editorial Assistants, soothed my Editors that I was still around, and fretted about the new journal. I stared at blank workflow documents, and waited. I finally met with the new EIC to get acquainted and lay out her agenda. I quickly realized she was in frequent contact with the outgoing co-EICs, and no one seemed overcome with drama. By the end of that meeting, I had transition dates and contact information for the current administrative assistants. I took the bull by the horns and wrote to them, and it turned out I was actually holding a sleepy steer by the ears. One of the co-EICs was having heart bypass surgery and wanted to be done even earlier than planned. The other’s assistant was very candid about her eagerness to be done with the journal so she could focus on her full-time job at the hospital. They had all, they said, been waiting for us to tell them what to do.

This is when I remembered that my job title included the word “managing,” and that stepping forward to take charge of a transition was not an insensitive thing to do. It was expected; transitions need a point person. Journals are the arena of transition. Papers are constantly shifting from person to person; authors and reviewers and editors come and go. An effective journal has a Managing Editor to coordinate the constant state of movement and change.

Was the transition easier after this stunning epiphany? Not really. I still made mistakes, hesitated too much, forgot to include this person or that or an email, had to mitigate unrealistic
A Hot Mess

Organized documentation is my best friend. Don’t be afraid to ask the outgoing personnel if they have anything written down, or wouldn’t mind filling out a brief questionnaire. (I speak from hindsight on this—I did not ask the outgoing administrative assistants to fill out any workflow documents, and I wish I had.)

Be prepared to offer training materials to new people. New EICs like to bring on new Associate Editors and reviewers, and there’s no guarantee any of them have used the systems before.

Reach out to others. Ask what they did, if they have any templates for workflow documents or training packets, any best practices, any advice. Sometimes all you need is a sympathetic ear for a few minutes before you go back to your desk and answer that pile of questions from your new Editor.

expectations from the incoming EIC, and was generally plagued with the daily feeling that I was missing something for the first month or so. We ran over our target dates for the outgoing co-EICs to wrap up their papers, but by that point, we had our workflow in place, so no one was confused and the world didn’t end. A smooth transition doesn’t mean there are no problems; it means the problems are well handled.

I found out this week that two of my other titles are getting new EICs next summer. Yikes! Here’s what I’ll be keeping in mind:

- Step up and manage. If no one coordinates the transition, or even gets the ball rolling, I should do it myself. Most, if not all, parties will be thankful someone took charge.
- Simple and direct communication is best. If I act like everything is business-as-usual, others will be put at ease and follow my lead.
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