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Wow. It may be an understatement that this year’s meeting was a great success! We saw record breaking attendance, with a final count of 207 attendees, including 92 first-time attendees. The main room was packed and some sessions were standing room only. There was a sense of excitement and engagement throughout the conference—everyone seemed to feel that this was a place to be with “our people.”

Favorite activities returned, such as the speed networking session, the exchange forum, and back by high demand, the dine-around dinners.

Sixteen posters—an ISMTE record—were submitted this year and were displayed during the conference. Congratulations to Sarah McCormack and Kimberly Rhodes from the American Society for Nutrition (ASN) on receiving First Place for their poster “ASN’s Interactive Peer Review Checklist: Regulating the Peer Review Process.” Visit the ISMTE website to view this year’s posters.

COPE North American Seminar 2015

COPE’s North American Seminar was held Wednesday, August 19 and covered the theme of understanding metrics in publishing. David Crotty, Senior Editor at Oxford University Press and Scholarly Kitchen chef, kicked off the seminar with a discussion on why we need metrics and what new metrics can offer Editors and journals. The debate continues on what is the best way to measure the impact of a journal or a particular article. Both the Impact Factor and altmetrics are flawed in their own ways and at the end of the day, there is no substitute for human judgement.

Elizabeth “Betsy” Donohue, Vice President and Publisher Business Development at Digital Science, talked about altmetrics in more detail, mentioning that researchers can use altmetrics to gauge the popularity of an article and that altmetrics lets researchers discover and network with others. Publishers have been a key driving force in the development of altmetrics, which can be used by Editorial Offices to encourage submissions, identify content, and determine high-profile authors.

Finally, Todd Carpenter, Executive Director at National Information Standards Organization (NISO), presented on NISO’s initiative to explore and identify.
standards for alternative assessment metrics. Although we have been using non–citation-based metrics for decades, there has not been the technology to collect or analyze data until recently. The NISO website contains more information about their altmetrics initiative and a 2014 white paper on phase 1 of the project.

After lunch, participants broke into groups to discuss cases previously reviewed by COPE. Next, the groups participated in an interactive workshop where they designed a new COPE flowchart answering the question, “What to do when an author appeals a review decision?”

More information on COPE can be found at their website, http://publicationethics.org.

ISMTE North American Conference 2015

Thursday, August 20: Morning Plenary Session

Keynote Address: Scholarly Communication Free-for-All: An Update on the Current State of Predatory Publishing and Related Scams

Reported by Meghan McDevitt

ISMTE welcomed back Jeffrey Beall, from the University of Colorado, Denver, to this year’s North American conference. He began with an overview of publishing models, from traditional subscription-based models to Gold Open Access (OA) where authors must pay a fee to publish, before describing ways in which to identify predatory publishers—those that exploit the Gold OA model for their own profit, taking advantage of scholarly researchers. Predatory publishers can provide cheap, easy, and fast publishing, leading to a breakdown of the research culture and damaging science along the way.

There are many ways in which predatory publishers aim to look authentic, including posting ISSNs on websites, obtaining fake Impact Factors, and hijacking legitimate journals to deceive authors. Publishing in a predatory journal can pose risks to a researcher’s career, such as harming his/her reputation. Beall concluded that the author-pays model has been a major cultural change in scholarly publishing that has led to the creation of scams and an upsurge in predatory publishers.

Thursday Morning Breakout Sessions

Session A: The Landscape of Predatory Publishing: An Exploration of Concerns

Reported by Deborah Bowman, MFA, ELS, Managing Editor, GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
Donald Samulack, PhD, from Editage, Jeffrey Beall, Hazel Newton from Nature Publishing Group/Palgrave Macmillan, and Gordon MacPherson, Director of Conference Quality at IEEE, reported on predatory publishing. This session took the form of a question-and-answer format, with Samulack asking the questions. A number of important ideas came out of this session: (1) It is important to distinguish between predatory journals and legitimate OA journals. (2) Some predatory publishers have “ghost conferences” where people pay to be published in the conference proceedings, but then they find out that there is no actual conference. (3) Pressure to publish is driving much of predatory publishing (or “questionable” publishing, as Beall’s lawyers prefer) because authors will do whatever it takes to get their articles published for the sake of their careers. (4) If you managed to knock out one predatory publisher, three or more would just spring up; therefore, it is going to be impossible to get rid of them all. (5) Authors choose a journal for submission based on many factors, including the reputation of the journal, the Impact Factor, its consistency, and whether it progresses the science. It is extremely important, therefore, that we make sure our journals fulfill all of these criteria if we hope to attract reputable authors. (6) Predatory publishers sometimes create a journal with the name of a legitimate journal to fool people into thinking that the journal is reputable. Editors should search the Internet for their journal on a regular basis to ensure that no one else is using their name.

One very large benefit of scholarly publishing is that we are a community, but predatory publishers threaten that. The only way to defeat them is for authors to stop supporting them. The panel members said that the future of science is at stake because these predatory journals are contaminating the body of knowledge by publishing articles without peer review or any other kind of quality control. It is crucial for us, as Editors, to be aware of this trend and to take steps to guard against it.

Session B: Best Practices vs. Legal Requirements: What Every Editorial Office Needs to Know

Reported by Jan Higgins, Managing Editor, Genetics in Medicine

Kathy Lyons, head of Editorial and Author Services at Nature Publishing Group, first defined a best practice and then went on to detail which are the current relevant policies for journal Editors. Those included authorship descriptions at ICMJE and NIH’s recent checklist to improve study reproducibility. She then explained how journals can be compliant with those policies (e.g., using CrossCheck to check articles for plagiarism).

Debra Parrish, an attorney who works with institutions as well as publishers and researchers on matters of research integrity, talked about the legal liabilities we can sometimes encounter in the Editorial Office. Her advice to avoid legal issues was to follow the published guidelines from organizations such as CSE and COPE as these are the industry standards. She also recommended that journals have public guidelines so authors and reviewers know what is expected of them, and so that Editorial Offices can refer to them if misconduct is alleged.

Session C: Doing More with Less: Help for Small Journals

Reported by Steve Musser, Sales Representative, Sheridan

Judy Connors is the Associate Director for Editorial Services at the Drug Information
Association (DIA) and she shared her experiences of doing more with less in small journal Editorial Offices. Faced with a significant retirement of editorial staff, Connors was challenged to accomplish a number of goals with a leaner editorial staff. This included increasing the number of manuscript submissions and citations, raising the Impact Factor, boosting advertising sales, and driving blog engagement.

Connors further explained the process by which they undertook this challenge. First they identified needs for the publishing program, namely developing a DIA knowledge center with publications at its core, and establishing continual sources of current content. Second, they raised awareness of the publications by partnering with publishers, incorporating social media marketing with an internship program, and providing a business card for editorial board members to spread the word. Lastly it was time to take action. The DIA strengthened their working editorial board using publishers and volunteers to lighten the load. They further established performance metrics and a monthly reporting system, automating as many of the tasks as possible. Marketing plans were developed for the publications, including social media in the form of a blog, podcasts, and a Twitter presence.

Connors concluded by noting the importance of setting a sustainable structure around editorial efforts by engaging volunteers, tracking metrics closely, and automating as many tasks as possible. She advised that communication is key; be prepared to make course corrections as needed since nothing is perfect and don’t be afraid to spin content through different media channels.

Session A: Predatory Author Services: What Can Be Done About It?

Reported by Deborah Bowman, MFA, ELS

In the continuation of the predatory publishing session, Newton, Samulack, and Beall returned and were joined by Josh Dahl from Thomson Reuters. Samulack reiterated that we are at a dangerous time in publishing history because of predators. Unfortunately, the problems caused by predatory publishers are not confined to post-publishing; rather, author services in the pre-publication stages have attracted predators as well. “Author services” includes all pre-submission work, including pre-submission peer review, copyediting, and translations. Some of these service companies are only too happy to take an author’s money without doing any real work on his or her article, or they charge exorbitant fees and agree to work on poor-quality articles just to get the author’s money. In addition, there are brokers who, in exchange for a payment, promise authors that their articles will get published. As a result, science continues to be tainted with poor articles that may be indistinguishable from good articles to the average reader. Samulack said we are at a tipping point in publishing history; publishing itself as a reputable business is at stake.

This panel quoted Ginny Barbour (COPE Chair), who has said we need a culture of responsibility for the integrity of the literature. Therefore, the people on this panel are enacting a call to action by starting the Coalition for Responsible Publication Resources (CRPR). Their purpose is to help preserve the integrity of scholarly literature by ensuring transparency, discoverability, and accountability of responsible scholarly services to industry norms, guidelines, and best practices, so that academic authors can make informed decisions at point-of-service when seeking publication support and when publishing their scholarly works.
Careers are being destroyed by predators, both pre- and post-publication. CRPR wants to curb this trend by educating authors and setting quality standards. They welcome the support of anyone who attended the ISMTE conference.

**Thursday Afternoon Interactive Workshops**

**Session A: Advanced Tips and Tricks for Word**

*Reported by Stephanie Kinnan, Editorial Assistant, GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Martin Spiering of CSR Incorporated, a research support company, discussed ways to improve the way you work in Microsoft Word. He began by stressing the importance of customizing your toolbar or “ribbon” to your preferences, adding tools you use often and doing away with those that get in your way. He referred to File → Options as Word’s “secret portal” where you can customize everything from autocorrect to grammar settings.

He also offered tips for dealing with multiple versions of the same document. Review → Compare allows you to track the differences between two similar pieces, while Review → Combine helps merge the modifications made by several contributors into one document. Spiering warned, however, that simply accepting all changes in a document created with the Combine function is unlikely to give good results, so this feature is better for keeping track of changes than for quickly creating a final, revised document.

Other hints included going to File → Options → Proofing → Settings to activate a requirement for a serial comma, using View → Split to split your screen to compare sections of your document, and setting up Insert → Quick Parts → AutoText to quickly insert stock phrases.

Finally, Spiering discussed the more advanced trick of creating your own automated tasks through the use of macros (View → Macros). Macros can significantly cut down the time it takes to complete certain tasks in Word. For example, you can preprogram a frequently used comment and simply click that macro to insert the comment instead of typing it out at every use.

Overall, Spiering’s presentation was instructive and engaging. He gave step-by-step instructions for customizing the Microsoft Word user experience, leaving the session attendees equipped and well informed.

**Session B: Improving Your Instructions to Authors**

*Reported by Steve Musser*

Ashley Smith and Kurt Spurlock from Research Square offered their thoughts on improving your instructions for authors. Impediments to publishing can be frustrating to all people involved, including authors and Editors. With the goal of creating standardization and predictability, Spurlock notes the audience for instructions is researchers who want the submission process to be as easy as possible and who view instructions as a reference to consult.

To make guidelines easy to follow, Smith and Spurlock suggest organizing information into tables, building a checklist of required elements, providing example citations and references and placing this information on a single or central page.
with links to other guideline pages. They went on to provide several “before and after” examples which neatly demonstrated the effectiveness of the table format.

Smith then shared her thoughts on figure formatting, noting that authors are frequently confused by terminology and procedures. To avoid figure-related questions it’s best to avoid esoteric terms and instead show examples and provide brief instructions for specific procedures. Smith went on to provide specific examples of common figure formatting problems including image resolution, figure dimensions, file types, and color space. The session concluded with a collaborative discussion where attendees shared their experiences, good and bad, with each other.

Session C: Poster Research/Presentation Skills

Reported by Michelle English, Director of Operations, J&J Editorial

The main takeaway of this session from all the presenters was that creating a poster should not be intimidating. Alethea Gerding, Managing Editor of the Journal of Prosthodontics and Sara Welliver, Client Manager/Systems Support Manager at J&J Editorial, both spoke about their prior experience creating and submitting posters at past ISMTE conferences and stressed that if a topic is of interest to you then it is likely going to be interesting to your colleagues. Poster ideas don’t need to be grueling research projects carried out over a number of years—they can be about simple topics or issues that are quantifiable. Presenter Margot Puerta, an Executive Editor at the Feinstein Institute for Medical Research, urged audience members to think of the three most pressing issues in your Editorial Office, and then brainstorm ways you could address those problems. If information must be gathered to prepare the poster, consider how could you do this (custom reports, spreadsheet tracking, etc.).

Each poster should be split into a few basic parts: introduction, objectives/hypothesis, materials and methods, results, and a discussion/conclusion. The presenters split the audience into groups to workshop some case study examples of issues that an Editorial Office might face. The audience was tasked with determining how a poster could be created out of the information given. It seemed like everyone walked away with some concrete examples and inspiration for future poster submissions. The session closed out with helpful slides and explanation by Puerta on how ISMTE members can submit an abstract proposal and create a poster for next year’s conference. ISMTE has made it especially easy for newbies who have never created a poster before by offering poster mentoring and an easy to use drag-and-drop poster template.

Thursday Afternoon Breakout Sessions

Session A: The Publishing Environment in China

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

Yan Shuai, Director of Journal Publishing at Tsinghua University Press, gave attendees an inside view of STM publishing in China. A key feature is the prominent role of the central government in publication practice. For instance, in 2014 a government agency set criteria for academic journals. Currently 5,756 publications—sponsored by a variety of research institutes, societies, and universities—are officially licensed as academic journals in China. But Chinese government ambitions go far beyond regulating domestic STM publishing: there is a clear goal to support Chinese journals instead of emphasizing publications by Chinese authors in foreign journals. To that end, there is direct government support for top-tier journals such as Nano Research (copublished by Tsinghua University Press and Springer; currently ranked number 11 in the “Nanoscience and Nanotechnology” category of Thomson Reuters’
Journal Citations Reports [JCR]), to make these publications even more competitive internationally. Similarly, the China Association for Science and Technology (CAST), an umbrella group for scientific and technological societies, launched a project in recent years to enhance the international prominence of China’s English-language journals, 163 of which are already included in the JCR. China-based journals are also focusing on recruiting top international scientists to be Editors-in-Chief and Associate Editors and on soliciting content from conferences. In another effort to improve quality, the Society of China University Journals (CUJS) has launched an award for the best Chinese journal and organizes international exchanges.

The session continued with a complementary perspective from Xianyong Yin, PhD, who conducted genomics research in China for 10 years prior to his recent hire as a research assistant professor at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Yin reminded attendees of the breathtaking rise in publications from Chinese authors, which by 2025 will equal the research output from the United States. He gave hints about how US journals can attract high-quality submissions from Chinese authors by explaining how he decides on the appropriate journal for his work. In his view, the number one criterion is the journal’s reputation, followed by the speediness of the review process (he likes an initial triage decision within one week), whether it is OA (while he prefers everyone to have access to his paper, he adjusts the importance he ascribes to this based on available funds), how quickly publication happens (epub ahead of print is a must), and how well the journal promotes the paper. In terms of promotion, he mentioned Elsevier’s “My Research Dashboard” and CiteAlert services, which made him feel he was able to effectively monitor the performance of his papers. Yin highlighted three sources of information for selecting journals: the JCR, the journal homepage, and a Chinese-language website, MedSci, which provides crowdsourced journal reviews from authors, including metrics such as average consideration times.

Session B: Alternative Article Types: Identifying New Opportunities

Reported by George Woodward, Publisher, Elsevier

The aim of this session was to encourage attendees to think beyond traditional article types and to consider novel options relevant to their specific fields. Speakers Deborah Bowman, MFA, Managing Editor of GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, and Paige Shaklee, PhD, Publisher at Elsevier, reported on their experiences in identifying opportunities and implementing new article types.

Bowman discussed GIE’s video articles, which have proved so popular they are actually being spun off into their own journal. Although it is becoming fairly common for articles to be accompanied by supplemental videos, in this case the video itself is the article. Given the use of video technology in gastrointestinal endoscopy, these articles are an excellent example of how a journal can meet a need in its field by developing a publication outlet for materials that are already being created during the research process. Bowman noted that the articles do not have abstracts because they did not want to risk them being considered citable source items for the Impact Factor. This decision may be revisited, as the Impact Factor may not be a significant concern for the new journal. Unexpectedly, the articles are showing up in PubMed searches, although it is not known whether this will continue.

Shaklee spoke about the publication of data articles in the relatively new journal Data in Brief. Data articles consist of descriptions of data—without analysis—and either the data itself or a link to a publicly accessible repository containing the data. These articles benefit authors by providing publication credit for the data itself, while fitting with the trend of increasing author, institution,
and funding body interest in making data more easily available. Shaklee emphasized the cross-disciplinary nature of the journal, pointing out that researchers would be able to take better advantage of relevant data from another field, something that is not currently easy to do. As this is still an emerging area, Shaklee noted that there are still many questions to be answered.

Both speakers spoke to the value of using templates in establishing new article types, to help guide authors through the formatting process and to ensure that key elements were included.

Session C: New Technologies to Support Editorial Office Operations

Reported by Kerry O’Rourke, Senior Managing Editor at KWF Editorial Services

Change is a constant in scholarly journal publishing and it can be a challenge to keep current with new technologies and tools that are launched continually. This session introduced three offerings that many ISMTE meeting attendees may find themselves using in the coming year.

Dryad

Dryad is a general-purpose data repository that has been curated to make the data that underlie scientific and medical publications more easily discovered, reused, and cited. Executive Director Meredith Morovati said authors generally agree that data should be shared and reused and that more and more funders are requiring researchers to post their data publically.

Dryad, a nonprofit based in Durham, North Carolina, has developed technology to integrate the process of submitting data to be archived into the manuscript submission process. The system is flexible in order to meet varying journal data policies. All data in Dryad is free to access and download. “Data hoarding” is on the way out, Morovati said.

Dryad employees are involved in the data curation process to perform a basic check when data come in and to make sure that authors are not uploading content that they shouldn’t be. Morovati explained that each data set uploaded receives its own DOI, which provides a permanent link from the data to the article and back.

Morovati encouraged attendees to examine their data policies and consider requiring authors to submit data. “A simple workflow change can produce big results,” she said.

Find more information at www.datadryad.org.

RightsLink for Open Access

RightsLink, a system from Copyright Clearance Center that allows publishers to automate certain transactions with authors and other stakeholders, can be integrated into a journal’s workflow in a number of ways. The system even can be used for transactions that don’t involve money, said Director of Business Development Chuck Hemenway.

With the growth of OA options, there is no longer “one price fits all” for authors, which means publishers must take a more active role in making sure all institutional and funding requirements are met. “The new normal is there is no normal,” Hemenway declared.

RightsLink is a robust, common platform that can leverage the data provided by ORCID, FundRef, and Ringgold, he explained. The system seeks to simplify the fee process for authors and reduce the chance of errors. It also has resulted in publishers being paid faster, he noted. The system provides comprehensive reporting; publishers can pull every piece of data about the transaction that they may need.

In addition to monetary transactions, RightsLink can integrate marketing and promotional efforts about society membership, rewards, and other services.

Find more information at www.copyright.com/content/rightscentral/en.html.
Aries Systems

Aries Systems, which developed Editorial Manager and ProduXion Manager, continuously works on practical ways to integrate new technology and tools into the peer-review workflow, said Director of Strategic Client Solutions Jennifer Fleet. The peer-review system is a “central hub” and a logical point to integrate new tools, she noted.

For example, users can log in to Editorial Manager with their ORCiDs. The technology is such that an author’s ORCID username and password are never exposed to Aries.

The Dryad system is integrated into Editorial Manager and allows authors to upload the URL where their data resides with their manuscript. The live link to the data becomes part of the submission PDF and reviewers and editors can click through to access the data, Fleet said.

Editorial Manager also has integrated the RightsLink system for article processing charges. As Fleet described, if authors want to submit a paper for OA publication, they simply click a button and the system will estimate the charge for them. Editorial Manager feeds information about the manuscript into RightsLink to create the estimate. Once the article has been accepted or another trigger event occurs, authors receive a deep link that takes them into the RightsLink payment system. Payment processing occurs outside of Editorial Manager, Fleet explained.

Find more information at www.editorialmanager.com.

Alice Northover, the Social Media Marketing Manager for Oxford University Press, opened the discussion with an overview of several common marketing tools. She discussed some of the advantages and challenges of public relations, social media, paid advertising, and direct marketing. Northover reminded attendees that “free” marketing still has a cost in terms of time and staffing. Even with limited resources, however, any journal office has the opportunity to promote its content. Northover also discussed how a journal can benefit from conferences and leveraging existing partnerships.

Charlie Rapple, the Sales and Marketing Director of Kudos, then presented on working with authors promote their own content. She pointed out that authors frequently know their community better than outsiders, providing an advantage for locating an appropriate audience and identifying the “story” that will capture their interest. The journal office can encourage authors to promote their own work by demonstrating the return on their invested efforts. Trackable links, mentions, altmetrics, views, downloads, and citations are just a few of the tools that journal offices can use to measure promotion.

Both speakers emphasized the importance of clearly defined goals. Identifying the key message and target audience can help the journal office make the most of limited resources. With a number of tools at their disposal, attendees can experiment with promotion and adapt their strategies as needed.

Friday, August 21: Vendor Sessions

Breakout sessions were held Friday morning for eJournalPress, ScholarOne, Editorial Manager, and Elsevier’s EES/EVISE, covering new and upcoming features across editorial systems.

Friday Breakout Sessions

Session A: Public Relations for Journals and Helping Authors Promote Their Work

Reported by Sarah Forgeng, Editorial Process Manager, Journal of Investigative Dermatology

This session focused on the challenges and opportunities for promoting journal content.
Session B: Pre-Submission Vendor Space: Selecting Great Partners

Reported by Jessica Rucker, Manager of Peer Review Systems, American Chemical Society

The panel, hosted by Charley Trowbridge, Director of ACS Publications, treated the audience to a high-level overview of current activity in the pre-submission vendor space. Trowbridge warmed up the discussion by encouraging publishers of every size to consider their vendor needs in this growing pre-submission sector, focusing on the high cost of learning what authors need and developing internal resources to meet those needs. The three panelists shared information on the author services their respective companies provide, and suggested some key considerations that publishers and societies should make before selecting a pre-submission vendor partner.

Shawn Maloney, PhD, Co-Founder and President of Journal Prep, kicked off the panel by honing in on the difference between what authors want versus what authors will pay for and the importance of knowing where to position your services. Maloney also addressed the emerging desire for statistical analysis in certain fields of scientific and medical writing.

Deric Corlew, PhD, Vice President of Business Development at Research Square, made important distinctions between author challenges and journal needs, underscoring the importance of understanding a publisher’s goals before selecting a vendor partner. Corlew also provided the audience with a very clear overview of the different flavors of partnership, from private labeling to referral programs.

Donald Samulack, PhD, President of US Operations for Editage, wrapped up the panel with insights into the value of partnering with a large international firm, especially one that has experience working in the Asian markets. Samulack shared his experience working in China, where the demand for author services is as high as their desire to publish in high-impact international journals.


Reported by Jen Mahar, Origin Editorial

Heather Goodell, Director of Scientific Publishing at the American Heart Association (AHA) and Debra Parrish, an attorney with expertise in the field of publishing, spoke about how to apply ethical policies into your workflow when handling cases involving integrity issues. They used a series of cases of authorship, editor conflict scenarios, and retraction issues showing the need to look closely at policy when considering how to handle such cases. Both speakers shared cases that explored where policy could be enforced or changed to more fully cover situations when they arise.

Goodell led her discussion by discussing development of ethics policies (following COPE, CSE, and ICMJE guidelines as best practices), but stressed that you often are taken off the beaten path of the documented process due to the complexity and nature of each case. The AHA provides their ethical guidelines online as a resource and as a place to point authors, Editors, reviewers, and the media. Goodell described a few cases where her stated policy was tested. The first was related to an AWOL author’s paper that was eventually rejected. She stressed the importance of emailing all authors correspondence related to a paper and discussed staffing implications to any change in your workflow.
Goodell then went on to discuss a case in which an author published a paper without his principal investigator’s knowledge or participation. Although it was agreed that it was bad form for the author to publish the paper, when the procedures and policies were reviewed, the journal concluded there was nothing more that could be done because the author had legitimate access to the data and the paper met journal requirements for publication.

Her third scenario revolved around a published conference abstract. The author who uploaded and submitted the original abstract was not present at the meeting and another author took over. The original author claimed identity theft. Goodell stressed the importance of determining who signs the copyright transfer agreements for abstracts and what type of security might be needed during the conference to check that the author who signed the form is the one who uploads the slides. Journals might also consider publishing abstracts after the meeting, instead of in tandem with it. Goodell pointed out that there are also staffing implications to many of these considerations.

Finally Goodell discussed ethical concerns about policies as they relate to Editors and the appearance of any ethical concerns. She stressed the importance of having a workflow when an Editor is involved in an allegation of misconduct. You should have a set structure for where the manuscript should be sent and who should be informed and act as Editor for the paper in question. One important aspect to journal policies should address is obtaining conflict-of-interest information on your Editors so that there can be some review of what else the Editors are involved with to determine if there is conflict or concern with a submission. Goodell mentioned that if you use Guest Editors, you should have

---

**Congratulations to the 2015 ISMTE Award Winners!**

**ISMTE Award for Excellence**
Mary L. Chang  
Publications Manager, *American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*

**ISMTE Award for Achievement or Innovation**
Tim Vines  
Managing Editor, *Molecular Ecology*

**ISMTE Jason Roberts Founder’s Award**
Elizabeth Blalock  
Managing Editor, *Journal of Investigative Dermatology*
a policy and workflow for their involvement in your journal.

Goodell had many practical angles for how to handle when your policy is challenged by your workflow or when your workflow is challenged by your policy.

Parrish posed a case that would test any retraction policy—a high-profile author who was unable to provide the underlying data for many published studies. After outlining the case, she posed questions to the audience about retracting the papers. Parrish reviewed how institutions and universities handled the cases, pointing out that there was a finding of misconduct by at least one institution and a pattern of misconduct on the part of the author (for being unable to provide data and for destroying materials). However, another institution the author worked at did not make a finding of misconduct.

Parrish went on to note that the COPE guidelines advise that you should be justified to retract if it is clear that findings are unreliable or after an institutional investigation has found misconduct is present. A journal can retract even without author agreement. She stressed it is important for journals to understand that it is the institutions’ responsibility to perform these investigations, not the journals; journals typically do not have these types of resources or access to authors or data. A university should have a system in place for management of ethical concerns for its faculty. But there are variations by country and institution and if you are dealing with a non–US-based university, you may find that their practices are very different. Parrish detailed how each of the institutions handled the finding of misconduct and the involvement of co-authors, which ranged from agreeing to retract to disagreeing strongly. One co-author feared being sued by the accused author if she agreed to retract, although she was aware the data were likely fabricated.

Parrish gave the audience many things to think about when approaching a potential retraction, emphasizing that your journal should have a system in place for handing retractions. Retractions are corrections to the literature and should be detailed in the information you provide about your journal.

**Friday Afternoon Plenary Session**

**Plenary Address: Science out of the Box**

*Reported by Michelle English*

Audrey Huang, MA, PhD, Director of Marketing and Communications for Research and Education at Johns Hopkins, closed out this year’s conference with a plenary address about communicating science to the public. Huang explained that her background in research and science writing is what brought her to her current position at Hopkins, with her main goal being to help the institution recruit the very best educators and trainees from around the world. While previously the school’s marketing and communications used traditional print forms, it’s been a new challenge to figure out how to communicate with and attract incoming medical students who are of the iPhone generation. The “Science Out of the Box” program was launched a little over a year ago to increase the social media presence surrounding the scientific research programs at Hopkins and offer something that would appeal to a very broad audience.

The audience was able to watch a few Science Out of the Box YouTube videos. In each, a researcher was given a box of toys and used those toys to explain the science behind their findings and core research initiatives. In one video, a researcher used building blocks and rope to explain how protein chains are affected by cell signaling. In another, a string quartet was used by a doctor to explain cancer epigenetics—with instruments playing in and out of unison to tell the story of cells turned cancerous.

Huang explained that these days researchers have many groups that might potentially care about what a laboratory is doing: peers, students, policy makers, grant funders, general news media, philanthropists, and so on. Each group comes to the table with a very different knowledge base, so the goal was to find a way to translate what the researchers are doing for nonexperts. Each video’s focus
tries to be a bit broad, and to contextualize the very specific science being done by one researcher to a more relatable or practical application. Using toys helps to cut through the highly technical jargon that experts sometimes tend to use, and makes the language simple and the applications relatable. Huang said that filming each short video typically takes two to three hours and that it can only be successful if the researcher is actually comfortable in front of a camera playing with toys. Check out the Science Out of the Box videos by visiting their YouTube channel.

Conference Wrap-up

Congratulations to Elizabeth Blalock and the rest of the conference planning committee, Michelle English, Jessica Rucker, Kurt Spurlock, Steve Musser, Julie Nash, Sarah Forgeng, Kerry O’Rourke, Margot Puerta, and George Woodward, for the excellent planning and execution of another great ISMTE North American Conference.


View handouts and conference materials from the meeting online at the ISMTE website.

Hope to see you next year, when we’ll be back in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 11-12, 2016.

Editor’s Note: Photos courtesy of Kristie Overstreet, Carolyn deCourt, Michael Willis, and Meghan McDevitt.
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The Best of Both Worlds

By Jennifer Deyton
Senior Partner
J&J Editorial, LLC (www.jjeditorial.com)
Jennifer@jjeditorial.com

Several years ago, I was asked to write an article for *EON* on remote management of the Editorial Office.1 As a senior partner for what at the time was a very small band of contractors specializing in professional peer review, I was proud to tout the benefits of working from home as our Managing Editor profession developed into something more permanent that could be done off-site from the publisher, society, and university. We worked very closely with Managing Editors and as Managing Editors to serve a few publisher and society journals located in other parts of the country. The article I wrote gave tips and tricks on working remotely and mainly focused on the remote relationships with Editors, publishers, and societies. A handful of us worked together to manage a handful of titles from our home offices. We often met in cafes and collaborated via instant messaging, email, phone, etc. At that time, technology and the changing landscape of academic peer review enabled us to professionalize the role of the Managing Editor without the need for overhead such as rent, utilities, furniture, and other expenses related to managing a brick-and-mortar office. We were very successful as Managing Editors working from home, just like most of you are still today.

Fast forward seven years, and I was asked again by *EON* to address this topic in the “modern” world now that remote management of the Editorial Office is not such a novel idea. Online submission systems like ScholarOne, Editorial Manager, and eJournal Press have propelled this profession into the twenty-first century. Of course, J&J still has clients all over the globe and continues to function as Managing Editors from remote locations on behalf of our clients. However, as we have grown, I have less advice on how to manage a growing staff working out of home offices. On the contrary, what I have found and would like to share here is that as our small band of independent Managing Editors has morphed in a growing professional company of almost 70 full-time employees with benefits and human resources needs, the partners and management at J&J really feel the need to have a presence in a brick-and-mortar office. Do not get me wrong, I do still think this job can be done from anywhere, and so we allow all employees to work from home one to two days a week. However, in order for us to fully optimize our skills, share experiences, and collaborate in such a way as to offer our clients the most professional peer-review management possible, we have found we need a “command center” and have begun to put more and more emphasis on our company structure.

In January of 2014, J&J converted all contractors to employees. In doing so, we felt we would be able to better recruit and retain professional Managing Editors focused on a career in academic peer-review management. We now offer a robust

benefits plan that includes vacation, sick time, professional development, and health insurance, among many other benefits.

J&J has also developed a management structure to help ensure effective communication, professional development, and collaboration. In addition to the two original partners, we also have a director of operations who manages all aspects of the office, our recent expansion into a new suite, computer needs, human resources, hiring, and everything else that helps us maintain the best Managing Editors possible. We have also appointed coordinators for each of our four areas of focus: peer review, production, copyediting, and system support. Each publisher also has a client manager reporting to their respective coordinators who oversees the needs of that particular client and manages the Managing Editors and Editorial Assistants working in that department.

As we have grown and developed a management structure, our employee-based company really needs traditional office space and hours to properly function as a cohesive organization.

As I mentioned, we do allow all employees at J&J the opportunity to set their schedule and work from home up to two days a week. However, we have found over the years that we are able to offer a better service to our clients, as well as a more engaging company atmosphere for our employees, if we have office hour times together as an organization. Although there are countless benefits to working from home, like saving on commute time, saving gas money, and saving the environment, to name a few, working as an independent Managing Editor can often be a slightly isolating profession, especially if you work from home in a different state than your publisher, Editor-in-Chief, and society. Our focus over the last few years has been to develop a company that not only better serves our clients, but contributes to the original mission of J&J to professionalize the role of Managing Editor and other professions involved in managing successful peer-reviewed journals. We feel our employees gain great insight from each other when they have face-to-face time to collaborate and exchange ideas. Carolyn deCourt, a J&J Managing Editor who works with the American Chemical Society, explains it best:

Most days I prefer coming into the office, because I feel I’m more motivated being surrounded by other working bodies, and I am more likely to be able to help out with other projects around the office. It is easier to communicate thoughts with my team and is great for team bonding! Working from home is always a nice change of pace, and allows you to focus without the hustle of the office. In the case of sickness or a family emergency, it’s great to have the option to work from home to take care of things while being able to complete your daily tasks at the same time. The happy medium between the two keeps me from getting burned out at one or the other.

Our evolution to a brick-and-mortar office also helps to keep all our employees abreast of important and pressing issues in the publishing world. For example, when we send 10-12 employees to the ISMTE annual conference, we ask them to then report on their favorite sessions at the next J&J staff meeting. In this way, everyone learns about predatory publishers, COPE, system upgrades, poster topics, standards initiatives like ORCID, CRediT, and Ringgold, and other hot topics in STM publishing. J&J sends several staff to all the major meetings, including those of the Council of Science Editors, the Society for Scholarly Publishing, and the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, as well as editorial management software user conferences, and many more. Then we bring back the topical and informative sessions to the company as a whole.
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Our ability to have staff meetings, department meetings, and management meetings in our conference room allows for better collaboration, training, oversight, coverage, and a sense of community for our employees. Without our office presence, we feel this sort of industry growth would be more challenging for a company our size. Our abilities to work from home, set our own schedules, and work autonomously on our own titles are usually considered benefits and are easy enough to do, as there is a lot of flexibility in this profession. What we have found as a company is that the right balance of company office hours and home office hours gives our employees the best of both worlds.

Kat Farley, a J&J Production Editor for PLOS copyediting sums up our current situation quite nicely:

In this field, it’s easy to get bogged down in isolated processes and day-to-day tasks. We’re all only responsible for one or two pieces of an immense publishing puzzle, and staff and department meetings help us keep the big picture in mind. All of our teambuilding happens in the office, and I believe it’s strength as a team that makes us able to meet and exceed our clients’ needs and expectations. However, your work wardrobe might become a weird mix of pajamas and blazers.

Stay Connected through ISMTE’s Discussion Forum

Forums are threaded ongoing discussions that allow users to ask questions and have conversations on various topics.

You can subscribe to a forum digest that will send a single email containing all recent forum activity. If you want to be alerted immediately about forum activity, you can subscribe to a specific forum or to a specific forum topic to be notified of new replies that have just been posted.

Visit the ISMTE website to subscribe to the Discussion Forum or contact Deborah Bowman for more information.
Discovering Our Roots: Monster Mash

By Stephanie Kinnan
Editorial Assistant

GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

It’s October 31st, Halloween, All Hallows’ Eve, and you’re too old for trick-or-treating. So what do you do? Curl up on the couch with a mug of apple cider and an entire bag of fun-sized Snickers® (the trick-or-treaters can fend for themselves, you’re not sharing) and watch a good old-fashioned horror movie. Nothing’s better than the classics, right? What screams Halloween more than “redrum, redrum,” projectile green vomit, a shadow behind a shower curtain, or a bucket of blood on prom night? But what about the real classics? I’m talking about the old Hollywood monster movies, ripped right from the pages of iconic literature. Believe it or not, before vampires sparkled in the sunlight and werewolves became teen heartthrobs, monsters were meant to be scary, and no two more so than Dracula and Frankenstein’s monster. We all know they’re fiction, just characters adapted from old books, but they still raise the hair on the back of our necks and make us jump with every knock at the door. The slicked hair and billowing black cape, the scared face and bulging neck bolts, Hollywood sure knew how to paint a picture, but did they get it right? In honor of Halloween, let’s take a closer look at the things you thought you knew about two of literature’s creepiest creatures.

Dracula:
The first movie adaptation featuring Dracula was released in 1931, and while that film certainly left a lasting impression, it set a precedent for countless followers to stray from Bram Stoker’s original vision. Most people will never pick up a copy of Dracula and so sadly will never learn the truth of the vampire that launched a thousand franchises. Believe it or not, Dracula is actually the result of a crab-and-mayonnaise-fueled nightmare that Stoker experienced after an evening of overindulgence. Like a nightmare, this character was meant to be hideous and terrifying. Stoker’s Dracula was certainly no love story. The vampire wasn’t so easy to kill either. A stake through the heart wasn’t going to get the job done. According to Stoker, the way to ensure the death of a vampire is to take off his head—talk about gruesome. Although the biggest vampire myth that resulted from Dracula movie adaptations was the aversion to sunlight, Stoker’s Dracula was perfectly able to walk around during the day. He certainly didn’t sparkle in the sunlight and you probably wouldn’t find him on a beach somewhere sipping a piña colada, but nor did he burst into flames at first light. Although, I guess it makes for a much more theatrical death when the first beams of sunrise turn a vampire to dust.

Frankenstein:
Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* was also the product of a nightmare in which Shelley saw a corpse coming back to life, and when her friend Lord Byron suggested a contest to see who could write the greatest horror story, Frankenstein’s monster was born (or created may be a more appropriate word). Movie adaptations of *Frankenstein* are also littered with inaccuracies, the most glaring of which is the name itself. Frankenstein is the name of the creator, not the creation. The narrative is really centered on the scientist Dr. Frankenstein, not his monster. And anyone who has actually picked up the book can tell you to forget about Igor or any other hunchbacked assistant. Dr. Frankenstein did his twisted experiments alone, experiments that were far more successful in the book than in any movie. Although he is rarely portrayed as such, what with all the grunting and stiff-arm zombie-walking, Shelley’s monster was actually an intelligent being who could read and write, although an educated zombie probably didn’t lend itself well to movie magic.

Adapted in part from:
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**WHAT DRIVES US TO DELIVER...**

You do.
Your goals, your time,
your resources, your revenue.

It’s why we offer you...
Services for every aspect of production – from peer review management, copyediting and composition to author services and fulfillment.
Print and e-products of which you can be proud.
The perfect balance of technology and automation to quality craftsmanship and professional service.
Sheridan-developed processes and workflows to make you more efficient, and the training and support you need to use them.

Services to deliver your content on time and on budget.

www.sheridan.com

*Sheridan is the proud sponsor of Editorial Office News.*
Peer-to-Peer Content Distribution

By Joe Wikert
Director of Strategy and Business Development
Olive Software

Editor’s Note: This text was originally posted on July 20, 2015 on Joe Wikert’s Digital Content Strategies. It has been adapted and republished with permission. Click here to view the original.

The smartwatch movement inspired me recently, which is surprising because I haven’t worn a watch since I started carrying a smartphone many years ago. I’m about as far as you can get from being a fashionista and I liken a watch to other obsolete single-use devices like the GPS. I doubt I’ll buy one anytime soon but I believe the device synchronization model used by smartwatches lends itself to content distribution as well.

You’re probably aware of how most smartwatches get paired with your smartphone. Although they don’t have all the capabilities of a smartphone, things like text messages and phone calls can be redirected from your phone to your watch, thanks in large part to Bluetooth technology. Your phone communicates with your watch the same way your phone connects with a wireless headset or desktop Bluetooth speaker, for example.

Let’s fast-forward to the day when we’ve all become peer-to-peer content distributors. Rather than relying on centrally-managed and hosted sites and services that handle everything from reviews to downloads, this peer-to-peer model means we’re doing all that for each other using Bluetooth or some other simple networking protocols. For example, your phone or computer can easily be turned into a Wi-Fi server, allowing you to connect multiple devices to it; that’s a capability that exists today and I’m suggesting it could be extended for new uses in the future.

The Kindle introduced a whole new level of reading privacy. Once upon a time on a crowded bus you could see the cover of the book being read by the person across the aisle. Now we’re all masking our reading habits with tablets and phones. No, I’m not suggesting we embrace an overly intrusive model that has privacy advocates screaming in the streets. Rather, I believe a peer-to-peer model could be used to improve discovery and consumption at the hyperlocal level.

Think of the hundreds of riders on a commuter train each morning. Maybe they’re traveling from the northern suburbs into Manhattan. Some of them are neighbors. Many of them are businesspeople. All of them probably follow and read some type of news. Instead of just knowing the top global trends on Google, wouldn’t it be interesting to know what news stories your fellow commuters are reading?

The same concept can be applied to passengers on a plane or even homeowners in a neighborhood. Just as NextDoor.com has disrupted Angie’s List and brought communication and recommendations to the local level, I suggest a peer-to-peer model could do the same for content.

The peer-to-peer aspect really shines when you consider how the content gets from my device to yours. That news story I just read on TheGuardian.com still lives in my browser’s cache. If enough of my fellow commuters read the same article, it floats to the top of the popular news list for our little commuter community. You click the link to it in our peer-to-peer content app and the article is pulled from my cache to your device.

In short, we’re distributing content to each other, without having to go up and down, to and from a central server. Wouldn’t this be terrific on a 4-hour flight with no Wi-Fi? Each of our
devices acts as a mini-server, hosting content for everyone else.

Publishers would freak out over this model, at least initially. They’ll no longer control distribution and it will create holes in their analytics. I’m sure most, if not all, publishers have something buried in their terms and conditions preventing this sort of thing, but those who want to embrace broader distribution and consumption will eventually warm up to it.

By the way, the model isn’t limited to Web pages. Think about the benefits this offers the book publishing sector. What if you could see a list of the popular e-books in your neighborhood or among your fellow commuters? And what if you could pull a sample of one of those popular titles from someone else’s device, again, a particularly useful solution when you’re outside Wi-Fi and cellular range? If you decide you like that sample and you end up buying the e-book your peer-to-peer commuter friend gets credit for the sale with an affiliate cut of the resulting transaction.

We place way too much emphasis on the ability to measure global trends. You see it every day on Google, Twitter, etc. While we all care about these global trends, we’re also keenly interested in local and hyper-local trends. This peer-to-peer model addresses that point while also providing some relief for data plan limits and spotty Wi-Fi coverage.
Changes in authorship

(b) Corresponding author requests removal of author before publication

Clarify reason for change in authorship

Check that all authors consent to removal of author

- All authors agree
- Authors do not agree

- Amend author list and contributor details (role of each author/contributor/acknowledgments as required)

Proceed with review/publication

Suspend review/publication of paper until authorship has been agreed

Inform excluded author(s) that if they wish to pursue the matter they should do this with their co-authors or institutions rather than the editor

Note: Most important to check with the author(s) whose name(s) is/are being removed from the paper and get their agreement in writing.
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October 13, 2015
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2015 Mediterranean Editors and Translators Meeting
October 29-31, 2015
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ISMTE Chicagoland Local Group
November 4, 2015
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Publication Ethics: Fraud and Misconduct
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The RFP Process
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www.ismte.org

ISMTE Asian Conference
April 4-5, 2016
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