*The following abstracts were accepted for poster presentations at the 2015 annual North American and European ISMTE conferences.*

## Relevance of English Language Assessment for Submitting Authors and Journals

Eleanor Bailey, Liz Caloi, Tara Noonan, Iris Poesse, Gareth Watkins, Michael Willis

*Wiley*

Aim: We explored the relevance of English language assessment for authors, editorial offices and editors. Using qualitative and statistical evidence, we sought to determine if additional English language editing has an impact on the paper's path through the peer review process (i.e., editor assesses manuscript without being influenced by the standard of English language). Method/Result: We surveyed more than 70 Wiley in-house editorial offices regarding their language policy and types of check. This revealed that only a small number of journals had some form of language policy. We decided to use a case study to establish the impact of English language editing on a manuscript's chances of being sent for review. We selected a health science journal for which 14% of Desk Reject decisions are based upon language standards. Of the original submissions received within a six month period, 42% of the authors indicated that their manuscript had been professionally edited for English language prior to submission. We analyzed the number of Desk Rejects based on level of English, tracked the rejected manuscripts and compared this with data collected by the publisher's editing service (Wiley Editing Services). We also sought the input of the journal's editor regarding what assessments informed the decision to reject based on the level of English. Conclusion: We found a range of editorial office approaches towards English language checks for submitted manuscripts. Qualitative evidence from our case study suggests it would be beneficial to develop best practice guidelines in order to provide better guidance and support for authors, editors and editorial offices.

## Harnessing ScholarOne Data to Benchmark Journal Performance

Mary Miskin and Andrea Watson-Lee

*Emerald Group Publishing Limited*

Emerald's "Journal Programme Health Check" has been an intensive data-gathering and analysis exercise, bringing together ScholarOne data for all journal sites on key metrics related to peer review performance. Parameters were defined within each dataset to highlight performance that could be a cause for concern and require greater analysis. The data has provided an understanding of — and insight into — the peer review performance of our journal titles, challenging some previously held assumptions and leading the way for an evidence-based approach. Following the review of data, strategies to improve the peer review performance of titles have been agreed upon and implemented between publishing/editorial and our external editors.

ISMTE

## #Share: Using Multiple Social Media Sites for Your Journal

Deborah Bowman, MFA, ELS, Meghan McDevitt, Stephanie Kinnan

*American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

*Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* (*GIE*) uses multiple social media sites to post links to articles, author interviews, podcasts, news about new features and entertaining posts about medical history or humor. Currently, we use Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Doximetry, our blog (Endoscopedia) and WeChat. We will show how to decide which sites to use and how to handle multiple sites without it taking up your entire day. We will also look at how this benefits both the journal (e.g., by drawing attention to our published articles, thus possibly causing other authors to cite them and ultimately raising our impact factor) and authors (by highlighting the work they have done to their colleagues, giving them the chance to re-post for their friends and fellow doctors to see, and raising their Altmetric score — now shown on every article online). Whether we like it or not, social media is the way of the present and the future. To ignore that is a disservice to our authors and our journals. We will show how to handle this new, necessary part of the scientific editor's job description.

## The Impact of Information Ethics on Scientific Journals

Liu Huiqiang

With the extensive application of information technology, we have become an "information society" — with issues such as information privacy, information property rights, and information ethics receiving widespread attention. We have investigated the current information ethics predicament in order to provide a preliminary analysis, discuss its impact and allow relevant departments to develop policies and regulations.

## Characteristics and Methods of Submitting Manuscripts by Telephone at Science and Technology Journals

Lijian Jun

This article attempts to distinguish between the concepts of "submitting" and "organizing" manuscripts — an issue which is often problematic for science and technology editors. Areas of concern include both contradictory directions as well as the speed and manner of communication. We have identified four primary models of submitting manuscripts by telephone including "direct speaking," "hinting," "inserting needle in the cracks" and "manner cushion."

## Monitoring the Reasons for Returning Submissions to Authors: Can This Help to Improve the Submission Process?

Hannah Wakley, Emma Stephens, Sarah DiBari, Verity Butler, Emily Brown

*Wiley*

We undertook a study of papers that had to be sent back to the author on submission to identify any trends. Having to return papers and request additional information or changes to the formatting takes a considerable amount of time — and is a source of frustration — for editorial offices. We hoped that monitoring submissions would enable us to make any necessary changes to improve compliance and save authors' and managing editors' time. We tracked the reasons for returning submissions for six weeks using a spreadsheet and then analyzed the results in a pivot table. We focused on the most common reasons for needing to return papers and made specific changes to the author guidelines and questionnaire to make these requirements clearer. We then monitored submissions for another six weeks to check whether the changes had been effective. Our interventions reduced the total number of papers that were returned to authors across our journals (with few exceptions); although the reliability of the results

may be limited by the length of the monitoring period. Overall, our study gave us a better understanding of where authors were struggling with the submission process and how we can help to improve this.

## ASN's Interactive Peer Review Checklist: Regulating the Peer Review Process

Sarah McCormack and Kimberly Rhodes

*American Society for Nutrition*

Background: The American Society for Nutrition (ASN), a medium-sized society publisher, needed a tool to systematically identify and assess criteria used by staff to process manuscripts submitted for peer review. Methods: Staff reviewed the journals' "Information for Authors" as well as documentation created by peer review support specialists. Requirements were summarized in a single list with a limited number of defined responses.  Utilizing advanced Visual Basic and Microsoft Excel functions — including conditional formatting, if/then formulas, and macros — staff created a single interactive checklist. Results: The checklist has improved training time for ASN's newest peer review staff member. In her first week on the job, she processed 13% more manuscripts than her predecessor and learned to process one additional non-standard article type. Using the checklist in that week facilitated coverage for ASN's journals with three-fourths of the staff. Management's recent review of checklist items resulted in procedural changes for approximately 10% of requirements.  Conclusion: While creating and maintaining the checklist is time-consuming, it accelerated training of new staff, eased the burden of providing cross-coverage and communicating procedural changes and provided management with an effective tool for overseeing operations. Technology, industry standards and ethical guidelines are constantly evolving. The checklist facilitates the structure and accountability to manage this constant change.

## A New Method to Reduce Reviewer Fatigue and Find New Reviewers!

Ian Potter, Chris Heid, Josh Dahl, Chris Carwile

*Thomson Reuters*

Overuse of an existing reviewer pool is a significant issue in peer review. Avoiding reviewer fatigue and finding new suitable reviewers is a big time-sink for busy editors and staff, often involving manual database searches and adding those individuals to the peer review system. ScholarOne Reviewer Locator provides an ideal tool to alleviate this by automatically identifying suitable expertise from the Web of Science, comprising over 12,000 journals, 150,000 conference proceedings across 251 subject categories in the sciences, arts and humanities. Reviewer suggestions and their relevant publications are ready and waiting with a new manuscript. Invitation response rates are comparable with those from the local database (38% vs. 43%). ScholarOne Reviewer Locator uses a unique multi-factor 'fingerprinting' system rather than relying on simple profile comparisons, combining author (their research interests), paper (its topic and keywords) and journal (its field and scope) information to produce refined and relevancy ordered suggestions. Each fingerprint is a complex map of meaningful data relationships. Manuscript metadata are analyzed with our ATLAS text metadata analysis tool to produce fingerprints for comparison with five years of Web of Science data, a pool of over seven million potential reviewers.

## Your Ideas, in Oxford English: English Language Editing for All

Jeannine Botos, Cindy Brown, Nes Diaz, Jane Wiejak, Andrew Williams, Fiona Williams

*Oxford University Press*

Oxford Language Editing (OLE) is a service from Oxford University Press (OUP) offering English language editing support to all researchers worldwide, regardless of what or where they

want to publish. Employing highly qualified editors with discipline-specific knowledge and native command of English, OLE works with researchers to ensure that their ideas are expressed in the highest quality English. OLE draws on the established language expertise of OUP (publisher of the prestigious Oxford English Dictionary, acclaimed reference resources, and leading English Language Teaching materials). Language editors and academic editors collaborate in a two-stage, seven-day process, ensuring that researchers' work is expressed in the highest quality English, thereby maximizing potential for acceptance in the target publication. OLE is available to edit abstracts, journal articles, books, dissertations, letters, presentations, theses and grant proposals in all disciplines. Information on the service is available in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese and Spanish to meet the needs of researchers worldwide. OLE is offered as a standalone service directly to authors before or during peer-review, and can be incorporated into an editorial workflow. OUP offers competitive pricing, and offers discounts for academic institutions investing in OLE on behalf of their researchers, and to societies and their members.

## Editorial Office Factors Influencing Reviewer Performance

Chris Reyes, MS, and Karen Dorman, BA

*Human Pathology*

Biomedical reviewers have full schedules and often cite time constraints when declining invitations to review manuscripts. In the last quarter of 2010, our review period was increased from 14 to 21 days with the goal of increasing invitation acceptance rates. To assess the consequences of this change, invitations recorded in Elsevier Editorial System were compared for two defined intervals: 2006–2010 (n=9,133) and 2010–2014 (n=10,734). Results showed the number of accepted invitations did not change notably, but review completion decreased slightly from 95.9%

to 92.2%. 20% of reviews were completed in the first two days regardless of review period, with a second peak at the due date (17% at 14 days, 18% at 21 days). Late reviews decreased from 36.5% to 24.7% of completed reviews, and yet the mean time to complete a review (13 ± 11 days vs 14 ± 11 days) did not change with longer review period. In effect, average reviewer turnaround time is independent from length of review period, and lateness is more a function of how close the deadline is to average turnaround. We also explore how reviewer reminders may influence reviewer performance. This information may help guide editorial office staff in shaping their relationship with reviewers.

## Reporting on Success: Quantifying and Visualizing Employee Efficiency and Productivity

Alexandra Kahler, Kerry O'Rourke, Alexis Mogul

*Kaufman Wills Fusting Editorial Services*

Background: Kaufman Wills Fusting (KWF) Editorial Services is hired by client journals to provide editorial support for defined tasks in the peer review workflow. To provide a metric for individual employee workload and productivity, we created the KWF Time Management System (TMS), a custom web-based application that collects qualitative and quantitative data on tasks performed and ensures timely workflow. Methods: Employees login to TMS and select from a pre-defined menus of tasks, indicating the start and stop of each task with the push of a button. Each task is assigned a productivity goal based on client input and performance history. A daily log of time per task is visible on the employee's home screen while more detailed analysis may be accessed by managers via a reporting function. Results: TMS data is automatically exported to Excel and used in the creation of customized spreadsheets and graphic representations of employee output. These reports accompany monthly client invoices and are used by KWF for employee goal setting, staffing plans and workflow monitoring. Discussion: The TMS applica-

tion provides KWF with a valuable tool to monitor employee workload and productivity and its flexible reporting structure allows us to quantify the monthly return on investment for our client partners.

## Reducing the Length of Peer Review by Amending the Timing of Reminders and Deadlines: An Analytical Observational Study of Two Interventions

Jason Roberts, PhD, and Steven Cavanaugh

*Origin Editorial, LLC*

Aim: To determine if editorial offices can manipulate the time reviewers spend reviewing by altering the regularity of reminder communications and imposing shorter deadlines. Methods: By plotting the frequency of the return of completed reviews against the number of days beyond the agreement to review date, we assessed reviewer behaviors following our interventions at two predominantly clinical medical journals: *Annals of Surgery* and *Headache*. For *Headache*, we added a second pre-deadline reminder. For *Annals*, a new pre-deadline reminder was introduced and the deadline to review was shortened by seven days. We measured — for three quarters, both pre- and post-intervention — responsiveness to reminders, median review times, and the proportion of completions by deadline while monitoring the conversion rate of invitations into agreements to review. Results: Both journals witnessed reductions in reviewer turnaround times, though only significantly in the case of *Annals*. For *Headache*, a dramatic improvement in the proportion of reviews completed on time was observed instead. Discussion: Visually, data suggests reminders — especially close to deadline — seem to prompt reviewers to complete their review. Evidence from *Annals* additionally implies a "procrastination effect" can be minimized by shorter deadlines. Conclusion: Journals can shape reviewer responsiveness with smarter deadlines and carefully scheduled communication.

Disclosure: Origin Editorial is paid to provide editorial office services for both journals.

## Making the Round Trip: Introducing Automatic Updates of ORCID Records

Elizabeth Krznarich, Laura Paglione, Catalina Wilmers

*ORCID*

Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID) identifiers are increasingly being collected during manuscript submission and peer review. As publishers also integrate ORCID identifiers into production processes, a growing number of articles contain authenticated ORCID identifiers upon completion. With several changes recently introduced in the ORCID registry and Application Programming Interface (API), it is now possible for ORCID member organizations to — with permission from record-holders — update ORCID records with publication metadata. In turn, when a record is updated, ORCID can now send push notifications to other systems. Automatic updates will not only speed the communication of research and free researchers from manually updating information in multiple systems but also support author and reviewer verification processes by enhancing the quantity and quality of data available in the ORCID registry. As authoritative metadata sources — such as publishers and DOI registrars — implement automatic updates, ORCID records will increasingly be populated with information whose accuracy can be easily assessed by reviewing the metadata source, which is displayed for each publication in the ORCID registry. This poster introduces the technical steps involved in the ORCID record automatic update process, provides examples of existing implementations and use cases and discusses the implications of automatic updates in review and publishing workflows.

## Creating a Dashboard for Editorial Metrics

Elizabeth Ralls and Emma Shumeyko

*American Society of Clinical Oncology*

Background: The American Society of Clinical Oncology publishes *Journal of Clinical Oncology* and *Journal of Oncology Practice.* To track trends within and between journals, we created Excel-based dashboards to easily collect and display editorial metrics. Methods: Based on input from the publisher, editors and editorial office staff, we identified several key metrics to track by month and by year including submissions, time to first decision, time to final decision, accept rates and page budget tracking. Data was pulled from Bench>Press, calculated, and entered into the dashboards. Graphs make the data easier to interpret and make trends more readily identifiable. Results: Dashboards are updated monthly, distributed to journals staff and housed on a shared drive. At a glance, readers can discover the length of time it took Original Reports to go through the initial review process and can easily see how many pages are left in their page budget. Over time a process was developed for quickly updating the dashboards with data from the most recent month, eliminating the need to pull ad hoc reports. New metrics are added to the dashboard as needed. Clearly identifiable trends allow for immediate implementation of corrective action. For example, declining published articles for one journal led to submission and publication targets for both journals. Conclusion: Visual dashboards of editorial metrics facilitate the tracking of journal trends and easy sharing of data. Staff workload, production and digital metrics dashboards are in development.

## Next Generation Metric to Monitor Editorial Office Workload:  A Follow-up Study

Kristen Overstreet and Jennifer Mahar

*Origin Editorial, LLC*

Background: In our initial study, we developed and tested a metric to monitor editorial office workload and alert us to an impending situation of overload among the staff.  The original metric was useful, but all participants grossly underestimated the time they spent on individual tasks compared to total time worked. Purpose: To determine if a modified metric more accurately captures time spent on individual tasks. Method: We will modify the original metric by including categories of communication, which is where we believe time was not captured previously. Participants will use the metric to calculate start and stop times for their daily work and time spent on individual tasks separately for one week, calculating the differences between the totals for each variable at week's end.  In the second week, the same participants will record the same data but compare the totals at the end of each day, adjusting the task times as needed until the total times are the same.  We will collect data from the same editorial offices that participated in the first study. Conclusion:  The revised metric should accurately capture time spent on tasks so editorial office managers can monitor staff workload and identify changing resource needs quickly.

Disclosure: We have no known conflicts of interest. Kristen Overstreet is president of the ISMTE.

## Quantity vs. Quality: Introducing Submission Fees to Reduce Editorial Workload Without Compromising Manuscript Quality

Christina Nelson[1] and Christine Dymek[2]

[1]*The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*

[2]*Kaufman Wills Fusting Editorial Services*

Background: Between 2009 and 2012, original scientific submissions to *The Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery* (*JBJS*) increased by over 33%. This resulted in higher staffing costs, longer turnaround times, and heavier editor and reviewer workloads. *JBJS* introduced an administrative article submission fee in May 2013 to offset the administrative costs of processing the manu-

script pre-review and encourage the deliberate submission of quality, publication-worthy manuscripts. Methods: A thorough implementation schedule and contingency plan was developed several months prior to launch of the submission fee ($250 per submitted scientific paper). Metrics concerning submission rate and quality, including author-reported Levels of Evidence and number of desk rejects, were recorded and compared against previous years to track submission quantity versus quality.  Feedback from all parties was also carefully monitored. Results: After an initial decrease in manuscript submissions, the submission rate slowly regained momentum. Nearly two years after fee implementation, *JBJS* has decreased submissions and related workloads by 17%. Journal turnaround times and workload continue to decrease in response to this strategic reduction in submissions; as such, the editorial staff is allowed greater time to focus on workflow efficiencies. The quality of papers has also appeared to increase. Conclusions: The introduction of a submission fee has resulted in a more manageable number of submissions for staff, editors, and reviewers while maintaining and potentially increasing manuscript quality. This change also allows staff the additional time to focus on new projects and initiatives. We continue to monitor the reception to this policy and will remain open and adaptable to any future changes.

### Seamlessly Transferring Manuscripts Between Publications in a Submission and Peer Review System

Michael DiNatale, Kathleen Horgan, Alison McGonagle-O'Connell

*Aries Systems Corporation*

As organizations look to keep submissions within their own publication ecosystems, the need for a seamless and straight-forward transfer of metadata, submission files, and review information across publications has become more and more apparent.  In anticipation of rising market demands, Aries Systems Corporation has built numerous pieces of functionality into Editorial Manager in support of editorial workflows which may result in a submission being transferred from one publication to another.  No two approaches will be identical and great care was taken during the design and implementation of this functionality to ensure publications have the greatest amount of flexibility possible to support these diverse workflows. For example, transfers may require author consent and additional information in certain circumstances, whereas in others the editor may have the final say in whether a submission is appropriate for transfer. Development has also been focused on supporting open peer review requirements which will allow reviewers to opt into sharing their review with another publication. This poster will identify the complexities of a transfer workflow implementation and highlight the benefits such a change would provide for authors and publications. It will also illustrate an ongoing commitment to incorporating reliable metadata capture, leveraging emerging and established standards like Journal Article Tag Suite, FundRef, Open Researcher and Contributor ID and Ringgold toward flexible transfer workflow solutions.

### Using ScholarOne to Improve Promotional Opportunities

Duncan Nicholas

*Taylor & Francis Group*

This poster will detail a cross-departmental editorial trial involving 15 journals — including their editors, managing editors, peer review administrators as well as production and marketing managers — using ScholarOne Manuscripts to highlight media-worthy articles on acceptance.  The aim of the trial is to systematically identify interesting papers as early as possible, raise journal profiles, and provide services to authors. A workflow was devised to confirm involvement of all parties to ensure the project met their requirements. ScholarOne emails

for all trial journals are currently active and papers are being identified for promotion. The pilot study will run for one year from 1st January 2015, to be reviewed after six and twelve months, after which time it will be evaluated by all team members of the participating journals. Evaluations will rate ease of use, time costs, ratio of promotion of highlighted articles, figures for usage, downloads, citations, and Altmetrics. We would like to see significantly higher than average figures for the engagement measures. The six month evaluations will provide data for the full final poster.