

The official publication of the International Society of Managing and Technical Editors

The following abstracts were accepted for poster presentations at the 2016/2017 ISMTE annual meetings in North America, Europe, and Asia.

Increasing Citation Diversity in the Journal *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*

Marjolaine Hamelin¹ and Eric Lichtfouse²

¹UR0050 Laboratoire de Biotechnologie de l'Environnement

²*Agronomy for Sustainable Development*

Agronomy for Sustainable Development (ASD) is an international peer-reviewed journal of the French Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA). The journal has been renovated from 2003 by changing the title, the editorial policies, the management, the topics, by communicating in a blog and in social media, and by increasing the number of published reviews. As a result, the journal rank in the JCR Agronomy category increased from 29/53 (impact factor of 0.56) in 2003, to 2/81 (impact factor of 3.99) in 2014. Whereas the positive influence of the number of published reviews on the impact factor is well established, there is little knowledge on the effect of topics diversity. Therefore we studied the citation diversity of *ASD* articles from 2005. For that we analyzed the topics diversity of the 5,504 articles citing *ASD* articles, by counting the Web of Science (WOS) categories. Results show that the number of WOS categories increased sharply from 7 in 2006 to 74 in 2015. Moreover we found that some citations originate from journals in rather remote disciplinary fields such as pharmacology, anthropology, biophysics, or computer science. Our findings thus demonstrate the increasing

topics diversity of *ASD* articles and a broader, more diverse readership.

Seamlessly Import Manuscripts from Overleaf to Editorial Manager

Michael Di Natale¹, Kathleen Horgan¹, Alison McGonagle-O'Connell¹, Mary Anne Baynes², and Shelly Miller²

¹*Aries Systems*

²*Overleaf*

In an expanding market, the support of a variety of tools and services is increasingly seen as a valuable part of the author experience. In anticipation of market demands Aries Systems Corporation developed the Editorial Manager Ingest Service (EMIS) and, through partnerships with innovative new platforms such as Overleaf, has leveraged existing technology standards to facilitate the import of relevant data directly into the Editorial Manager peer-review system thus bypassing the need for authors to re-key required metadata or re-upload submission files. No two approaches will be identical and great care was taken during the design and implementation of this functionality to ensure that integrations with third-party tools and services are convenient for authors while remaining flexible for publishers. For example, as in the case of Overleaf, authors can enter their relevant submission data and create LaTeX files right within the Overleaf system and can authorize Overleaf

to transmit that data directly to the journal's Editorial Manager submission portal. Editorial offices have the opportunity to review submitted information, and when necessary, send the submission directly back to author requesting additional required information or files, such as copyright forms. This poster will identify the complexities of Editorial Manager's ingest workflow implementation with Overleaf.

Disclosures: Three authors work for Aries Systems, makers of Editorial Manager; two authors work for Overleaf.

Instigating a Series of Workshops to Improve Author and Reviewer Standards: The Australasian Journal on Ageing's Experience

Lynne Parkinson, Yvonne Wells, Richard Lindley, Vasi Naganathan, Jane Sims, and Stephen Neville

Australasian Journal on Ageing

Since 2010, *Australasian Journal on Ageing* editors have organised "Writing for Publication" workshops at regional national and international conferences in ageing. The concept for the workshops arose from editorial team discussions about increasing the skills of our reviewers. There are some simple tips that journal editors can provide potential authors to improve manuscript quality and increase publication success. Learning more about the journal review process can also help authors to be better reviewers. Training up reviewers can be useful for editors, who sometimes find identifying good manuscript reviewers frustrating. The general aims of these workshops are to: encourage quality writing; encourage quality reviewing; and encourage early career researchers to submit to *Australasian Journal on Ageing*. The workshops are run once or twice per year, at regional gerontology conferences (recently, Australia, New Zealand, and Thailand). "Writing for Publication" workshops can have varying duration, from 1 to 3 hours. Registrations have ranged between 6

and 20 participants. These events have continued to evolve over the last 5 years. Some benefits to the journal have been increasing its profile at regional meetings, journal submissions, and enrollment of new reviewers. The poster will also describe some of the popular features of the workshops.

Peer-Review Mentoring Program

Ashley Ketelhut

American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO)

I created a reviewer mentoring program for *Journal of Oncology Practice (JOP)*. The goal is to support early career oncologists by providing them with a mentor, giving them hands-on experience of the peer-review process, enhancing their reviews by providing them with comments from the handling editor, and rewarding mentees' progress by inviting them to join *JOP's* reviewer pool once they had completed several reviews. I solicited editorial board members and current, seasoned reviewers to act as mentors. Mentors and mentees were matched and once the mentor accepted a review assignment, the mentee was added as an additional reviewer. Mentees were provided a welcome packet outlining *JOP's* peer review process to get them started. The mentor and mentee would review the manuscript, discuss best practices and the mentor would critique the mentee's draft review before they submitted. Mentees were asked to complete a short survey so the program could be improved. I coordinated with other departments to promote the program and to seek participants through *JOP's* websites, ASCO's magazine, marketing initiatives, and editor meetings. We've had an enthusiastic response from participants so far and mentees have been from the U.S. as well as international.

Increasing Altmetric Scores: A Good Deal For Everyone

Deborah Bowman, Stephanie Kinnan, and Meghan McDevitt

American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Background: Altmetrics are an indication of engagement in a researcher’s article. The score is immediate and tracks citations and mentions across many platforms, including news outlets, blogs, tweets, and Facebook. A high score is desirable for authors because it shows that their article is getting attention; it is good for the journal because increased attention will likely lead to increased, early citations, which lead to a higher impact factor. Issue: Previously, we posted to Facebook and Twitter when an article was published as part of an issue. Our plan is to post each accepted article as soon as it goes online and to follow that with an email to the authors encouraging them to re-post it to their friends. We will track the average Altmetric scores of our articles at a set point in the publication cycle. Expected results: We believe our plan will result in increased article Altmetric scores because of early posting and notification of the authors. Expected Conclusion: Tracking articles online and emailing the authors will cause increased Altmetric scores, which will be beneficial both to the authors and to the journal.

Customer Experience: Who is the Customer?

Tracy Ronan and Karen Baulch

Editorial Office, Ltd

As the breadth and variety of journals available to authors grow and the method to publish evolves from print to online, identifying your customer amongst the range of relationships involved in publishing is key. Depending on the publishing model on the most basic level the reader and/or author could be considered the primary customer. Looking beyond this, the publisher also heavily relies on the services of academic editors and reviewers in order that

quality articles reach the final reader, therefore these can be considered as the publishers, customers too as their services are vital to the success of the journal. At all stages of the process whether this is interaction with authors, academic editors, or reviewers it must be based on receiving good clear editorial support as customer service is paramount and reduces the barriers to fast and effective publishing. Across the board, journals’ communication requirements and instructions must be customer centric and tightly controlled to ensure coherent messaging is received.

Disclosure: Editorial Office Ltd is a Bronze Sponsor of ISTME.

Mind the Gap: Expectation vs. Reality in Peer Review: Findings from the Taylor & Francis Whitepaper

Elaine Devine

Taylor & Francis Group

Peer review: much discussed, much covered, much maligned, but what do researchers really think of the system which is at the heart of scholarly communication? Is it as broken as we are sometimes led to believe? How much of a discrepancy is there between expectation and reality? Building on previous research by the Publishing Research Consortium and Sense About Science, Taylor & Francis conducted a global survey and focus groups in 2015 with authors, reviewers, and editors from around the world. With over 7,000 survey respondents and focus group participants, the research covered issues such as ethics in peer review, different models of review, the mechanics of the process, motivations to review, and training. The findings presented here will focus on uncovering the gaps between expectations and reality in peer review. It will show where there are differing opinions between those working in the humanities and social sciences and those in science, technology, and medicine; where researchers believe those

reviewing should focus their efforts (with views from the researchers authoring the papers, those reviewing them, and those editing the journals); and will reveal the one area where peer review reality is exceeding expectations across all disciplines.

Value of Author-recommended Peer Reviewers

Stephen E. Cavanaugh

Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine (Origin Editorial, LLC)

Background: Editorial offices and publishers are concerned about peer review integrity. Instances of author misconduct involving the suggestion of fake reviewers or of reviewers who have an inappropriate relationship to the authors have been reported. Issue: Some publishers, in order to prevent the use of inappropriate reviewers have created policies to block reviewers who do not have institutional email accounts or inhibit the ability of authors to recommend reviewers during the submission process. This can lead to blocking legitimate reviewers. Methods: All invited reviewers over a period of 3 years were identified as author-recommended reviewers (ARR), associate editor-recommended (AER) or other. Papers having at least one ARR were included in the analysis. Three scores were established, more severe, equivalent, and less severe. Results: Analysis showed 42 ARRs provided a less severe recommendation than AERs or others, 31 provided an equivalent recommendation to AERs or other reviewers, and 38 ARRs provided a more severe judgment than AERs or others. Conclusion: ARRs, when properly vetted, are not more likely to provide favorable reviews than other reviewers.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Kristen Overstreet for her encouragement in pursuing this study.

Why Reviewers Decline

Adrian J. Paylor

Emerald Group Publishing

With the timeliness of publication being a major concern for authors it is important to be mindful of the aspects of the review process that cause delays. One of the lengthiest stages of the process is often finding people willing to review papers. Despite inviting many people, editors are often confronted with a litany of declined invitations. The poster I propose would examine why those invited to review decline the opportunity. To achieve this, this article would provide a synchronic analysis of reviewer refusals on several ScholarOne sites in 2015. In doing so, it would show that review fatigue does not feature as prominently in a person's decision not to accept the invitation to review as is commonly thought. Rather it demonstrates that an article's scope being outside the individual's area of expertise is the most prominent factor in declining to accept an invitation to review. From this, the poster would examine possible solutions to mitigate the most prevalent reasons why invitations to reviews are declined. In addition to proving solutions, this poster would also propose that review completion rates could be established as a new metric by which to monitor editorial performance and the overall health and scope of the journal.

Does a Larger Reviewer Database Reduce the Time to Secure Reviewers?

Kristen Overstreet and Jennifer Mahar

Origin Editorial, LLC

It can be difficult for editors to find appropriate and available reviewers. Thus, a larger reviewer database could be hypothesized to reduce the length of time required to identify and secure reviewers. We will determine (a) whether a larger database reduced the time to identify and secure reviewers, and (b) whether the time to reviewer

acquisition was different among various sized journals. Using the database from a mid-size publisher, who merged the submission-system databases for their journals in November 2013, we will examine whether reviewer acquisition time changed following the merger. The time to acquisition will be defined as the number of days between “editor assignment” and “all reviewers assigned.” The before-merger sample will comprise the last 90 manuscripts that received a final decision before October 31, 2013. The after-merger sample will comprise the first 90 manuscripts that received a final decision after October 31, 2013. The samples will be stratified according to journal submission size: 1 high, 1 medium, and 1 low. Because editor work style is another potential variable affecting reviewer acquisition, only 1 editor’s data per journal, chosen at random, will be analyzed. Data will be entered into an Excel database and analyzed with descriptive statistics.

Time Savings Versus Control: What to Expect When Switching Online Submission Systems

Brit Stamey

J&J Editorial, LLC

This poster will present J&J Editorial’s experience partnering with Future Science Group (FSG) to move 31 journals from an in-house system to ScholarOne with the aim of making the peer review process more efficient, and some of the pros and cons we discovered along the way. The previous system had less automation for emails and was time consuming to edit or update. By switching to ScholarOne, we found that the total time spent on FSG titles decreased and that most individual journals also saw a decrease in time spent on the peer review process. It is important to note, though, that switching from either an in-house system or from not using an online system will be a significant transition and initial time investment since editors and editorial assistants will be more used to

having more control over the process. Having a system that sends out automated emails is a huge part of the time savings we experienced; however, staff will have to relinquish a good deal of the control over the customization of the communications that they send out, which they may dislike.

Acknowledgements: Heather Blasco, Sara Welliver

Impact Vizor: Data-driving Insight Into Some of Publishing’s Big Questions

John Sack, Neil Mehta, Barry Reuter, Michael Puff, Lynn Sinclair, and Kevin-John Black

HighWire Press

HighWire Press built the Impact Vizor suite to deliver visual data-driven insight into some of publishing’s big questions. The three main areas addressed are rejected articles, published articles and cohort articles. The highly visual data provide editorial managers, editors, and publishers with answers to critical publishing questions: • Where do my rejected articles get published? • Once those rejected articles are published, how much are they cited? Am I rejecting high-impact articles? • Which articles are driving my impact up, or down? • Which types of articles are resonating in the scientific community? • Are this year’s articles higher impact than last year’s articles? • What are the trending topics in my fields? And who’s publishing them? Impact Vizor was built to greatly advance the understanding of your journal’s impact. The analytics suite provides a powerful and visual method for journals to “slice and dice” the data in categories that are meaningful for the individual publisher. The data is accumulated rapidly and continuously while the interface gives stakeholders a visual set of “point and click” tools to generate actionable reports.

Disclosure: Impact Vizor is a set of analytics tools made available via subscription by HighWire, Inc.

Benchmarking Editorial Office Time for Manuscript Handling

Kristen Overstreet and Jennifer Mahar

Origin Editorial, LLC

Background: Five touchpoints were identified as areas where the editorial office has complete control over a manuscript during the peer review process. A goal of 1 day (median) for each touchpoint was set to see if the time a manuscript spends in these stages could be reduced, thus reducing total time from submission to decision. Method: We will run and analyze benchmarking data from the time periods of six months prior to the time the goal of 1 day for each touchpoint was established and the six months after the goal was established. We will analyze data from 6 journals for the 5 touchpoints when the editorial office was in control of the manuscript in peer review to determine if the touchpoint times decreased as a result of the 1-day goals. We will also analyze if there was any significant effect on the total turnaround times and cite the percent difference in the touchpoints and the total turnaround times. Conclusion: We hypothesize that having a heightened awareness and goal for each of these touchpoints will result in decreased times and increased efficiency in processing manuscripts through peer review.

.....

This supplement is supported by the American Gastroenterological Association and designed by Lindsey Brounstein