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2017 Award Winners

**Award for Excellence**
Phaedra Cress  
Executive Editor  
The American Society for Aesthetic Plastic Surgery

Phaedra Cress has worked in the publishing industry for over 17 years. She has implemented a social media strategy for the journal she manages. Not only has she spearheaded and educated about the importance of altmetrics but helped bring about awareness to the issue of predatory publishing and open access. She has also published an editorial on predatory conferences and produced a five-part video interview on publication ethics, which was awarded the ASHPE Silver award for “Best Use of Video.”

“I am so honored to be selected for the Award of Excellence from ISMTE—to be recognized in this manner by such an esteemed organization is a career highlight, and I thank you sincerely. In a field where we compete based on Impact Factor, Kantar scores, website downloads, Altmetrics, and other rankings, it is organizations like ISMTE that allow us to focus collectively on educating, networking, and innovating at the peer-to-peer level. By improving efficiencies now, together we are paving a sturdier path for those who come after us, and it is a great privilege to be a part of this society of devoted professionals who have proven their ability to adapt successfully to the ever-changing, multimedia landscape.”

**Award for Achievement or Innovation**
Thomas E. Gaston  
Managing Editor  
John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Thomas Gaston has devised and developed a game called “The Peer Review Game.” The game covers reviewers, bad/unresponsive/fake/biased reviewers, ORCID, and double blinded review. The game is fun and has been imaginatively created. The Awards Committee hopes that Thomas will be able to bring the game with him to London and we can feature it at the conference, and we hope Thomas will agree to place a video of the game with an article in EON.

“I am proud to have been awarded the ISMTEs’ Award for Achievement or Innovation for the creation of the ‘Peer Review Game.’ The game was originally conceived as a topical Christmas gift for our colleagues working on our editorial offices. The idea was to create a game that illustrated how improving your reviewer pool is important to ensure the quality assessment of submitted articles. Within the game players have various options to mitigate the impact of fake, unresponsive, lazy, and biased reviewers.

I must acknowledge the assistance of my colleagues, who gave up lunch breaks to assist me test the various iterations of the game and suggest improvements.

I am convinced of the need to improve peer-review standards across journal publishing to ensure the rigor and quality of scientific and scholarly articles. In a world of ‘alternative facts’ and ‘fake news,’ the role of peer review in strengthening the trustworthiness of scientific and scholarly output has never been more important. Organizations like ISMTE are vital in encouraging those improvements in cross-industry standards.”

**Jason Roberts Founders Award**
Jan Higgins  
Managing Editor  
Genetics in Medicine

Jan Higgins established the Research Triangle Park local group in North Carolina, which paved the way for other ISMTE local groups. Today, following Jan’s lead, ISMTE currently has 11 local group worldwide. Jan has also been instrumental in upgrading ISMTE’s approach to sponsorship, which has contributed to more corporate members. Today we have more membership thanks to her efforts. This growth and visibility has enhanced ISMTE’s profile in the larger academic community. Finally, Jan has secured for the society pro bono legal counsel, which will provide ISMTE its next tangible step in enhancing governance.
I am deeply honored to receive the Jason Roberts Founders Award for 2017. I have been involved with ISMTE since its inception and have been thrilled to see the society grow in members, in industry stature, and to now start leading the way with best practices for editorial offices. When Jason Roberts and colleagues founded the society, it was in part because editorial office professionals had no real society to call ‘home.’ We could relate to other professional societies for some parts of our job, but no society truly understood the role of editorial office professionals and their day-to-day issues and problems. ISMTE stepped into that niche and now with over 1,000 members worldwide, three annual meetings on three continents, and a growing list of educational resources, ISMTE has more than filled that niche.

As ISMTE celebrates its 10th anniversary, I’m proud to serve on the board, to contribute to the educational content that ISMTE is developing, and to continue to assist the society in its governance.

Ira Salkin Scholarship
Jennifer Mahar
Managing Editor
Origin Editorial, LLC

With a clear take-home message, Jennifer’s essay describes the developments during the past 10 years and how editors now trust the editorial office to manage ethics and other similar issues. Look for Jennifer Mahar’s winning essay and an interview with her in the October issue of EON.

2017 Editage/ISMTE North American Conference Travel Grant
Prabin Chhetri
Managing Editor
Birat Journal of Health Sciences
Look for an interview with Prabin Chhetri in the October issue of EON.

2017 Poster Awards
1st Place Poster
Have we opened Pandora’s box? Image integrity checking at the editorial office
Authored by: Franca Bianchini, Florian Grünschlager, Yvonne Ohl, and Sherryl Sundell of The International Journal of Cancer

2nd Place Poster
What Does a Managing Editor Do All Day?
Authored by: Alethea Gerding, Managing Editor, Journal of Prosthodontics, American College of Prosthodontists
What Does a Managing Editor Do All Day?
An Analysis of Emails Received in an Editorial Office
Alethea B. Gerdin, MA, Managing Editor, Journal of Prosthodontics, American College of Prosthodontists, Chapel Hill, NC

Objective
1. Use email and communication tools to maintain consistent communication with authors.
2. Identify the most common messages and responses of a managing editor
3. Use this knowledge to increase the communication efficiency of an editorial office

Background
Through focus groups and a survey, it was revealed that managing editors are responsible for author communication, manuscript evaluation, and manuscript publication. This study evaluates the general communication habits of managing editors and identifies common threads.

Methods
Emails for the three months of June, July, and August 2017 were analyzed using a data spreadsheet, categorizing the data into order number, author, journal, and message. The following analysis was performed: daily volume of emails; author correspondence; common issues; message length; and email response time.

Results
The results showed that 72% of all emails received were for peer review. Only 7% of all emails received were for production. The majority of emails received were for peer review, followed by production. The average response time for peer review was 1.5 days.

Email correspondents
Emails were categorized into the following categories: author, editor, production, management, committee, and other.

Conclusion
Managing editors are often the first point of contact for authors and are responsible for maintaining clear communication and managing the workflow of the journal. This study highlights the common threads in managing editor communication and provides insights into the efficiency of communication in an editorial office.

Keeping Up To Date???

We are.
It’s the best way we know to serve you.

It’s our privilege to play an active role in the journal publishing community, working directly with publishers on solutions to industry initiatives and workflow challenges, always looking to improve our processes to better serve you.

We are proactive developers of new technologies and quality providers of copyediting, composition, print and online journals, a variety of mobile content solutions, and so much more.

Expect more from Sheridan.
Sheridan service means providing everything you need—author services, subscriber services, fulfillment, mailing and postal expertise, back issue storage. Yes, expect more from us. Sheridan Delivers.

Sheridan is the proud sponsor of Editorial Office News.
Council of Asian Science Editors’ Role in Helping Asian Editors Promote Their Journals to International Standards

By Sun Huh
Professor of Parasitology
Hallym University, Korea

Paralleling the rapid economic development in Asian countries, there has been an increased rate of article production in these areas. When looking at the number of research articles published in Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE) journals in 2016, China, Japan, India, and Korea are included in the top 10 ranking countries (Figure 1). Although there are high-quality journals from Asia, many journals from Asian countries find it challenging to maintain international publishing standards. Out of 213 Web of Science journals with a 2016 Impact Factor greater than 10, two journals are from Asian countries. Usually scholarly journals from Asian countries are published by scholarly societies or nonprofit research organizations where the editor is usually working without any compensation. In addition, society journal editors can be frequently changed by publishers and society presidents.

In Korea, a group of scientific, technological, and medical editors met to launch the Korean Council of Science Editors (KCSE) in 2011. Since then, KCSE has held workshops or seminars with attendance numbering about 1,000 per year. The number of participating journals is up to 334 as of June 2017. In 2014, Korean editors spearheaded the organization of the Council of Asian Science Editors (CASE) to communicate with and train scientific editors in Asia.

CASE would like to help local editors meet together and organize local science editors’ associations so that they can study editing and publishing more conveniently. One fruitful result was the organization of the Vietnamese Council of Science Editors in 2016.

Major topics dealt with in the CASE annual conference and workshop are digital standards, information technology such as XML, peer review, and publication ethics. In recent times, one of the most influential organizations in scholarly publishing has been Crossref, which has provided services such as digital object identifier (DOI), Crossmark, Fundref, text and data mining (TDM), and Similarity Check. Those services have become mandatory tools for editors. Another important technology is the journal article tag suite (JATS) XML for full-text publishing on the web. It has been an ISO standard for scholarly journal web publishing since 2012.1 Asian editors should keep up with these international trends. To publish a competitive scholarly journal, it is essential to have not only high-quality articles but also accessibility by adopting information technology.2 Improving article quality requires some time because it depends on the society members or submitters’ scientific competency; however, adoption of information technology is easy to be realized owing to a high level of information technology in Asian countries. CASE has emphasized this in previous conferences.

Figure 1.
The Fourth Asian Science Editors’ Conference and Workshop was held at Nong Lam University in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam on July 6-7, 2017. This year’s conference covered topics such as journal format, Crossref services, digital standards, manuscript editing, open access, publication ethics, and peer review. Although those subjects are somewhat commonplace, they are still essential parts of journal editing and publishing.

There are now science editors’ groups in three continents: the Council of Science Editors in North America, the European Association of Science Editors in Europe, and the Council of Asian Science Editors in Asia. Another organization, called the Asian Council of Science Editors, based in Mid-east Asia, also has held meetings, workshops, and conferences since 2014. It remains to be seen in which ways CASE can continue to help Asian editors; however, the organization of science editors in each country will be a milestone for the promotion of the local journals.
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When Should Reviewers Receive Reminders?

By Noel McGlinchey
Senior Editorial Assistant
Wiley

Every editorial office experiences difficulties with late reviews. Arguably, the biggest sin a reviewer can commit, outside of dishonesty, is to promise a review and then fail to send it in. Manuscripts become delayed, authors get upset, and editors get stressed. Furthermore, while journals with fast turnaround times like to publicize them, it is clear that without effective and timely reviewers no peer-reviewed journal could possibly achieve a rapid service for authors.

Editorial offices tend to send a series of automatic emails to reviewers once they have agreed to contribute a review. These start with an initial confirmatory email giving instructions and the date by which the review is due. This is followed by a series of reminder emails up to (and beyond) the due date. For the purposes of this story, I’ll refer to all automatic emails as Reminders. Recently, a team of interested peer-review management practitioners, gathered from around 30 Wiley editorial offices across the globe, set out to answer a question: can reviewer turnaround times be improved by better scheduling of Reminders?

Figure 1
With so many offices involved in the study, it was possible to study the natural variation in the use of Reminders from historical data (from October 2015) to see how factors such as the days on which Reminders were sent, number of Reminders, and the amount of time reviewers were allowed to return their reviews (Time Allowed) affected outcomes between editorial offices. The average time (Median Days) for reviews to be returned was considered as well as the longest review time for each office within the time frame studied (Maximum Days). The final results were surprising.

**Days Allowed for Peer Review**

The vast majority of editorial offices set Time Allowed at 14 or 21 days. In this time period most offices sent three to five Reminders, with 21-day offices tending to send out more. This wasn’t very surprising, but the trend that emerged next was a bit more interesting.

Reducing Days Allowed seemed to reduce Maximum Days to Return Reviews (Figure 1). The trends aren’t statistically significant. However, the Median Days line from 21 to 14 Days Allowed shows a clear drop from 38 to 22 in terms of Maximum Days. Late reviews are those that cause the most problems. So, if reducing Days Allowed reduces late reviews it seems well worth giving it a go.

Of course the data are not statistically significant and (famously) correlation does not show causation. Without a wider range of data (i.e., from a journal with 30 Days Allowed or 7 Days Allowed), it’s difficult for statistical techniques to pick out statistically significant trends. There is also bound to be a lot of natural variation between journals run by different editorial teams in different styles, which would also obscure trends.

**Number of Reminders**

With such differences in outcomes correlating with Days Allowed, it was important to consider the rest of the data in two sets: a 21 Days Allowed set and a 14 Days Allowed set. Looking specifically at the 21 Days set it’s pretty clear that the number of reminders sent out is very important (Figure 2). If there are fewer than two reminders, Maximum Days will be longer. Increasing the number of reminders above four doesn’t have an effect on Median Days but does seem to have a slight effect on reducing Maximum Days. So, four to five Reminders seems to be the useful limit on a 21-day review.

---

**Figure 2**

Less than 2 Reminders Contributes to Longer Maximum Days to Return a Review. Increasing Reminders from 4 to 5 May Improve Timeliness.
period. Further data in journals allowing only 14 days indicates there’s little point sending more than three Reminders. Note: the initial confirmatory email counts as a Reminder.

**Timing of Reminders**

When comparing the timing of the last Reminder for 21-Day journals, a last reminder sent on day 14 would be 7 days before due date while one sent on day 19 would be 2 days before due date (Figure 3). Whether looking at journals sending reminders close to 7 days before the deadline or close to the actual deadline itself, correlations ($R^2$ values) were all less than 0.1. This means that there’s a 90% chance that the timing of Reminders has no effect. So, in everyday terms, the timing of Reminders is irrelevant. It’s the number of Reminders and Days Allowed that count.

**How Does This Make Sense?**

Do you have an editor who always answers emails on the day you send them? (If so, please can I come and work with you?) Academics, not even editors with a strong commitment, don’t tend to read emails as they arrive. They travel, carry out studies, lecture, and even sleep. I can imagine a reviewer with only one Reminder from ‘The Slow Journal of Slowness’ in her inbox might think that her review isn’t urgent while ‘Fast Journal’ may already have sent four Reminders that are sitting there unread. If you are a reviewer with outstanding reviews from both journals, which one will you do first? So the take-away message is to make sure you are sending out enough Reminders, and don’t worry too much about the exact order of their deployment as long as it is reasonable. And therein lies a whole maze worthy of Capability Brown, full of avenues of research.

**What Next?**

In light of this, if you decide to reduce Days Allowed on some of your journals or alter the number of Reminders sent out, please get in touch. It would be great if we could establish a cause-and-effect together.

*This article was originally published on Wiley.com on March 23, 2017.*
Taming the Feedback Beast: Five Strategies for Freelance and Technical Editors

By Tracy Majka
Consultant
tracymajka.com

Note: This piece is geared toward editors who work hands-on with clients and authors or in decentralized environments without an established editorial structure or support.

As editors, we all want clean, usable, standardized copy that conforms to an existing style guide. (Right?) Unfortunately, I’m sure some of us have heard the following from clients and stakeholders: “You’re changing my voice,” “This needs to be completely rewritten,” or (my favorite) “I just don’t like it.”

How can you address vague, subjective, or problematic feedback? Here are some strategies.

Do some detective work. How does your client prefer to see content? In a Word template? Email? Excel spreadsheet? Color-coded table? I often just ask “How would you prefer to see this?” or ask for a sample document if they’re not already using a template. You might also check with colleagues to see if they have any input.

Sometimes trying multiple options helps. For example, after years of presenting Web content in Word documents and Excel spreadsheets to physicians—and hearing “I hate it” or “I just can’t see it” over and over again—I realized that, even if the content was in the early stages, they were visual thinkers and thus needed to visualize it in its final format. So I’d load the content into a Web page, preview it, and take a screenshot. Often, this changed the way they thought about the content—and the direction of the conversation.

Show comparables—but be sneaky about it. Client or stakeholder not sold on your style guide? Check out his or her LinkedIn profile—are there any organizations that he or she follows and/or seems particularly interested in? If so, track down that organization’s content, find samples that align with what you’re trying to do, and show them. Put on your most innocent face and say, “But that’s how they do it at E-Corp!”

Use sayback. Sayback is a composition response technique in which the reader describes or summarizes the piece to the writer without referring to it: “You’re saying that…” I used this technique pretty frequently when teaching but find that it also works in the corporate world; sometimes just summarizing the piece helps them to realize that the tone is off or that information is missing.

Often I find it helps to take sayback a step further and repeat the client’s feedback back to them as neutrally as possible. “So you think semicolons are stupid.” “So you think nobody uses the active voice.” “So you really hate that color of blue.” Sometimes clients will seize the opportunity and elaborate (“Yes, because…”), and you can get to the root of whatever it is they’re really objecting to.

Be blunt. Years ago, at a conference panel, I watched a special-effects team describe the feedback they received from studio executives on a scene in a low-budget monster movie: “They said, ‘We love the monster. The monster is great. But can you light the monster on fire and make it fall down some stairs?’” The team’s response? “We don’t have the time, and you don’t have the money, so no.”

Let that be your mantra. Or list the consequences: “If you want a third round of edits, we’ll need to add an extra two weeks to the project.”

Offer options. Worst-case scenario, give the client two options—one with your edits and one with theirs. When they see both, they may go with yours. (In theory, anyway.)

Whether you’re advocating for a staff writer or just defending your edits, I hope these strategies help. (And I’d love to hear yours; feel free to contact me at www.tracymajka.com with suggestions.) Good luck!
What a great ride it’s been!

I can’t believe it’s been 20+ years since I began in an editorial office. I started my career as a Staff Assistant at the USDA Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging at Tufts University. I was actually using my English degree—I knew what an abstract was! After four years of working with the Nutritional Immunology and Toxicology Laboratories, I was told that we had lost grant funding and my position was to be cut to half time. From that point on I decided my salary would never again be determined by a grant.

With the help of a great mentor I was able to find my first editorial position at Brigham and Women’s Hospital in the Renal Division, and I became the managing editor for the American Journal of Physiology, Renal Physiology. When you look back on your career, you can pinpoint a time in your life when a change in your path occurred; this was mine. I had found a real calling within the editorial office. When I started, we were still managing manuscripts on paper, cutting the tops off faxes to send them around, and the only database in play was the one I created in FileMaker Pro. My career would take me places I would never have otherwise gone. One day my boss came into the office and said “Jennifer, I’m moving to Nashville to take a position at Vanderbilt University—do you want to come?” I promptly went home and told my then boyfriend we had better get married if he wanted to come along for the ride. Within six months we were hitched and moved to Nashville. I spent six years and three cities with that journal, from Boston to Nashville to New Haven. While at Yale, I became a beta tester for a new online peer-review system named ScholarOne, and it was so fun to be there at the beginning stage of our online systems. When my time was finished with the journal (in those days often you worked directly with your editor on site, and when it moved to another Editor-in-Chief your time was up), we decided to move back to Nashville.

In Nashville, I had six months’ overlap with AJP: Renal with the new editorial office to get them on their feet and complete the resubmissions. During that time, I was able to find a new journal, Neuropsychopharmacology, and I worked directly in house at the society’s main office. I worked with that journal for six years before we decided to move home. Along the way, I had joined CSE and the Editorial Policy Committee, became an author on the White Paper, learned eJournal Press in and out, took on some freelancing jobs, became well-versed in publication ethics, and met a lot of great people.

My next stop was at a major publisher, Blackwell (now Wiley). This time it was to work as an in-house managing editor on two life science titles, Evolution and Conservation Letters. These journals were so far from medicine that I was tickled pink! I spent five blissful years handling peer review for some of the kindest researchers. I was able to learn the ins and outs of a major publisher, RFPs, offshore vendors, production, and could see the ‘other side.’ I will always be grateful for my time spent there.

My current position is one that found me, after hearing about this newly founded ISMTE group, joining it, and finding like-minded professionals. I formed a friendship with Jason Roberts. He had recently left Wiley to strike out on his own and, unbeknownst to me, I wouldn’t be far behind. The American Institutes for Physics was looking to contract their peer-review management and this was just the challenge I had been waiting for; the opportunity to work with an entire group of professionals all working toward a common goal. I’ve been contracting with Origin Editorial for almost five years now and am having the time of my life! Kristie Overstreet and Jason have been nothing short of challenging, fun, inspiring, and motivating! We are fortunate to work with the most talented pool of individuals who care so much about their journals that they inspire me every day to be the best I can to support them.
I don’t know what’s in store for the future, but I know whatever it is I will give it 100% because I believe so much that what we do every day makes a difference in the lives of our parents, our children, our friends, and ourselves. We are all working toward a common goal in science: to be better, whether it’s working to reduce kidney failure, helping to curb dementia or treat bipolar disorder, encouraging conservation, advancing evolutionary adaptation—who knows, maybe we will even help to cure cancer. This is the power of the editorial office!
Processes for Inviting Commentaries

By Carolyn Sperry
Editorial Assistant
Archives of PM&R
Co-Editor-in-Chief
EON

During a recent exchange regarding processes for inviting editorials or commentaries that discuss an original research article, a few managing editors shared their thoughts.

Stephen Cavanaugh, Peer Review Manager at the Journal of Chemical Physics:
Twice a year, the EIC and managing editor look over the accepted articles that are ready for inclusion in a print issue (we have a fairly large backlog of papers that are published online, awaiting print publication). Anywhere from one to three articles are selected that might be worthy of a commentary, and we then consider people who are known authorities in the area whom we invite to compose an editorial. We give them three months to do this after agreement.

Once the editorial is submitted, it is reviewed by an associate editor or senior reviewer, and once accepted it is queued for publication along with the articles. The managing editor keeps track of this in an Excel sheet, sending reminders as needed.

Glenn Collins, Publishing Director and Managing Editor at Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation:
I ran a cardiology journal that invited editorial comments on papers for at least 30%-40% of the original research content—hundreds per year.

The editors met weekly to discuss the papers that had reviews in and were ready for a decision. They would accept about eight papers per week, give or take. When discussing each of these accepted papers, they would ask does this warrant an editorial, and generally the key factor was whether the topic is interesting enough for an editorial author to put the paper in context with what is going on in the field. That was said over and over—they need to put the paper in context. We would send the notification of provisional acceptance (pending revision) for the paper first, then invite the editorial second. We kept an Excel sheet for pending editorials starting with invitations sent out and whether the response was yes or no; for those marked yes, when the revised manuscript came in we would send the revision to the editorial author and set a due date of three to four weeks. We aimed for 1,500 words.

All of the above was made pretty simple by the fact that 90% of the time the invited editorial author was one of the reviewers. They were almost always invited to review the revision. Occasionally the editorial author/reviewer had issues with the revision, and the editorial was put on hold, a second revision was called for, and when it came in a new due date was set.

The editorial was seen as a reward to the reviewer for reviewing the paper. Sometimes they wrote such a good review that the editors would tell them please just clean up your review and make it into an editorial—it is perfect.

Rarely did the editorial point out problems in a paper. Limitations maybe, but the general goal was that someone should not read the editorial and wonder why the journal took the paper.

Along with the spreadsheet, we added notes and flags to the paper in the system to alert staff. The spreadsheet was on a shared drive so anyone could access it—the person sending the invitation would create the entry. The staff checking in revisions would always check to see if the paper had an editorial, and the production manager would always check before exporting the paper to see if the editorial was in and ready to go.

Diane Drexler, Managing Editor, Journal of Clinical Lipidology
One of my journals offers the below information as instructions:
Editorial Commentary. All articles by invitation only.
Commentaries should be confined to articles in the current issue or a very specific topic that is current and high interest to the readership.

Often, an associate editor nominates a reviewer (during the decision process) they think can offer a unique perspective on a paper. Next, the EIC invites the perspective commentary nominee with a personal note. The associate editor can nominate the reviewer (or another nominee) by placing a comment in the confidential notes to the EIC. We don’t have set limits per year on editorial commentaries but probably publish one per issue (six issues per year).

Join an ISMTE Local Group Today!

ISMTE Local Groups have formed through the efforts of members who would like to meet with peers and colleagues in their local area for networking and discussion. Participation is not limited to ISMTE members, and the only cost associated with participation will be your meal, if the group meets at a restaurant.

Active Groups:
- Boston, Massachusetts
- Chicagoland Area
- Heidelberg, Germany
- New York, New York
- North Carolina - Research Triangle Park Area
- Australia
- Russia
- Oxford, United Kingdom
- Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Rochester, New York
- Washington, DC Area
- Tokyo, Japan
- London, United Kingdom
- Kathmandu, Nepal

Visit the ISMTE Local Groups page to join a local group or to find more information.

Call for Submissions

Are you a fan of EON? Do you have an idea for an article, column, or special section? EON is currently accepting submissions for all 2017 issues. Contact our editorial office today for more information.
Dear Editor,

Cross contamination of cell lines has become an important topic in the field of cell biology, all the more since researchers began to present data on the extent of the problem and then issued a “call to action” in 2007. In 2010, after considerable discussion among our editors and our failure to engage like journals in a consortium to address the problem of cross-contaminated cell lines in cell biology and cancer research, the International Journal of Cancer (IJC) editors decided to implement a step-wise process to require that authors provide evidence at submission that any human cell lines used in their studies were authentic.

When we initiated the cell line requirement at IJC, one of our main concerns was how it would affect submissions and we worried about the amount of work it would involve. In addition to our dismay that we couldn’t get a consortium together to address a common-knowledge problem in the cell biology community, we also wondered how taking such a step on our own might affect the reputation of our journal. Therefore, we decided to monitor the process and began to keep track of papers that needed to be sent back to authors because they didn’t fulfill our requirements and to document the fate of those papers. Ultimately, the requirement didn’t affect submissions in any meaningful way, but, yes, it was a lot of work.

Then in 2012 when ISMTE issued a call for posters for the first time, it so happened that two projects were underway at our journal, one dealing with handling special cases and the other on our cell line authentication requirement. Thus, we were able to prepare and submit two posters. The special cases poster actually won first prize that year (http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.ismte.org/resource/resmgr/eon/dec_2012_jan_2013.pdf). However, our cell line poster got less attention (Figure 1). Indeed, the questions posed at the poster session that year had more to do with what “cell line authentication” meant so we thought we had perhaps missed the point of presenting the process better.

However, step-by-step, slowly but surely, other journals and agencies became interested in IJC’s requirement, perhaps through our authors and reviewers, perhaps because the wider cell biology community kept working tirelessly to...
develop and propagate standards (http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.ismte.org/resource/resmgr/eon_shared_articles/Cell_Line_Contamination.pdf), perhaps, too, because our IF didn’t sink. As a matter of fact, editors from the “top journals” called us to ask about the process; our editors were interviewed by popular science journalists and the national press. In the meantime, the “reproducibility” discussion is in full force and cell line validation plays a major role in that conversation — even on Retraction Watch (http://retractionwatch.com/2015/12/08/hela-is-the-tip-of-the-contamination-iceberg-guest-post-from-cell-culture-scientist/). So, we were on the right track and had data to show for it. An additional positive outcome was that, through this collaboration within the journal, the editors and editorial office staff alike were able to gain insight into the scientific subject matter and the administrative efforts and processes needed to implement and monitor such a requirement.

Last year then, the editors of PLOS Biology contacted our editor-in-chief and invited us to submit a paper about our experience in implementing mandatory cell line authentication. We got our authors together and prepared a paper that was ultimately accepted and published in the journal (http://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.2001438).

Besides the personal satisfaction and the benefits to our journal and to science, our journey — from project to poster to publication — seems to well exemplify the importance and potential of our work in the editorial office and indeed the value of ISMTE:

1. ISMTE has offered us managing and technical editors the opportunity to become true professionals in scholarly publishing and provides us with tools and skills to excel in our work.
2. The more professional we become, through developing, implementing, and sharing policies and best-practices experience and even validating these processes through research and peer review, the better we can meaningfully contribute to scholarly communication.
3. The more we can contribute to scholarly communication, the deeper is our understanding and the louder and more significant our voice becomes in shaping the landscape.

Sincerely yours,
Franca Bianchini
Sherryl Sundell
Editorial Office
International Journal of Cancer

Can you trust what you read? Can you trust where you read it? The Centre for Journalology and ISMTE are pleased to announce a session focusing on the phenomenon of potentially illegitimate and predatory publications. This session presents evidence-based criteria for distinguishing predatory entities and discusses journal standards, legitimacy, and transparency. Concerns about the validity of research published in predatory journals accompany a fear that these titles are little more than scams. Equally, that perfectly good research may have been published by these so-called journals is concerning. Yet, it seems impossible to discern whether and how they apply peer review to the papers they publish. Our session calls for universally higher journal standards and demands fully transparent implementation of such standards. Visit our website for more information or to register today!
From the Forum

The ISMTE Discussion Forum is available to all registered ISMTE members and is a great resource to get and stay connected to a network of peers, publishers, vendors, and potential clients and employers. Here we highlight a question about editors holding positions at multiple journals followed by further discussion.

Can your editors play a part in other journals?

Does your journal allow your editors (associate editors, deputy editors, even the editor-in-chief) to play a role, such as editorial board members, in other journals, or do you consider that a conflict of interest? Or do you consider them on a case-by-case basis, depending on the other journal and whether it is a competitor of your journal? What is your policy when one of your editors is invited to be involved with another journal?

We assess these potential conflicts of interest on a case-by-case basis.

Interesting question. I have worked with some journals where this is allowed and others where it is not. I think the decision is based upon the perceived risk to the first journal. Could proprietary information be unintentionally (or intentionally!) shared? Could the time spent on the second journal detract from the time the individual spends on the first journal? Would the first journal retain top priority?
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G. Collins
Posts: 11

I think this is case by case but I would err on the side of COI. I do not think you can stop editors from serving on the editorial board of other journals. Many editors I know cannot even keep track of how many editorial boards they get appointed to. However that often gets them invited to editorial board meetings where confidential information may be shared. I think that gets very dicey. Since so many editors are doing this work on a volunteer basis they most likely do not want to be limited in what they can do - it all helps their career, their CV, their research. But as I said I would err heavily on the side of caution and say that this is a COI and be careful.
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D. Epstein
Posts: 9

On all journals we currently manage the Editors are active on other journal boards. To date we have only had 1 case when an Editor advised he had to resign since he had accepted an Associate Editor position with another journal (competitor in the same field) and therefore had no other option. This was the policy of the other journal-not ours. Some smaller journals may struggle to put together an EB and cannot really “afford” to put limitations on EB members.

Diana Epstein
Di-Ep Biomedical Editorial Services Ltd
Calendar of Events

INANE 36th Annual Meeting
August 3-5, 2017
Denver, Colorado, USA
https://inane2017.com/

ISMTE North American Conference
August 10-11, 2017
Denver, Colorado, USA
www.ismte.org
EASE members receive ISMTE member registration rate

Asia Pacific Meeting of ISMPP
September 5, 2017
Tokyo, Japan
http://www.ismpp.org/

8th International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication
September 10-12, 2017
Chicago, Illinois, USA
www.peerreviewcongress.org

ALPSP Conference and Awards
September 13-15, 2017
Noordwijk, the Netherlands
http://www.alpsp.org/

8th iPEd National Editors Conference
September 13-15, 2017
Brisbane, Australia
http://iped-editors.org/

12th annual Be a Better Freelancer® Conference
September 15-16, 2017
Rochester, New York, USA
www.communication-central.com

ISMTE European Conference
November 9-10, 2017
London, England
www.ismte.org
EASE members receive ISMTE member registration rate
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Oxford University Press
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Taylor & Francis
Technica Editorial Services
Thomson Reuters
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Editorial Office News (EON) is the official newsletter of the International Society of Managing and Technical Editors (ISMTE) and is published monthly. The contents and opinions expressed by the authors do not necessarily represent those of the Society, the Board of Directors, or EON Editors, nor does the publication of an article constitute an endorsement on the part of ISMTE of the authors’ organizations or companies. Submissions are welcome and can be sent to the Editors at the address below. Submissions may be edited for style and format without the author’s permission. Authors must seek permission to reprint any copyrighted material and provide this permission to the Editors.

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

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