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When reading Michael Willis’ President’s Message written in February 2016, I was struck by how much our society has accomplished with his key focus areas: international membership growth, grassroots activity, peer organization collaborations, and resource development. The society’s international membership is growing, as is its meeting attendance and relationships with other professional publishing organizations. In the last two years, the society’s resources available on our website have expanded substantially.

Looking forward to 2018 and beyond, the society is looking to continue its amazing growth by targeting members from other fields and societies who haven’t learned about us yet. In addition, we plan to provide new ways for members to learn and grow professionally. We also are looking to increase volunteerism within our membership by expanding the roles of committees and offering more ways to get involved. Finally, we are excited to have a number of new board members and committee chairs who will certainly help us meet these goals.

**Beyond Scientific, Technical, Medical**

Since ISMTE was founded in August 2007, the society has relied on generosity and support of many large publishers to get started and grow. Many committed volunteers who worked predominantly on scientific, technical, and medical (STM) journals banded together to turn the idea of ISMTE into a reality. But even as the society’s membership has increased during the last 10 years, most members still come to us from large publishing organizations and focus on STM fields.

The society’s leadership wants to continue to appeal to that core membership base but also is interested in expanding beyond who we know. One of the board’s strategic goals is to look beyond the STM world and find managing and technical editors who might not know about ISMTE, but who could benefit by joining our community. Efforts are being made by our membership committee to bring more student members into the society. We also are looking to research other ways to reach managing and technical editors working at university presses.

As a result, you can expect to see more outreach on social media and in email communications to educate more colleagues working at humanities, business, legal, and other academic field journals. We also hope to increase our visibility outside the STM community by attending meetings and making contacts through our peer organization collaboration efforts.

One of the best ways we can increase our visibility is for our current members to spread the word about ISMTE in their own organizations and at professional meetings where we might not be represented. Membership information is located on our website. Potential members can reach out to any board member listed in the chart later in this article or Kelly Schild, our executive director, to get more details.

**Professional Development**

ISMTE has always focused most of its volunteer hours on professional development for its members. That effort certainly will continue and expand in 2018.

Perhaps our most visible professional development opportunities are our three conferences, giving people around the world the opportunity to connect and learn from educational presentations and from each other. This year our Asian-Pacific meeting will be in Singapore on March 27-28, our North American meeting in Baltimore on August 2-3, and our European meeting in London on November 8. We also are happy to collaborate with COPE again this year at our Asian-Pacific meeting. Information about registration and program details is available on our website.

New for 2018, we will be offering our first workshop at our North American meeting this year. This workshop will focus on iThenticate and plagiarism detection best practices. My hope is to offer more workshops on various topics at all of our meetings in the future. In addition, we created a committee to potentially develop ISMTE webinars, giving members yet another opportunity to learn.

I hope these efforts combined with the excellent work of our education and standards committees will make ISMTE
the place to be for managing and technical editors to grow professionally.

**Getting Involved**

For ISMTE to continue to thrive, it needs members to volunteer. One of my primary goals is to increase the number of members actively involved with the society. That might mean attending a local group meeting, writing an article for EON, participating in discussions at a conference and in our Discussion Forum, or joining a committee.

ISMTE’s local groups are a key part of what makes our organization shine. Members around the world meet in their local regions—some for lunch, some for a structured program, some for wine and cheese—and connect with other professionals. Forming a local group or joining one that already exists is an excellent way to support the society.

Our editors of EON are always looking for new authors and viewpoints for our publication. Writing for EON is another excellent way to connect with ISMTE and get published too.

Attending one of our conferences is another great way to get involved with the society, network, and grow professionally. But when meeting face-to-face isn’t possible, members can share experiences and ask questions on our Discussion Forum.

Finally, to help achieve this goal, we have created some new committees this year—Workshops and Webinars. We also expanded board focus areas into full committees—Membership, Social Media, and Standards. In addition, most committee chair positions in 2018 will be filled by non-board members, giving more leadership opportunities within the society. With these additions, I hope to see a lot of members getting involved on committees for the first time in 2018. Please see the list of new committee chairs below to get involved.

**2018 Board Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Julie Nash</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President-Elect</td>
<td>Erin Landis</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Jan Higgins</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Past Pres.</td>
<td>Michael Willis</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nonvoting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Meghan McDevitt</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Wendy Krank</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director 1</td>
<td>Chris Heid</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director 2</td>
<td>Alethea Gerdning</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director 3</td>
<td>Margot Puerta</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director 4</td>
<td>Carolyn Sperry</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director 5</td>
<td>Beverly Lindeen</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director 6</td>
<td>Thina Hedbom</td>
<td>2018-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2018 Committee Chairs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Committee Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Pacific Conference</td>
<td>Tony Alves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards &amp; Scholarships</td>
<td>Alison O’Connell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editorial Office News (EON)</strong></td>
<td>Stephanie Kinnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Hannah Wakley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Conference</td>
<td>Duncan Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Julie Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consists of conference chairs and respective board liaisons</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Carolyn deCourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations</td>
<td>Michael Willis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always chaired by the</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate Past President</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Conference</td>
<td>Michelle English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>Shari Leventhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Michael Willis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consists of chairs and respective board liaisons from the Education, Standards, Webinars, and Workshops Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>Katie Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Naomi Connelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Stephanie Sacharov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Beverly Blalock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Jan Higgins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Names and Faces

I am extremely thankful to all of the board members who rotated off at the end of 2017. Being a board member takes an incredible amount of time and commitment. I want to recognize our Past President Elizabeth Blalock and board members Meg Weist, Deborah Bowman, Diana Epstein, and Adam Etkin for their countless volunteer hours and commitment. I also want to thank Michael Willis, our Immediate Past President, for his excellent work as President for the last two years.

At the same time, I am excited to get to work with a new team of board members. We have two new members on our Executive Committee: President-Elect Erin Landis and Secretary Wendy Krank. We also have three new board members joining our team: Alethea Gerding, Chris Heid, and Thina Hedbom. This year promises to be an exciting one for us.

Start 2018 off on the right foot by renewing your ISMTE membership today!

ISMTE Members Are:

- **connected** to a network of peers, publishers, vendors, potential clients, and employers
- **learning** from the experience of other members
- **training** and mentoring others
- **involved** at the ground level of a growing organization

Click [here](#) to renew your membership, and don’t forget to tell your colleagues and friends about the benefits of joining the ISMTE!
Overview of 10 Years of ISMTE & Academic Publishing

Reported by Duncan Nicholas
Director, DN Journal Publishing Services Ltd

Jason Roberts, PhD, Senior Partner at Origin Editorial and Past President of ISMTE, and Michael Willis, Senior Manager of Peer Review at Wiley and President of ISMTE, started the tenth anniversary event with a detailed overview of developments in editorial offices and the ways that ISMTE has responded to these changes.

Roberts told of the origins of ISMTE, which began at a time when online peer-review systems started taking off, resulting in an “explosion of submissions.” Yet, as a community involved in the same job, we had little idea of how other journals operated, no consensus on how to measure our performance, and we had no cohesive ethical guidance—to which Roberts commented that “not a day goes by when I don’t check the COPE site. I can’t imagine not having it, yet there was a time when we didn’t!”

Roberts went on to describe how professionalised the industry has become over the last decade, giving anecdotes about times, as a journal manager, he was not invited to editorial board meetings and how conscious he became of sexist attitudes. Perhaps these things have not improved to a level of total satisfaction, but as publishers involved themselves with the Society and supported their editorial staff’s development and profile within their journals, ISMTE played a pivotal role in changing the isolation of being an editorial manager into an internationally organised community, adept at sharing knowledge, fostering talent, and showcasing technical and workflow innovations.

Willis then gave us some fascinating empirical insight into the structure of the Society and presented details from the Society’s 2016 core competency survey, which revealed that ISMTE consists of almost 1,200 members across the world, 82% of whom are women and over 50% of whom have a master’s degree or higher. Eighty percent of members make use of the online resources provided by the Society, and almost the same number use the Society for learning from others and attend the conferences. Willis also presented data he had drawn from all conference agendas to determine the content of sessions; the resulting slide of which was eye-opening, with the initial meetings containing seven to eight different topics, but recent years almost doubling that, demonstrating the increased complexity of an editorial manager’s role and how quickly different areas are developing, driving the need for constant education in many areas.

Roberts finished the session by stating what he felt the mission of ISMTE would continue to be and what the role of a managing editor is—an embodiment of high standards, promoting community, demonstrating transparency and accountability, adopting technological advances, and curating content.

Making Board Meetings More Effective

Reported by Diana Epstein
Managing Editor, Di-Ep Biomedical Editorial Services Ltd

Niamh O’Connor, Director of Publishing at the Biochemical Society/Portland Press, presented this breakout session. She pointed out that every board is different; therefore, it is important to have an agreed upon plan and purpose to ensure effectiveness. Good leadership, clarity of roles, and a plan is important, especially to ensure the strategy of a board as opposed to the operation.

Governance—this will ensure the roles are in place, including rotation, relationships, length of term, and responsibilities. The governance should encompass the following: ethics, technical issues, and performance of the board members. There should also be an “escalation process” for when things go wrong.
Visions and strategy—what does the board/journal do? What is the aim/audience, and how does this relate to the scope of the journal? Strategic discussion can be challenging, and possible discussion options can include calls for special issues and social media feeds. All members should work towards an aim and agree on progress. An annual review of the strategy is required.

Challenges—working on the journal is not a day job for a board member. There should be mutual trust and respect, engagement and constructive dialogue, and collective responsibility for decisions. What happens if there is disengagement, micromanagement, and an editor who does not want to lead? The aims should be to part on good terms, with an awareness of potential political/community relationships and their implications. We as the editorial office can contribute to someone leaving on good terms by visiting the board members (meeting someone in their own environment) and being understanding of their situations.

Board Meetings—check the equipment before the meeting and always follow up afterwards with any information required.

During the Q&A, questions were asked by Helen Hancock, Tony O’Rourke, Delia Mihaila, and Franca Bianchini.

Who are the best people to decide who will join the board? Governance should cover this—there should be a nomination process, such as a senior committee which recommends people with input for suggestions from the editorial office, board members, and the editor. The decision should be a team decision and should not be used as a “welcome to the club.” There should be clear expectations and “new blood” to avoid “dead wood” on the board.

What is the optimal number of people on an editorial Board? Generally, 12-15 people.

What is the role of an Associate Editor on the board? The expectations should be discussed in advance and should be noted in the governance. Expectations might include promotion of the journal, review of papers, suggestion of potential authors to write review articles, and promoting the journal at conferences.

Delia Mihaila told the group about her experience with online board meetings. They send a list of questions by email to their board members by SurveyMonkey, and the members have two weeks to respond. They send them reminders, which this gives them time to think about the questions. This type of meeting works well, and they have received a greater response from board members. A small number of meetings are also held on Facebook, but SurveyMonkey seems to work well.

Image Manipulation / Ethics Cases

Reported by Maria Guerreiro
Senior Editorial Assistant, eLife

With a long career in publishing, in the last few years, Jana Christopher has been working actively with publishers and institutions to implement and develop good practices regarding figure preparation and treatment. Having worked for EMBO Press for a decade, where she set up their Image Integrity program, in 2015 Christopher established her own business—Image Integrity—whereby she provides consultancy and training in image-integrity data analysis. In her talk at ISMTE’s European Conference, Christopher gave a very practical workshop where she highlighted the motivations for illegitimate figure preparation, shared some examples (Christopher mainly works with blots, microscopy images, and photographs), and provided useful recommendations for publishers vis-à-vis the development of workflows and policies to tackle the problem of lack of image integrity.

Christopher started her presentation by mentioning that when we talk about image integrity and image fraud (primarily in the form of image manipulation and duplication), we need to take into account that this can occur due to unintentional error, but also due to questionable practice or outright scientific misconduct. Researchers can fall into this trap simply due to lack of knowledge about good image preparation practices or due to pressure to publish (fast and in a high volume) and to achieve good results (which often does not happen). This can be problematic as it damages the public trust in science and equally damages scientists’ trust in their peers. Christopher talked about some high-profile cases involving not only image manipulation but, more concerning, scientific misconduct, such as the one involving Haruko Obokata, a Japanese stem-cell scientist who published two breakthrough articles that were retracted due to image manipulation, plagiarism, and serious misconduct (intentional error in reporting the type
of stem cells used) and tragically resulted in the death (by suicide) of her mentor.

Christopher expanded on the different types of issues one can encounter, such as duplication of blots, spliced bands, beautification, selective reporting, and deliberate data fabrication. She also alluded to the study published in 2016 by Bik et al., “The Prevalence of Inappropriate Image Duplication in Biomedical Research Publications” (https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00809-16), that screened 20,621 papers published in 40 scientific journals from 1995 to 2014 and concluded that 3.8% of papers contained “problematic figures, with at least half exhibiting features suggestive of deliberate manipulation.”

During the discussion, Christopher emphasised more than once that, despite image manipulation and fraud being a problem we cannot ignore, publishers are not police in the sense that we are not looking for fraud. Conversely, publishers and editors have a role in preventing these issues and have an ethical duty to act if they suspect misconduct (as per COPE guidelines).

Finally, Christopher gave some recommendations that involved having clear guidelines in the instructions for authors on what is acceptable and not acceptable in terms of image presentation, performing regular checks on images prior to publication, and ultimately working with editorial boards towards educating the community.

---

**Reporting Guidelines and the Editorial Office**

**Reported by Claudia Welburn**

Account Manager, Editorial Office Ltd

Caroline Struthers, Education & Training Manager for the EQUATOR (Enhancing the QUAlity and Transparency Of health Research) Network, opened by welcoming all and gave all attendees a pre-workshop questionnaire. Jennifer de Beyer, Research Coordinator for the EQUATOR Network, introduced the group to the EQUATER Network website, which includes resources for the following:

- Planning
- Database of Reporting Guidelines
- Extensions
- Status Analysis

Jen asked the room if anyone has been involved with developing a strategy for reporting guidelines. EQUATOR deals with reporting guidelines for health research for humans. Researchers use their work to do something to make a change; to try to improve health in some way. The presentation went on to what we all know about how research works and who uses it and how we want this to be used to changed policy, etc. On submission to a journal, the research is in one document submitted to a journal office. If we have an unusable research article submitted to a journal, it is meaningless. Without these guidelines, this is wasting time for academics, editors, and space in a journal. The easiest solution to this is to include reporting guidelines. An example provided was a CONSORT (CONsolidated Standards Of Reporting Trials) checklist, which was described as a shopping list for researchers.

The presentation then moved on to the practical barriers, such as what is worrying the editors and what is stopping these guidelines from being used? Small groups were then formed to discuss these issues. Some points raised included the following:

- Authors must jump through enough hoops to submit a paper, so to ask for checklists to be completed may feel like another hoop, and they may well submit to a journal elsewhere with fewer restrictions.
- Clinical trials must have a CONSORT checklist, and their submission will not progress unless they provide the document. The barrier is with the author themselves as they resist wanting to complete the checklist.
- Authors don’t know which checklist to use; there are so many!
- Author guidelines gently suggesting does not work; checklists do need to be made mandatory for journals in order for it to work.
- Education is needed for the authors and help for them to understand why a journal would need these guidelines.

On the EQUATOR website, there are toolkits provided to cover most scenarios. If the guidelines are clear, then this could speed up the overall peer-review process.

Finally, the presentation was wrapped up with the question: Who is up for the challenge? For editorial offices, please go to the EQUATOR website where the information is broken down into categories.
Harbingers of Change: Early Career Researchers and Publishing

Reported by Duncan Nicholas

We were incredibly pleased to host this session at the conference and give David Nicholas, Founding Director of CIBER Research Ltd., a platform to debut the second year of results from this research investigation into the attitudes towards the publishing industry of 120 early career researchers (ECRs) from seven countries. Nicholas was a delightful presenter, addressing the audience as the "engine room of scholarly publishing," and warning us that “we’d had our breakout sessions, but this may be the breakup session!” as his talk would address the potential disruption that young researchers might cause to the traditional foundations of scholarly communication.

The first half of Nicholas’ talk gave us the foundations from the first year of the study, benchmarking attitudes towards concepts such as publishing papers, peer review, social media, and metrics.

Nicholas reported initial attitudes as being “focused on publishing in highly ranked journals.” and “more fixated with publishing papers than seniors because of their precarious position.” For peer review, half of ECRs interviewed had reviewed for a journal, and the prominent opinions were that they liked double-blind review and were wary of open review, deeming it “risky, dangerous, more difficult to reject papers, and attracts unwelcome comments.” ECRs also suggested they would like to see “a feedback and ranking system adopted for reviewers.” Social media usage was inconsistent between those surveyed, with ResearchGate being the most popular platform, followed by LinkedIn and Twitter, though none were used for significant outreach of research activities. In journal metrics, the Impact Factor was the most important feature, directing most of their work towards choosing journals based on high metrics. The ECRs were “not interested in altmetrics,” which Nicholas suggested was not unexpected because they are not used by universities as a system for reputation.

Then came the second year’s results, comparing current attitudes to those from the same researchers in 2015. The biggest changes were in open access, which is now “seen as vastly more acceptable and desired to increase visibility,” and in peer review, which now has a greater element of distrust, in part due to the raised profile of retractions as a result of unethical practices, an increase in sharing and collaboration, and the continued rise of ResearchGate as the catalyst, which Nicholas said the ECRs saw as “their scholarly communication dashboard.” There was also more interest in altmetrics, but not much more, as they are still not the primary methods of assessing researchers’ work.

Nicholas concluded by saying that “if it was up to them, they would behave different, but their behaviour is controlled by the assessment system.” The potential for change depends on whether “ECRs take their millennial beliefs in sharing, openness, and transparency into leadership positions.”

A fascinating insight into the opinions of young researchers, and we look forward to the third and final phase of the project when it is complete.

Reproducibility / Pre-registered Reports

Reported by Maria Guerreiro

Damian Pattinson, Vice President of Publishing Innovation for Research Square (prior to joining Research Square, Pattinson held positions at the BMJ as Scientific Editor, and he was Executive Editor and Editorial Director at PLOS ONE), gave a lively talk focused on reproducibility, the trendiest long word in science. Pattinson started his presentation by reminding us of the study that sparked concern around reproducibility, “Drug development: raise standards for preclinical cancer research” by Begley and Ellis (https://doi.org/10.1038/483531a), which concluded that 89% of preclinical cancer studies failed to be reproduced. According to Pattinson, when we talk about reproducible research, we can mean that 1) a study was successfully reproduced by an independent laboratory (exact replication); 2) a variation of the study (for example, doing the same experiment using a different cell type) was successfully reproduced, thus proving to be methodologically robust and generalisable; or 3) enough information was provided that allowed others to successfully reproduce the findings.

Initiatives such as the “Reproducibility Project: Psychology” and the “Reproducibility Project: Cancer Biology,” both led by the Center of Open Science, deserved Pattinson’s
attention, as work that has been done in recent years to tackle the issue of the so-called reproducibility crisis. Pattinson focused especially on the latter, the first results of which were published by *eLife*, in partnership with both the Center of Open Science and Science Exchange, in January 2017. The project endeavoured to replicate experiments from high-profile papers in the area of cancer biology published between 2010 and 2012. Pattinson discussed how the project made use of registered reports and replication studies to exemplify how they can be a good approach to avoid bias in reporting.

On the subject of good reporting as a way to promote reproducibility, Pattinson highlighted the work done by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in setting principles for reporting clinical research. NIH’s recommendations encompass mandating data and material sharing (e.g., depositing datasets and making underlying data available) and transparency in reporting of materials and resources (e.g., catalogue numbers for antibodies and validation of cell lines). Another initiative to promote good reporting behaviours was the introduction of statistical/reproducibility checks in journal workflows, such as the ones developed by *Nature*.

Pattinson challenged the audience to think about barriers to the implementation of the NIH recommendations, and one of the points that was discussed was authors’ resistance to share data, either due to fear of getting scooped or due to confidentiality issues, which can be more field-specific (think about areas such as psychiatry or genetics). The take-home message is that there are simple steps publishers can take to encourage better reporting and thus facilitate reproducibility, such as have clear guidelines to authors, have a data sharing policy in place, and have no restrictions in the length of methods sections in journal articles. Other more complex, but still feasible, actions involve introducing reporting checklists, using tools such as Penelope and StatReviewer, and adopting registered reports (see Pattinson’s slide above for more).

**Excel Tips and Tricks**

**Reported by Diana Epstein**

Maggie Donovan, Microsoft Professional at DCS Computing Skills Limited, presented this breakout session.

Keyboard shortcuts and tips and tricks in Excel (for Windows) were shown, including the following:

- Ctrl and semicolon enters the current date in an Excel sheet
- Ctrl A selects All
- Ctrl and home goes to beginning of file
- Ctrl and right arrow goes to end of data
- Ctrl and down arrow goes to all the way to the end

Other tips included recommending using pivot tables as required to summarise and analyse information. Also, to turn data into a chart, check out the button F11.

**Artificial Intelligence in Peer Review**

**Reported by Maria Guerreiro**

Chadwick DeVoss, President of StatReviewer/Next Digital, and Tim Houle, PhD, Chief Scientist of StatReviewer, joined us from across the pond to talk about the applications of artificial intelligence (AI) in peer review. They are the founders of StatReviewer, an automated manuscript analysis tool that aims to improve statistical reporting in journal articles.
In the first half of their talk, DeVoss, who comes from the tech/product development world, gave an overview of the meaning and history of AI, emphasising how machine learning is a good part of what is understood today as AI: the capacity of making decisions (in an automated way) based on previous information. According to DeVoss, we are still at the very beginning of AI in publishing, but there is some work-around machine language processing and plagiarism checks (Meta and iThenticate, for instance), which are based on AI.

Houle carried on the discussion questioning “why is automation important in peer review?” For Houle, peer review, at least from his perspective as a statistician, is essentially about content and expectation. A reviewer looks at a manuscript to evaluate content, assesses the robustness of the study design, and ponders how well it is reported against a certain expectation. It was around these two values—content and expectation—that Houle and DeVoss built StatReviewer, teaching the software to assess content against a certain expectation of good reporting.

StatReviewer applies specific algorithms based on the type of study that is screened. When running StatReviewer on a manuscript (by uploading it, as an author or a publisher, to the StatReviewer website), StatReviewer will, in the first instance, classify the paper and then evaluate if guidelines are needed (for example, in the case of a randomised clinical trial, it will flag that compliance with the CONSORT guidelines is needed). StatReviewer will also evaluate if Student’s t-test was done in the way it should have been done. It will analyse the methods, the maths, check that p-values are reported, as well as confidence intervals. Houle made a demo of the product, and the output of the algorithm is a clear review, as if it had been produced by a statistician, with specific recommendations. As an alternative to the review, the software can also return a checklist. Houle stressed however that StatReviewer will not replace a human being in his lifetime, but that the software can complement review work, either by taking some of the burden off reviewers or by being an asset to publishers when unable to secure statistics experts.

At the end of the demo, the audience was interested in hearing how StatReviewer could be implemented in editorial workflows. StatReviewer should be integrated with the submission system Editorial Manager in 2018. The product will be fully customisable so that publishers have the freedom to decide which features they want. This is a commercial product that, as mentioned above, will be available to authors as well. In the ‘author-mode,’ authors can screen manuscripts using StatReviewer prior to submission and will get a more detailed report than the one returned via the publisher. In the ‘publisher-mode’ option, the idea is to allow authors to take the report/checklist to another journal in the event of a rejection, if StatReviewer is fully integrated with the journal workflow. In the interests of improving the way science is communicated, StatReviewer will operate on a subscription basis to publishers.

Vendor Lightning Talks

Reported by Duncan Nicholas

The vendor sessions provided a great chance to compare and contrast several platforms involved in the authoring and peer review process, combining different aspects of these activities to offer different tools and solutions for issues within the publishing industry.

Laura Harvey, Head of Publisher Relations at Publons, started off the rapid-fire session with a preview of Publons’ forthcoming Reviewer Connect feature, which combines Clarivate’s Web of Science author records with the Publons reviewer database to offer a search tool that contains a wealth of validated information. It is a step up from the existing Reviewer Locator functions and furthers
This session was hugely popular and points to the fact that increasing author profiles and getting research read is one of the key issues that editorial offices and academics are currently facing. Catherine Williams, Chief Marketing Officer of Altmetric, brought together a great panel from a range of organisations that gave very different perspectives from each other, resulting in a nicely balanced and highly informative session. The panel consisted of a commercial publisher, a progressive open-review platform, a large globally integrated health society, and a small ornithology society.

The core of Elaine Devine’s (Senior Communications Manager at Taylor & Francis) presentation was based on asking customers what they want and need and how they incorporate feedback from various sources into the creation of the resources and structure of their platforms. She spoke of ways in which Taylor & Francis analyse their website traffic to determine success, saying “in communications, people don’t realise how much data informs the process.” She detailed the resources Taylor & Francis develop for authors and readers, adapting tone of voice and medium for each individual audience the resource is targeted to, using podcasts, videos, Twitter Q&As, and Facebook Live events to communicate.

Michaela Torkar, Publishing Director at F1000, spoke about F1000’s revolutionary post-publication peer-review model, creating a system that encourages transparent living articles, intended to provide unrestricted and immediate access to new findings to facilitate compliance with funder and institutional open science policies. By publishing papers on receipt, and allowing the research community to determine the suitability and relevance in an open forum, F1000 removes publication bias, offering a real alternative to the very closed traditional publishing system.

Michael Alexander, Head of Publications at the European Society of Cardiology, started his section by “just saying” that despite his reservations of its value, his journal is the first cardiology journal to reach an Impact Factor of over 20; “whatever you think of this horribly flawed metric...we were first.” Very droll! He gave a very detailed description of the size and sprawling complexity of the organisations in his community that interact with each other—99 cardiac societies with nine congresses a year, with between 1,000-6,000 people in attendance at each, the largest of which publishes thousands of poster presentations and slide sets. As a learned society, their role is to provide information to support their authors to better develop the medical
innovations and procedures their specialist field can offer. In a comment which echoed Devine’s in the opening section, Alexander said that their society spends time measuring, analysing, and discovering what people do with their content in order to make it better and more useful.

Finally, Steve Dudley, Senior Administrator at the British Ornithologists’ Union, showed us how #TheTweetingBird uses social media to increase attention to papers in ornithology, ably demonstrating some clever tricks by having scheduled the slides from his talk to be tweeted during his talk, thus live tweeting his own presentation (and eliminating our need to photograph and fiddle with our phones during his talk). He gave a fascinating insight into the relation of social media presence, altmetrics, and citations, using versions platforms to promote not only his society, but the work of the whole field (between 55%-95% of Twitter Altmetric scores of individual ornithology journals), in fully supportive, non-competitive fashion. Dudley showed us some Altmetric scores from papers from his journal, and analysed the sources, showing how retweets and quotes could be traced back to reveal one author’s activity as the source for 40% of the Twitter contribution. He ended by showing us some intriguing results from a recently published paper that finds an association between journal Impact Factor and Altmetric Attention Score.

Individual Performance Development Plans

Reported by Chris Heid
Product Lead, Clarivate Analytics

Claudia Welburn, Account Manager at Editorial Office Ltd., conducted an engaging presentation and discussion. This breakout session focused on tools and strategies to reach a diverse array of life goals, both professional and personal.

As an experienced professional in both the banking and publishing industries, Welburn shared with her audience how she has utilized personal development plans to document specific goals, lay out intermediate milestones, and achieve positive outcomes.

Early in the session Welburn made an important differentiation between personal development plans and the performance appraisals most people undertake annually as part of their employer’s review process. She noted that these appraisals are retrospective, static, and often take a large amount of time to prepare and discuss. In contrast, personal development plans are forward looking, a path to your goal with manageable steps. They are also dynamic; individual steps or overall goals can be changed or removed as your wants and needs change. They are a means to put “your future in your hands.”
However, Welburn stated goals within a personal development plan should be SMART just as they are for your work appraisals. SMART is a common acronym representing the concepts of Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-boxed.

As part of the session Welburn walked attendees through her development plan process using a personal goal of training for a long-distance swim as an example. This example was very instructive as Welburn worked through a reusable chart, which was provided to attendees (see image), who were encouraged to create a plan for one of their own goals.

A key takeaway for me in this exercise was the ability for development plans as a means to mitigate risks and problems, which could hold you back from your goals. By laying out a plan and looking at intermediate milestones, roadblocks and risks can be circumvented and mitigated. This is a strategy that many of us use for work projects and goals but rarely apply to personal situations. In Welburn’s personal example, she needed to train through the winter to be ready for the swimming competition, but her preferred training location was a natural lake. Recognizing this issue early, she was able to devise several mitigation strategies including the use of a wetsuit and gaining use of a local pool.

Welburn left attendees with three key pieces of advice as they approach professional and personal goals: aim high, don’t be shy, and you can do anything you want.

**Tendering / Acquisitions / RfP: Acquiring New Business**

**Reported by Duncan Nicholas**

In this session, Simon Rallison, Director of Scientific Programmes at The Physiological Society, gave us some helpful guidance on tendering for society journals, drawn from his experiences as a publisher at Blackwell and as the director for a learned society. He started by telling us about llama weddings and otters which scooped best opening gambit of any session of the conference.

Rallison spoke of the pivotal role of the managing editor who would be directly responsible for the journal day-to-day, which harkened back to Jason Roberts’ statements from the opening plenary, about the importance and value of professionalism in the role. He gave us a breakdown of reasons why societies start journals (to shape their field and provide members with a benefit) and reasons why a publisher would want to acquire a journal (strategic expansion into a field, increasing status, access to new readers). He spoke of some of the downsides for the publisher, such as profit share and risks of financial guarantees, and those for societies, such as the profit share, as well as relinquishing some control of how they operate the journal. Despite the downsides, there is a long list of benefits for a society, which includes wider distribution, economies of scale, marketing, and relative guarantees of financial return.

As a conclusion, Rallison stressed that, although preparation, prioritising requirements, and planning were all important to winning bids, relationships are key in the final decision and successful maintenance of the contract, giving us an anecdote of winning a contract because he was the “only publisher prepared to go to Saskatoon in February.”

**Applications of Metrics**

**Reported by Diana Epstein**

This breakout session was presented by Peter Shelley, Head of Business Development at Kudos; Jean Liu, Product Development Manager at Altmetric; Ian Potter, Global Business Development Manager of Publishing & Associations at Clarivate Analytics; and José Oliveira, PhD, Editor-in-Chief at Wiley.

This session began with the question “why?”: Why count citations? This is the signal of usage; it helps support and dispute the usage. It builds on links, time, and subject.

Why collect the numbers? The reason is the effectiveness of publication strategy—check out your competitors, compare, benchmark, identify new opportunities, and understand the impact of authors. They help with interpretation and help you demonstrate the success of publications in different ways.

For Altmetric, quantitative data includes mention counts, Altmetric Attention Score. Within three days of
publication, 50% of data are on Twitter, followed by blogs, policy, and citations. There are alternative metrics: quantitative, such as number of papers, and quality, such as mention of papers.

Editorial staff, publishers, news/media, Publons, blogs, social media (Twitter/Facebook, Wikipedia, YouTube) can all contribute to citations.

Publishers can use Altmetrics to monitor the competition’s performance, identify key opinion leads, target the specific audience, and identify hot topics.

Kudos works with the authors in preparing a summary of what an article is about and the reason why it is important, as well as to prepare a short title for a broad audience. There is a link to the full text of the article. There is the possibility to share and track activities against the metrics. Visits on a Kudos page count towards the Altmetric score.

Generation of activity correlates to the article performance. The author signs up with Facebook/Twitter, and Kudos prompts authors to share their article. Metrics should be evaluated in the context of action taken across closed channels as well as open ones: The full social media picture, what is liked on Twitter/Facebook, shows what authors shared. This can result in growing your network and finding new reviewers and editorial board members.

The editor’s view of measuring research and impact was also discussed. The submission downloads, financial implication, and the reason for measuring, especially for librarians to help them find the right journal.

In the Q&A, questions were asked by Prabha Choubina, Sheila Hancock, and Diana Epstein. For a question about how to decide metrics for journals in the moment, Potter noted topic, clustering, and graphs, and Liu noted there is no comparison, look at similar paper/journal attention in topics. Two questions were also asked about Impact Factor. The first was about why case report journals do not receive an IF, and Potter noted that a decision was reached not to count case reports. The second question was if a document is under 10 pages long would this mean that it will not be counted for citation, to which Potter noted that length is irrelevant.

Tools of the Open Science Trade: How to Facilitate Preregistration and Other Best Practices

Reported by Duncan Nicholas

David Mellor, Project Manager at the Center for Open Science (COS), ended the conference by consolidating some of the themes raised in other presentations across the two days, and explaining in detail how openness, collaboration, and recognising exemplary best practice behaviours can lead the way to better transparency and accountability, improve the efficiency of science, and help build public trust and utility of research findings.

In his reproducibility session on Thursday, Damian Pattinson had shown us several ways in which a lack of replication was harming confidence in the scientific method. Mellor picked up from this, to show us an example from PsyArXiv (Silberzahn et al., 2017; https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/QKWST), in which 29 teams of analysts used the same dataset to determine whether football referees were more likely to penalise dark-skin-toned players than light-skin-toned players. The teams used 21 unique combinations of covariates, with 20 teams (69%) producing statistically significant positive effects and nine teams (31%) producing a non-significant relationship.

With this example setting the scene, Mellor presented ways in which the COS and the Open Science Framework (OSF) are attempting to address the issues, and the ways in which editorial offices can help support their endeavours. Mellor lamented that “incentives for individual success are focused on getting it published, not getting it right.” And this is the culture that needs to be changed.

The COS have a badge scheme, which journals can adopt to show when authors provide open data, materials, or pre-register their methods. There is growing evidence that these badges might increase the likelihood of people opening up their research.

The OSF foster these initiatives by attempting to make everything as easy as possible for researchers. Their website helps researchers collaborate on projects, facilitates version control of papers, including code and the data they are based on, and offers a central point for a range of services and resources.

For journals wishing to allow their authors to submit preregistered reports, the OSF would be an essential website.
to direct people to in order to understand all they need to know about progressing. As a closing note, Mellor suggested that one of the key goals for pre-registration is to make researchers more honest with themselves, and to develop accurate, unwavering skills in conducting their research.

Editor’s Note: Figures courtesy of Maria Guerreiro.
Editor’s Interview with an Editage Travel Grant Winner

By Carolyn Sperry
Co-Editor-in-Chief
EON

“This kind of conference is always an eye opener,” says Prabin Chhetri, winner of the Editage travel grant. He was thrilled to attend the ISMTE European Conference, calling it a “once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.”

When asked how he got started in academic publishing, Mr. Chhetri explains that he first worked as a medical transcriptionist, then as an administrator, and then in 2016 he became the Managing Editor of Birat Journal of Health Sciences (BJHS). BJHS was established in 2016 and is a tri-annual, open access journal published by Birat Medical College and Teaching Hospital, Biratnagar, Nepal. Mr. Chhetri helped start the journal from scratch, and it was a rough road at first. “We were shuffled and re-shuffled,” he says. BJHS is one of only a few peer-reviewed journals based in Nepal, and pursuing a career in academic publishing there is not easy. Maintaining international standards is challenging, plagiarism is a significant issue (for more information, see the essay that Mr. Chhetri co-authored), and there are few local colleagues to share information with. BJHS has been strict with plagiarism, which often happens because of a lack of knowledge.

When asked for any advice he would give to colleagues founding journals in developing countries, Mr. Chhetri advises “find a good statistical reviewer,” as well as a strong board. Connect with as many people as possible, at all levels. He also stresses the importance of getting involved with ISTME, which he says is critical in learning about industry developments and keeping abreast of technological advances. He appreciates the efforts of Michael Willis, Kelly Schild, and others at ISMTE who have provided invaluable help, and he is grateful to Editage and Cactus Communications. Mr. Chhetri plans to share the knowledge he has gained, and to educate newcomers about plagiarism and publication ethics.

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 2018 issues. Contact our editorial office today for more information.
What Does a Managing Editor Do All Day? An Analysis of Emails Received in an Editorial Office

Editors’ Note: Alethea Gerding won second place in the ISMTE North American poster competition. See her winning poster at the end of this article.

In early 2016, I attended a focus group at the offices of J&J Editorial. The purpose of the focus group was to collect information on managing editor job tasks and functions, and the results of the focus group were used to formulate the survey of Managing Editor Core Competencies, the ultimate results of which have been reported previously in EON.1-5

My group was led by Jan Higgins, who asked us to tell her what tasks we were responsible for, while she wrote our (politely) shouted answers on a white board. Check in manuscripts! Run plagiarism reports! Manage production schedules! Chase reviewers! The answers came fast and furious. Once the low-hanging fruit was identified, the answers started to slow. Check for image manipulation, copyedit accepted manuscripts, present reports to editorial boards, schedule social media posts… We were now on a list of things that some, but not all, of the participating managing editors do. Next came the list of things that most of us didn’t do: collect publication fees, produce podcasts, manage editorial assistants.

At some point I realized that if I could check my email from the last week, I could quite easily and quickly list most of the tasks I accomplished on a daily or weekly basis, and if I checked a month’s worth of emails, I could tell with some accuracy everything I had accomplished in the past month.

At some point not too long after, it dawned on me that I had a working concept for a poster: Because many, if not most, managing editors work remotely from their editors-in-chief, societies, publishers, authors, and reviewers, the vast majority of a managing editor’s tasks are assigned via email. Additionally, questions from authors, editors, and reviewers tend to come through email (often via online peer-review management systems). Therefore, I thought that an analysis of a managing editor’s email inbox would provide an answer to the question, “What does a managing editor do all day?”

Methods
I decided I would track every email I received for three non-consecutive months. I chose the first month (July 2016) randomly, and then in four-month increments from there (November 2016, March 2017). I chose non-consecutive months because I wanted to capture a bigger picture of a year. Choosing only summertime (when I find myself chasing authors and reviewers more frequently) or autumn months (when much of my time is spent preparing for my society’s annual session) may not have been completely representative of my working life.

For each of the three selected months, I entered every email I received into an Excel spreadsheet (Fig. 1), capturing the following data: sender, email synopsis, and my action taken in response. The following emails were excluded from data collection: spam, acknowledgements to my email (i.e., “Thanks! Got it!”), and personal emails (i.e., inside jokes with colleagues). I used the data provided to categorize the emails into associated tasks (peer-review management, production, ethics issues, article promotion, journal business, society collaboration, etc.).

Results
The three months surveyed showed remarkable consistency in the number of emails received (July: 342; November: 346; March: 341).

Tasks
In all three months, most emails were related to peer review (49.7%, 54.6%, 50.0%) and production (17.3%, 15.0%, 22.3%). Outside of peer review and production, the other most common subjects of emails were:
While peer review and production reliably made up the bulk of the emails, non-peer-review or production activities were more variable from month to month, given the differences in work assigned (i.e., a non-journal-related project completed by October, executive director turnover in the fall, a plagiarism concern arising in March). Figure 2 compares the emails received for each month tracked.

Overall (Fig. 3), for the three months observed, nearly 70% of emails received were in reference to the peer-review (51.1%) or production (18.2%) processes. While this study did not track the time spent on each of these emails, to say that managing editors in general, and I in particular, spend 70% of the time on peer review and production seems reasonable.

**Correspondents**

Managing editors are often the hub of communication between the society, publisher, authors, editors, and reviewers. The data collected here reflect that role (Fig. 4).

Given the primacy of production and review, it is unsurprising that more than three-quarters of emails came from authors (37.9%; many of these auto-generated through ScholarOne), the editor-in-chief (EIC; 20.3%), the production editor (7.8%), and ScholarOne (4.4%). The society’s communications/marketing director (my immediate supervisor with the society) and communications/marketing manager (the other member of my division) were the most-prolific correspondents outside of the production and review process. As a group, society colleagues sent 15.4% of emails received.

For the period studied, the top five journal-related tasks (and associated correspondents) were:

1. Peer review (authors, EIC, AEs, reviewers)
2. Production (production editor, EIC, authors)
The image contains a page from a document discussing the tasks a managing editor performs. The document outlines various tasks such as journal business, PR & promotion, and ethics. It also mentions limitations of the study, including the time spent on emails, and concludes with core competencies of a managing editor.

### Limitations of this study

**Email ≠ time.** While many responses to peer-review and production emails are pro forma and take very little time, other emails (i.e., a plagiarism concern in a published article) can take up hours or days of work. This project shows that nearly 70% of emails I receive involve production and peer review. I feel in my gut that this is roughly the amount of time I spend on those two processes, but have no proof that this is so, and I am considering a similar project to track the time I spend on my day-to-day activities.

Each email was coded into one category. For instance, an acceptance letter from the editor-in-chief could be considered a peer-review task (it completes that process), a production task (it begins that process), or ethics task (plagiarism screening is part of the acceptance process). I made these judgments myself. Having a second person to ‘code’ the tasks and an inter-rater comparison would improve the reliability of the data. Additionally, I could have given each email more than one code to improve the study’s accuracy.

Statistics were not analyzed. This is a descriptive view of emails received and meant to serve as a snapshot of one particular journal. Statistics were not analyzed to determine if any results were significant.

### Conclusion

I am not so narcissistic as to believe anyone is interested in hearing about what I do in painstaking, cross-tabulated, and pie-charted detail. Quite frankly, even I found it a little navel-gazing! But as a society, we are interested in naming what it is that the members of our profession do. This is a portrait of what a single-staffed, society-employed, Wiley-published managing editor’s job looks like. Therefore, while the data presented here may accurately reflect this and similar journals, a larger, publisher-owned, or self-published journal might have different results.

That said, given the data presented, this study identifies the following core competencies of a managing editor:

1. Excellent communication skills; ability to communicate journal goals consistently with varied journal stakeholders.
2. Attention to detail for successful, efficient peer-review and production processes.
3. Ability to multitask, with responsibilities as varied as business and administration, scientific integrity, and grammar/proofreading skills.
4. Desire to stay up-to-date on issues in the field.
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What does a Managing Editor Do All Day?
An Analysis of Emails Received in an Editorial Office
Alethea B. Gerding, MA, Managing Editor, Journal of Prosthodontics, American College of Prosthodontists, Chapel Hill, NC

Overview

The three months surveyed showed remarkable consistency in the number of emails received (July, 342; November, 343; March, 314). In all three months, most emails were related to peer review (42.7%, 44.5%, 58.5%) and production (17.2%, 19.2%, 22.2%). Outside of peer review and production, the most common subjects of emails were: society meetings, personal emails, society newsletters, and business issues. In the first two months, personal emails made up 21% of the total emails received, while in March, personal emails made up 28% of the total emails received.

Conclusions

Managing editors are often the hub of communication between the society, publisher, authors, editors, and reviewers. The data collected here reflect that role. Given the privacy of production and review, it is unsurprising that more than three quarters of emails came from authors (77.5%), many of these auto-generated through ScholarOne, the editor-in-chief (20.3%), the production editor (7%), and ScholarOne (9%). The society’s communication manager (my immediate supervisor) and the communications manager (the other major contributor to the total) wrote the most emails, each of the outside of the production and review process. As a group, society staff sent 16.6% of emails received.

For the reported study, the top 5 journal-related tasks (and associated correspondents) were:
1. Peer review (authors, EIC, AEs, reviewers).
2. Production (production editor, EIC, authors).
3. Journal business (publisher, EIC, society staff, communications director).
4. PR & promotion (society marketing manager, media PR, publisher).
5. Ethics (EIC, publisher, publishers, IMET).

Study Limitations

Emails were not randomly selected from the data set, but were selected by the editor-in-chief and her colleagues. Since the data provided is based on the emails sent to the associate editor, it does not necessarily reflect the number of emails sent to the editor-in-chief, business, or society staff.

Overall, for the three months observed, over 70% of emails received were in reference to the peer review (51.1%) or production (18.2%) processes. While this study did not track the time spent on each of these emails, it is likely that many of these emails were not read or responded to during the same three-month period.

The data collected here reflects the role of the managing editor as a hub of communication between the society, publisher, authors, editors, and reviewers. The data also suggests that more than three quarters of emails came from authors, many of these auto-generated through ScholarOne. This highlights the need for proper communication channels and tools to support the work of the managing editor.
Looking for New Members for the Awards Committee!

The Awards Committee is looking for several new members to help develop the society’s awards criteria, promote the awards to members, and evaluate the nominees. US and non-US members are encouraged to volunteer. Committee meets via teleconference six to eight times a year.

Click here to volunteer today!
Committee Update:

Preview of the 2018 Asian-Pacific ISMTE Conference in Singapore

The 2018 Asian-Pacific Conference Planning Committee is excited to welcome everyone to the third Asian-Pacific ISMTE conference, which returns to Singapore. The meeting this year is being held on March 27 & 28 and will be at the Novotel Singapore Clarke Quay, site of the first Asian-Pacific conference!

Our theme this year—shared across the North American, European, and Asia-Pacific conferences—is “Committed to Editorial Excellence.” This has guided our planning process, and the result is a lineup of practical sessions focused on providing editors and editorial staff useful skills to help them in their everyday responsibilities, as well as sessions that discuss emerging trends and forward-looking strategic initiatives.

One highlight is Dr. Jose Lapeña’s keynote presentation, “A Report from the 8th International Congress on Peer Review.” The Peer Review Congress is one of the most important events in science and biomedical publishing. Every four years, journal editors, scientists, and publishers come together to present and discuss their research projects on peer review. It is organized by The JAMA Network, the BMJ, and the Meta Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS). The stated aim of the Peer Review Congress is to encourage research into the quality and credibility of peer review and scientific publication and to establish the evidence base on which scientists can improve the conduct, reporting, and dissemination of scientific research. Dr. Lapeña, of the University of the Philippines, was one of the organizers and a member of the advisory board for the 2017 Peer Review Congress. Dr. Lapeña will provide a summary of the best and/or most interesting presentations, with a particular focus on how the research can be applied in a practical way to the everyday management of a scientific journal.

We are also really excited about the rest of the program too! Following are the topics we will be covering:

Preprints (research articles posted online prior to peer review), which have been commonly used for a long time in mathematics and physics, are now becoming more numerous and growing in popularity. “What You Need to Know about Preprint Servers,” will include presentations from the founders of bioRxiv and ChemRxiv, as well as a discussion of the ethics of preprints.

“Communicating Science Effectively beyond the Journal Article” will delve into some of the emerging communication formats editorial offices are working with, including how the scientific community in China is using WeChat to collaborate and share new research findings.

In the session “Professionalizing the Editorial Office,” you will hear from three successful publishers about their personal paths to success in this industry and learn what opportunities are out there, how to grow your skill set, and tips for peer networking.

“Practical Aspects of Launching a New Journal” will review various aspects in starting up a new academic journal, such as the types of business model, how to form an editorial board, what peer review policy to adopt, how to do production and costing estimates, as well as issues related to sales and marketing.

In recent years, publishers have begun recognizing and responding to author needs more promptly and innovatively than before. In the session “How Publishers are Nurturing their Author Community throughout the Research Cycle,” publishers will share case studies and first-hand accounts of engaging authors. They will also cover factors to consider when choosing an author-services partner.

No academic publisher conference would be complete without a session that discusses “Standards and Identifiers.” This session will focus on how metadata is evolving and review best practices for adopting standards into workflows. Initiatives to be discussed include ORCID (Open Researcher & Contributor ID), Crossref services (Cited-By, CrossMark, Funding Data, Event Data), and new initiatives such as Organizational Identifiers, Metadata2020, and I4OC (Initiative for Open Citations).
Finally, ”Editorial Office Workshop” will look at some innovative tools, such as StatReviewer, which examines and reports on statistical methodology, PACE, which examines and improves artwork quality, and Similarity Checking, which compares submitted manuscripts with already published articles and identifies overlap. This session will also include a discussion of policies and processes for handling issues that are surfaced by these tools.

We are also pleased to welcome back COPE, the Committee on Publication Ethics, who have organized an optional workshop that will take place on the afternoon of March 28. COPE provides advice to editors and publishers on all aspects of publication ethics and, in particular, how to handle cases of research and publication misconduct.

We hope that you find these sessions compelling and invite you to register to attend. We encourage you to use the hashtag #ISMTE2018 on social media to connect with others from around the globe and to bring attention to the meeting!

Please visit the ISMTE website to view the full conference program, and to register today.

We look forward to seeing you in Singapore!

2018 Program Committee Members:
Tony Alves, Aries Systems, United States (Chair)
Rick Lee, World Scientific, Singapore (Co-Chair)
Julie Nash, J&J Editorial, United States (Board of Directors Liaison)
Jenn Deyton, J&J Editorial, United States (Immediate Past Chair)
Yan Shuai, Springer Nature; China Periodicals Association, China
Nobuko Miyairi, ORCID, Japan
Clarinda Cerejo, Editage, India
Donald Samulack, Editage, United States

---

**ISMTE Resources**

Energize your editorial office operations and check out this month’s featured resource, Editorial Board Reports 1-5, ScholarOne and Editorial Manager tutorials, from the ISMTE Professional Development Education Committee. Whether you’re looking for direction on a process or browsing for an idea to improve your workflow, click on the link and see if you can learn something new today.
What to do if you suspect ghost, guest or gift authorship

(see also flowcharts on Changes in authorship, as such requests may indicate the presence of a ghost or gift author)

Review acknowledgement section and authorship declaration (if supplied)

and/or

Send copy of journal’s authorship policy**

to corresponding author and request statement that all qualify and no authors have been omitted (if not obtained previously)

and/or

Request information for further details of individual contributions***

Authorship row missing
(e.g. contributor list does not include anybody who analysed data or prepared first draft)

Listed author does not meet authorship criteria

Satisfactory explanation of author list

Doubts remain/head more information

*Initial action will depend on journal’s normal method of collecting author/ contributor info.

**Including clear guidance/criteria for authorship in journal instructions makes it easier to handle such issues

***Miwuk et al. Have shown that the method of collecting such data (e.g. free text or check boxes) can influence the response.

Letting authors describe their own contributions probably results in the most truthful and informative answers.
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Developed for
COPE by Liz Wager of Slicksilver
www.slicksilver.com © 2013 Committee on Publication Ethics
First published 2006
A non-exclusive licence to reproduce these flowcharts may be applied for by writing to: cop@publicationethics.org

Permission to publish this flowchart was granted by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Please visit http://publicationethics.org/ for additional flowcharts and information.
Calendar of Events

2018 ALA Midwinter Meeting & Exhibits
February 9-13, 2018
Denver, Colorado, USA
http://acseconference.com/

ACSE Annual Conference 2018
March 21-22, 2018
Dubai, United Arab Emirates
http://acseconference.com/

ISMTE Asian-Pacific Conference
March 27-28, 2018
Singapore
www.ismte.org
EASE members receive ISMTE member registration rate

14th Annual Meeting of ISMPP
April 30-May 2, 2018
National Harbor, Maryland, USA
http://www.ismpp.org/

2018 CSE Annual Meeting
May 5-8, 2018
New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/

The 4th Asian Science Editors’ Conference and Workshop 2017
July 18-19, 2018
Bogor Agricultural University, Indonesia
http://asianeditor.org/

ISMTE North American Conference
August 2-3, 2018
Baltimore, Maryland, USA
www.ismte.org
EASE members receive ISMTE member registration rate

ISMTE European Conference
November 8, 2018
London, UK
www.ismte.org
EASE members receive ISMTE member registration rate

CORPORATE MEMBERS

PLATINUM SUPPORTER

Wiley

SILVER SUPPORTERS

American Chemical Society Publications
American Institute of Physics
J & J Editorial, LLC
Origin Editorial, LLC
Wolters Kluwer Health Medical Research

BRONZE SUPPORTERS

Aries Systems Corp.
Clarivate Analytics
Compuscript
Elsevier
Enago
Oxford University Press
SalientContent, LLC
Taylor & Francis
Technica Editorial Services
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.
THANK YOU TO OUR CORPORATE MEMBERS!
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