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In recent years, the open access (OA) movement has been gaining ground within the academic community, but despite increased efforts to make scholarship free for readers online, there are concerns about how to do so in a way that’s structurally and economically sustainable. Funding for OA journals, like budgets for serials, still comes primarily from academic institutions. With some article-processing charges creeping into the high thousands of dollars, there is concern that OA publishing fees could eventually meet or surpass subscription fees, resulting in a new research funding emergency.

On Thursday May 18, 2017 at 4PM EST, Scholastica hosted a panel-style webinar titled “OA Advocates Weigh in on the Democratization of Academic Journals.” During the webinar, three leading OA advocates deliberated the current state of OA publishing and what’s needed to achieve sustainable OA in the future.

The webinar featured the following panelists:
- Dan Morgan (@djmorgan), Digital Science Publisher at University of California Press
- Roxanne Missingham (@rmissingham), Chief Scholarly Information Officer at Australian National University and Australian OA Support Group Deputy Chair
- Stevan Harnad (@AmSciForum), Professor in the Department of Psychology at Université du Québec à Montréal, Green OA advocate

Webinar Highlights

The webinar panel resulted in a lively discussion about how to advance OA without depleting institutional budgets. Missingham, Harnad, and Morgan discussed:

- The sustainability of current OA journal publishing approaches
- Possibilities and challenges surrounding the democratization of academic journals
- Next steps to speed up the transition from subscription-based journals to OA
- The role of technology in democratizing academic journal publishing
- How nonprofit organizations and scholars can facilitate sustainable OA

Stevan Harnad spoke to his longstanding call for universal Green OA to solve the serials crisis, which would require all researchers to make their works freely available in institutional repositories or preprint servers and thereby enable libraries to cancel expensive journal subscriptions. Harnad argues that if this were the case, publishers would be forced to downsize their operations to their most basic and necessary function, the management of peer review, and cut all other production costs. In this scenario, he argues publishing and production services could be offered as extras that journals could elect to have and pay for separately.

“Until you cancel the journals, you can’t force the publishers to downsize to the post-Green essentials,” explained Harnad. “They are going to still keep on doing and charging for stuff that we don’t need. That’s the obstacle.”

Missingham and Morgan both agreed on the importance of Green OA but took a more multi-model approach, arguing Green OA should be happening but so too should different OA journal publishing models.

“One thing we’ve seen great success of is handing more power back to the scholarly authors, letting them be involved with support in terms of creativity and creating new partnership models that are about exploration of content management and also about different funding options” said Missingham.
Missingham argued that trying out different OA publishing approaches simultaneously and not being afraid to experiment is necessary to move the needle in terms of making OA sustainable. “I think letting, to a degree, a thousand flowers bloom may not mean a thousand flowers continue, but it means we’re actually learning by doing, which is important in terms of the space.”

One approach to publishing OA journals, which Dan Morgan is directly involved in as digital publisher at University of California Press (UCP) where he works with their Collabra: Psychology journal, is service-supported journal publishing. Rather than signing a contract with a corporate publisher, UCP uses Ubiquity Press publishing services to produce its journal and is therefore able to retain control over all of its content and copyright and have the ability to switch publishing services at will if it chooses. Another example mentioned of a journal that is publishing using services was Discrete Analysis, an arXiv overlay journal founded by Fields Medalist Timothy Gowers and managed using Scholastica.

In speaking on instances of groups of scholars or nonprofit journal organizations choosing service-based publishers or publishing software to operate their own journals instead of contracting out to a corporate publisher, Morgan said “I really don’t see that kind of transition as controversial as it can sometimes be made out to be. I think a journal leaving any publisher to go and do more by themselves or with a startup publisher, that’s the story in itself.”

Considering such examples, Morgan said, “enables a more mission-driven approach to publishing, it enables you to require less capital upfront to get it started, it enables you to experiment with ideas.”

Participants also discussed budgetary concerns, with Dan Morgan suggesting more centralized control of academic funding for OA publishing initiatives. Stevan Harnad argued that journals, in a post-Green OA landscape, could charge per manuscript submission to spread out the cost of peer review among all papers.

Overall, the participants agreed that there is too much money being spent on journals and that steps must be taken to lower the cost of OA publishing. Much of the discussion centered around breaking up the publishing model into different services and functions journals can choose between.

“I see reductions in cost and efficiency for things like typesetting or even reducing the need for typesetting as not just ways to minimize expenditure on publishing,” said Morgan, “but also opening up other potential things that you can do if authors want.”

Want to hear more about the webinar discussion? The full recording is now available to watch on demand. You can access it on the Scholastica blog or request a link via email.
Keynote Session: What Makes a Successful International Journal Brand and a Committed Editorial Team?

Reported by Michael Willis
Senior Manager, Peer Review, Wiley-Blackwell

was fitting therefore that he be invited to provide the keynote session at ISMTE’s first conference in China, although this time the topic was rather different, as he described the factors leading to a successful publishing operation at ASCO. This was essentially a matter of finding the right balance between culture (the organisation’s values and behaviours) and strategy (its goals and tactics).

Sampson exemplified this in numerous ways, beginning with ensuring that every activity within the operation could be measured. As Lord Kelvin put it, more or less (and this mantra surfaced again in a number of presentations at the conference): If you cannot measure it, you cannot improve it. At ASCO, therefore, every aspect of the editorial operation is measured, with performance dashboards reporting regularly on, for example, each stage of the publication process and handling times for Associate Editors. (This is of course very much in line with ISMTE best practice: See our editorial office reporting tools.)

Alongside operational excellence, ASCO seeks to provide ‘customer service without compare,’ with a ‘can do’
attitude to dealing with its members’ enquiries and going above and beyond expectations. Service level is measured by surveying authors and reviewers on a weekly or ongoing basis to gauge their satisfaction with the publishing process.

Beyond external interactions, Sampson noted, it’s also vital that co-workers are developed and motivated. ‘What’s worse than training your workers and losing them? Not training them and keeping them,’ wrote motivational speaker and author Zig Ziglar. Sampson likened the breadth of expertise required of a typical managing editor to the variety of skills required of a commercial airline pilot (Figure 1), and his approach is to ensure that each of his team members is ‘a student of the profession,’ supporting and participating in relevant organisations such as ISMTE, sharing knowledge, and facilitating networking. He also described the immense level of trust bestowed on ASCO employees: They have an ‘open leave’ policy, meaning they can take as much annual leave as they like, without it being recorded—as long as, of course, they perform to the highest level. More information about ASCO’s workplace culture is available on their website.

Professional development extends beyond co-workers, and ASCO also has a programme for developing the knowledge and skills of its editors and reviewers, the latter group likely to turn into tomorrow’s editors.

The keynote set an incredibly positive and helpful tone for the meeting, showing that an organisation’s culture as well as its strategy need to work in tandem to produce excellent results.

ORCID! What Is It and Why Is It So Important?

Reported by Tony Alves
Director, Product Management, Aries Systems Corporation

What is ORCID, why is it important, and how is it used? Nobuko Miyairi, ORCID’s Regional Director in the Asia Pacific region, addressed these questions in her presentation on ORCID, which stands for Open Researcher and Contributor ID. Following Miyairi’s presentation, Dr. Choon Shil Lee, from the Korean Association of Medical Journals (KAMJE), described how ORCID identifiers have been integrated into Korean publishing platforms developed and operated by KAMJE.

Founded in 2010, ORCID is an open, nonprofit, nonproprietary organization with global reach. ORCID provides a “persistent digital identifier that distinguishes researchers from each other.” Not only is the 16-digit identifier persistent, it is also “actionable” which means you can “plug it into a web browser and be taken to the identified source.” This also means that someone can click on an ORCID and be delivered to a person’s ORCID record to see their published articles, work history, reviewer activity, and other professional information. Miyairi opened the session with a story about 38 authors with the name Wang on a single paper. Speaking to a largely Chinese audience, Miyairi’s point about the importance of disambiguating author names was well received. Transliteration is a major problem in Asia, as sometimes different names will have the same Western spelling. Similarly, first and last name constructions in Asian countries can be switched around, and Western systems can’t always handle this.

Miyairi stressed that ORCID is not a profile system, but rather it is a researcher-centric mechanism for claiming identity and for permitting other organizations and services to make assertions about that researcher’s work and accomplishments. ORCID is free for researchers who opt in and register themselves. Researchers manage their own data including the level of privacy for different data elements (Figure 2). Member organizations, such as publishers, universities, funding bodies, etc., do pay fees which help support ORCID, and this gives those organizations the ability to “assert” that the information and accomplishments listed in a person’s ORCID record are valid, which builds academic trust.
Over 3 million researchers have registered for an ORCID identifier, and hundreds of institutions and businesses have become supporting members. ORCID has become a hub in the STM ecosystem. An example of this is the interaction between manuscript submission systems, publishing platforms, funding organizations, and other entities that pass data and research papers back and forth (Figure 3). An ORCID collected from an author during the manuscript submission process is passed along to the publishing platform, which passes the ORCID on to Crossref, which then updates the author’s ORCID record, which in turn notifies the researcher’s institution and funding sources that the research has been published!

A great example of ORCID in use was presented by Dr. Choon Shil Lee, professor at Sookmyung Women’s University and a member of the Committee for Information Management at KAMJE. There are two databases developed and operated by KAMJE: KoreaMed and Synapse. KoreaMed is a bibliographic database for articles published in Korean medical journals, while Synapse is a digital archive and reference linking platform for these same journals. ORCID is integrated in these systems in a couple of different ways. First, an author’s name is a link to that author’s ORCID profile, and by clicking the link the user can view whatever is designated as public information on that author’s ORCID profile. Second, an author can automatically add works that are listed in both KoreaMed and Synapse to their ORCID profile, which makes it very simple for a researcher to build their ORCID profile and make their previously published works more accessible.

ORCID is fast becoming an indispensable service that not only helps disambiguate researcher names but also helps connect researchers, funders, and publishers, making science more discoverable.

[Useful links: https://orcid.org; https://orcid.org/organizations/integrators; https://www.kamje.or.kr/

Crossref: Setting Standards, Innovating Scholarly Communication

Reported by Tony Alves

Crossref is an organization that is well known for setting standards and for innovation in the scholarly communication echo system. Rachael Lammey, Member & Community Outreach Manager at Crossref, began her presentation by stating, “We do stuff that doesn’t make sense for publishers to do individually.” Lammey then went on to give an overview of Crossref, as well as a deep dive into the various standards and services offered and administered by Crossref. Also discussed was how scholarly publishing benefits from these services, and how publishers can participate in Crossref’s initiatives.
Crossref is a nonprofit organization working to make scholarly content persistently findable, citable, and linkable. Crossref has over 5,500 member organizations from over 100 countries. They are best known for providing “publishers with the organization and technological backbone to facilitate linking by associating Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) with publisher metadata.” They collect metadata on published research and manage the linking of that data to the article-of-record wherever it exists on the World Wide Web. Crossref also explores new technologies and promotes solutions that solve other problems plaguing scholarly publishing, such as prevention of plagiarism, assuring the integrity of published work, and identifying the sources that fund research.

Similarity Check (previously CrossCheck) is one of the most popular services offered by Crossref, and this service continues to expand. The service is a partnership between Crossref and the company Turnitin. Similarity Check is currently used by publishers to check for similarity between submitted manuscripts and already-published works. Lammey announced that Turnitin has added some new functionality to their iThenticate product (the technology backbone of the service), which allows publishers to check submitted manuscripts against accepted, but not yet published, papers.

Another Crossref service, Crossmark, is used to inform readers of a publication’s status wherever that publication appears on the Internet. Lammey pointed out that a status update is “any change significant enough to affect the crediting or interpretation of the work.” Crossmark will let the reader know if the article is current, if and when it was updated, or if it was retracted. Crossmark includes authors’ ORCID iDs, licensing and rights information, funding sources, and other historical details. A really exciting Crossmark feature in beta now is the aggregation of clinical trial information. For an article that uses clinical trial data, Crossmark will show other published articles that use the same clinical trial data, allowing readers the opportunity to compare studies based on the same dataset.

Lammey also discussed Crossref Open Funder Registry (previously FundRef). The challenge faced by funders and granting agencies is that it is difficult to track and validate the effectiveness of their funding choices. There is no standard way to cite funding information, which is often buried in cover letters and acknowledgements. Funder Registry “provides a standard way to report funding sources for published scholarly research. Publishers deposit funding information from articles and other content using a standard taxonomy of funder names. This funding data is then made publicly available through Crossref’s search interfaces and APIs for funders and other interested parties to analyze.” For example, there is a mechanism that allows users to enter a funding organization’s name, and all of the research funded by that specific funder will be displayed. Similarly, a user can enter a journal’s ISSN and retrieve a list of all funders who funded research published in that journal. The Funder Registry taxonomy is available for free and is incorporated into most manuscript submission systems. The associated Funder ID numbers are transmitted, along with other accepted manuscript metadata, downstream to publishing platforms, to the Crossref record, and potentially on to ORCID and other systems and services where this information can be analyzed by the funding agencies, institutions, and governments.

There were several other Crossref innovations mentioned by Lammey, such as DOIs for preprints, protocols for citing data, and a program to make all reference lists open via Crossref. One interesting new service, called Crossref Event Data, has been designed to capture information about various scholarly research “events” that take place outside of publisher platforms, such as blogs, sharing services, and social media (Figure 4). Crossref will “collect and store this activity and make it available as a raw data record for anyone interested.”

It is clear that Crossref is an integral part of the international scholarly publishing endeavor, with systems and services that support and refine scientific communications. It will be interesting to see what new system or service they come up with next!


Figure 4. Crossref Event Data has been designed to capture information about various scholarly research “events” that take place outside of publisher platforms.
JATS & BITS: Facilitating the Flow and Preservation of Science

Reported by Tony Alves

JATS (Journal Article Tag Suite) is an XML format used to describe scientific literature published online. It is a technical standard developed by the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) and was originally developed by the US National Library of Medicine (NLM) for archiving and interchange of scientific information. BITS (Book Interchange Tag Suite) is the “book” version of this XML format, and though it is not yet an approved standard, there is increasing interest in adopting BITS for book-related workflows. Both JATS and BITS XML are important standards, used for passing data and content throughout the scholarly publishing ecosystem. This session started with an overview of JATS and BITS, including history, the XML structure, and other basic facts about these XML formats. The session also included a close examination of how JATS and BITS are used in the real world at two different organizations, a commercial publishing services company and a professional society.

Chandi Perera, CEO of Typefi, a provider of automated publishing software, presented “What is JATS and BITS.” He started by discussing the fact that all the largest publishers had invested in their own, proprietary XML standards, while the smaller publishers couldn’t afford this luxury. This created a nightmare situation for vendors and others who provided publishing and distribution services. Meanwhile, the NLM (part of the US National Institutes of Health) had defined an XML format intended to be used for archiving electronic journals. This XML format, originally called the NLM DTD, was adopted by many small and medium journal publishers as a standard data exchange format. Soon after, companies and other organizations began to create various off the shelf tools utilizing the NLM DTD, and just about all repositories, distributors, and libraries have since chosen to use this standard. Because of this widespread adoption, the standard was expanded to cover requirements beyond medicine, and thus the Journal Article Tag Suite, or JATS, was born. JATS is a NISO standard, NISO Z39.96-2015, and is very flexible and highly configurable. Because book publishing is very different than journal publishing, a book version of JATS, called BITS was also developed and, though it is not yet a NISO standard, it is already being used by many publishers. It is also a flexible and highly configurable XML model.

Dr. Choon Shil Lee, professor at Sookmyung Women’s University and a member of the Committee for Information Management at the Korean Association of Medical Journals (KAMJE), discussed how JATS is used by KAMJE for their medical journal databases and for biomedical journals that they publish and host. There are two databases developed and operated by KAMJE: KoreaMed and Synapse. KoreaMed is a bibliographic database for articles published in Korean medical journals, while Synapse is a digital archive and reference-linking platform for these same journals. KAMJE also has an e-journal platform, called KAMJE Press, used by their members. There are currently 73 journals hosted on this platform, and each journal has its own custom identity and branding. JATS allows KAMJE to do this economically because, as long as the data and articles are in JATS XML, they can display the content in whatever branded way their member journals prefer. Also, creating a single XML file facilitates low-cost distribution since it can be used to send data and articles to many different organizations and platforms, including to production vendors and for printing.

Mr. Hidehiko Nakanishi, President of Nakanishi Printing Company Limited in Kyoto, Japan, also discussed the benefits of using JATS but focused on its usefulness beyond Western publishing and on JATS multi-language support. Nakanishi Printing works closely with J-STAGE, which stands for Japan Science and Technology Information Aggregator, Electronic. J-STAGE supports the submission and peer reviewing of manuscripts and provides free access to full-text electronic journals from various Japanese scientific societies. In Japan, many journals publish in English, but a majority of them do not. In 2011, JATS introduced support for non-Latin-scripts articles, and J-STAGE adopted this immediately (Figure 5). This meant that Nakanishi Printing could take advantage of JATS XML for Japanese-language articles, which helped the streamline of many processes. Some challenges still exist; for example, there are not many tools available for creating Japanese XML, so Nakanishi Printing converts Microsoft Word files to Microsoft Office Open XML and then converts those files to JATS XML.
But overall, being able to utilize an XML standard that is language-independent has really helped them become more efficient, thus saving time and money.


Metrics in Journal Publishing: What Do You Measure and How?

Reported by Michael Willis

The two speakers presented in turn information on traditional journal metrics and alternative metrics. Adam Finch, bibliometric analyst at the Australian research funding agency CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation), described the various traditional metrics, which are essentially based on article citations and measuring academic (as opposed to ‘real world’) impact. These metrics are valuable for different participants in the research process—journal editors and publishers, researchers, libraries, institutions, and funders. An inherent weakness of all citation metrics is that they are based on indices which are not always reliable or show marked variations between disciplines. The most commonly used metric, the Impact Factor, is arguably much easier to understand than its rivals (Eigenfactor, SJR, SNIP, CiteScore, and H-5 Index) but just as vulnerable to manipulation and fluctuations between and within subject areas. The presentation concluded by recommending that, ultimately, the best way to improve a journal’s metrics is to publish strong research.

Mike Taylor, Head of Metrics Development at Digital Science, followed by describing the role of alternative metrics (altmetrics) in understanding ‘how research is being talked about and used in the wider world.’ Far from being restricted to interaction on social media, altmetrics reveal how research is discussed and reviewed across the web, including on blogs and by media outlets; furthermore, books, patents, and data are now evaluated alongside research articles. As distinct from the company Altmetric, founded in 2011 and makers of the renowned Altmetric ‘doughnut,’ altmetrics encompasses a whole field of research into how new metrics are of benefit to, for example, policy makers and funders. Examples include Elsevier’s Plum Analytics, Impact Story, and Kudos. Research so far shows that traditional citation metrics and altmetrics do not usually correlate and that altmetrics show different kinds of reader behaviour; that industrial researchers who do not typically cite articles are nevertheless using and reading relevant articles (which traditional metrics cannot detect); that topics on medicine, space, and climate change engage the public most of all; and that ‘absence of evidence is not absence of impact,’ a principle which most traditional metrics do not allow for. Altmetrics are becoming more mainstream in the thinking of policy makers and funders, as shown, for example, by the European Commission’s Expert Group to investigate altmetrics. The presentation included a stunning graphical representation of altmetrics—more than just numbers and exploring networks between research and researchers—and these visuals, created by Professor Chaomei Chen of Drexel University, are well worth checking out just for the striking artwork.
The Implications for Journal Editor Staff of Open Access Policies and Trends

Reported by Michael Willis

Since the 2002 Declaration of the Budapest Open Access Initiative, which described the convergence of an old tradition—the willingness of scientists to share their findings—and a new technology, namely, the advent of the internet, ‘to make possible an unprecedented public good,’ open access (OA) has advanced rapidly and is perhaps the single greatest transformation in publishing in the last decade. This session explored its impact on journal editorial staff.

Joyce Li, Associate Publisher of the OA publisher BioMed Central (owned by Springer Nature), described how, according to analysis by Simba Information, OA articles constituted between 10% and 20% of all research articles published in 2015, with over 3 million OA articles likely to feature in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) by 2017 and a faster growth rate than for all research articles published annually. OA funder policies and mandates have also grown hugely, with 725 distinct policies in place across the globe in 2017 and article processing charge (APC) funding increasingly available. Beyond the interest in OA research articles themselves, there is growing demand for such access to underlying datasets, software code, and protocols. Nevertheless, the guiding principles of clarity, discoverability, peer-review controls, and proper attribution of credit pertain to all aspects of OA. Sharing data in particular promotes transparency and replicability of experiments, with some research suggesting that making data publicly available leads to more citations. The UK JISC Journal Research Data Policy Registry pilot has shown, however, that only around half of all journals currently have a full policy on making data accessible (the proportion unsurprisingly lower for social science journals). Publishers are increasingly working with funders and societies to implement data sharing policies.

The presentation by Tom Olijhoek, DOAJ Editor-in-Chief, followed on seamlessly by describing the importance of quality assurance in OA publishing. In collaboration with COPE, OASPA, and WAME, the DOAJ has formulated 16 principles for transparency and best practice in scholarly publishing, applicable to all journals but also a benchmark for OA journals indexed by DOAJ. Some of the principles are absolute requirements for DOAJ, including providing details of the peer-review process, listing a website, giving names and contact details for the editorial team, and providing clear information about access policies, APCs, and licensing terms. OA journals should publish both a statement about their OA policy and full details of the licensing conditions—quite often journals publish one but not both. The DOAJ also awards a ‘seal of approval’ to journals which adhere to ‘the highest level of openness,’ publishing full details about accessibility, openness, discoverability, re-use, and author rights. Although there are OA journals which do not meet the threshold for acceptability by the DOAJ, it was pointed out that some of these criteria—misleading or inadequate information, or lacking details about the transparency of the editorial process—are not limited to OA journals. The presentation concluded by making the point that OA is not necessarily linked to low scientific quality, given that major publishers now have OA programmes and that OA research output is growing at such a phenomenal rate.

Plenary Session: The Direction of Chinese Publishing—Mandates and Vision of Internationalization

Reported by Donald Samulack, PhD

President, US Operations, Editage / Cactus Communications

China invented papermaking and printing techniques more than 1,000 years ago, which alone is a remarkable contribution to publishing history. The Industrial Revolution in the West introduced modern printing technology to China, leading to a boom in the publishing industry of modern China. Later, the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 ushered in a completely new era for the Chinese publishing industry, and China became actively involved in the communication of world culture and information.

Presently, the publishing industry has become one of the most dynamic industries in China; in 2015 China printed 470,000 book titles and regularly published 9,966 journals. Now, the total size of China’s publishing market ranks third in the world, and with the world’s largest population of researchers, now publishes the second-greatest number of scholarly papers in the world. Currently, the Chinese government acknowledges...
its culture industry—including printing and publishing—as one of its pillar industries for the twenty-first century. China is always ready to cooperate with its international counterparts and is dedicated to the creation of a more open, more humanized international publishing community.

This Plenary Session explored China's publishing history and outlined the direction the industry is taking. Presentations were offered by Dr. Yan Shuai, Associate Chief Editor and Director of Journal Publishing, Tsinghua University Press, and President of the Society of China University Journals; Dr. Shengli Ren, Science Editor of the Science Communication Center of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC); and Hong Xiao, Vice General Manager & Deputy Editor-in-Chief of the China Academic Journal Electronic Publishing House Co. Ltd.–CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure).

Dr. Shuai offered an overview of the current publishing landscape in China, including metrics regarding book titles, STM journals, and other periodicals. He also described the recent publication reform that took place in China to refine the national definition of an “academic journal.”

Dr. Ren continued in the same direction by offering further metrics on the performance of China’s STM journals. He also went on to describe some of the challenges faced by China’s STM journals and offered commentary on how these challenges shape the future approach to publishing in China.

Mr. Xiao continued the discussion by exploring how using technologies to bring forward a bilingual journal will help in the internationalization of China's published materials, facilitate comprehension and discoverability, and enhance international two-way dialog with Chinese researchers.

The three presentations collectively offered an authoritative overview of the current achievements and future trends of scholarly publishing in China.

Best Practices in Peer Review: What Societies, Publishers, and Vendors Are Doing to Increase the Quality of Peer Review

Reported by Jennifer Deyton
ISMTE Asia-Pacific Program Chair, Senior Partner at J&J Editorial, LLC

Sarah Tegen, PhD, is Vice President for Global Editorial and Author Services within the Publications Division of the American Chemical Society (ACS). She oversees the operational management, financial oversight, and strategic planning of the global editors and editorial offices of ACS’ peer-reviewed journals. Her team coordinates the technologies, staffing, training, and user support for the peer-review functions conducted by editors-in-chief and associate editors of ACS journals. Tegen discussed general industry trends surrounding efforts to increase the quality of peer review, as well as specific initiatives at the ACS. The ACS has determined that to improve peer review, they must read the author’s mind. How much time to prepare? How much formatting? How many hoops? How long for peer review? How do I make sure I am getting a fair process? After asking these questions, they found the answer to what authors really care about, to get their research published in the best journal possible. They seek to maximize impact, speed, quality of review, and audience. As part of their findings suggested, the quality of review impacts all these areas. Tegen demonstrated ACS Reviewer Lab, a free four-hour online source to educate researchers on the principles of quality peer review. The course features interactive modules covering the basics of peer review. We think this is going to be a great resource for the industry. [Useful link: http://www.acsreviewerlab.org]

Laura Harvey is Head of Publisher Relations at Publons and works with publishers, reviewers, editors, and authors to help them get the most out of Publons. She has over six years of experience in STM publishing and a distant background in chemistry. Harvey focused on
recognizing reviewers, growing reviewer pools, increasing the quality of the reviews, and improving the author experiences and consequently speeding up the process to publication. Publons is growing every day and providing these advantages for reviewers around the world in top notch journals. [Useful link: http://www.publons.com]

Tom Merriweather is an Executive Publisher for Medicine and Life Sciences at SAGE Publications, based in the London office. His team is responsible for the management and development of over 150 journals in medicine and life science disciplines, as well as the launch and acquisition of journals. Merriweather discussed SAGE Publications and their approach to quality of peer review. They ask the question, what do we mean by the “quality” of peer review? As the largest independent publisher, they found the process of peer review and ethics and quality standards to be at the heart of the matter. Merriweather suggested that publishers can ensure ethics and quality standards by embedding best practices and keeping up with market and industry changes. He also showed that tools and services like presubmission services, speed of review, better reviewing, and post acceptance services add improvement. [Useful link: http://www.languageservices.sagepub.com]

Best Practices in the Editorial Office

Reported by Jennifer Deyton

This session highlighted best practices for a journal’s editorial office and the importance of an efficient editorial office to the overall publishing process.

Julie Nash is Senior Partner at J&J Editorial, LLC in Cary, North Carolina. Julie has a Bachelor of Arts degree in Journalism from the Pennsylvania State University and a Master of Arts in Liberal Studies degree from Duke University. She was an award-winning journalist in Washington, DC, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina before becoming an Assistant Editor with Arthritis and Rheumatism (A&R) in May 2000. After working on A&R and other titles for several years, she founded J&J Editorial with partner Jennifer Deyton in 2008. Nash began her presentation by establishing a definition of a managing editor based on how J&J Editorial and their clients most often identify this position:

- Oversees the day-to-day operations of the journal.
- May handle all journal tasks or delegate to an editorial assistant.
- Often communicates directly with the editors, authors, and reviewers.
- May represent the journal at editorial board meetings.
- Can serve as the liaison between the journal and the publisher and/or society, if applicable.
- May report on the journal’s statistics and performance.
- Can serve as a best practice expert for all publishing issues (open access, publishing ethics, etc.).

Of course, not all managing editors do the same things for all journals, but this was a helpful list of the main components typically seen under this job description. She also listed some of the things you can possibly expect from your typical managing editor:

- Working with editors
- Editorial board meetings
- Working with authors and reviewers
- Working with production editor
- Editorial office reporting
- Workflow changes
- Publication ethics
- Marketing

Nash used some of the above information to put forward a great job description and defined key skills necessary to perform the job. She focused on the importance of understanding the industry concepts and terms like ORCID, open access, etc. She also listed great resources for managing editors at the end of her insightful presentation.

James W. Murphy leads Wiley’s scientific, technical, medical, and scholarly publishing activities in Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. This includes publishing peer-reviewed English-language journals for the global market on the behalf of academic societies and research institutes, as well as driving Chinese authorship for Wiley’s global portfolio of journals. Murphy brought great insight into best practices in peer review from his vantage point as Editorial Director for Great China. He brought different perspectives on journal strategy, editorial development, and editorial office optimization. He claimed that his most common observation from all this perspective is that “managing editors can make the difference between successful versus unsuccessful journals.” He went...
through some of the bottlenecks in the peer-review process and outlined where the managing editor role can make the difference. He touched on managing the pipeline, improving turn-around times, monitoring acceptance rates, and nurturing the reviewer pool, as well as liaising between the editors, the society, and the publisher.

Panel Forum: Scrutinizing the Manuscript—Is It Acceptable for Publication?

Reported by Donald Samulack, PhD

In a world where there is ever-increasing pressure to publish, authors have been known to participate in irresponsible publication practices. To protect the integrity of the scholarly literature, the editorial team of a journal is forced to be on guard to detect irregularities in a submitted manuscript and to catch them prior to publication. This session offered practical advice to journal editors on how to look for instances of such irresponsible behavior.

The session was moderated by Dr. Donald Samulack, President of US Operations at Editage / Cactus Communications, and offered presentations by Helen (Yuehong) Zhang, Journal Director of Zhejiang University Press and Managing Editor of the Journals of Zhejiang University, and Dr. Samulack. In the session, some of the irresponsible publication practices perpetrated by authors and supportive publication services were exposed. Best editorial practices were explored to identify manuscript irregularities with respect to authorship, sale of manuscripts, peer-reviewer fraud, plagiarism, duplicate publication, image manipulation, self-citation, and other forms of unethical publication practices. As well, real-life examples and practical advice regarding what to watch out for and how to scrutinize a manuscript received for publication were presented.

Helen Zhang commented on the foundation of ethics and integrity in academic publishing and presented some of her research on research integrity. She also gave an overview of the recent timeline in China regarding the writing of ethics policies, establishment of research integrity offices, and growth in the number of papers published on publication integrity.

Dr. Samulack presented on various aspects of predatory and irresponsible publication practices and how authors, and ultimately the integrity of the scholarly literature, are being affected by these practices. He described various author resources, including Editage Insights, ThinkCheckSubmit, and the Coalition for Responsible Publication Resources as efforts underway to help inform authors about good publication practices.

Dr. Samulack then went on to give very practical advice to journal editors on how to scrutinize a manuscript for irresponsible publication practices, such as plagiarism and undeserving authorship. He then focused on image manipulation, presenting examples of how authors manipulate images, and then describing how industry-grade software tools available to journal editors can be used to detect such manipulations.

Special Session: Tribute to Dr. Jing Duan (1979-2017)

Reported by Donald Samulack, PhD

This past March, before she was to present on the panel “Scrutinizing the Manuscript—Is It Acceptable for Publication?” at this year’s ISMTE Asian-Pacific Conference in Beijing, the publishing industry of China lost one of its prominent editors due to a tragic automobile accident.

Dr. Jing Duan earned her PhD in Environmental Management from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and then she joined Acta Ecologica Sinica (International Journal) as Editor in 2009, and later held the position of Managing Editor.

She was a pioneer in her editorial involvement in the publishing industry of China. She helped break down barriers in international relations through her collaborative work to promote the internationalization of Chinese journals.

She also helped break down barriers through her long-standing involvement in the collaboration between the Ecological Society of China and the American Ecological Society that dates back to 2011. The fruit of this collaboration and dialogue was the joint and collaborative publishing of the journal
Ecosystem Health and Sustainability (an open access journal in the Wiley collection, which launched in March 2015).

In addition, she was active in training and encouraging young editors in China to be the best editor they could be through her organizing and hosting of a monthly activity that she used to refer to as the Editor’s Café.

Jing was fearless. She lived with forcefulness that came from her fierce intellect, coupled with her love of adventure and all things new. All around her, she has left a lasting legacy of change by touching so many of our lives.

She will be sadly missed.

New Online Tools and Technology Available to Researchers and Authors: How They Are Impacting Scholarly Publishing

Reported by Jennifer Deyton

In the 25 years since Tim Berners-Lee published the first website, the impact, reach, and connectivity of research has exploded along with the potential for discovery, connectivity, and solutions to the world’s problems. Today, at the heart of China’s Internet plus (Internet+) strategy is the use of advanced computing technology, the Internet, and big data analysis techniques to transform industry. This session discussed these services, why they are important, and how they are impacting the future shape of the publishing industry.

Lyndsey Dixon is Regional Journals Editorial Director at Taylor & Francis Asia Pacific. She is responsible for the growth and development of this multidisciplinary Asia Pacific journal portfolio. She started out over a decade ago with Elsevier’s engineering books program, before moving on to manage a portfolio of serials titles in the life sciences. She joined Taylor & Francis as Journals Publisher. Since moving to Asia, she’s gained experience in both STM and SSH (social science and humanities) spheres working with academic societies, editors, and authors. Dixon presented on delivering research impact: service-focused publishing in the Internet+ age. Quoting Pony Ma, the chairman of Tencent, she described how this effort involves “using the Internet to help industries upgrade and transform, generating new products, services and business models, and creating a whole new ecosystem.” She discussed market growth forecasts and the increase in publishing jobs worldwide (global, circa 110,000, of which some 38,000 and 25,000 are in the United States and Europe, respectively). She showed that global research trends are up in China. Based on this growth, we are seeing STM tech trends changing.

Sharon Yi is the China Marketing Manager of Research Square. She is responsible for developing China marketing campaigns, overseeing content management of digital properties, and partnering with cross-functional leaders to inform author service market strategy, Chinese author insights, and paper publication trends in China. Yi discussed how the scholarly publishing industry is flourishing inside the “Wall” and the Chinese Internet environment (behind the “Great Firewall”). Yi also touched on recent paper publication trends on a global scale compared to China. She gave a glimpse into digital tools and platforms for Chinese researchers.

Both presentations gave a lot of great information on the continued trend in growth of science coming out of China and new tools available for researchers and publishers alike.

Chinese Online Submission Systems Catch Up With Western Systems

Reported by Charley Miao

TrendMD Director, China

Nowadays, the online submission systems that publishers, journal editors, and authors use ensure the easy submission of manuscripts and a smooth production workflow, thus greatly shortening the whole publication turnaround time and becoming basic tools for almost any journal. Fundamental questions for these online submission systems include whether the submission is simple enough for authors, whether the system is easy enough for editors to operate, and whether the underlying scholar database is big enough for associate editors to select peer reviewers. And yet, these basic features are not the reason why the four major Chinese systems, MagTech, Qinyun, Tengyun, and Sanmson, are so welcomed in the Chinese markets. For example, they have more than
1,800, 1,200, 2,000, and 1,000 clients in China, accounting for 25.7%, 17.1%, 28.6%, and 14.3%, respectively, of the Chinese market share.

The main reasons why these Chinese submission systems are so welcomed, compared with Western systems, rest on four facets: 1) They are in Chinese, meeting the needs in China, where more than 86% of academic journals are in Chinese; 2) These platforms are not only online submission systems but can also be used as websites for journals, displaying content to a wide Chinese audience; 3) Each of the Chinese websites can be switched to English websites, hosting all key content in English (titles, authors, abstracts, keywords, footers, figure and table titles, and references), meeting the needs for internationalization; and 4) Most advanced publishing technologies (XML-based enriching, RichHTML, mobilization, visualization publishing, semantic publishing, and so on) have been promptly merged into these systems.

The ISMTE 2017 Asian-Pacific Conference was a very good window for the international publishing world to learn more about the Chinese publishing industry, and vice versa. Therefore, more international journal conferences of this kind are called for, to be held in Beijing, Shanghai, or any big cities in China in the future.

Committee Update:
ISMTE Poster Committee

By Shari Leventhal
Managing Editor, CJASN
American Society of Nephrology

On behalf of the ISMTE Poster Committee, I am pleased to tell you about new and improved prizes for this year’s poster presenters beginning with the 2017 North American Conference, taking place this August in Denver, Colorado.

Thanks to the Board’s generosity, the new prizes are as follows:

- First-place winner- complimentary registration to all three conferences.
- Second-place winner- complimentary registration to the conference of their choice.
- Audience members will have the opportunity to vote for their favorite poster, and the audience-choice winner will be highlighted in a future issue of EON.

Complimentary registration can be used by the submitting author or transferred to a colleague who would present the work instead. The first-place winner can attend all of the conferences or some and transfer the others to colleagues.

As in previous years, all poster abstracts will be published in an online supplement to the August 2017 issue of EON, and all posters will be posted to the ISMTE website.

Did you know that poster presenters receive one $50 discount to the meeting of their choice? Or, that ISMTE will provide you with a template to help you design your poster? Stay tuned for details on how to submit in 2018.

We are also looking for new committee members to help us further improve the submission process and review poster submissions. If you are interested in serving on the ISMTE Poster Committee for 2018, please email me at sleventhal@cjASN.org.
ISMTE Member Profile: Kristen Overstreet

By Kristen Overstreet
Senior Partner, Origin Editorial
Chair, ISMTE Professional Development Education Committee
Past President, ISMTE

I was the editor-in-chief of my high school newspaper when I decided my future career lay in journalism. However, as a journalism major in college, I discovered that I really didn’t like reporting, which was a significant problem; what I really liked was editing and publishing. I lived in Denver, Colorado at the time, and this was the pre-Internet era: The only jobs in journalism that I knew of were working for the two daily papers, and you had to start as a reporter, probably writing obituaries, in order to climb the ladder to editor. So . . . I changed my major to English literature and minored in journalism with a plan to teach at the high-school level.

The next twist on my career path was working as a transcriptionist on a child pain research grant while still in college. This led to becoming a project manager for another grant, etc. I forgot my plans for publishing and settled into administrative roles in research, but more twists lie ahead. One of the professors I was working with was awarded the editorship for her society journal; about a year in, her editorial assistant quit and I lobbied for the job. Time passed; the Internet came along, and my journal was bought by a bigger publisher. Suddenly, I had the ability and connections needed to begin to establish myself in academic publishing, but the most significant twist was answering a call in the Blackwell newsletter for those interested in starting a managing editors’ society. Working with that group of people put me in the right place at the right time to be on the founding board of directors for the ISMTE. I served on the Board for nine years as a director, the founding editor of EON, and finally as president (2014-2015). Currently, I serve the society as chair of the Professional Development Education Committee.

In 2010, Dr. Jason Roberts and I started our company, Origin Editorial, which provides editorial and consulting services for academic journals. I never anticipated my career path would include running a company. These days I wish I had changed my major to business instead of literature. My focus is still on improving peer review, and being a member of ISMTE provides me with invaluable resources. Although I have worked from my home office for the past ten years, Origin and ISMTE connect me to many of the wonderful people in the field of peer-review management who challenge me to improve my knowledge and skills each and every day.

Our corner of the publishing world has been in flux for a number of years and will be for many more. I never know when I sit down at my desk each morning what challenges and opportunities await me. I can’t imagine what twists lie ahead, but I am certain that ISMTE will continue to provide what I need for the rest of my journey.

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.
COMIC

The Grammatic Fanatic

This author keeps spelling "hemangioma" as "hemangoma."

Sure, medical writing is all fun and games until someone loses an "i."

www.ISMTE.org
Save the Date!
Peer Review Week 2017

This year’s Peer Review Week will be held September 11 to 17 and will focus on the topic of transparency. Join the conversation and help promote Peer Review Week on social media by using the hashtags #PeerRevWk17 and #TransparencyinReview. Submit ideas and resources to the Peer Review Week committee to make sure your journal, organization, or institution is represented during Peer Review Week. Find the latest information and resources at www.peerreviewweek.org.

ISMTE Upcoming Conferences

2017 North American Conference
10-11 August 2017
Denver, Colorado

2017 European Conference
9-10 November 2017
London, England

UPDATES

www.ISMTE.org
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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 guest editor policies followed by further discussion.

Guest Editors

What does your journal do when your EiC or Associate Editor submits a paper to their own journal? Different journals have very different policies. I have worked on a journal where any paper from the EiC or an AE went immediately to an outside Guest Editor-in-Chief. He handled all peer review and decision-making working directly with the managing editor. The EiC and AEs were all but forbidden from bringing appeals to the EiC or arguing with the process. The EiC had no idea which editors may have had a paper under consideration at any time and strongly preferred it that way.

I then worked on a journal with an EiC and a large number of Associate Editors. If any of the AEs submitted a paper the EiC would assign it to one of the other AEs. If the EiC was on a submission the same idea. This would not be acceptable to the standards of the first journal.

Along comes journal three, much the same as journal two.

So which is the correct way? I would say journal one for sure. What do others think?
Hi Glenn,

I’d say that transparency about the process is most critical, and then that the process is unbiased and independent. Here’s the guidance from COPE’s ‘International Standards for Editors’ (http://publicationethics.org/files/International%20standard_editors_for%20website_11_Nov_2011%20%281%29.pdf):

‘Journals should also have a process in place to handle papers submitted by editors or editorial board members to ensure unbiased and independent handling of such papers. This process should be stated in the information for authors.’

Many journals have a process of some sort, but not many express it in their author instructions.

It is true that I have rarely seen the process outlined in the instructions. Coupled with some journals having a paper from an editorial board member in nearly every issue it makes for a negative impression that could be avoided.

I agree with Michael that the key is transparency. I’ve worked with journals who allowed an EIC to submit to their own journal, but a guest editor was asked to handle the review process and it had to be as blinded as possible. I’ve worked on other journals where not only was the EIC not allowed to submit, but their students were not allowed either.
Calendar of Events

The 4th Asian Science Editors’ Conference and Workshop 2017
July 6-7, 2017
Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
http://asianeditor.org/

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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THANK YOU TO OUR CORPORATE MEMBERS!

PLATINUM SUPPORTER

WILEY

SILVER SUPPORTERS

AIP Publishing

j&j editorial, LLC

ORIGIN

Wolters Kluwer Health

ACS Publications

Most Trusted, Most Cited, Most Read

BRONZE SUPPORTERS

Aries systems

compuScript Limited

Editorial Office Ltd

enago

Author First, Quality First

Thomson Reuters

Oxford University Press

Taylor & Francis Group

Salient Content

Technica Editorial Services