Earlier this summer I had hip replacement surgery. Everything worked out fine (oh no—I gave away the happy ending!), but in case you are thinking about having a hip replacement, here are the three worst things about the surgery: (1) Instead of having extra time to get work done, as I had anticipated, I fell behind because I only wanted to sleep all the time. The weariness lasted far longer than I expected. (2) The necessity of depending on other people for everything I needed was difficult to accept. My solace was in knowing that it was temporary. And finally, (3) I had to miss the ISMTE Conference. I thought I would be up to traveling by August, but I was wrong. It was the first ISMTE North American Conference that I missed, and staying home was a difficult decision for me. Fortunately for me and for all the rest of the EON readers, we have a summary of the conference sessions by Meghan McDevitt. I hope you enjoy her perspective, whether you were there or not, and enjoy the many photos, taken by Kristen Overstreet. If you are able, attend the ISMTE European Conference in Oxford, England on October 23.

The conference summary and photos take over this issue of EON, in large part, but please take an extra minute to read Wendy Krank’s Whistling in the Dark article about the need to get away from the computer from time to time and the solution she found that works for her. It’s great advice for all of us who struggle to keep from developing a computer-humped back. Erin Dubnansky and her Editor-in-Chief discuss how their Journal highlights co-first authors and why they find it to be important to make the distinction. And please take a look at the special features in honor of Halloween, “Literary Ends” and “Scary Stuff.”
I urge you to sign up for the ISMTE webinar, “Defend Your Journal Against Image Manipulation and Fraud.” It is free to ISMTE members (why would you not attend?) and will take place on November 7. You need to register by October 31.

Summer may be over, but the ISMTE is looking forward to good times as we grow and thrive. Enjoy the benefits of your membership and celebrate our strength. Hip hip hooray!

The Philosophy of Editing

Robert Louis Stevenson once wrote, “To travel hopefully is a better thing than to arrive.” The word “hopefully” meant, as you might expect, “full of hope.” Stevenson was saying, I believe, that if your journey is full of hope and expectation, you will enjoy it more than you will your destination. Today, the sentence could be read differently, especially if you add a couple of commas: “To travel, hopefully, is a better thing than to arrive.” In this construction, you aren’t saying anything about traveling with hope, but rather just about travel being good. You hope. The new meaning came in the 1960s, much to the dismay of language purists. What to do?! Although many still object to the newer meaning, the usage has become so widespread, both in print and in language, that it is becoming accepted. Such is the nature of our ever-evolving language!
North American ISMTE Conference Report

Society Updates
• Happy 5-year anniversary to the ISMTE!
• Membership
  ° We have reached 346 members internationally, showing steady membership growth
  ° Nearly 150 participants attended the 2012 ISMTE North American Conference
  ° We encourage you to participate by attending meetings, joining online discussions, writing for EON, or by joining a committee
  ° Two board positions are now available
• 2012 ISMTE European Conference
  ° Spread the word! Recommend the conference to colleagues
  ° In case you miss it, EON will publish a conference summary
• ISMTE research grants
  ° Two $2,000 grants will be awarded for member research
  ° Check the ISMTE website in November for more information
• Check out ISMTE’s Resource Central
  ° COPE flowcharts, rejection rate calculator, publishing terms, image editing, and more!
• Find us on Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn and join the discussion!

Congratulations to the Poster Sessions winners!

• First place ($300): “Making the Case for Handling Special Cases” by Sherryl Sundell, Mariel Radlwimmer, and Yvonne Ohl from the International Journal of Cancer
• Second place ($200): “Blogging the Journal: Dispatches from a Small Editorial Office” by Liz Bury from the American Journal of Kidney Diseases

Poster Presentations
• “Using Publishing Metrics Strategically” by Ian Potter, Josh Dahl Strategic Business Development, Thomson Reuters, Charlottesville and London
• “‘D.I.Y.’ Podcasting for STM Publishers” by Christopher Lowe, Assistant Managing Editor, Gastroenterology, American Gastroenterological Association, Bethesda, Maryland
• “Data-driven Methods Available to an Editorial Office for Boosting Citation and Readership Levels” by Jason Roberts, PhD, Managing Editor, Headache, Plymouth, Massachusetts
• “Creating a Multilingual Manuscript Submission, Peer Review, and Production Tracking System” by Anthony Alves, Director of Product Management, Aries Systems Corporation, North Andover, Massachusetts
• “Creating a Reviewers’ Manual to Improve the Quality of Peer Review” by Kristen Overstreet, Managing Editor/Senior Partner, Origin Editorial, LLC, Arvada, Colorado
• “Blogging the Journal: Dispatches from a Small Editorial Office” by Liz Bury, Associate Managing Editor, American Journal of Kidney Diseases, Boston, Massachusetts
• “Making the Case for Handling Special Cases” by Mariel Radlwimmer, Yvonne Ohl, and Sherryl Sundell, International Journal of Cancer, German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Germany
• “Survey of a Society’s Members to Gauge Level of Interest in a Podcast” by Jan McColm, PhD, ELS1, Tanya Lehelldt, MS2, and James P. Evans, MD, PhD3
• “Cell line authentication: Implementing and monitoring a new (potentially unpopular) journal requirement” by Dr. Franca Bianchini, Editorial Assistant, Andrea McIntosh-Suhr, Editorial Assistant, Sherryl Sundell, Managing Editor, International Journal of Cancer, Heidelberg, Germany
• “Implementing QR codes into your Journal” by Deborah Bowman, MFA, Managing Editor, and Meghan McDevitt, Editorial Assistant, GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, Oak Brook, Illinois
• “From Manual to Automatic—How Automating Author Fees Collection Enables Open Access & Strengthens Emerging Business Models” by David Daniels, Charles Hemenway, and Christopher Kenneally, Copyright Clearance Center, Danvers, Massachusetts

Opening Remarks
The 2012 ISMTE North American conference was held in Washington, D.C. from August 14 to August 15 at the L’Enfant Plaza Hotel. Attendees

1 American College of Medical Genetics, Bethesda, Maryland.
2 University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina
3 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
represented ISMTE’s international membership, including nearly 150 members from Australia, Germany, the United Kingdom, Canada, and all across the United States.

**Julie Nash,** North American Conference Committee Chair, presented opening remarks and introduced ISMTE President, **Glenn Collins,** stated the society’s mission to enhance the profession of editorial office staff, and recognized its commitment to the publication of STEM journals. Glenn acknowledged society collaborations with EASE, Equator Network, and COPE and corporate sponsorship. He encouraged member participation by attending meetings, joining online discussion groups, writing for **EON,** joining a committee, and spreading the word about ISMTE.

**Keynote Address—The Publisher’s Panel: The Future of Publishing**

**Bart Wacek,** an Executive Publisher from Elsevier, kicked off the conference with an overview of the “Article of the Future.” This new type of article format aims to optimally communicate scientific research, offer authors a better research outlet, and increase value to end users. Mr. Wacek explained that this new three-pane system moves away from the traditional PDF article format and focuses on the presentation of content and reader usability. With the new design, the article text appears in the center pane, accompanying figures or tables are located in the right pane, and navigation tools are placed in the left pane. Tabs run across the top of the page, allowing users to jump easily from one section of the article to the next.

The “Article of the Future” has already been launched in certain discipline-specific journals, such as **Cell,** and Elsevier has received positive feedback. Overall, Elsevier found that users spent more time *exploring* a paper when using the new layout and are 33% more efficient in deciding relevancy.

Previously the Publisher of **PLoS ONE,** **Peter Binfield** is the founder and Publisher of **PeerJ,** an open access journal focused on the biological and medical sciences. He discussed the history of open access and presented his predictions on the possible future of open access, stressing that open access
is a distribution model, not a business model. The structure of open access encourages an “article” rather than a “journal” centric mindset and strives to accelerate, improve, and facilitate academic progress.

New launches of open access journals are occurring at a rapid rate, although none of the “clones” have had the success of *PLoS ONE*, which received more than 22,000 submissions in 2011. Open access journals typically charge a fee for submission, generally costing between $1,000 and $1,500 per article. Just as with traditional journals, open access journals range in focus from niche journals (*BMJ Open* and *Scientific Reports*) to broad journals (*PLoS ONE* and *SAGE Open*).

*PLoS ONE* has found that 45% of authors now come to *PLoS ONE* as a first choice and that 30% of authors come to *PLoS ONE* as their second choice. Mr. Binfield noted that the growth in open access models shows that authors are interested in both the speed of a decision and the overall speed of the process and that an added cost to submit or publish an article does not seem to be a deterrent.

Mr. Binfield concluded his presentation with some predictions for the future of open access, mentioning that open access will disrupt the subscription model so that by 2017, 50% of content will be available as open access. Because of competition between open access journals, article processing charges (APCs) will decrease and it will become less “interesting” to try to make money from charging people to publish. Finally, new businesses and new business models will develop and evolve to act on open access content.

You can follow Mr. Binfield on Twitter: @p_binfield

Our final speaker from the publisher’s panel was Elizabeth Barrett Welsch, a Senior Editor at Wiley-Blackwell, who presented on “The Rise (and Rise) of Publication Ethics.” Ms. Welsch began by presenting some information about the Office of Research Integrity, which investigates cases of research misconduct. Falsified or fabricated research has become more prevalent but survey results from science journal editors conducted by Wiley-Blackwell show that most editors are not concerned with publication ethics and believe that problems occur rarely.

Wiley-Blackwell is the first publisher to produce a best practice guideline on publication ethics (http://www.wiley.com/bw/publication ethics/). All Wiley-Blackwell editors are members of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and strive to help journals handle situations of ethical misconduct.

Ms. Welsch laid out three key ethical areas to consider when reviewing an article for ethical misconduct. First, look at transparency. Who funded
the work? Was the work published before? Are author contributions correct? Second, consider research integrity and look at possible research misconduct, such as whether informed consent was provided by the study participants. Make sure that readers are informed of any errors in data or information in the form of an erratum. Finally, think about your editorial standards and processes including peer review, appeals, and conflicts of interest.

Production Editor Roundtable
ISMTE conference attendees received a behind-the-scenes look at what goes on once an article gets sent to production during the Production Editor Roundtable. Karen Accavallo, Senior Production Manager, and Matt Hollender, Associate Production Manager, from Wiley-Blackwell explained their roles and job functions from a production standpoint.

The production side includes the process of typesetting, content editing, and proofing to produce high quality, efficient publications. Production editors help manage relationships between authors, distributors, editors, and societies. Typically, production editors have little to no direct interaction with Electronic Editorial Office (EEO) applications (think Editorial Manager and ScholarOne Manuscripts) because those systems are not production interfaces, although they do rely on submitted information. The production staff joins the workflow once an accepted manuscript is transmitted to the publisher.

Production assistants evaluate article files for correct file types, check figures, and validate metadata. A workflow schedule is produced so that the article can be tracked throughout the production phases. Copyeditors edit the manuscript for grammar, style, and structure and then typesetter’s process graphics, text, and tables into typeset page proofs. These proofs are then released to the authors for review.

Once revisions are returned from the author, production editors process any alterations and typesetters revise the article according to the requested changes. The article is checked by the production editor a final time, and if approved, it will be sent to the typesetter who prepares electronic and print deliverables. These files are transmitted to printers or to the publisher for online publication. The production editor performs a final quality control check and approved articles are published online and released for printing.

Production editors also assist with post-publication corrections, such as errata (published to correct text or information that appeared in an earlier issue) and retractions (an article retracted or withdrawn by the authors, academic or institutional sponsor, editor or publisher because of pervasive error or unsubstantiated or irreproducible data).

Tips from the production editors
- Discourage complex formatting of manuscripts at the time of submission.
- Submit corrections through PDFs or at least in an electronic format. It is very difficult to read hand-written corrections that have been scanned in and emailed.
- Encourage authors to respond quickly to queries from production as any delays at this stage will prevent timely publication.

Startups in Scholarly Publishing: Rubriq
Keith Collier, Co-Founder, and Laura Stemmle, Director of Product Management, introduced meeting attendees to Rubriq, an independent peer review system launching in the Fall of 2012. Rubriq has created a standardized scoring system for peer review that they hope will streamline the review and publication process, thus benefitting authors, journal editors, and reviewers.
The Rubriq Scorecard is a peer review rating system for establishing the quality of manuscripts intended for submission. This scorecard rates the manuscript objectively, outside the lens of one specific journal. Authors pay a fee to get their paper reviewed and the reviewer receives compensation for completing a review.

Once a manuscript has been reviewed and scored, Rubriq will recommend the manuscript to certain journals based on the review score and journal profile. Rubriq plans to work with all publishing models including traditional journals and open access journals.

Rubriq is not a publisher and is not trying to replace traditional peer review. They simply want to identify quality articles before they are submitted to a journal and provide recommendations to participating journals.

So, why do retractions matter? Ethical misconduct damages the reputation of the author(s), hurts the journal, and calls into question the review process. Detection software, such as iThenticate and CrossCheck, can help detect plagiarism, fraud, and even image manipulation. Mr. Marcus recommends that journals use these tools to avoid ethical misconduct and encourages journals to require authors to disclose any prior retractions.

Finally, Mr. Marcus reviewed some of the major scandals covered by Retraction Watch including cases of technical plagiarism and self-plagiarism at journals such as *Anesthesiology News*. Be sure to check out the blog (http://retractionwatch.wordpress.com/) to stay up-to-date on the latest in retracted articles and investigations.

Dr. Geri S. Pearson, Editor of *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care* and member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), answered the question, “How do you handle a retraction?” She began with a discussion on the importance of publication ethics and research integrity. Because published research influences other researchers and changes practice, it is important to publish ethical research. Scholarly journals (and journal editors) are the guardians of the research record and the integrity of our journals should be protected.

COPE is an organization established to help editors of scholarly journals figure out what to do in complicated situations of ethical misconduct. With over 7,000 members, COPE is now international in scope and covers many disciplines and fields.

Support/resources from COPE:
- COPE website — guidelines, flowcharts, and other resources
- Quarterly newsletter
- Ethical audit
- Annual seminar
- Research grants

How can COPE help you? Dr. Pearson recommends bringing any cases of ethical misconduct to the COPE Forum for advice. Take advantage of the many COPE resources available online and attend the COPE Seminars in Europe, North America, and Asia-Pacific. Getting support...
from COPE can make negotiations easier for editors. Contact your publisher to see if your journal belongs to COPE.

Dr. Pearson also discussed retractions, how to initiate a retraction, and the importance of establishing retraction procedures. Currently, there is little consistency in journal policies or procedures for issuing a retraction, and because the retraction process is stressful and upsetting, most editors would rather avoid it. Retraction is unavoidable if “a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published.”1 Because retraction is one of the most serious sanctions a journal can take against an author, the retraction process is rarely straightforward. Journals should establish clear procedures for article retractions. Retraction can be initiated when:

- There is redundant publication, plagiarism, and duplication
- Data is fabricated
- Authorship is falsified

Unfortunately, retractions are a reality of publishing; however, increased awareness, firmer policies, and the use of detection software will hopefully decrease the instances of ethical misconduct in scholarly publications.

ACS created a methodology and established several test scenarios. For one publication, they ran all submitted manuscripts through iThenticate. In another publication, they chose every fifth manuscript to run through the detection program. For a final publication, only certain manuscripts chosen by the Editor were put through iThenticate.

Overall, ACS found that iThenticate was easy enough to use but it was very time consuming to interpret the results. During the pilot period, they screened 2,550 manuscripts; plagiarism was detected in less than 3% of submitted manuscripts and instances of self-plagiarism were the most common. CrossCheck only screens text and does not detect image manipulation in figures.

A Focus on Tracking Systems: Breakout Sessions

Editorial Manager

Those who attended the Editorial Manager breakout session were joined by Tony Alves, Director of Product Management for Aries Systems Corporation. Mr. Alves discussed Editorial Manager’s newest updates and features.

Some highlights from Mr. Alves’ presentation include:

Anne Coghill, Manager, Peer Review Operations for American Chemical Society Publications, was the final presenter in the ethics panel discussion. She shared ACS’s experience with a pilot program exploring the detection software, CrossCheck and iThenticate.

Goals of the pilot program included:

- Determining appropriate placement in workflow for plagiarism check
- Minimizing editorial burden of manuscript screening

continuing the discussion on ethics, attendees asked questions about self-plagiarism and how specific editors should be in determining what constitutes ethical misconduct. It was mentioned that it is common for areas like the methods section to be repetitive, thus possibly allowing for some flexibility; however, results sections should most likely not contain any repetitive information.

Closing out the exchange forum, attendees discussed the effects of open access on traditional publishing. in ten to fifteen years, will most articles really be published via open access journals? an ismte member recommended the book, the race for relevance, by harrison coerver and mary byers, CAE, which focuses on how associations are making changes in their functionality and offerings in order to better suit members’ needs and stay relevant in today’s society.

Poster Session
Conference attendees had the opportunity to view eleven posters submitted by members displaying innovative research and unique experiences in the realm of scholarly publishing and editing. the posters were exhibited during the wine and cheese reception, allowing attendees ample time to catch up with old colleagues and make some new ones.

The posters will be presented at the European Conference. Information about the posters can be found in a future issue of EON.

Wednesday, August 15, 2012
The second day of the conference began with a breakfast session with past ismte presidents,
Journal Publishing 101
Brian Crawford, President of the Publications Division of the American Chemical Society, gave an overview of what makes journal publishing successful. Mr. Crawford began by describing the essential roles of a scholarly journal, namely to provide validation and certification, to establish priority and precedence, to enable communication, and to ensure the preservation and archiving of the scientific record.

Quoting a former Wiley executive, Mr. Crawford compared journals to posh clubs, where some are welcome while others are excluded. Journal editors and reviewers, therefore, can be considered club bouncers in that they make those decisions about who will be “let in.”

In general, authors want quick turnaround times, leading possibly to prompt publication. They want their work to be distributed widely, ensuring that their work is being seen by a larger community. Finally, authors want to see evidence of a demonstrable impact, which can lead to more research funding.

Customers (journal subscribers) want reliable and timely delivery of information as well as dependable and easy access (specifically, 24/7 online access), and the product (journal) must be worth the value for the money. Reader loyalty (what keeps subscribers coming back) can be established in a number of ways. Readers want information to be easily discoverable and easily navigable, thus providing related links or references and downloadable content will encourage subscription renewal.
Publishers must assume risks when launching a journal because they must build up an audience and create demand around certain content. Publishers require a predictable source of revenue such as the traditional subscription model or through author fees. A reliable distribution to a loyal customer base helps increase revenue, which must be balanced with operating costs.

Mr. Crawford briefly discussed open access, noting that there is a potential for editorial rigor to be compromised if open access publishers do not follow ethical practices. However, he noted that some publishers, like PloS ONE have been very successful and follow good practices, producing quality results. New social and technological advances should not be rejected; instead, publishers should focus on how to deliver content to the next generation, the “digital natives,” who require a fast-paced, steady stream of information.

Hands on Social Media By Fiona Williams
Publications Director, ACRM, and Origin Editorial

“Hands on Social Media” was a well-received session at this year’s meeting. As social media becomes increasingly prevalent in our everyday lives, it is becoming a tool that more and more journals are adopting. But for many, it’s still new, or even unknown, and can be daunting. The four presenters in this session highlighted different forms of social media employed by their journals and how they might work for others.

Sarah Bidgood is a Journal Manager for Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography and the social media manager for the ISMTE. She began the session with “How to Make a Facebook Page and Twitter Feed for Your Journal” and gave general pointers for implementing these two forms of social media into everyday journal life using the platform Hootsuite.

Christopher Lowe, Assistant Managing Editor of Gastroenterology, followed with “D.I.Y. Podcasting,” showing how journals and societies can invest in this medium for delivering and promoting journal content with relatively minimal effort and expense.

“Implementing QR Codes Into Your Journal” presented by Meghan McDevitt, Editorial Assistant at GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, gave an overview of Quick Response (QR) codes, and how they can be incorporated into your journal and be used to engage users in a variety of ways by promoting online media such as videos, blogs, and podcasts to name a few.

Last but by no means least, Liz Bury, Associate Managing Editor of the American Journal of Kidney Diseases, talked about “Launching a Journal Blog: A Case Report,” using her experience as an example of how to launch and maintain a blog highlighting journal content and the broader field of interest using a simple WordPress platform. Ms. Bury also presented this information in her poster for this year’s poster session and won second prize.

The take home message from each speaker was that you don’t have to be an expert, just come up with a plan, do some research, and give it a go!

Communicating the Value of Peer Review
Dr. Leonor Sierra introduced attendees to Sense About Science, a charitable trust that equips people to make sense of scientific and medical claims in public discussion, and how peer review plays an important role in helping the public understand scientific research and results.

Dr. Sierra mentioned a number of audiences who might have an interest in peer review besides researchers and scientist from a specific field. These included news/media outlets, higher education, teachers, governments, NGOs, medical charities, policy groups, discussion forums, museums, libraries, and celebrities among others.

In 2011, the United Kingdom Parliament launched an inquiry into peer review in scientific publications. Despite talk of concern in the peer review system, the survey found that the peer review process was not in crisis and that, in fact,

most reviewers are satisfied with the current system. When asked why they participated as a reviewer, most respondents said that they enjoy playing their part as a member of the academic community and that they like being able to help improve a paper.

Surveyed reviewers thought that double-blind peer review was most effective; however, it was acknowledged that in smaller fields, reviewers and authors typically know their colleagues well enough to know who was an author and who was a reviewer. Respondents were given an opportunity to voice opinions on how to improve peer review. They suggested creating incentives, such as waiving submission or subscription fees, and the mentioned the importance of acknowledgement or recognition. Additionally, reviewer training guides were recommended, especially for new reviewers.

General attitudes reflected that the peer review system could use some improvement, but it is not a system in crisis. Without peer review, there would be no control in published scientific communications.

You can read the full report here.

---

Scary Stuff

Halloween is all about things that go bump in the night. Some people have more fears than others. Here are some phobias that you might not know about:

- amathophobia: fear of dust
- hagiophobia: fear of saints
- linonophobia: fear of string
- cataphrophobia: fear of mirrors
- gymnophobia: fear of nudity
- tomophobia: fear of surgery
- maieusioiophobia: fear of childbirth
- siderodromophobia: fear of train travel
- ergasophobia: fear of work
- ballistrophobia: fear of being shot
- clamacophobia: fear of staircases
- laliophobia: fear of talking
- emetophobia: fear of vomiting
- lepraphobia: fear of leprosy
- ophthalmophobia: fear of being stared at
- verbaphobia: fear of words
- phobophobia: fear of being afraid
Literary Ends

Most of us know that poet Sylvia Plath put her head in a gas oven and Virginia Woolf filled her coat pockets with stones and walked into the River Ouse. Here are some literary deaths you might not be aware of.

Chinese poet Li Po drowned one night when he leaned over the edge on a boat to kiss the reflection of the moon. He fell in and drowned.

Author Guy De Maupassant hallucinated as a result of the syphilis that finally killed him. Sherwood Anderson choked to death on a toothpick.

Tennessee Williams choked to death on the plastic top of a nasal spray.

Charlotte, Anne, and Emily Brontë all died of tuberculosis.

Sir Walter Raleigh was executed after the accession to the throne of James I. His head was sent to his widow.

Ernest Hemingway shot the top of his own head off while he was suffering from depression.

Antoine De Saint-Exupéry was on a reconnaissance mission in 1944 over Southern France when his plane disappeared. He was never seen again.

Christopher Marlowe was stabbed in the eye and killed in a bar when he was 29.

John Kennedy Toole killed himself because he was depressed over not finding a publisher for his book, A Confederacy of Dunces. It later won him a posthumous Pulitzer Prize.
Acknowledging Joint First Authors of Published Work: The Time Has Come

Erin Dubnansky  
Senior Director of Scholarly Publishing, American Gastroenterological Association (AGA)

M. Bishr Omary  
Editor-in-Chief, Gastroenterology

The AGA’s flagship journal, *Gastroenterology*, has recently introduced a new and simple format in the References section to highlight joint first authors of citations. The journal’s board of editors believes this is a critical step to acknowledging equal contribution to published work as research becomes increasingly team-oriented and inter-disciplinary.

To our knowledge, not much is written about the importance of acknowledging the contributions of joint first authors in citations. Notably, Dr. Sandra L. Schmid, President Emeritus of the American Society of Cell Biology (ASCB) wrote about this in the *Presidents Column* of the monthly ASCB September 2011 Newsletter: “I have discussed the issue with the administrators of PubMed, who in turn took the matter to the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). Their search of approximately 10,000 PubMed Central references identified only 0.8% as having co-first authors. Thus, at this point they did not perceive a need for action. However, the PubMed administrators had difficulty defining this parameter, and I wonder whether these statistics underestimate the magnitude of the problem, especially in specific areas of research such as cell biology.”

We did our own analysis of original manuscripts *Gastroenterology* published during the randomly selected period of August 2011–July 2012. To our surprise, of 290 published papers, 61 papers (21%) had two or three joint first authors (seven of 61 papers had three joint first authors; none had more than three). We predict, without having done the analysis, that there is a significant, if not surprising, increasing trend during the past three decades of joint first authorship as team science and the number of authors per manuscript become the norm. The latter is likely to apply primarily to the biological and medical sciences, as contrasted with physics papers that historically and routinely have even 50 or more authors.

To highlight co-first authors in the References section of our articles, we now require contributing authors to use bold lettering for all last names and initials of the joint first authors. For example: Pox CP, Altenhofen L, Brenner H. et al. Efficacy of a nationwide screening colonoscopy program for colorectal cancer. *Gastroenterology* 2012;142:1460–1467. We will require this style of reference citation from authors of original papers, reviews, and commentaries.

We expect that our new display of citations in the References section will add time spent by our contributing authors preparing their manuscripts for submission. However, we believe this extra time is important to the manuscript preparation process because ideally, all cited papers should already be scrutinized by the authors beyond inspecting the abstract. Additionally, the extra work benefits the greater objective of acknowledging the collaborative nature of research and the equal contributions of authors.

In conclusion, we have instituted a new policy that we hope other peer-reviewed journals and PubMed will adopt. The manner that we have implemented this policy is rather simple and most, if not all, publishers will be able to accommodate such a change without making major alterations in their publication workflows. The importance of acknowledging joint first authors resonates well, given our current times and trend of how research is conducted.

Reference
Not long ago, I contemplated changing careers to work in a field other than a self-employed business editorial office (EO) option. The major consideration for a change was primarily an effort to increase my annual household income, and to become a bit more physically active. The constant sitting in front of a computer screen had become a chore, not unlike the chores I had to do when I was a kid straightening the house, using the same mental repetitive actions for a small allowance. Really!!! How long had it been since home chores only earned a child 15 cents? Factoid… it was a long, long time ago, e.g., the 1960s.

Allow me to provide a brief overview: my EO started with one journal, six issues per year, beginning in 2004, for a rather small stipend. I enjoyed the computer work to facilitate inviting authors to submit a manuscript. I also enjoyed helping the editors move the manuscript toward peer review, then onward and forward through to publication. While the resulting financial reward wasn’t quite what I had hoped, it was, at the very least, enjoyable work that was fulfilling on many levels. A triad of key issues stood out as I contemplated my next steps: 1) the issue of income; 2) the self-employment factor and the impact of being a solitary business entity; and 3) the physical limitations and confinement inherent to a computer-based career.

To begin on the financial side, I had to seriously increase the profile of the EO to allow for the opportunity to earn more money. While it took an additional year, I finally added another journal that successfully increased income. The downside of the additional journal, while increasing income, brought home the reality that I was sitting at my desk for even longer periods of time. What could I possibly do to change my work habitué to allow the opportunity to be more physically active and yet maintain an income?

My dilemma continued into the late summer of 2011, when out of desperation I started searching the Internet for options to become more physically active. It was obvious that my sedentary work situation wasn’t improving. Every Internet search took me to sites that certainly earned more income, but retained the downside requirement of sitting before a computer screen for extensive periods of time.

Now I’m not a believer in fate, but fate in this case, did step forward one day last fall and knocked me upside down—well kind of—with an invitation to “become a certified yoga instructor in 9 months!” It was so new and intriguingly refreshing that I jumped at the chance to take a class. I felt so refreshed after one class and carried on an adrenalin high feeling that I could take on the whole day without ever being stiff or sore from sitting again! I was just thrilled with this new physical exercise. I had to tell everyone about yoga, the unique clothes, classes of all kinds, and yogic awareness—ohm, ohm, and ohm. Really, yoga! While it was new to me, the practice is actually 5,000 years old. For those who know me, I’m the type of person who views the world as a place where all things are possible… I began to spread the word about yoga, and wanted to share it with everyone who would listen.

As with all things new, the freshness of my budding yoga relationship wore off a bit, but I remained smitten with everything yoga. It provided me such a boost mentally that I was almost shouting from the roof tops. “Try yoga…it works!” Then, reality stepped in once again, and I realized that yoga wasn’t for everyone. Armed with that understanding, but still undaunted, I followed through with an educational course and became a certified yogini in May 2012 with a mission to continually enlighten myself and better the EO world.

Today, several months after becoming certified as a yoga instructor, my EO has a yoga mat just parallel to, and (certainly Feng shui appropriate) next to the office desk. I’m learning from Eastern physiologies a perspective of self-preservation. Frankly, my perception has changed regarding editorial offices. My yoga mat has become more than just another tool in my office;
it is a place to go when I need to reflect and view the EO world from an entirely different perspective. There is something delightful about having the blood rush to the top of my head that really improves my thought process. “Downward facing dog” is more than a pose; it’s a place of reflection because it takes concentration to hold the pose. There are poses that I hold for 10 minutes or more—all the while adjusting slightly into the correct muscle alignment within the skeleton, thereby holding true balance. The process gives me focus. What remains then for me is a clear mind. So much so, that when I physically move from my mat to my desk, I am capable of working projects through more quickly. I don’t expect everyone to understand the focus that yoga practice can give, but my hope is to simply share that if one wants to survive in a self-employment environment, then balance must occur. For me, yoga provided a balance.

I can use yoga to unblock my brain when I have a particularly dicey problem arrive to my email inbox. Most tasks in my EO’s email inbox are rarely what they first appear. There is always an underlying question or another layer to the issue that requires resolution. Viewing my office from a yogic perspective gives me a moment to respond with clarity for difficult questions. As I reflect on the question, “move to handstand with eyes open” allows for fresh oxygen to flow to my brain. When I return to standing, the problem I was struggling with has become more focused. I can now respond appropriately.

Since the early days of my EO, I have also sought support from ISTME colleagues and the ISMTE website for answers when attempting to resolve issues within my EO. With yoga, I have yet another option to maintain the balance of my EO by creating my own space to calm myself and breathe. In the past, sitting at my computer, I realize I would forget to breathe for a minute or two, which definitely shortened my life. Now that yoga is part of my daily EO routine, the functionality of the EO has become much more efficient as I approach problems with a clear mind and a rested body.

The challenges are great for any stand-alone editorial office. Simply keeping up with technology is a huge portion of the equation to maintain balance and an efficient Managing Editor. Therefore, staying mentally healthy and increasing physical stamina through the practice of yoga increases the opportunity to maintain quality within the work environment. My EO functions much more smoothly these days, all because I can view my office “upside down,” knowing that by taking care of myself mentally and physically, I create more time to run an efficient editorial office. Recently, due to my yoga practice, my EO has added another journal, interestingly enough, the journal of Restorative Medicine, and more recently a book editing project about Medicare policy reform. My EO now has the potential to grow in the future because of my adjusted perception of my work world and environment. I do know that my yoga training has given me a renewed perspective to see projects clearly, which in turn balances my life and increases income.

A take-away message for the readers of this “Whistling in the Dark” article is to stay focused in your work by taking care of yourself first by any healthy measures that are best for you, therefore allowing you to remain efficient and maintain your self-employed status. I hope you find your balance.

Namaste.
What to do if a reviewer suspects undisclosed conflict of interest (Col) in a submitted manuscript

- Reviewer informs editor of author's undisclosed Col
  - Thank reviewer and say you plan to investigate
  - Contact author(s) and express concern
    - Author(s) supplies relevant details
      - Thank author but point out seriousness of omission
      - Amend competing interest statement as required
      - Proceed with review/publication
      - Inform reviewer of outcome
    - Author(s) denies Col
      - Explain journal policy/Col definition clearly and obtain signed statement from author(s) about all relevant Cols
      - Amend competing interest statement as required
      - Proceed with review/publication
      - Inform reviewer of outcome

To avoid future problems:
Always get signed statement of Cols from all authors before publication (or get them to tick a box if they declare no conflict)
Ensure journal guidelines include clear definition of Col

Developed for COPE by Liz wager of Sideview (www.lizwager.com)
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A non-exclusive licence to reproduce these flowcharts may be applied for by writing to: cope_administrator@publicationethics.org
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Contact author(s) and express concern

Author(s) supplies relevant details

Thank author but point out seriousness of omission
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To avoid future problems:
Always get signed statement of Cols from all authors and reviewers before publication
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Don’t Forget!
ISMTE Debuts First Webinar!
Defend Your Journal Against Image Manipulation and Fraud
November 7, 2012
2–3PM Eastern Standard Time
Register by October 31

Are you protecting your journal from the rising tide of inappropriate image manipulation—and in the worst case—image fraud? There are simple steps you could be taking right now to ensure the scientific accuracy of the content you publish, guaranteeing the soundness of your journal’s reputation. ISMTE is pleased to provide you with these steps, as well as a wealth of additional information, in our first-ever webinar “Defend Your Journal Against Image Manipulation and Fraud.” Our subject matter expert for the webinar is Lindsey Brounstein, publications and graphics manager for the American Gastroenterological Association. Ms. Brounstein manages the image screening process for the AGA’s journals and was instrumental in developing their image manipulation policy.

Don’t delay—register for this webinar today; registration cut-off is October 31. It’s free for ISMTE members and costs just $25 for nonmembers.

Finish this Sentence....

Here are the answers we received from last month’s question:

The best part of the ISMTE North American Conference was…

…meeting up with colleagues and sharing new ideas for my editorial office. Bountiful ideas. (Wendy Krank)
…seeing all my ISMTE friends! (Kristie Overstreet)
…connecting with colleagues. Both those I’ve met before and ones I met for the first time. (Susan Scalia)
…learning something I could take back with me and make a difference in my office. (Glenn Collins)
…getting to meet and talk with other ISMTE members and learning more about scholarly publishing. (Meghan McDevitt)
…realizing that it was even better than last year—which was pretty hard to beat. (Susan Sundell)

For next month, finish this sentence:

The best thing about Halloween for an Editor is…

Sample answer: …getting the chance to alphabetize your kids’ candy.

Email me with your answer at dbowman@asge.org and it will be published in next month’s issue of EON.
Calendar of Events

ISMTE European Conference: Be there!
ISMTE European Conference
October 23, 2012
Oxford, UK
http://www.ismte.org

COPE North American Seminar and Forum:
Correcting the Literature
Reston, Virginia

Getting the Most from Journal Publicity
October 25, 2012
http://www.alpsp.org

Beyond the Rhetoric: New Opportunities in
Open Access
November 20, 2012
http://www.alpsp.org

Editorial Manager User Group Meeting
December 10, 2012
London, UK

Preprint Manager User Group Meeting
December 11, 2012
London, UK
http://www.editorialmanager.com/

Project Management for Publishing
December 11, 2012
http://www.alpsp.org

2013 European Meeting of ISMPP
January 22–23, 2013
London, UK
http://www.ismpp.org/

Thank You
to our Corporate Sponsors!

Platinum Level

Wiley-Blackwell

Silver Level

ACS Publications, BMJ Group,
Elsevier, Informa Healthcare,
Nature Publishing Group

Bronze Level

Aries Systems Corporation, eJournalPress,
Newgen Knowledge Works,
Oxford University Press, ScholarOne
Thomson Reuters

Additional Support: CrossRef

Interested in supporting ISMTE?
Please visit http://ismte.org/supporters.html
 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 Editor 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 Editor.

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 U.S. Copyright law requires written permission from the EON editor.

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.

ISMTE Executive Office:
107 Mantua Pike Ste. 701 #122, Mantua, New Jersey, USA 08051-1606
TEL: (+1) 856-292-8512
FAX: (+1) 856-292-8513
ismteoffice@gmail.com
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