I have been thinking about the evolution of language lately. We Editors are the caretakers of words; many of us wring our hands to see a misplaced apostrophe or to hear someone say, “Me and Tom went to a movie.” But why?

Many (oh so many!) years ago, the professor of an undergrad English class made us read The Canterbury Tales in the original Old (or should I say Olde) English. I felt like I had to learn a foreign language to accomplish this; the text bore little resemblance to the English I knew. Recently I was horrified to read that Merriam-Webster is adding an additional definition for the word “literally”; it can now, as a secondary definition, be used interchangeably with “figuratively.” No, I’m not making this up, and yes, I am furious. Literally.

Many (oh so many!) years ago, the professor of an undergrad English class made us read The Canterbury Tales in the original Old (or should I say Olde) English. I felt like I had to learn a foreign language to accomplish this; the text bore little resemblance to the English I knew. Recently I was horrified to read that Merriam-Webster is adding an additional definition for the word “literally”; it can now, as a secondary definition, be used interchangeably with “figuratively.” No, I’m not making this up, and yes, I am furious. Literally.

Still, I have to reflect on how English today is radically different than it was several thousand, or even 100 years ago and how, in many ways, that is a good thing. If you have a baby, you don’t expect it to stay the same as the moment it was born; you know that creature is a living being that will change a bit every day for the rest of his or her life. To expect less from our language is to deny that it, too, is a living being. Would we even want to be caretakers of the language if it were never-changing?

What will English look like 100 years from now? Even 25 years from now? Websites, blogs, Facebook, Twitter, texting…these are all having profound effects on our language; it is changing faster than ever before. I can just hear a future generation: Did u know they used to spell tnx as “thank you”? Y do u think? (Maybe I’m optimistic in using punctuation and capitalization in my vision of the future.)

But here’s my point: So what? If that is the direction language is going, maybe we are going to have to accept that. The future is in the hands of the young, and that includes the future of language. For now, my journal, everything I write, and everything I speak will continue to be grammatically correct with impeccable spelling. But I’m going to keep an eye on what is happening with our language, and I’ll try to avoid becoming an old lady who says, “Well, back in my day….”

This October issue of EON is full of amazing articles, and they are all grammatically correct, at least for the year 2013. Enjoy!
INTRODUCTION
Social technologies such as blogs, social networks, wikis, rating and reviews, tags, really simple syndication (RSS) feeds, and widgets are currently being explored as communications tools for businesses large and small. While these new technologies present opportunities to enhance both internal and external communication, caution should be taken to ensure the applied technologies meet the needs of consumers.

Social Technographics™ profiles may be a useful tool in helping to identify these needs. Social refers to the community and the “people-to-people” aspect of these activities and Technographics refer to the technological behaviors of people (akin to demographics). This method was introduced by Li and Bernoff in the book Groundswell, which describes the phenomenon of people using technology to obtain goods, services, and information from other people instead of from traditional sources such as companies. Examples include the websites Craigslist and eBay, which allow users to obtain products and services directly from other individuals as opposed to traditional bricks and mortar institutions. The main feature of the Social Technographics profile is assignment of individuals into categories based upon their affinities for various social media. There are six categories: Creators, Critics, Collectors, Joiners, Spectators, and Inactives. These categories are not exclusive; an individual may fit within more than one category.

The Social Technographics Profile is intellectual property that belongs to Forrester Research. While these survey methods attempt to duplicate the methods used by Forrester Research, they have not been licensed or endorsed by the company, and the results are not strictly comparable with results published by Forrester Research. Forrester Research does not endorse or support the results in this paper. Forrester’s Social Technographics has been updated to include additional categories and the company has published new statistics for 2010 and 2011; the comparisons in this paper refer to the earlier published material.

A profile is generated from the combination of data in all categories. Li and Bernoff have defined the categories as follows.

Social Technographics Profile Categories: (Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Technographics Profile Category</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creators</td>
<td>Members of this group are the content generators who publish content online at least once a month. This may take the form of items such as a blog, article, webpage, or video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critics</td>
<td>Members of this group react to content put forth by creators. They post comments on blogs and contribute reviews or ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>Members of this group categorize and aggregate the work of creators and critics by saving URLs and tags on bookmarking sites (del.icio.us) and voting for content (Digg).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiners</td>
<td>Members of this group are active in social networking sites such as Facebook and LinkedIn and enjoy being part of a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectators</td>
<td>Members of this group do not contribute to content the way the other groups do. This group reads and listens but does not necessarily produce, react, categorize, or join.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactives</td>
<td>Members of this group are online, but do not participate in any social technology whatsoever.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Social Technographics Profiles. A description of characteristics for each profile.

1 Technographics is a registered trademark of Forrester Research, Inc.
Using Social Technographics™ Profiling to Assist in a Journal’s Social Strategy

Social Technographics profiles may be used when comparing different groups of consumers, for example, the average U.S. adult and the scientific research community. An understanding of one’s target audience may then be used to generate an appropriate social strategy and marketing initiative. The purpose of this work was to generate and examine the Social Technographics profile of scientists, the authors, and reviewers of the biomedical journal Molecular Medicine. This profile was then compared with the average online adult (U.S.) profile.

METHODS

Audience: The scientific audience included members from the database of an international, peer-reviewed biomedical journal, Molecular Medicine (www.molmed.org). The journal publishes work focusing on increasing knowledge of disease pathogenesis and the generation of molecular tools for disease diagnosis, treatment, and prevention. This subject matter caters to an audience that includes biomedical researchers as well as physicians. Two hundred forty-six responses were received from the Molecular Medicine community (April 2010). These responses were compared to data from average U.S. adults, available via an online tool from Forrester Inc.

Survey: An online survey was generated using SurveyMonkey (www.surveymonkey.com). Demographic questions included: sex (M/F), age (options listed in five-year increments), country of origin (responder fill-in), country of current residence (responder fill-in), computer preference (Apple, PC, no preference), job title(s), and degree. In addition to demographic data, respondents were asked how often they used various types of social technologies. For example, how often do you watch video, visit social networking sites, contribute to online forums, or “vote” for websites online? Response options included several times a day, daily, weekly, monthly, rarely, don’t know, and never. Responses of “monthly” or more frequently were counted as using the technology. This approach mimicked Forrester Inc.’s method. Comparisons were made between the Molecular Medicine audience and the average U.S. adult. Results were tallied and individuals grouped according to Social Technographics preferences. The Molecular Medicine profile was then compared with the average U.S. adult profile.

RESULTS

Demographic Data: The demographic data showed the sample of Molecular Medicine responders was male-dominated (M: 68.8%, F: 31.2%) (Figure 2A). Computer preferences indicate a higher affinity for Windows (PCs, 67%) when compared with Apple (21%), while 11% responded “no preference” (Figure 2A). Fifty percent of respondents...
cited their countries of origin as either: U.S. (19%), China (13%), Italy (13%), or India (5%) (Figure 2B). The other 50 percent included respondents from more than 40 other countries. The age range followed a bell curve distribution (Figure 2C). The majority of respondents were from age groups 46-50 and 51-55. The top two job titles selected were “Investigator” followed by “Physician” (data not shown). The scientific population is highly educated with approximately 55% of respondents reporting a terminal degree of PhD; 30%, MD; and smaller percentages citing master’s (5%) and bachelor’s (5%) degrees (Figure 2D).

Social Media Data: Social Technographics preferences for the Molecular Medicine audience are shown in Social Technographics profile of Figure 3. Percentages for each category are as follows: Inactives (18%), Spectators (76%), Joiners (44%), Collectors (37%), Critics (40%), Creators (29%). Published data from Forrester Research for 2009 are as follows: Inactives (18%), Spectators (73%), Joiners (51%), Collectors (21%), Critics (37%), Creators (24%) (see http://forrester.com/empowered/tool_consumer.html). Percentages do not sum to 100% due to overlap of individuals in categories.

DISCUSSION

Facebook reports 699 million daily active users worldwide. Competitor Google+ was released to the public. Social technology companies such as LinkedIn, Groupon, Pandora, Twitter, and Zynga have issued or are entertaining initial public offerings (IPOs). The success of social media and the ease with which these technologies may be adapted begs the question, how should businesses be developing social media strategies? Social media may be a value added service and could have positive effects such as creating brand awareness, fostering direct connections with clients and customers, managing brand image, and providing a new platform for testing and distributing products. However, the questions of whether to invest time and energy into these services and which avenues to choose for one’s audience may not be easy to answer.

Social Technographics profiles may aid in this decision making process. Once surveyed, individuals from a target audience may be classified into one or more of the Social Technographics categories (Table 1, Figure 1). When combined, the categories form a profile. This information can be used to develop a social technology strategy. For example, if a business’s target market falls mainly into the Creator group of the Social Technographics categories, the business should focus on using social media technologies that harness the creativity of this audience and play to their strengths.

Molecular Medicine, a peer-reviewed biomedical research journal, surveyed a sample of its audience to determine which categories of the Social Technographics profile were predominant, and how the overall profile compared to the average U.S. adult. The Molecular Medicine audience scored highest in the category of Spectator (Figure 3). This indicates that with respect to social media technologies, much of this audience is interested (at a minimum) in reading, listening to, and absorbing what others are offering. This result is not surprising given the survey was sent to authors and reviewers of the journal. The Molecular Medicine audience scored lowest in the category of Inactives. While not surprising from this highly educated sample, this result is encouraging and indicates there is room for a social media–business strategy for this audience.

The Molecular Medicine audience scored similarly in the categories of Joiners (44%), Collectors (37%), Critics (40%), and about 10% lower in the category of Creator (Figure 3). These results indicate that while there are individuals interested in the types of social media reflected by these categories, less than 50% of those sampled registered as such. When creating a social media strategy, technologies that engage these types of consumers may warrant exploration.

When the Molecular Medicine profile is compared with the average U.S. adult, one can make several
interesting observations. First, *Molecular Medicine* and the U.S. adult score equally in the Inactives category. Second, *Molecular Medicine* scores higher in all other categories except for Joiner. Third, *Molecular Medicine* scores almost double in the category of Collector. This was an interesting finding and indicates the scientific audience may be more open and responsive to social media technologies that “collect,” for example categorizing and aggregating the work of the Creator and Critic groups.

These results indicate the scientific audience is interested in watching, listening, and reading the work of others—being spectators. Social strategies that play to these strengths include items such as an easily navigable website and readily accessible content—perhaps through multiple channels and delivery systems such as e-readers, tablets, and mobile devices. This audience is also strong in “collecting.” Tasks that support this category should be highlighted. This may include options for tagging manuscripts with pertinent keywords, which will lead to better organization and retrieval via search engines. Features that include voting or short polls may appeal to this audience as well. The scientific audience scored lower in the Joiner category than U.S. adults indicating this group may not respond with overwhelming acceptance at the creation of a community page (such as Facebook or LinkedIn). However, one must know their audience—as of early August 2013, *Nature’s* page on Facebook showed over 188,000 “Likes”.

The Social Technographics profile for this scientific journal audience indicates the most successful platforms to pursue would appeal to the technology behaviors of Spectators and Collectors. These include social technologies that encourage the rating, review, organization and categorization, access, and consumption of data/information. This may include technologies such as forums, rating systems, polls, and tagging, which may encourage reactions from end users. Leadership at *Molecular Medicine* have used this information to update the journal website which launched in March 2013. Additional content was added in the form of videos in a video gallery, content from sponsored events, and discussion forums. In addition to being organized by publication date, published manuscripts are now also grouped into disease “channels” (e.g. heart, lung, neuroscience, infectious disease) allowing users to search pertinent content more easily. End users may also rate individual papers using a 1-5 star system, share papers (e.g. email to a friend or post to FB), add comments to papers, and tag papers with keywords. Technology was included to support polling mechanisms as well as collaboration tools (e.g. group sharing micro sites and workspaces).

The data presented here represent a snapshot in time and as younger generations advance to more senior scientific positions these profiles will change. Scientific journals will need to monitor these trends and assess the data and metrics in order to plan appropriate and successful social strategies. Attention should also be paid to the downstream effects on workload, workflow, staffing, and operations.

**REFERENCES**

As an Editor, you have undoubtedly encountered challenges identifying appropriate reviewers for a manuscript. You also have likely had to spend more time than you had thought possible tracking down prior work by an author due to issues with name ambiguity manifested through variations in spelling, last names, or shared common names. This problem—connecting researchers and scholars with their works—is shared by everyone in the research community, and it is the driving force behind ORCID.

ORCID (http://orcid.org) is a non-profit organization dedicated to providing an open registry of unique person identifiers for researchers and scholars, and to working collaboratively with the research community to embed ORCID identifiers in workflows. ORCID identifiers connect researchers and scholars with their contributions by incorporation into the metadata of publications and other works. Ultimately, ORCID supports discoverability, ensuring that contributors get credit for their work.

ORCID was founded in 2010, a product of conversations among publishers, research funders, professional associations, universities, repositories, researchers, and data providers, who together determined that to solve the name ambiguity problem in scholarly and research communication required an organization that represented the entire research community without proprietary interest. ORCID spans sectors, disciplines, organizations, and nations. It is a community-driven effort to implement a standard and persistent representation of an individual contributor’s name, and to link that standard to others, such as document and dataset identifiers, research sample identifiers, grant identifiers, association membership, other person identifiers, and other research activities as determined by the community. Together these linkages support attribution and discoverability across the research and scholarly community.

What is an ORCID identifier? It is a 16-digit number, expressed as a URI, that is unique to an individual. The format of the ORCID iD is consistent with the ISNI ISO 277729 standard, and ISNI has set-aside a block of numbers from its range for assignment through the ORCID Registry. An example of an ORCID iD is http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5109-3700.

How does ORCID work? ORCID is an open effort. ORCID code and APIs are available as open source code and the identifier is not tied to any proprietary system. Individuals may register for a unique identifier, for free, at http://orcid.org, and use it throughout their career. To support international use, the ORCID Registry is now available in Chinese (Simplified and Traditional), English, French, and Spanish. In the year since ORCID launched the Registry, over 300,000 identifiers have been issued to individuals around the world.

Many people come to the Registry through member integrations, such as a manuscript submission system. This is one opportunity for ISMTE members to get involved. You can encourage your authors to register for an ORCID identifier, and use it when they submit a paper. Better yet, encourage your authors to add all of their name variants to their ORCID record, in any character set—English, Chinese, Russian, Danish, etc. You can also encourage your journal, if they do not already, to request ORCID identifiers of your authors, to ensure that ORCID iDs are embedded in metadata for published articles, are displayed appropriately in published articles, and are submitted in the XML deposit to CrossRef. Editors can play a critical role in the adoption of ORCID identifiers.
What about articles that have already been published? Authors may link their ORCID iD to their existing publications and datasets, using search and link tools available for free through the Registry. ORCID also provides wizards for record holders to link their ORCID iD to other identifiers, including Scopus Author ID and ResearcherID. Not only does this linking process bring works together in the ORCID Registry, it also embeds the identifier in these existing works. For example, the Web of Science updates its records on a weekly basis with ORCID iDs associated with ResearcherID records. That means you can now search WOS using ORCID identifiers in addition to searching by keyword or author name, certainly a benefit to both you and your authors.

On the submission side, a number of publishers and publishing platforms have been working on embedding ORCID iDs. Nature Publishing Group and Hindawi Publishing have both integrated ORCID iDs end-to-end in their journal publishing processes, from capturing iDs at the time of manuscript submission through to submitting iDs in article XML to CrossRef and other publication repositories. Elsevier, in addition to providing a wizard to allow linkage of ORCID iDs with Scopus Author IDs, allows users to validate the articles associated with their Author ID, and recently launched collection of ORCID iDs in their ElsevierConnect system for authors and co-authors. Other publishers, including Wiley and Springer, plan to launch integrations later in 2013. Publishing platforms, including ScholarOne, eJournal Press, and Editorial Manager have already integrated ORCID identifiers in their submission and review workflows, and will be adding new features to support validation and inclusion of ORCID iDs in production workflows, and a number of journals have started using these features. A number of association publishers are starting to think about how to embed ORCID identifiers in member management and conference registration tools. The community is also starting to discuss how to leverage ORCID identifiers to acknowledge reviewer service.

So, in the realm of publishing, we see enthusiastic adoption of ORCID among a wide range of publishers—associations, open access, and commercial. But, for ORCID to deliver on its promise of connecting researchers and scholars with their contributions, we need to ensure that the identifiers are embedded in funding, association, and employer workflows. The US National Institutes of Health (NIH), the US Department of Energy (DOE), and Wellcome Trust all have integrated ORCID iDs into grant application workflows. Other funders are starting this process, as are universities. Boston University and the University of Michigan started creating ORCID records for their academicians in September. We also are seeing integration of ORCID iDs into dataset repository management, including a tool to link
your datasets referenced in DataCite, and in altmetrics tools such as Altmetrics, ImpactStory, and ScienceCard.

What does this mean for Editors? In practical terms, ORCID supports a quicker and more effective way to find an author’s works by ensuring they are connected by a common identifier. Starting now, you can with one search start to find connected information about an author—across datasets and name variants. For your authors it means better recognition for their work, and as ORCID identifiers are embedded in submission and application workflows, a quicker and more automated way of filling forms and supporting reporting efforts. Linking contributions over time—by embedding persistent identifiers—means we may actually be able to solve the name ambiguity problem in scholarly communications. Together with digital object identifiers for articles and datasets, and initiatives such as FundRef for funding information, ORCID can transform the way we understand knowledge flow in the research and scholarly community.

For more information about ORCID, visit http://orcid.org. Create your own ORCID record, encourage your organization to embed ORCID identifiers, and become part of the solution today.

**Autobiographies**

Do you plan to write an autobiography when you retire? Here are some views of autobiographies by famous people.

There ain’t nothing that breaks up homes, country, and nations like somebody publishing their memoirs.
–Will Rogers

The trouble with writing a book about yourself is that you can’t fool. If you write about someone else, you can stretch the truth from here to Finland. If you write about yourself the slightest deviation makes you realize instantly that there may be honor among thieves, but you are just a dirty liar.
–Groucho Marx

If you do not want to explore an egoism you should not read an autobiography.
–H.G. Wells

All autobiographies are lies. I do not mean unconscious, unintentional lies; I mean deliberate lies.
–George Bernard Shaw

All those writers who write about their childhood! Gentle God, if I wrote about mine you wouldn’t sit in the same room as me.
–Dorothy Parker
New Online World for International Social Work

Elizabeth Ryan
Journal Manager, International Social Work

In 2009, a new editorial team was appointed to run International Social Work, a journal published by SAGE, but owned by three international social work societies, International Association of Schools of Social Work, International Council on Social Welfare, and International Federation of Social Workers. The new team consisted of two co-editors and one administrative role. The decision was taken to implement SAGEtrack at the same time for an easier overall transition of the journal online.

However, this process revealed some challenges that had to be overcome. The new team inherited the previous system which was administered offline, with no real handover notes, but very helpfully, the previous team did send their files to us in the new office. It became apparent that the records of peer review were held on spreadsheets, and decisions were not made until issue assignment. This was a system which wasn’t compatible with using SAGEtrack. Basically, the inherited system worked very well with the previous team, but was personal to them and therefore not readily transferable to others. This required the new editorial team to start from scratch with SAGEtrack at the heart of a new system.

One of the main challenges of this transition was the identification of what needed to be done. For example, no firm publishing schedules were in place, and again this was probably something clear to the previous team, but not something we could identify. Also, International Social Work translates published abstracts into five languages, publishes “News and Views” from the owner societies, and had two special issues ongoing. This all had to be incorporated into the new structure. In addition, there was the issue of dealing with the previous offline system as there were papers still in process.

Administrating an offline system parallel to an online submission system is not ideal. The decision was made to upload the remaining offline papers onto SAGEtrack to reduce any delays that could occur in the spreadsheet systems. Training the co-editors and other users to use SAGEtrack was also a priority. This was to overcome any reluctance in using the site. In the experience of International Social Work, offering this training, in conjunction with what the publishers offered, was crucial in the smooth transition of the journal online.

Taking International Social Work online meant the implementation of a whole new system and procedures. The most important thing was to implement publishing schedules in liaison with the publishers. This was to ensure everyone knew when issues had to be ready and eliminated the possibility of running late. This was the most important thing to do! New records were created to keep track of special issues, translator lists, and proof checking by editors. The creation of written guidelines was significant. These were created mainly for special issue guest editors to ensure everyone had access to the same information, and also to avoid having to replicate the same information frequently. The same thinking lay behind the creation of written instructions for using SAGEtrack, as being able to send a document to complement assistance via email or over the telephone has proved to be very helpful.

There was no International Social Work presence on social media. So in 2011, with support from SAGE, putting the journal on social media sites, such as Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn, was accomplished, and this helped to connect the journal more closely with its audience. These pages have proved very popular and we keep them updated with information such as new issue releases, free content, and calls for papers for special issues. To date, we have nearly 700 “Likes” on the Facebook page, over 1300 followers on Twitter, and approximately 200 connections on
LinkedIn. Being connected with the journal users in the more informal setting of social media is very interesting and is an easy way to disseminate information and publicise the journal.

During this process of taking the journal online, we achieved the objective of creating a simple system. The most important aspect was to put in place procedures that were not editorial team specific, but that were transparent and would make sense to any new members of the team. For example, publishing schedules, written guidelines and instructions, and keeping simple records were implemented. If all processes have a clear procedure, then there is much less room for error or misunderstanding. This includes having a journal specific email account. The problem with using personal accounts is that if a person leaves, their inbox often leaves with them.

Defining clear roles within the editorial team from the beginning makes the process easier. Knowing how involved the editors wish to be in the administrative side is vital. Some editors prefer to be more hands on, while others prefer to take a step back and let the administration be managed without much input. In my opinion, this is the difference between being a Journal Manager taking a lead on the administration, or an Editorial Assistant, assisting the editor with day-to-day tasks. Due to the commitments of the new co-editors of *International Social Work*, it became clear that the journal required a Journal Manager. This has been very helpful as it let the editors focus on their editorial decisions without having to deal with queries and problems.

In conclusion, we received *International Social Work* in great shape, with a solid foundation inherited from the previous team which had to be transformed to be compatible with a new online world for the journal. We discovered the benefits of using social media as a great way of connecting with the audience and developing the journal further. On the whole, making the process as seamless as possible for the editors makes the role of Journal Manager easier in the long term.

You can contact Elizabeth at isw@durham.ac.uk.
The Squeaky Wheel Finally Gets the New Release

Taylor Bowen
Founder and President
Aegis Peer Review Management
Founding Board Member, ISMTE
Chair of ISMTE’s first 4 US and European Conferences

For 10 years I have been on the receiving end of a steady stream of inquiries from confused and frustrated editors and reviewers who have not been able to find the author’s response to the previous decision letter in the ScholarOne Manuscripts™ system. “I don’t see the authors’ response anywhere in the system. Please ask the authors to provide a response,” they would say.

I have calmly explained to editors and reviewers that the authors’ response is, in fact, in the system, but very difficult to find. I have spent countless and valuable hours showing users how to navigate to the poorly placed, nearly invisible, teeny tiny “view author’s response” link in the ScholarOne Manuscripts™ system.

Relaying my clients’ frustrations, and my own, I have bombarded ScholarOne/Thomson Reuters with multiple enhancement requests to improve the visibility of the “view author’s response” link. I even produced a mock-up (Figure 1) in 2010 to show an ideal place where a “view author’s response” button could be placed. I emailed my proposal to several staff at ScholarOne hoping someone—anyone—might help me push the idea into a new release of the software. This was a no-brainer, right? Surely I was not the only ScholarOne Manuscripts™ user complaining about this! Easy fix, yes? Well, not exactly—I guess.

With the “view author’s response” issue still unresolved after multiple enhancement requests and pleas to ScholarOne staff, I attended the 2012 ScholarOne Manuscripts™ User Conference in Washington, DC, determined to lobby aggressively for my enhancement idea. My big opportunity finally came during the “ScholarOne Ideas” session where I pulled out my laptop and submitted an idea on the spot for my cause célèbre—and was excited that my idea immediately shot to number one. I proudly sat back as my submission garnered instant support and votes from attendees and was projected onto the big screens at the front of the conference hall: “#1 - Improve the visibility of the authors’ response.” Numero uno. Top of the heap! A groundswell of support was happening right then and there. Everyone loves this idea! Gonna get some action now, I thought.

Alas, my sensible and popular idea stayed on the ScholarOne Ideas list for more than a year. It received many additional votes (1,110 total, in the end) and supportive comments from users via the ScholarOne Ideas portal, which I thought would mean that the improvement would be added soon to a release. Imagine my frustration (and yours, perhaps) as the easy-as-pie enhancement languished as new versions were released without it. I was losing hope.

Now imagine my surprise and—whew—utter relief when I received the ScholarOne Manuscripts v4.13 Release Notes email in August 2013 and saw that the idea I had championed, pushed and lobbied for, and yes, whined about for years, would finally be implemented—and gosh, almost exactly as I had suggested in my mock-up three years ago! Hooray! Tick that one off the list.

All joking aside, being a squeaky wheel is not my style, and I do not actually take credit for this new feature finally making it into the ScholarOne software. But on this issue I felt I had to take on the squeaky wheel role because I was passionate (and tired and frustrated) about an issue that directly affects my daily work. I had to do something outside my comfort zone—and I chose to be a persistent nuisance. My complaining is done, I hope; I got what I (and at least 1,110 others) wanted. No more whining from me.
Hey, ScholarOne, glad you got this right, finally, and happy to have provided you with the mock-up for how to resolve this in 2010 (wink-wink). But why did this idea take so long to implement?

ScholarOne Response
Tiffany Pillifant
Director, Product Management
Thomson Reuters

First, I want to acknowledge the great opportunity Taylor has provided in asking me to write about this topic. Given that my job is, at its heart, about understanding what scholarly publishing professionals do for a living, it’s not every day that I get the chance to talk about what I do for a living! So thanks, Taylor, for inviting this discussion and for your great idea.

At Thomson Reuters, we’re very fortunate to have an involved and creative audience that is fully invested in helping to continually evolve ScholarOne Manuscripts™. With almost 6,000 journals using the system, over a billion permutations of configuration, and a user base of around 20 million, we’re never short of good ideas or advice from our users. And with forums to share these suggestions, such as ScholarOne Ideas, it’s easier than ever for us to collaborate with our users to deliver high-priority and impactful functionality. And in my position, I’m very conscious of the role our community plays in the development of our software, and how crucial you all are to our collective success.

While it’s wonderful to have so many open avenues for input, this means that we get so many suggestions that many of them may not be incorporated into the product. Our goal is always to add the features that impact the most people in the most substantive way, addressing the most urgent collective needs first. So, while the visibility of the “author’s response” button was and is a great idea, it wasn’t as urgent as the other features we released over the past year. And while we had some anecdotal evidence that the position of the button was problematic, we didn’t have concrete statistics to prove it.

The introduction of ScholarOne Ideas shed light on the fact that this idea was paramount in the user community. In fact, it was the #2 idea on the list! This quantitative information gave us all the backing we needed to invest in the functionality and release it as quickly as possible.

I’m glad that we were able to resolve this for you, Taylor, and please accept our sincere thanks for your persistence. Keep submitting your great ideas, and keep voting on others – as you can see, it really does feed directly into the product.

Figure 1. Screenshot of document submitted by Taylor Bowen to ScholarOne in August 2010 to request improvement of the location and visibility of the “view author’s response button/link.
**Thomson Reuters ScholarOne Journal Triathlon Q&A**

Interview with Tiffany Pillifant
Director of Product Management at Thomson Reuters
By Jen Breen
Manager, PR & Thought Leadership Sciences at Thomson Reuters

_EON:_ What led Thomson Reuters to host the ScholarOne Journal Triathlon? How will scholarly journals benefit from this competition?

_Tiffany Pillifant:_ It’s an exciting time in the scholarly publishing industry. Recent technology has led many publishers to make tremendous advancements in bettering their practices. We created the “ScholarOne Journal Triathlon” to both celebrate and honor this spirit of ingenuity. The triathlon provides a platform to communicate and celebrate many of the best innovations happening in scholarly publishing.

The journals will benefit by both having a platform to showcase the contributions they are making to the scholarly community and to learn from the innovative practices of other journals.

The competition coincides with the upcoming release of Thomson Reuters ScholarOne Web Services, the industry’s only scalable, enterprise-wide solution for integration with peer-reviewed recommendations based on the Web of Science®.

_EON:_ Is a journal required to be a ScholarOne customer to participate in the contest?

_Tiffany Pillifant:_ No, the competition is open to all scholarly journals.

_EON:_ How does the contest work?

_Tiffany Pillifant:_ The inaugural ScholarOne Journal Triathlon is a virtual tournament designed to have journals compete in three categories: agility, speed, and endurance, attributes essential for successful publications. Like a triathlon, there will be three legs of competition:

- Swim (Agility): the ability of a journal to validate that it is accepting the right papers
- Bike (Speed): how quickly a journal implements ways to increase its efficiency
- Run (Endurance): the longevity of a journal and how it seamlessly adapts its processes to stay competitive in an ever-changing industry

There will be two stages for each leg of the competition—a two week nomination period, followed by two weeks of public voting.

Journals can be nominated through one of two ways, via Twitter: @ScholarOneNews or on the ScholarOne Triathlon web page (http://scholarone.com/journaltriathlon/).

Once a journal is nominated for a leg of the competition, it will automatically be included in the voting period. Voting is open to everyone, and the top three journals receiving the most votes during each leg of the completion will move to the finals to compete for the title of the ScholarOne Journal Triathlon Champion.

_EON:_ Do you need to have a Twitter account to vote?

_Tiffany Pillifant:_ No, a Twitter account is not needed to vote on the web page.

_EON:_ The contest is broken into three categories—swimming representing agility, biking representing speed, and running representing endurance. Can you give us examples of the kinds of entries you are looking for in each stage of the contest and further explain the requirements?

_Tiffany Pillifant:_ During the first leg of our competition, Swim/Agility, we would love to hear how journals are nimbly sifting through the high volumes of submitted papers. In the second leg, Bike/Speed, we are looking for how journals have optimized and fast-tracked the time-to-publish. Then the third leg focuses on ways journals have adapted their editorial policies and processes to survive the constant changes in our space.

_EON:_ Can a journal be entered in more than one leg of the competition? If so, is it possible for a journal to win in more than one category?

_Tiffany Pillifant:_ Yes, a journal can be entered in each leg of the competition, with the ability to be a finalist in multiple categories. However, they must
be nominated during the specified nomination period for each separate leg of the competition.

EON: How long will the competition run?
Tiffany Pillifant: The contest will run through December. You can visit the ScholarOne Journal Triathlon web page to learn more about the contest dates: http://scholarone.com/journaltriathlon/

EON: Where can I go for updates on the ScholarOne Journal Triathlon?

EON: How will the final winner be chosen? What will they be awarded?
Tiffany Pillifant: The ScholarOne Journal Triathlon Champion will be chosen from among the finalists from each leg of the competition by a team of Thomson Reuters experts in scholarly publishing. The winner will receive a speaking slot at the ScholarOne User Conference, which will include a free pass and travel expenses. They will also receive a plaque commemorating their achievement and will be interviewed for a feature story on Thomson Reuters ScienceWatch. The second and third place winners will also receive a plaque commemorating their achievement. Visit the contest’s terms and conditions page to learn more: http://scholarone.com/journaltriathlon/s1-jtriathlon-rules.pdf

EON: You mentioned that part of the inspiration for the ScholarOne Journal Triathlon came from the upcoming launch of ScholarOne Web Services. How will Web Services enhance the publishing process?
Tiffany Pillifant: ScholarOne Web Services will allow publishers and associations to maintain competitive advantage by integrating internal tools and industry platforms using ScholarOne’s standard application programming interface (API). This enables clients to link to external resources, such as ORCID and FundRef for standardized, consistent data exchange, or to their own in-house systems. Users will also be able to extend their connectivity with Reviewer Locator, cutting-edge functionality that will automatically search Thomson Reuters Web of Science for uniquely qualified peer reviewer recommendations.

EON: When will Web Services be available to customers?
Tiffany Pillifant: ScholarOne Web Services will be available in December.

EON: How can I find out more about ScholarOne Web Services?
Tiffany Pillifant: Please visit the ScholarOne Web Services page to learn more: http://scholarone.com/webservices/

---

Puzzle Over It

The initials of some people lend themselves to self-descriptive phrases. For example, Development Tycoon could be Donald Trump. See if you can identify these people from the clues.

1. Jubilant Chef
2. Painted Pecurliarly
3. Outrageous Wit
4. Yankees Ballplayer
5. Suffrage-Boosting American

The answer will be found in next month’s issue of EON.

Last month’s question: The letters G-O-N-E have been removed from the words below, with the spaces closed up. The letters G-O-N-E always appear in left-to-right order, but not necessarily consecutively. What are these words?

(1) RIHTEUSSS; (2) PIEHOL; (3) THIHB; (4) UILLTI; (5) INRAC

Answers: Righteousness; (2) Pigeonhole; (3) thighbone; (4) Guillotine; (5) Ignorance
On Tuesday night of the North American Conference, many of us broke into groups and ventured out to find some amazing restaurants in Washington, D.C. Here is a review of one such restaurant.

**Fabulous Food at Founding Farmers**  
Jane Cooney  
Manager of Training and Documentation  
ScholarOne

Farm-to-Table freshness was the promise and Founding Farmers restaurant delivered. The atmosphere was city chic coupled with farm tables, barn doors, and a few country décor elements to remind us that the food is all made from farm-fresh ingredients. I would have expected to pay a premium for freshness, but the selections were all very reasonable.

Everything from the meals to the appetizers to the drinks were all made with fresh ingredients (have I said “fresh” enough?) – even the homemade sodas. The Organic Cucumber delight, made with vodka, cantaloupe, and yes, cucumber, was described as light and refreshing. And the Manhattan soda was a coffee soda topped with a generous helping of whipped cream.

We shared some appetizers of bacon-wrapped figs with goat cheese, fried green tomatoes, and the ranch-flavored popcorn-of-the-day. All were very flavorful. The menu was huge and included some traditional comfort foods (meatloaf, grilled tomato and cheese), interesting burger creations, pastas, salads, and a variety of savory tarts. I had the Chicken Sausage and Cauliflower tart, which was egg custard in a flaky crust topped with a generous helping of roasted cauliflower, greens, onions, and chicken sausage. The veggies were roasted to perfection and the tart was delicious with a buttery, wonderful crust. My dining companions had delights such as scallops and risotto, the Frisco Burger (perhaps the biggest burger I’ve ever seen), and goat cheese ravioli and chicken cutlet. The Chicken and Waffles were delicious and good enough to please an Atlanta native. There were so many choices, it was a surprise that two members of our party ordered the exact same drink and dinner – the Dark and Stormy and the butternut squash ravioli. My only regret is that we were all too full to sample dessert.

All of this wonderful food was served by a friendly waitress, who made some very good recommendations. She made us feel welcome and at home on the farm.
ISMTE Conference: Perspectives from a First Timer

Kimberly Rosenfield
Manuscript Coordinator, The Endocrine Society

This year has held a lot of firsts for me. ISMTE is my first professional association; it was the first conference I attended; and it was the first time I participated on a conference planning committee. As someone who is relatively new to the landscape of scholarly publishing, ISMTE’s conference was an invaluable experience, especially for a new editorial professional. The conference offered a variety of industry topics, from new publishing trends and developments in Open Access and ORCID, to the best practices in tracking systems and editorial office management. Clearly there was something for everyone.

As a first time attendee, I want to share some of the most valuable lessons I learned during my two days at the conference:

**Bring a notepad and write down everything that doesn’t sound familiar**

For many new ISMTE members, this will be the first time you will be hearing certain terms. For example, I didn’t know the difference between Gold and Green Open Access. Bring a notebook and write down the terms you don’t know. Keeping track of foreign and interesting concepts enabled me to do my research after the conference. Not only do I now know what Open Access is, I also have an informed opinion on it and how it relates to my journal.

**Don’t eat lunch with the people you came with**

Some of most valuable conversations I had were with strangers I sat with at lunch, which gave me a fresh perspective into the different ways other journals published and directed their peer-review process. I also learned about new trends in scholarly publishing and how publishing professionals felt on the matter. It was also a great networking tool; it’s always a plus to be acquainted with knowledgeable professionals in the field (especially for any new professional breaking into the publishing industry.)

**Attend a breakout session with a vendor you don’t currently use**

Hearing about the new features on a tracking system you don’t even use may sound counterintuitive, but it can provide more insight than you think. Learning about a system you don’t use allows you to compare and contrast vendors, but you might learn that the same frustrations or needs you have are shared by other users. Perhaps you will learn a new idea that can be brought back with you to make your own system and process better!

**Be well rested; you’ll need the energy!**

Conferences by definition are tiring. You’re on your feet, you’re meeting new people, and most importantly, you’re learning a lot. Rest up and conserve your energy—you want to make sure you’ll retain what you learn. The more information you retain, the more you can bring back to use in the workplace. And that’s the whole point of the conference in the end.
It is said that one of the hardest things in business is to achieve controlled growth. That is probably also true of journal business.

Growth can be rapid or slow, and both kinds are hard to handle. Rapid growth tends to cause chaos. Slower growth is insidious. It seems positive and rewarding at first, but if you only rest on your laurels, you will soon find yourself struggling with a number of problems: increasing publication backlog makes authors impatient, overload of editorial work wears out the editors, and too much pressure on key reviewers causes withdrawal from active cooperation. Combined, these trends result in general slowdown and frustration. We had that experience with our clinically oriented general neurology journal some time ago.

We had been aiming at growth on the global scale and seemed to be achieving it. There were more submissions from emerging Asian markets. There were more high-quality submissions from Europe and North America. Our Impact Factor was rising, and our prospects seemed good. Gradually, however, minor concerns arose and began to have an impact on our progress.

Small headaches – and bigger
Our editorial team is globally spread with editors in Europe, the US, and Asia. The editors represent different subspecialties of neurology, and only some of them know each other personally. The European editors have an opportunity to meet twice a year, but not nearly all can make it to the meetings every time. I meet some editors once every couple of years, but there are some that I have only met once, and one that I have not met at all during our seven-year online team membership.

This geographical separateness and dispersion across time zones makes interaction and communication somewhat challenging. We communicate by email, and most of the communication is from me collectively to the editors or between myself and an editor regarding specific issues. There have been instances that have inspired general discussion between the editors, but there should probably be much more mutual communication to reach a truly cooperative team atmosphere.

I make a special effort to keep everybody informed by sending statistical reports monthly and emails whenever something important comes up. I have also given all editors viewing rights to all manuscripts in our submission system and encouraged them to use those rights to keep up with what is going on.

Despite this, we began to see some unwanted consequences of the growth. First, the range of editor turnaround times began to increase. The committed and efficient editors were still able to handle their increasing manuscripts fairly quickly, but those who did not have so much time to spend on journal work began to have quite long turnaround times. Second, as the quality of incoming papers improved, some editors continued to use the benchmarking habits they had adopted over the years and ended up accepting more papers than we could accommodate in our page budget. For some reason, those two trends coincided in such a way that those who had long turnaround time also had high acceptance rates.

We kept reminding the editors to be strict about acceptance and encouraged them to use the option for “rejection without peer review.” Again, some adopted that practice easily, while some others used it once or twice and then reverted to their old ways. Inequality in the author experience only seemed to increase, and the range in editor performance widened further.

How about triage?
When the idea of triage at submission was introduced in a meeting between our society, publisher, and editorial team, it was eagerly accepted. There was clearly
a need for improvement, and our journal publishing manager encouraged us by quoting the favourable developments he had seen in some other journals.

We decided to appoint some of our nine associate editors in the role of triage editor. We were lucky to have three who were consistently efficient and reliable. We approached them, and they all agreed. They now have the dual role of triage editor and handling editor.

We needed site reconfiguration to have a triage section added between chief editor assignment and handling editor assignment. The triage editor makes a recommendation similar to the handling editor’s recommendation for editorial decision. There are four common reasons for immediate rejection, and I drafted four email templates for the triage editors to choose from: 1) manuscript has low priority, 2) manuscript is outside the journal’s scope, 3) manuscript is too specialized, and 4) manuscript is scientifically substandard. The fifth option is to pass the manuscript for peer review.

I also gave triage editor rights to myself, so that I can pass on editorials, comment letters, pre-reviewed guideline articles and any other material that only requires formal confirmation of acceptance by the chief editor.

What did we achieve?
Our chief editor suggested that we should aim at 50% triage and decisions made within 72 hours. For our first month, we achieved 66% triage and decisions made within an average of 24 hours. After six months, we are very close to 50% triage, and some decisions take longer than a couple of days, but we are doing extremely well compared to the pre-triage time.

These are the main benefits:

Diminished workloads
With half of the manuscripts rejected at triage, the handling editors’ workloads have become more manageable. They are still free to reject manuscripts without peer review, and they occasionally do, but they no longer need to worry about the most low-priority and low-quality submissions.

My own workload has also decreased. I need to find reviewer suggestions for the manuscripts, and it used to be frustrating to see the editor reject a manuscript I had spent a long time finding reviewer candidates for. Now I know that for 99% of the papers, my reviewer suggestions are really needed.

Better author and reviewer experience
Authors appreciate prompt decisions, even if they are negative. Instead of having to wait for weeks for the negative decision, they are now free to proceed with re-submission somewhere else within days or even hours. We occasionally get positive author feedback about that.

The impact on reviewers is harder to detect, as we have aimed at all times not to burden our reviewers with more than three reviews per year. But since reviewers naturally appreciate being invited to evaluate good rather than very poor manuscripts, we can hopefully expect a higher agreement rate in the long run.

Clearance of backlog
It took a few months to see the impact of triage on our backlog, but we are seeing it clearly now. Fewer manuscripts are passed on for peer review, and even fewer get accepted for publication. The quality of published articles is more consistent, and our backlog is already close to the optimal two to three issues’ worth of copy.

Lower cost
Lastly, there is a financial benefit. The triage editors are paid less than the full honorarium for their quick triage evaluation. Instead of getting paid the same for manuscripts rejected without peer review and those passed through a lengthy peer review process, the handling editors now get paid only for peer-reviewed manuscripts.

Anything negative?
It could be argued that all properly prepared manuscripts should be given the benefit of peer review. It is easy to sympathize with this argument, but there is also the brutal fact that scientific publishing is savagely competitive. Journals move up and down the ranking ladder, and each occupies a certain niche after any given IF publication. We could counter-argue that authors should be so familiar with the journals in their field that they can submit their manuscript to the most appropriate one. If they don’t, triage will facilitate their process of re-submission.
Book Promo

We are proud to announce that Elizabeth Blalock, past ISMTE President, and Michael Willis, ISMTE Board member, are contributing authors to the European Association of Science Editors handbook, *Science Editors’ Handbook, 2nd Edition*. They are co-authors of the chapter entitled “Peer Review Reports as a Tool for Improving a Journal.” Find more information at http://www.ease.org.uk/publications/science-editors-handbook. Congratulations, Elizabeth and Michael!
October means that scary things are out and about. Here are a few fears you might not have known were possible:

- Deipnophobia: fear of dining
- Graphophobia: fear of writing
- Oenophobia: fear of wine
- Taphephobia: fear of being buried alive
- Macrophobia: fear of long waits
- Rhytiphobia: fear of getting wrinkles
- Aichurophobia: fear of being touched by pointed objects
Calendar of Events

The Future of Peer Review
November 12, 2013
London, England
http://www.alpsp.org

Understanding eJournal Technology
November 13, 2013
Oxford, England
http://www.alpsp.org

Getting the Most from Journal Publicity
November 20, 2013
London, England
http://www.alpsp.org

Advanced Journal Development: Strategic
Development for Journal Managers
December 4, 2013
London, England
http://www.alpsp.org

Editorial Manager User Group Meeting
January 17, 2014
London, England
http://www.editorialmanager.com/homepage/conferences.html
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