eon

editorial office news

How Are Your Resolutions Faring?

Deborah Bowman, MFA
Managing Editor, Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
dbowman@asge.org

Has 2013 been treating you well so far? Take heart; it's still early. We still have time to revisit broken resolutions and make good on the promises we made ourselves on January 1. My resolution, which I picked up from a random Twitter post, is "Live Intentionally." I have succeeded or failed to varying degrees, depending on the day and the intensity of my experiences, but I keep trying.

In this month's issue of *EON*, Kimberly Rosenfield writes about the differences between working with science scholarly publications and working with humanities journals. She has worked with both, and in this interesting Whistling in the Dark article, she clues us in to the dissimilarities. Some of her findings might surprise you.

Open Access still befuddles many of us, especially those of us who haven't had to deal with it yet. Megan Knouff discusses the question of copyright law as it deals with OA in her article, "Creative Commons Licenses." We all need to understand how we will be affected if any of our journals move to Open Access. And if you are looking into your crystal ball, you'll want to read "The Future of Publishing: Part 2" where I hazard a guess as to where our field might be heading.

ISMTE Board member Wendy Krank furthered her education by attending ScholarOne University. In this issue, she tells us what she learned and whether she found it to be useful. In addition, as a continuation of our series on ISMTE Committees, look for Kristin Overstreet's overview of the Poster Committee.

I hope you are enjoying your issues of *EON*. Please let me know if you have suggestions, comments, articles you could write, articles you would like to suggest for others to write, etc., and I'll keep trying to improve your ISMTE journal. Contact me at dbowman@asge.org, and let me know how you are succeeding at living intentionally.

ISMTE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF MANAGING AND TECHNICAL EDITORS

Whistling in the Dark
The Speed of a Racecar, the Pace of a Snail: Understanding the differences between humanities and scientific scholarly publishing

Kimberly Rosenfield, Manuscript Coordinator
The Endocrine Society

Before my current job, I considered myself an academic; now I'm a manuscript coordinator for a scientific journal, managing the peer-review process of manuscripts. Prior to entering the world of publishing, peer-review, and technical editing, I was a graduate student pursuing a Ph.D. in History. I first experienced the world of academic and humanities publishing during my time as a graduate student. From the moment I entered graduate school, I was acutely aware of the imperative to "publish or perish," otherwise I would be left unprepared for the terrifying academic job market that awaited me.

In 2009, I built up the courage and submitted an article to *The Journal of Religious History*, and I had my first taste of what academic publishing was like for an author. This process also tested my patience—humanities publishing is slow, painfully slow, a reality that I later learned was not standard across all academic journals. My article was ultimately rejected, but the experience was invaluable; I was only able to draw on it after I left academia and started my job with *JCEM* and *Endocrinology*. I discerned quickly that not all scholarly journals and submission experiences were created equal.

The Speed of a Racecar; the Pace of a Snail

The first of many lessons I've learned is that scientific and humanities publishing processes are very different. My colleagues have some theories : many have cited journal organization techniques, open access, and technology adoption as important differentiating qualities, but I believe it is the purpose of each discipline that dictates the speed to which they are published. Historical scholarship (and a large majority of the humanities), unlike STEM[1] disciplines, does not change the course of current politics, education policy, or medical practices; while I stress that historical research for example, is important, its influence is in helping build context, rather than influencing current events or initiatives. History helps us, as consumers of information, speculate on the complex narratives of our past, behavior, and condition to better determine our present. It is not to say that humanities research and publishing is obsolete—rather that speed is not an important factor in producing it. Scientific research hinges on the speed to print. Because it is pedagogy entrenched in technology and data collection, it is imperative for scholars and publishers to move research to the public before it becomes expeditiously outdated. In examining the larger picture, I come to a general conclusion: humanities deal with a scholarship in abstract ideas, science, a scholarship of physical implementation, and each specialty's respective scholarly journals meet the needs of what the pace requires.

Many have told me that in the world of publishing the humanities are far behind the learning curve of scientific publishing: peer review is slow, and if the *American Historical Association*'s statement in 2012[2] is indicative of anything, the historical community is wary to the point of hostility and will not be embracing Open Access any time soon. While I would agree that the process may be antiquated, there isn't a necessity for an overhaul in publication methods for the humanities—avant-garde ideas are slow to percolate within the community, threads of discourse can span decades, and in turn, humanities journals do not have the need to speed up production in an already financially lean and intellectually exclusive industry.

[1] Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

[2] Find the statement here: http://blog.historians.org/news/1734/aha-statement-on-scholarly-journal-publishing

This slow pace seems logical: it is cheaper and meets the needs of its users. Scientific publishers are meeting the need of their clientele in the same way, adopting new technology and speed of print to distribute scholarship as fast as possible. This divide is evident, and at times, confusing to those in the scientific publishing field. It would seem logical that the humanities field would not want to fall victim to outdating itself, but in a field in which scholars take on average three years to complete an article, and even longer for a full length book, the slow speed to print and aversion to new digital advancements is more understandable. Each journal follows the pace of their authors and the environment.

The Misleading Byline

The second lesson I've learned is one that has less to do with the way scholarly journals produce, and more in the way authors submit their research, and it all has to do with collaboration. At first glance, you could conclude humanities research to be a solitary journey—after all, research is conducted alone, and articles are written and published with only one author in the byline, normally. But whatever art there may be in publishing an article, it takes an academic village to bring it to life, despite how collective or solitary that venture may seem. There are days when I marvel at the length of a manuscript's byline that makes it to my desk—sometimes up to 15 authors at a time contribute to the scholarship of an article we publish in *Endocrinology*, which is a rarity to see if you were handling the same type of article at *The American Historical Review*.

There is contrast in this collaboration. Scientific research follows what I like to call an "open collaboration system," where most research, done in the lab or with patients, requires many fingers in many pots, with multiple people contributing to the research, analysis, and argument. These people are credited in the byline because everyone has contributed a piece of analysis to produce the final product. Historians pass their work through an "unspoken collaboration network" of peers to challenge argument, research, and any weaknesses in writing, but their role is less obvious. I'd argue that these individuals have as much of a role in shaping the final version of an article as a co-author does for an article in a scientific journal. The explicit extent to which they shape the final version is just not as obvious. Instead of the byline, they are credited as an acknowledgement. It is not to say that this process does not happen in science publications (it is evident that it does). Science journals manifest their collaboration methods more explicitly, while the humanities are less prone to do so.

In The End, Some Common Ground

I am no longer a historian actively writing, but I've learned through my academic and professional career that editors and authors share the same anxiety. At times, my stress levels peak when I work with authors who attempt to broker deals over word length and figure amounts, and plead with me to bend submission rules. Still, my anxiety is matched with sympathy—I too have been the author who has too much to say without enough space to say it. I understand the perilous "publish or perish" mentality, but I also have to balance my journal's limitations and deadlines. Otherwise we risk creating monthly tomes. Yet it is important to remember that despite all of the differences between authors and editors, humanities and sciences, there is something that the scholarly publishing community at large shares—and perhaps the common stresses of writing *and* publishing can bring us together in commiseration and understanding.

Creative Commons Licenses

Megan Knouff, *Peer Review Specialist*
The Endocrine Society

Navigating the world of copyright law is never easy. As publishers, we are watching many of our authors moving to open access, either by choice or due to new regulations placed on them by funding sources or universities. While it may be too early to accurately predict how this will affect the scholarly publishing industry, a primer on the basics of open access licenses and uses is very timely.

The major player in open access licensing is Creative Commons, whose six basic licenses cover a spectrum of permissions. All Creative Commons licenses require that the original work be attributed to the author. The most permissive is CC-BY, which allows any commercial or noncommercial use of a work including changing or building upon it so long as attribution is given to the original author. CC-BY is the primary license that is now required by some funding sources.

Other licenses include CC-BY-NC, which allows any noncommercial use including altering or modifying the source material; CC-BY-ND , which allows any use without altering the source material, including commercial use; and CC-BY-NC-ND, the most restrictive license, which allows no commercial use or alteration. The remaining two licenses allow alterations but require any altered versions to be licensed the same way; CC-BY-SA and the noncommercial version CC-BY-NC-SA. These two licenses ensure that no matter how many permutations a work goes through, the original author will always be credited for their work.

The difference between these and the older open access standards is considerable. Gold Open Access (Gold OA) is based on journals that choose to make some or all of their articles open access, while Green OA is self-archiving by the author in a central repository such as PubMed or an institutional repository. The Creative Commons licenses work hand-in-hand with Green OA publishing. The term "open content," meaning open access work that can be modified by others, is covered by the CC-BY-SA and CC-BY-NC-SA licenses. Creative Commons has in effect made publishing any open access work simple and accessible and allows a lot of flexibility for collaboration and continued research.

Creative Commons licenses allow authors a lot of freedom. Others can use their work without the often time-consuming and cumbersome process of obtaining permission, and research becomes easily accessible for others to utilize as soon as possible. The benefit for the academic community as a whole is obvious as shared ideas allow others to innovate. Students have access to any articles they may need even off-campus, or from journals to which their library doesn't subscribe. Patients can read up on the latest research on their conditions, and anyone with an interest in a subject can keep up with innovations without hitting pay walls. Commercial use licenses also allow new publishers to reprint articles for resale, helping new companies get off the ground. Established journals will not need to seek permission to reprint figures and extracts of articles. Digital preservation of information is much easier when the information is spread across several websites and document repositories, not to mention the increased ease of finding that information.

The downsides to these licenses are the major topic of debate right now. Creative Commons licenses currently must be enforced by the content creator—a task that is daunting for even a full-time author, let alone one with a research schedule, classes to teach, a clinical practice, or a company to manage. Some "predatory" journals take advantage of open access to plagiarize. However, the immediate problems apply mainly to two groups of people in the publishing process.

The first group is authors, who may want to protect the commercial interests of their research.

Many have no problem with the more traditional open access standards of free to read, but take issue with allowing others to modify or profit from their work. The second group, of course, is publishers who rely on charging for access to research for the bulk of their revenue. As funding sources effectively remove the choice on open access from the hands of authors, publishers may have to use new strategies as they look to the future.

What advantages will publishers retain in an open access world? Researchers will still have an easy portal to find the latest quality writing without having to search for it. Peer review will always remain important in determining the most vital research. But in many other ways, publishers may have to adapt to keep up with not only new technology, but also the new ways of disseminating information that goes along with it.

The Philosophy of Editing

Bring versus Take

How do you know when to use "bring" and when to use "take"? Sure, you would say, "Bring me the chocolate!" and "Take that dead mouse away!" But what if you want to deliver a pan of lasagna to the home of a sick friend? Do you bring it to her or do you take it to her?

The answer depends on what you want to emphasize: the point of arrival or the point of departure. If you want to focus on your sick friend, then you would bring her the food. If you want to focus on the fantastic lasagna you made in your unbelievably well-equipped kitchen, you would take her the food. Which perspective do you want to take?

Manuscript Central training at ScholarOne University: another perspective

Wendy Krank, Managing Editor
Headache Currents

For those of you who haven't taken the time to attend ScholarOne University for the Manuscript Central database, I'm writing this article to offer a few revelations about my experience. My sole purpose for attending the course was to look at the flow of manuscripts received by my editorial office through the database. I realized that I was spending too much time changing manuscripts that were submitted. Authors were sending manuscripts via email to the editorial office. I'm not sure how this trend occurred but it had to stop. I had to update the instructions for using Manuscript Central. First, I reviewed all of my journal's author guidelines and copied all of the email templates currently in use into a Word document for review. Then I obtained feedback from the editors to ensure that our journal had all the quality checks in place for manuscript submission. Finally, I was ready to make some changes to the website. It was to my benefit to spend time with on-site training to make the extensive changes that I wanted for our database. My other mission was to remove the redundancies out of the database that was slowing down my flow of work. Then I scheduled time out of the office to attend ScoholarOne University in Charlottesville, VA for a four-day intensive "review-and- tweak" to the database. http://mchelp.manuscriptcentral.com/gethelpnow/certification/

I purposefully made the effort to attend the first day of the class. This first day of the course is primarily for people new to the system, but for me it was a terrific general overview of the complete process. The trainers started with the Author Center to build my understanding of the roots of the data tree. While in the Author Center, it became apparent that the author guidelines on the Manuscript Central site weren't matching our author guidelines on the journal's site. Here was my first opportunity to add clarification on each menu page of the website. One of the major issues for my site was that authors had started to use longer and more complex file titles that included several periods in the file name. Users of the Manuscript Central software should understand that using multiple periods in a file name creates a problem for the system. At file collation, the database .PDF creator only recognizes the first period in the title name. Therefore, the file will most likely not combine properly, requiring an adjustment to the file name. Another issue that came to light was that authors often used parentheses and question marks in the file name. The use of these special characters raises havoc with the Manuscript Central database. My goal for the class was to rewrite all the author guidelines on each web page. After the first day, I spent that evening adjusting all screens with the new author guidelines using programmer's code HTML. The Author Center pages were much improved after essentially simplifying the web page instructions to authors.

The second day was focused on the peer review flow process. I quickly discovered I wasn't utilizing to my benefit the user search options efficiently. The database has flexible search tools available for user search via Google Scholar, Pub Med, or one of the other quick search options. I was able to write up a quick overview with the help of the trainers to share the search options with my editors. As a result, the overview was much easier to understand. The other problem I was experiencing was the frequently overlooked computer troubleshooting of the Internet caching. I now have this handy tip in my tool box to help share with editors and authors the best practice for clearing cache easily.

The third day was by far the most productive of the time spent at ScholarOne University. We reviewed all the potential troubleshooting problems that can happen with the site. My entire

goal was to streamline my time using the system. The trainers explained why the "back arrow" on the browser is not a good option in Manuscript Central database. You'll have to attend the course to get the answer. It might surprise you. Another troubleshooting process was that I wasn't using the available flags to my best advantage. In addition to all the colors, I now have short descriptions by each color to alert the editors to the purpose of the flag. Updating the web pages was a critical step to streamline the flow of work with the system.

By the fourth day, I was getting deep into the Cognos reporting system. My favorite browser is Chrome and interestingly Cognos functions best with Firefox browser, which is a much smoother interface for the Cognos software. I realized that my report building skills were minimal at best. With new tools at my disposal, I was able to create usable reports in .PDF file with charts and graphs

for the entire 2012 year. Currently, I'm working to completely clear out duplicate users, inactive users, and inactive manuscript stubs. I've learned how to optimize the invited manuscripts options and recently added iThenicate to the database. I also plan to add key words and specialty to all the user accounts to help the editors make better decisions when inviting peer reviewers. This task will take time, but in the long term, the database will be more efficient for the editors and for when I need to run reports.

The topics offered during the course of four days improved my journal database, which will eventually improve the flow of manuscripts through my editorial office. The course for me was truly a benefit; I would recommend the ScholarOne University.

How to Relax

Ever wonder what writers do during their time off? Here are some writers' favorite pastimes.

Mark Twain: Billiards
William Wordsworth: Dancing
Jane Austen: Embroidery
James Joyce: Singing
Elizabeth Barrett Browning: Riding
Honoré de Balzac: Hypnotism
Matthew Arnold: Ice skating
John Milton: Fencing
Edgar Allan Poe: Swimming
D.H. Lawrence: Painting
George Eliot: Tennis
Anton Chekhov: Fishing
Samuel Taylor Coleridge: Horticulture
Charles Dickens: Conjuring

The Future of Publishing: Part 2

By Deborah Bowman, MFA
Managing Editor, *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Last month I talked about trends in publishing; this month I go out on a limb and discuss what I think our field is going to look like in the coming years.

My Predictions

One problem with predicting the future of publishing is that it depends on which future you are talking about. Five years? Ten? One hundred? We have no end point; there is no one future; we will continue to evolve and change as the technological world changes. So let's speculate what publishing might look like in 20 years.

Articles of all kinds will have changed; in fact, our very definition of articles will change. This process has happened already outside of scholarly publishing. In 2003, author Shelley Jackson wrote "Skin." She gathered volunteers who each agreed to have one word of the story tattooed on his or her body, so the story is spread across a large physical space. The participants are called "Words." As the "Words" die, the text will be altered.[13] Odd? Certainly. But it is an example of how we are going to have to expand our minds to alter our perceptions of publishing.

I have no doubt that all journals will be online only. In 20 years, the doctors who will be 50 years old are 30 now in 2012. Those who will be starting to practice in 2032 are about 10 in 2012. So we are talking about a generation of doctors who are used to technology and online reading. Students in many high schools now are issued laptop computers, and their textbooks for whatever classes they are taking are loaded onto each person's laptop. These students will be so used to electronic reading that print textbooks will seem foreign and unwieldy to them. Scholars will have come to accept that publishing online is every bit as valuable as publishing in print; the changes will be not only technological, but social

and institutional as well. At the same time, the web sites will have evolved to be easy to navigate. They will be completely searchable, both within each article and throughout the web site. The articles themselves will be laid out differently, with more information on the first page that will allow the reader to easily jump to whatever aspect of the article is of interest. Doctors tell me now that they rarely read entire articles; the format of the future will make this easier for them to isolate just the parts of the article that interest them. More articles will feature videos; many articles will be video only, and more journals will be developed that have only videos, showing clinicians how to do procedures. Author interviews, videos, multiple figures, and audio files will be readily available. Much like a musical mash-up, articles will be mash-ups of scholarly information.

Ads will be focused on the individual, both within medical sites and elsewhere. We will grow used to having advertisers know our preferences and will think nothing of having an ad pop up that addresses the same subject as a web site we just visited. Paying for this kind of access is how advertisers will support journals, and subscriptions will be rare or extinct. That will be necessary because all or most articles will be open access. This will actually make the impact factor (or a similar tool) more relevant and accurate than it is now because researchers will be able to access all articles and will cite the best ones because they can choose from everything written on that subject. Thus, citation of an article will mean more, making the impact factor a tool that people will acknowledge as accurate and relevant as opposed to now, when the number is almost universally criticized.

The lines between journals will become blurrier as articles are posted as open access. Still, I think journals will maintain their identities as individual

brands. Editorial teams will still exist; they will vet articles as they are submitted and decide which ones are worth moving forward. I predict that traditional peer review will become a thing of the past, spoken of fondly by older researchers. The articles of the future will be posted online, and anyone will be able to post comments. Before the comments will post, though, reviewers will have to post their names along with their conflicts of interest and affiliations, making them completely transparent. Comments on articles and comments on the comments will be ruthless. As an additional bonus, if anyone comments but doesn't completely disclose his or her COIs, other "reviewers" will call him out. To keep from throwing the baby of quality control out with the bathwater of anonymity, researchers will have to stop thinking they are hurting the authors' feelings; acknowledgment that comments are actually helping will become accepted. We are not that far away from these public comments; in Kindle devices, we can already see other readers' notes. Public peer review might actually deter authors from submitting sub-par articles. Authors will participate in the comments stage as well; they can answer questions as they occur and the comments can become a discussion. Traditionally, writing has been a solitary experience; authors isolate themselves so they can write for hundreds or thousands of people to read what they have to say eventually. In the future, writing will be a public, interactive experience. Authors will have to decide how to interpret silence. If no comments are made, does that mean the article is perfect? That readers are bored? That the article is beyond redemption? Interpreting it will be up to the authors, and it might depend on their sense of self-importance.

Once a specified period of time elapses, the authors will be asked to revise according to the comments, and the revised article will be posted to another part of the web site as a complete article. Each version of the article will be tagged in a different way so that when the article is cited, it will be clear which version is being cited. If a group of authors wants to update an article, either to make corrections or to add updates, they will simply tag the article as a later version of the earlier one. That will eliminate our current dilemma of not being able to change an article once it is posted. This will be made possible because articles will no longer be part of an issue. Articles will be identified by a digital object identifier (doi) or some other type of identifier, but will exist online as open-access, individual articles, easily found by searches on keywords. Features like page numbers, tables of content with page numbers, and headers will have no meaning.

One universal problem will be information overload. This is already seen to a large extent; no one can possibly read everything that is published on any given subject. This is really an age-old problem: in Ecclesiastes 12:12, we were told, "Of making books there is no end." In the year 1500, shortly after the printing press was invented, Erasmus wrote, "Printers fill the world with pamphlets and books that are foolish, ignorant, malignant, libelous, mad, impious, and subversive, and such is the flood that even things that might have done some good lose all their goodness."[45] Erasmus would have been aghast had he seen the glut of information flooding the internet today, and it is going to get much worse as more people realize that anyone can publish. Readers will become much more savvy and discriminating when it comes to choosing what to read. Articles posted by journals will carry much more weight than those posted by unvetted authors.

We are going to have to answer the question of what the smallest meaningful unit of research is that should be distributed. Articles themselves will need to be re-defined as researchers rush to post their information before anyone else, and so articles will get shorter with less information, but the authors will publish more frequently to get the same amount of information out there, eventually. Will "authorship" need to be re-defined as well? If a person's public comments add substantially to an article and his or her name is out there, can that person be considered an author as well, since the comments will be on that version forever?

With print, articles have an end point; in the future, the process of change can be unending. People will assume that articles will change over time, much like Wikipedia. With articles, though, the versions will be preserved as an article's history so you can see the article's evolution. Viewing articles will be more like watching DVDs; you will

be able to read just the most recent article or you can view the "Extra Features."

GIE recently started using QR codes on its print pages, and I have been struck many times as we worked on this by the thought that QR codes for journals have a shelf life. Although QR codes will still be helpful when people are walking through a convention hall, they will have no place in journals when people are reading online only and the links are readily available. Working on a new feature for our journal while its obsolescence is already in sight is an experience that we will have more and more frequently in the coming years. We will have to be willing to let go of our established views of scholarly publishing and be enthusiastic about accepting ideas that may conflict with our ideas.

English majors might find this more challenging than many; maybe this is because we love older, classical writing or maybe because we are taught to be aware of the details of writing, drilling down to individual words and punctuation marks. When I started working at Mosby (later purchased by Elsevier) in the 1990s, I was taught AMA style, and we copyedited the articles for our journals ourselves. Our goal was for every article to be perfect, and we frequently discussed the fine points of editing, laboring at times over a single word. When Elsevier announced that the copyediting was going to be outsourced to freelancers and we would thenceforth be known as "Issue Managers" instead of "Editors," we were horrified, and a number of my colleagues quit over the next several months. Letting go of that control was difficult, but it was nothing compared with what we might be facing. Some have called this a postgrammatical age,[46] and undeniably we are seeing more and more errors as people publish with haste. Language always has to be malleable; Old English is now unrecognizable as English, and year by year new words are added and old rules are discarded. Still, the purpose of language is communication, and when current rules are not followed, communication becomes more difficult. I believe rules of grammar and language will always exist and language nerds like me will always be around to point out the errors, but catching the errors before publication will become more challenging as time to publication grows shorter. I believe that copyediting as a separate process will disappear within 20 years, and

the only language quality control will be either (1) authors who care enough to write carefully or to make changes if comments on their article include attention to grammar and awkward language or (2) journal editors who care enough to do a very quick copyedit before posting the articles. In any case, the attention to detail that I experienced at Mosby Medical Publishing will fall by the wayside, except by individual authors who recognize its importance.

Authors of an article in *The New England Journal of Medicine* said that medical journals have had to navigate obstacles since their inception. In 1879, Surgeon General John Shaw Billings said, "It is as useless to advise a man not to start a new journal as it is to advise him not to commit suicide."[47] Yet new journals are created every day and old journals survive. Those that continue to survive in the new world of publishing will be those that have editors and publishers who are willing to change and evolve to suit the changing times. To do that, we all have to pay attention to trends, to the industry, and especially to our authors and readers. Let's lean back and enjoy the ride.

References

1. eBooks…by the numbers. Book Business. March/April 2012. p. 6.
2. Stephen Marche. The golden age for writers is right now. Esquire. December 2012. p. 90-91.
3. Evan Selinger. Why do we love to call new technologies "creepy"? http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2012-08/faciald_recognition_software. Accessed August 22, 2012.
4. Ethan Grey. Lean Back reading. http://www.economistgroup.com/leanback/lean-back-reading/five-questions. Accessed September 12, 2012.
5. Ann Michael. The article—not quite dead yet. http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet org/2012/29/the-article-not-quite-dead-uyeat/?utm_source. Accessed March 29, 2012.
6. Kent Anderson. The Elsevier boycott—does it make sense? http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2012/02/02the-elsevier-boycott-does-it-make-sense/?. Accessed February 3, 2012.
7. CBC News. Amid boycott, Elsevier backtracks on research bill. http://www.cbc.ca/news/

health/story/2012/02/27/science-elsevier-boycott.html. Accessed March 6, 2012.

8. Kent Anderson. Lumpers, splitters, and policy debates in scholarly publishing. http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2012/05/31/lumpers-splitters-and-policy-debates-in-scholarly-publishing. Accessed May 31, 2012.

9. Tim Worstall. Elsevier's publishing model might be about to go up in smoke. Forbes Magazine. http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2012/01/28/elseviers-publishing-model. Accessed January 31, 2012.

10. Kent Anderson. A proposed list—60 things journal publishers do. http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2012/07/18/1-proposed-list-60-things-journal-publishers-do/. Accessed July 23, 2012.

11. Joseph Turow. The daily you: how the new advertising industry is defining your identity and your worth. New Haven:Yale University Press. 2011.

12. Christopher B. Lowe, Erin C. Dubnansky. Charging ahead. EON: Editorial Office News. September 2012. p. 5.

13. Kathleen Fitzpatrick. Planned obsolescence: publishing, technology, and the future of the academy. New York:New York University Press. 2011.

14. Personal communication; one-on-one with Elsevier Publishers at St. Louis office. August 30, 2012.

15. Bart Wacek. Adding value with the article of the future. EON: Editorial Office News. November 2012. p. 3.

16. Terry Sunderland. What open access science research could mean for the developing world. Forests News. http://blog.cifor.org/10872/what-open-access-science-research-could-mean-for-the-developing-world/. Accessed October 3, 2012.

17. Simon Owens. Is the academic publishing industry on the verge of disruption? U.S. News and World Report. http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/07/23/is-the-academic-publishing-industry-on-the-verge-of-disruption/. Accessed July 24, 2012.

18. Kent Anderson. Are open access initiatives "catastrophic" for commercial publishers? http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2012/09/15/are-open-access-initiatives-catastrophic-for-commercial-publishers?/. Accessed September 14, 2012.

19. Philip M. Davis, et al. Open access publishing, article downloads, and citations: randomized controlled trial. BMJ 2008;337:a568.

20. J. Sanchez. Predatory publishers are corrupting open access. Nature. http://www.nature.com/news/predatory-publishers-are-corrupting-open-access-1.11385. Accessed October 8, 2012.

21. Patrick S. Kamath, Gregory Bologna. Impact factor: misused and overhyped? Hepatology 2009;49:1787-9.

22. Richard Van Noorden. Researchers feel pressure to cite superfluous papers. Science. http://www.nature.com/news/researchers-feel-pressure-to-cit-superfluous-papers-1.9968. Accessed February 7, 2012.

23. Allen W. Wilhite, Eric A. Fong. Coercive citation in academic publishing. Science 2012l335:542-3.

24. Jennifer Howard. Scholars seek better ways to track impact online. The Chronical of Higher Education. http://chronicle.com/article/As-Scholarship-Goes-Digital/130482. Accessed February 7, 2012.

25. Meadows, Alice. In praise of peer review—a personal perspective. http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2012/08/01/in-praise-of-opeer-review-a-personal-perspecitve/?utm. Accessed August 1, 2012.

26. Kassirer, Jerome P, Campion, Edward W. Peer review: crude and understudied, but indispensable. JAMA 1994;272:96-7.

27. Groves, Trish, Khan, Karim. Is open peer review the fairest system? No. BMJ 2010;341:c6425.

28. Vines, Tim. The famous grouse—do prominent scientists have biased perceptions of peer review? http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2012/02/01/the-famous-grouse-do-prominent-scientists-have-biased-perceptions-of-peer-review/ . Accessed February 1, 2012.

29. Hernandez, Lyndon. Online course for reviewers of GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy. http://www.asge.org/PublicationsProductsIndex.aspx?id=2890 .

30. Taylor, Michael P. Peers, review your actions. Times Higher Education. http://www.

timeshighereducation.co.uk-story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=417576&c. Accessed October 10, 2011.

31. Editors of Nature. Overview: Nature's peer review trial. Nature. http://www.nature.com/nature/peerreview/debate/nature05535 html. Accessed March 19, 2012.

32. ScienceInsider. Online social network seeks to overhaul peer review in scientific publishing. http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2012/01/online-social-network-seeks-to.html. Accessed February 15, 2012.

33. COPE. www.publicationethics.org. Accessed April 3, 2012.

34. Hames, Irene. Peer review and manuscript management in scientific journals. Guidelines for good practice. Malden, MA:Blackwell. 2007.

35. Center for Science in the Public Interest. Uniform rules would aid compliance, editors and bioethicists say. September 25, 2008. http://www.commondreams.org/news 2008/0711-20.htm. Accessed August 28, 2012.

36. Baillie, John, Kochman, Michael, Triadafilopoulos, George. Conflict of interest principles for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy. http://download.journals.elsevierhealth.com/pdfs/journals/0016-5107/PIIS0016510706019043.pdf . Accessed October 21, 2012.

37. WAME Editorial Policy and Publication Ethics Committees. Conflict of interest in peer-reviewed medical journals. http://www.wame.org/conflict-of-interest-in-peer-reviewed-medical-journals. 2009. Accessed October 21, 2012.

38. Editors of Science Editor. Guidance for journals developing or revising policies on conflict of interest, disclosure, or competing financial interests. Science Editor 2005:28:111-119.

39. ISMTE. Publishg ethics 101: a guide for the editorial office. http://www.ismte.org/Publishing_Ethics_101. 2001. Accessed July 23, 2012.

40. Marcus, Adam, Oransky, Ivan. What's behind paper retractions? Who are you? Editors should stop ignoring anonymous whistle-blowers. http://www.labtimes.org/labtimes/ranking/dont/2011_07.lasso. 2011. Accessed August 12, 2012.

41. Ketler, Suzanne. Intellectual property: dividing line between "fair use" and plagiarism? http://www.principalinvestigators.org/newsDetail.php?No.-19-Intellectual-Property. 2010. Accessed January 15, 2012.

42. Vines, Tim. The referee who wasn't there: the ghostly tale of reviewer 3. The Scholarly Kitchen. http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2012/07/31/the-referee-that-wasnt-there-the-ghostly-tale-of-reviewer-3-3/ . Accessed July 31, 2012.

43. Baskin, Patricia, Baskin, Denis. Should authors or journals define authorship? Science Editor 2011;34:78.

44. Elsevier. GIE Readers' Survey. http://www.surveymonkey.com/Report.asp?U=334111626839.

45. Blair, Ann. Information overload, the early years. The Boston Globe. http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/ides/articles/2010/11/28/information_overload. Accessed September 13, 2012.

46. Loviglio, Lorraine, Mahan, Margaret. Are we entering a postrammatical age? Science Editor 2000;23:192.

47. Podolsky, Scott, Greene, Jemery, Jones, David. The evolving roles of the medical journal. N Engl J Med 2012;366:1457-1461.

ISMTE Poster Committee

By Kristen Overstreet
ISMTE President–Elect

The ISMTE Poster Committee is a group of dedicated individuals who have the pleasure of reading about their colleagues' work before anyone else. Following the annual deadline, the Poster Committee reviews the submitted poster proposals and ranks them using the following criteria:

- Originality – new issue, not broadly known
- Relevance – significance to the field
- Applicability/practicality
- Overall assessment

(Scale: 1-Excellent, 2-Good, 3-Fair, 4-Poor)

Those proposals that meet the threshold (a score of 30 or greater on a reverse-coded tally) are accepted. The committee chair contacts each submitting author to let him or her know the outcome and to inform accepted authors of the instructions for preparing their posters and the deadline for poster submission.

After the poster submission deadline, the committee convenes again and judges the posters to determine the winners of the first- and second-prize awards ($300 and $200, respectively). The committee members submit their choices for first, second, and third place; then the chair tallies the votes and identifies the winners. Posters submitted by vendors or other companies are not eligible for the awards.

Authors are expected to attend either the U.S. or European ISMTE conference and be available during the appointed times in the program to answer questions about their posters.

The 2012-2013 poster committee is comprised of Erin Dubnansky, Julie Nash, Jason Roberts, Michael Willis, and Kristen Overstreet (chair). Committee members are chosen based on their record of commitment to ISMTE and their knowledge of the industry and serve at the discretion of the Board.

Puzzle Over It

Use each clue to find a word that ends in ASH. The letter immediately preceding ASH will be different for every answer.

1. Neck injury from a sudden accident
2. Forcibly indoctrinate to alter a mind-set
3. Sneak into a party without invitation
4. Go back over old material again
5. Indoor racquet sport
6. Fake definitions board game
7. Free a dog from its restraint
8. Corn and lima beans mixture

The answers will be found in next month's issue of *EON*.
Answers to last month's puzzle:

1. Option, delete, enter
2. Aphid, locust, cricket
3. America, Kirk, Ahab
4. E!, Cinemax, Lifetime

Erratum: On page 2 of the March 2013 issue of *EON*, the last sentence of paragraph 2 should read as follows: Today, we now boast 300 plus members representing solid member retention and growth.

Calendar of Events

ScholarOne Manuscripts User Conference
April 4–5, 2013
Brussels, Belgium
http://www.scholarone.com

Understanding eJournal Technology
April 26, 2013
London, United Kingdom
http://www.alpsp.org

Council of Science Editors Annual Meeting
May 3–6, 2013
Montreal, QC Canada
http://www.councilscienceeditors.org

COPE 3rd World Conference on Research Integrity
May 5, 2013
Montreal, Canada
http://publicationethics.org/events

Introduction to Journals Publishing
May 9, 2013
London, United Kingdom
http://www.alpsp.org

Society for Scholarly Publishing Annual Meeting
June 5–7, 2013
San Francisco, California
http://www.sspnet.org/

Editorial Manager Users' Group Annual Meeting
June 20–21, 2013
Cambridge, Massachusetts
http://www.editorialmanager.com

Save the Date!
6th Annual North American ISMTE Conference
August 6-7, 2013
L'Enfant Plaza Hotel
Washington, DC

6th Annual European Conference/ ISMTE/EASE Joint Meeting
September 23–24, 2013
Hotel Aazaert
Blankenberge, Belgium

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**

SILVERCHAIR
INFORMATION/SYSTEMS

Additional Support: CrossRef

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

ISMTE Editorial Office News

Editorial Office News (*EON*) is the official news-letter 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.*

Thank You to our Corporate Sponsors!

Platinum Level

WILEY-BLACKWELL

Silver Level

ACS Publications
MOST TRUSTED. MOST CITED. MOST READ

ELSEVIER

informa healthcare

npg nature publishing group

Bronze Level

Aries systems — Publish Faster. Publish Smarter.

BMJ Group

eJournal Press

Newgen KnowledgeWorks

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

SCHOLARONE

THOMSON REUTERS

Additional Support

crossref

SILVERCHAIR INFORMATION/SYSTEMS

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