Column: President’s Message

An Ever-Expanding Job Description

From the President - Jason Roberts

Early in 2008 I realized I was increasingly concerning myself with a host of issues that were not part of my original job description. That initial listing of general tasks consisted of: attending to manuscript input and output, answering queries, checking the online submission system was functioning effectively, and setting deadlines. A growing proportion of my time was now involved with monitoring ethical standards.

My awareness of publication ethics had been decidedly haphazard, a direct consequence of no formal training. After working on a couple of misconduct cases I began to read widely on the subject. That task was not easy, however, as there are almost no review articles on the subject, and hundreds of articles exist, many that simply lead you right back to where you started. Eventually Irene Hames’ book came along and, for me, that pulled together many disconnected thoughts. Since then, ethics has become an obsession for me. So much so that in 2007 I decided to put this obsession to good effect: Headache needed a set of guidelines outlining the journal’s ethical policies. These policies would state where the journal stood on many issues and would also provide support in better controlling author behavior, most obviously with proper declaration of conflicts of interest, a problem the journal had been battling. The impetus to take on the project at that moment was a misconduct case where the authors tried to squirm their way out of the prospect of disciplinary proceedings by attributing blame to everyone but themselves. While performing background research for the case (this was before I realized how useful the Committee of Publication Ethics (COPE) website really is) I repeatedly returned to a phrase from

the World Association of Medical Editors’ policy statements that holds true for whatever type of journal you publish, be it a medical or a humanities title, and I have used this phrase consistently to guide me:

*Authorship is a way of making explicit both credit and responsibility for the contents of published articles. Credit and responsibility are inseparable.*

I examined many different journal policies that delineated the roles and responsibilities of authors and journals alike. I also worked closely with the editorial board and publication committee of the journal with the result that a definitive policy document was produced. This document embraced several common standards but was also tailored to address specific concerns of the community the journal served. Altogether, the project from initiation to launch has taken 17 months — a significantly longer period than I had budgeted. Of course, now I am about to find out if all this work has spawned an administrative monster.

There is nothing revolutionary in developing a set of publication guidelines that detail policies on good, ethical practice. Some journals, like the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, have had explicit policies for years and no doubt many ISMTE members have long since been through this process. As with most other smaller titles, however, resources, time, and energy were scare, making it difficult to embrace these projects in a manner like what the largest titles can do.

It was with immense pleasure, therefore, when I learned the ISMTE Meeting Committee had been able to secure a speaking engagement for our Oxford 2009 meeting from Harvey Marcovitch, the Chairman of COPE. This meeting, with a focus on ethical behavior and our role in enforcing good practice amongst authors, reviewers, and editors will no doubt be an invaluable learning experience. I only wish I could have attended such a meeting earlier. I probably could have saved countless hours by better directing my attention to a number of core issues.

With leadership from top journals and organizations like COPE, I can only see more journals clarifying their ethical stances and tightening up their procedures in support of these principles. Editorial office staff will likely find themselves involved directly in setting new standards. And that is a good thing, for if these policies are to work effectively, they need to be expertly handled by the editorial office staff.

Through the ISMTE Discussion Forum, I would be most interested to hear the experiences of others handling these issues.

Jason

Jason Roberts, PhD
President, ISMTE
Plymouth, Massachusetts, USA
journal@ahsnet.org
It is all too easy to read guidelines, agree with them in a vague sort of way, but then do nothing about them. COPE (the Committee On Publication Ethics) has just developed a tool to help busy editors check whether their journal’s practices and policies reflect COPE’s Code of Conduct and are in-line with the most recent guidelines.

The 21-item tool is aimed to help journals identify policies and practices that need attention. Although it is based on the COPE Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines, the audit aims to help journals think about ethical issues and decide what is best for them, rather than to prescribe specific solutions or impose particular systems. COPE realises that journals vary hugely, particularly in the amount of budget and resources available to them. This means that it cannot offer a ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution to all publication ethics problems.

The audit is divided into the five broad themes of: detecting, investigating, and preventing publication misconduct; authorship; transparency; conflicts of interest; and handling appeals and complaints. The document highlights some of the major principles set out in the Code of Conduct and then suggests what evidence editors should seek to show whether they are adhering to it. For example, to demonstrate that a journal encourages its reviewers to comment on ethical issues and possible research misconduct, the instructions to reviewers should be checked.

The audit includes links to the relevant COPE guidelines and flowcharts and also provides links to background material and other resources that might be helpful. We hope, in future, to develop this aspect of the audit, including standard wording that could be used in journals’ instructions. If you have suggestions for background material that you think others might find helpful, please pass these on to COPE.

Although COPE was originally founded by a group of medical journal editors, it now has members across all academic disciplines, including humanities and social sciences. The audit is designed to apply to any COPE member, although some of the recommendations refer to certain types of publication. For example, questions about image manipulation are probably most relevant to journals that publish micrographs, electrophoresis gels, and radiological images, while recommendations about registering clinical trials obviously apply mainly to medical journals.

Some journals and their publishers have suggested that COPE might offer an audit service to journals, including certification if the journal ‘passed’ the audit. Given the difficulties of designing a tool that is suitable for journals of all disciplines, and recognising...
How Ethical Is Your Journal? continued

that constraints of time or budget may make it impractical for all journals to adopt the ‘gold standard’ techniques (such as routine use of anti-plagiarism software), COPE does not feel this is appropriate at the moment. However, we hope, as experience of using the audit increases and we receive feedback from journals about the tool, it might evolve into a more formal accreditation system. At present, however, the audit is completely voluntary for COPE members and we are not asking members to share their findings with COPE but simply to act on them as they think appropriate.

We piloted an earlier version of the audit with five journals and incorporated their suggestions. One journal used the audit results as the basis for discussion at a meeting with editorial staff. In other journals, a single editor ran the audit and implemented the appropriate changes – in these cases, the editors who took part in the pilot reported that it took between 30 minutes and 2 hours to complete the audit. The editors involved with the pilot all agreed that it was a helpful exercise. One commented ‘I’ve been meaning to do this for a long time!’ and another said, ‘The audit is a good way to discuss editorial policies’.

The audit is available from the COPE website (www.publicationethics.org). We are currently providing it only to members (so you will need to log on to the members area of the website to find it); however, the Code of Conduct and all the COPE flowcharts are available to everybody.

We offer our gratitude to Sage and Aries Systems for their support of ISMTE!
The following article discusses my experience as the editor-in-chief of a relatively small (approximate circulation of 1,000) biomedical journal, Medical Mycology. It is concerned with a very small niche area of clinical microbiology, i.e., the study of diseases in humans and animals caused by fungi. Consequently, whether what I describe in this paper is applicable to other situations, or represents a rather unusual set of circumstances is for you, the reader, to decide.

It seems to me that the granting of a doctorate degree is considered by many publishers and/or professional societies as the equivalent to granting a degree in editing scientific publications. I was more fortunate than some of my colleagues in that I was able to gain experience for my current position as an editor-in-chief by serving as a member of editorial boards, evaluating manuscripts as a peer-reviewer, acting as one of several associate editors of a leading clinical microbiology journal, and finally as being the editor-in-chief of an even smaller publication than the one I now serve. However, despite this background, I was not prepared for the ever-increasing complexities that confront me in my current role. Put another way, I have acquired most of my editorial training by learning on the job. While it would seem that I have successfully muddled through the past four years, I am not sure this would have been possible if I’d held a similar position in a journal with a larger circulation, receiving far more submissions, and/or dealing with a wider range of topics.

Medical Mycology, is owned and all rights are secured by the International Society for Human and Animal Mycology (ISHAM), a not-for-profit, tax exempt scientific organization charted in Switzerland. After association with at least four other publishers, it is currently published by Informa Healthcare. The journal began in 1962 as Sabouraudia and published a variable number of issues per year through 1985. Since most prospective readers did not know the individual for whom the journal was named, i.e., Raymound Sabouraud, the journal’s title was changed for marketing purposes to the Journal of Medical and Veterinary Mycology (possibly not one of the smartest decisions by the society). In addition, it became apparent that publishing a variable numbers of issues prevented the articles appearing in the journal from being indexed. Therefore, the society decided that publishing a fixed number of issues, i.e., six, per year, would potentially increase submissions and raise the journal’s credibility within the microbiology community. However, it was recognized by 1996 that the journal’s title was too long and perhaps did not appropriately reflect its broad mission. The result was the introduction of the journal’s present title and an increase to eight issues per year in 2006. Despite all the changes, the submission rate has remained relatively constant at about 300 per year for each of the last four
years. Unfortunately, the journal’s Impact Factor has not been as stable, reaching a peak of 2.1 in 2003 and a low of 1.4 in 2005. However, if one considers the impact of the journal from 1981 to 2006 under all three of its titles, it would rank second of the 17 journals in the mycology category.

The editorial staff is comprised of 14 associate editors (who handle the day-to-day management of manuscripts), 20 editorial board members (individuals who regularly serve as peer reviewers), and a reviews editor (who supervises the only commissioned works, review articles, for the journal). All are volunteer, professional scientists, and receive absolutely no remuneration for their work. The central person in the editorial network is the editor-in-chief. Initially all submissions were received at my office in hard copy form (the original and three copies) through routine post. I would then forward three copies to an associate editor for him/her to distribute to peer reviewers. Needless to say this was a rather cumbersome, time consuming, and expensive process. In addition, I never knew if the manuscripts were received in a timely manner, nor did I have knowledge of the peer-reviewers selected to evaluate the manuscripts. On the bright side, I quickly became a familiar face at my local post office.

All this changed in the fall of 2004, when Medical Mycology became among the first Informa-published journals to adopt ScholarOne’s Manuscript Central. I now have a more-or-less reliable system (if one doesn’t consider the emergency maintenance shut downs, the occasional rebooting of servers, and the famous unknown hacker who gained entrance to the program requiring all users to change their passwords), which overcame almost all the problems associated with hard copies and postal distribution of manuscripts. My major regrets with respect to the adoption of Manuscript Central are my limited understanding of the capabilities of the program and general knowledge of information technology (They had me in mind when they wrote all those helpful computer guides for dummies.) There are many areas in the workflow and content of the screens that I would have formatted differently during the Manuscript Central site set-up phase for my journal if I didn't have to make firm and lasting decisions over a short period without sufficient expertise in what to include or not to include in our site. Unfortunately, we grow wise too late, and to revise the site to be more user friendly to authors, associate editors, and reviewers would require serious expenditures of the journal’s funds, that is to say from the society that owns the journal.

Speaking of workflows, the editor-in-chief remains the focal point for processing submissions through the online submission system. I receive and initially review all manuscripts being considered for publication in Medical Mycology. When submitting manuscripts, all authors must indicate that their papers meet an extensive list of requirements, e.g., all authors have participated in the research; all authors have reviewed and approved the manuscript; the corresponding author has reviewed the Instructions for Authors; the paper meets the journal’s style and format requirements; etc. Unfortunately, I have found the authors of many manuscripts simply check the required fields but have made no attempt to even read the journal’s instructions. This, I believe, may be an all-too-familiar situation for many ISMTE members. It appears to me that authors actually review the requirements of any journal...
only when forced to do so by the editorial staff. In worst cases, I return the manuscript to the authors, along with a list of the corrections they must make prior to my forwarding the work on in the editorial process. This will result in one of the following: (1) I never hear from the authors again; (2) The authors actually follow my recommendations and correct the problem areas; or (3) I receive a manuscript back in which little to no changes were made by the authors. Since I have given the authors the opportunity to bring their work into compliance with Medical Mycology's standards, and they have elected not to respond or to follow my requests, I reject the paper without further editorial input. Those manuscripts that have been successfully revised by the authors will be entered into the general workflow.

Since I was formerly an active scientist in this area of microbiology, I perhaps have a better understanding of the subject matter included in the majority of papers than others who serve as editors of biomedical journals. Therefore, when I receive manuscripts of questionable scientific content, I forward them to one of the journal's associate editors for an informal evaluation. If he/she corroborates the conclusions from my initial review, I will reject the submissions without formal review.

Since I have appointed, with the approval of the Society's council, all of the present associate editors, I am quite familiar with each of their areas of expertise. This knowledge and my own background in the field allow me to relatively easily select the most appropriate associate editor to oversee the peer-review of a manuscript. I will personalize the cover letter generated by the Manuscript Central server to include my own comments on the paper's style and format, as well as possible questions concerning the scientific contents. However, to ensure that no one associate editor is overwhelmed with manuscripts (overwhelmed is a relative term when dealing with a journal that receives about 300 manuscripts per year), my assignment decisions are tempered by the manuscript histories of the associate editors', i.e., total numbers assigned and dates of the last assignments. Finally, when the journal receives a sudden surge of submissions (here, too, surge is a relative term), I will assume the role of associate editor and oversee the peer-review process of manuscripts.

As you may have gathered, it is the associate editor's responsibility to assign manuscripts to knowledgeable peer-reviewers, an ever increasing problem often requiring extending invitations to four or five prospective reviewers in order to secure two, in accord with the journal's policy. While the associate editors are free to choose the reviewers recommended by the authors or members of the journal's editorial board, they more often than not select individuals outside the existing peer-review panel who they personally know are experts in subjects discussed in the papers. The associate editors evaluate the reviewers’ comments, taking into account their own opinions on the quality of the submission to determine if the manuscript should be returned for revision or to recommend its rejection to me. A similar decision-making process will be followed when the revised manuscripts are returned to the associate editors. They may return the revised papers to the initial reviewers for their input, or they may make the final decisions based on their own evaluations of the revised works. Yes, there are occasions when manuscripts may be returned to the authors for two, three, or four revisions prior to
the associate editor making the final decision to accept a manuscript. In addition, since requests to revise manuscripts do not infer acceptance, there have been rare occasions in which manuscripts were rejected as being beyond repair. The associate editors’ recommendations to accept or reject submissions are forwarded to me for the ‘ultimate’ decision.

I review all associate editors’ recommendations and the comments of the peer reviewers. If a manuscript is to be rejected (approximately 55-60% of all submissions), I attempt to personalize the server-generated letter by highlighting specific comments made by the reviewers and associate editors that contributed to the decision. Alternatively, I review and edit all manuscripts that have been recommended for publication.

Unfortunately, despite repeated and quite specific requests I have made to the associate editors to carefully review manuscripts prior to recommending their acceptance, I still receive papers that are in need of further revision to the text, figures, and/or citations. I return those papers in the worst condition to the authors for further corrections, following the same procedures used in returning initial submissions. Not too surprisingly, I obtain the same three results from this action. It is a never-ending mystery to me as to why some authors will go through the entire editorial process but refuse to respond to my final requests or make the appropriate revisions. In these instances, I will again write to the authors to warn them that I will reject their manuscripts if I don’t receive the corrected manuscripts and will then follow through on my ‘threat’. I edit the revised papers like any other accepted submission. No manuscript is forwarded to the production office until I believe that it meets the journal’s standards. I find this final editing of accepted manuscripts to be the most intense and time consuming aspect of my job as editor-in-chief. However, I do admit that I leave many less technical corrections to the publisher’s copyeditors.

The forwarding of accepted manuscripts to Informa’s offices does not end my involvement in the production of the journal. There are manuscript ‘proofs’ to be reviewed; but to prevent a log jam, I restrict my comments to possible issues in the style and format of the papers. Finally, I work with the production team to establish the line up of the manuscripts to be included in each issue and select and provide the descriptions of the cover art.

If you have managed to work your way to this point in the article, you have probably correctly concluded that the editor-in-chief, managing editor, technical editor, and virtually all other editorial office positions for Medical Mycology are filled by the same individual. Working from a secured bunker (OK, a basement office – close enough) in an undisclosed location in upstate New York (Albany is about as undisclosed as you can get outside of the Australian Outback), I have been managing the journal’s affairs for close to four years. As has been discussed in previous EON issues, working as the sole journal staff can be, on occasions, quite lonely. More importantly, having had only on-the-job training, I initially had no outside contacts in publishing with whom I could discuss issues related to any aspect of my role in Medical Mycology. Then in 2006, I happened to sit next to a guy by the name of Jason Roberts at the Manuscript Central Users’ Conference. I immediately bonded with him; after all, he is somewhat short and I am definitely vertically challenged; he is bald, and I am almost bald; he has an English
accent (which works out well when you consider he was born and raised in the UK), I am a great anglophile; and he has a wealth of information on journal publishing. At the time, I had absolutely none. He discussed with me his concept of starting a new organization for those who work behind the scenes at scientific journals. In 2007, he asked me to be a part of the new society. As they say, the rest is history. ISMTE has given me a broader, and more detailed view of publishing in general and, in particular, my work as an editor-in-chief. Without the ISMTE, I would never have known about any of the professional organizations whose websites provide a wealth of information (almost as much as can be found at ISMTE.org). For example, when presented recently with ethical issues, I knew I could obtain recommendations through the COPE website. In addition, there are all the contacts I have made over the last 18 months as a member and officer of the society. These individuals have always responded to my requests for assistance. I only wish that the ISMTE would have existed when I started as an editor, because it would have made life so much easier.

If operating a one-person editorial office is not, by itself, unique in the world of biomedical journals, then my other role as a member of the ISHAM governing council really sets my position apart. Since the society’s statutes and by-laws designate the administration of the journal to the council, as a member of the council, I, in a way, oversee my own activities. Furthermore, in presenting my annual ‘state of the journal’ report to the council, I am reporting to myself. Finally, the tenure of the editor-in-chief is not fixed, e.g., five years, as in most journals, but is determined by the council upon the advice of - you guessed it - the editor-in-chief, me. I am happy to say that I have excellent professional and personal relationships with my colleagues who are council members. They have never directly or indirectly attempted to interfere with the journal’s operations or with my work as the editor-in-chief. Furthermore, they have always provided support when I have requested their advice, suggestions, and recommendations. I would like to think that their soft-handed management of journal affairs was due to their understanding that I have always viewed my appointment as an honor and privilege.

When it comes time in the not-too-distant future for me to leave this veil of tears of editing, I will be expected by the council to provide one or more names of individuals to serve as my successor. I will use the following criteria in making my recommendations for the position.

• First, the individual should have prior experience as an editor or even better, as an editor-in-chief of a biomedical journal. I believe that we are beyond the time that an individual’s status in the field and/or position in an academic institution or commercial facility should be the sole or most important factor in determining his/her capabilities to serve as the editor-in-chief of Medical Mycology.

• Second, the individual should be a resident of the US or Canada, so as to have immediate telephone access to customer service at Manuscript Central. The quick, helpful, and for the most part accurate assistance I have received through a simple telephone call has been essential in maintaining the smooth operations of the journal. I am able to respond to questions or
pleas for help from authors, reviewers, and associate editors by tapping into this service. Besides, it's not a bad ego boost to appear to be a hero to these individuals in critical times of their interactions with Manuscript Central.

• Third, my successor should be able to devote the time required to effectively oversee the operations of the journal. The responsibilities facing the editor-in-chief as a one-person editorial office and as a member of the society’s council have increased dramatically during my tenure. The production of the journal, from the selection of an associate editor to oversee a manuscript to the preparation of the final line up of papers for the next issue, requires the daily attention of the editor-in-chief. In this context, daily means seven days a week, even including holidays. Perhaps the best candidate who could meet this criterion would be one who has retired from active scientific pursuits, but would appreciate having the opportunity to remain active in the field. This qualification was possibly a major factor when the society’s council invited me to assume the duties of editor-in-chief. You know there are advantages to being a senior citizen beyond discounts at museums or the movies. As a former senior scientist (with respect to age not to status in the field), I was removed from writing the next Nobel quality manuscripts or pleading for grant support or attending faculty committee meetings or similar time consuming activities. With age come privileges, including the time needed to be an editor-in-chief.

If asked by my successor for advice in taking on his/her new duties I would simply recommend that the individual review all aspects of my present duties and the manuscript workflow as presented in this article. Come to think of it, this paper might make an excellent gift to the new editor-in-chief. As I have indicated, the Manuscript Central workflow was established without any real understanding of the program’s potential. In addition, many of my current activities were learned on the job. I believe that it is essential for my successor to take the time to critically evaluate the entire editorial framework of the journal. The individual should maintain those editor’s functions that match his/her plans for the journal and discard those that appear to be ineffective. The new editor should work with ScholarOne to improve the workflow, even if it does require the expenditure of society funds. As much as I hate to admit it, I might not have been correct in all the editorial decisions I have made over the years. A review by a fresh pair of eyes may be long overdue and would quite likely improve the journal.

Congratulations, you have actually made it to the end of this rather lengthy article. I trust that it has been informative, and that some aspects might assist you in your own editorial duties. I would be happy to discuss the contents of the paper though an exchange of e-mails (not hard copies through the post) or on the discussion forum.
Mark your diaries! The ISMTE 2009 European Conference is being held in England, at St Hugh’s College, Oxford, on Tuesday 25 August. The programme has now been finalised and we can look forward to a stimulating and exciting day. Registration opens this month, and we expect a lot of interest. To make sure of a place, book early!

The meeting will focus on two themes: ethical issues in the morning, and peer review and editorial office best practice in the afternoon. We’re delighted that two eminent and knowledgeable speakers have agreed to take part. Harvey Marcovitch will give the keynote address in the morning on ‘How Editors deal with publication fraud and misconduct’. Harvey is Chair of COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics), which now has over 6000 members, so has vast experience and knowledge of publication misconduct. He’ll be highlighting the prevalence of certain types of misconduct and telling us what actions editors and editorial offices can take to detect and minimise misconduct. The afternoon keynote address will be from Roy Pounder, Professor of Medicine at the Royal Free & University College Medical School, London. Roy has been an editor-in-chief for many years, and, as one who has a very hands-on approach, he is an expert on editorial office best practice and how to maintain good author and reviewer relations. The title of his talk will be ‘Without authors and reviewers, journal publishing will die’. From personal experience, I can tell you that both speakers are highly interesting and entertaining communicators.

Each keynote address will be followed by workshops related to those topics. Delegates will divide up into small breakout groups to discuss problems and case studies. Each group will be led by someone knowledgeable on the topic who will be able to stimulate discussion and provide guidance if needed. The day will be interspersed with refreshment breaks (included in the registration fee of £110 for ISMTE members, £160 for non-members, as are breakfast and lunch), which will provide opportunities for networking, catching up with old friends, meeting new people in similar roles (we know that some editorial administrators never get to meet up in person with anyone connected with their work), and chatting with ISMTE officers and members. The day will finish with a panel of experts question and answer session. There will then be a wine and cheese reception (5-7 pm, also included in the registration fee), which will provide another networking opportunity.
Managing Ethical Issues & Ensuring Best Practices in Peer Review
Oxford, UK

Tuesday, 25 August
St. Hugh’s College - St Margaret’s Road, Oxford

Dr. Harvey Marcovitch—On How Editors Deal with Publication Misconduct

Harvey Marcovitch was a consultant paediatrician in the UK for 24 years, latterly at Oxford Radcliffe Hospitals NHS Trust, and was also honorary clinical lecturer at the University of Oxford. From 1994–2003, he was editor of Archives of Disease in Childhood, and from 2001–2007, syndications editor for BMJ Publishing Group. He is now editor of Clinical Risk (Royal Society of Medicine Press), associate editor for the BMJ, and editor of Black’s Medical Dictionary. He is chair of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, http://publicationethics.org/), which now has more than 6000 members, a board member of the UK Panel for Biomedical Research Integrity, and a director of the Council of...
Plans are well underway for the Annual 2009 Meeting of ISMTE in Baltimore, Maryland, USA. The meeting will be held Tuesday and Wednesday, August 4 and 5, with registration and a reception on the evening of August 3. The theme of this year’s meeting is Managing the Journal In Print and Online, reflecting the ever-growing demands on the editorial office to successfully manage both versions of a journal. We have lined up two dynamic speakers to address this timely topic.

Kent Anderson is a member of the board of directors of the Society for Scholarly Publishing and is currently executive director, business and product development, of the New England Journal of Medicine.

Peter Binfield is the managing editor of PLoS One after a career at Sage Publications and the Institute of Physics Publishing in the UK. Both will be speaking about their experiences at their respective journals and the challenges of the online world for academic publishing.

Alongside our two speakers there will be a number of breakout sessions designed to give attendees valuable information, tips and tricks they can apply towards their everyday working life as well as their future careers. Sessions in the planning stages now include journal redesign, journal blogging, an Excel workshop for reporting, and best practices and protocols for running an editorial office. Other sessions are being considered and the final agenda should be set soon. Please join us in Baltimore for this exciting and rewarding meeting!

To register for the 2009 annual meeting of ISMTE please go to http://ismte.org/conferences2009.html.

Glenn Collins
Executive Editor, JACC Family of Journals
gcollins@acc.org

On behalf on the ISMTE American Conference Committee:

Taylor Bowen, ISMTE Vice President, Conferences Chair
Aegis Peer Review Management

Glenn Collins, Executive Editor, JACC Family of Journals

Ira Salkin, Editor-in-Chief
Medical Mycology

Dianne Dixon, Administrator, Journal of Radiation Biology
Science Editors. For 15 years he worked with Tim Albert as an instructor/facilitator on courses about writing scientific papers, journal editing, and departmental publication policies. He has authored chapters in *How to Write a Paper*, edited by George Hall (3rd edition published by BMJ Books) and *Medicine for Lawyers* edited by Palmer & Wetherill (RSM Press Ltd), and is a contributor to the CSE White Paper on *Promoting Integrity in Scientific Journal Publications* and the EASE *Science Editors’ Handbook*.

**Professor Roy Pounder—On Editorial Office Best Practice**

Roy Pounder is a professor of medicine at the Royal Free & University College Medical School in London. He studied medicine at Cambridge University and at Guy's Hospital in London, moving to the Royal Free in 1980. Roy has just finished a two-year term of office as clinical vice president of the Royal College of Physicians of London and is now the college's associate international director for the Far East and Australasia, and special adviser on the European Working Time Directive. He has edited more than 20 textbooks, is the founding co-Editor of *Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, and editor-in-chief of GastroHep.com.

**Peter Binfield:** Mr. Binfield began his career in publishing at the Institute of Physics Publishing in Bristol, UK, as a commissioning editor in their books program. From 2005-2007 he worked for SAGE publications running their US Journals Division. He has been managing editor at PLoS ONE since April 2008.

**Kent Anderson:** Mr. Anderson is a member of the board of directors of the Society for Scholarly Publishing and is currently executive director, business and product development of the *New England Journal of Medicine*. 
Open Access to Research - Increases Readership But Not Citations*

by Fiona Godlee
Editor, BMJ
fgodlee@bmj.com

In July the *BMJ* published a paper (doi: 10.1136/bmj.a568) that has nothing directly to do with medicine. It does, however, have everything to do with access to research results, a topic that should interest authors and readers in any field. The paper asks whether open access (free full text online publication) increases the chances of an article being read and cited compared with subscription access publication (where articles are accessible only to individuals or institutions who pay to subscribe).

It is a question that many have asked and tried to answer since academics first challenged the subscription-based publishing model over ten years ago. Open access offered an end to what they saw as profiteering by publishers at the expense of the academic community. It restored a public good. If it could also offer higher usage and citation rates, this was icing on the cake. Authors who submitted their work to open access journals might be rewarded with greater visibility, and publishers who launched open access titles or converted existing ones to open access might see their usage figures and impact factors rise.

Studies in various disciplines have explored this possibility. Most have found a correlation between usage and citation rates, as well as a citation advantage from open access. However, all of these have been retrospective observational studies. In what is, to the best of our knowledge, the first randomised trial of open access, Davis and colleagues sampled papers due for publication in a group of physiology journals and randomly allocated them to either open access or subscription access publication. They found significantly higher online usage of open access articles, but no significant difference in citation rates between the two groups in the first year after publication.

* This article was originally published in BMJ 31 July 2008. Cite this as: BMJ 2008;337:a1051

Competing interests: FG is editor of the *BMJ* and editor-in-chief of the BMJ Journals. Her salary is paid by the BMJ Group, which receives revenues from subscriptions, advertising, sponsorship, and reprint sales. The *BMJ*’s current publication model is open access for peer-reviewed research with no author charges and subscription charges for non-research content.
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1 Davis PM, Lewenstein BV, Simon DH, Booth JG, Connolly MJL. Open access publishing, article downloads, and citations: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2008;337:a568.

The study suggests that previous findings of a citation advantage from open access may have been the result of self-selection, with more highly citable articles being more likely to be published in open access journals. Indeed, a previous study of medical journals found that the higher the impact factor of the journal in which an article was published, the more likely it was that the article would be available on a non-publisher website. Davis and colleagues’ finding that open access provided no citation advantage, despite increased readership, may be explained by the fact that journal readers who generate citations already have subscription access to journals.

The study confirms that open access articles reach audiences that subscription based access does not reach. Interestingly, it also found that abstracts were downloaded less often when the full text was freely available. Of course, we don’t know whether this means that people are more likely to read the full text rather than just the abstract, but it raises the potential for an additional scientific advantage of open access—that readers and authors are able, should they wish, to build their ideas on a whole article rather than just the summary.

Can these findings be generalised to medicine? It is hard to see why not. However, one difference between medicine and physiology is the wider press coverage given to medical research. We know that press coverage increases citations. If open access increases press coverage, as some have suggested because of the convenience to journalists of being able to access the full text, it is possible that open access could lead to an increase in citations to medical research.

The BMJ’s own experiment with free or open access publishing of research is now ten years old and going strong, although as with all experiments it remains under evaluation. In 1998, the BMJ was the first major general medical journal to provide free full text online access to its articles from the moment of publication, to deposit the full text in PubMed Central, and to allow authors of research articles to retain copyright. Access controls were introduced for non-research content in 2006 to protect subscription revenue and to allow us to continue providing the research content free. Since then, the BMJ Group has extended its open access experiment by introducing BMJ Unlocked (http://adc.bmj.com/info/unlocked.dtl), which allows authors submitting research to any of the group’s 19 specialist research journals to pay an author fee in order to make their work open access. (The BMJ itself does not charge author fees.) We have also now made changes to our copyright licence and the information we include in the research articles so that they can be formally listed as open access articles in PubMed Central and other repositories.

Academic publishing is going through interesting times. We don’t know which model will prevail, or indeed whether there will ultimately be one or several coexisting models. Three things may precipitate a move towards greater openness of access—the demand from funding agencies, such as the US National Institutes of Health and the Wellcome Trust, that grant recipients must self-archive or publish in open access journals; the new Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Amendment Act, which requires trialists seeking FDA approval to deposit their main results in clinicaltrials.gov within 12 months of recruiting the last participant; and the rapidly expanding and unpredictable influence of Web 2.0 on the way we all communicate.

If greater openness is the future, as it almost certainly is, the academic and publishing communities have some decisions to make. What sort of quality control do we want in the 21st century and how do we fund it? Do we need the current level of peer review and technical editing before dissemination or could medicine move to the physics archive model—dissemination followed by selection for peer reviewed publication (http://arxiv.org)? How would such a model play in a world in which the media are hungry for new medical breakthroughs, and where manipulation of data and overinterpretation of results is rife? Should quality control continue to be funded largely through subscriptions or can author charges take the strain, either alone as at BioMed Central or with the help of charitable support, as at the Public Library of Science? If funders and institutions support greater access to research results, should they also fund the quality control? Where then would people look for independent verification? Should peer review be centralised and professionalised rather than run by individual journals?

These are questions that reach to the very heart of the way in which scientists and clinicians communicate. Much will depend in the short to medium term on whether publishers are able to make online usage profitable through advertising rather than subscriptions, whether author charges prove to be a sustainable model, how much pressure is brought to bear by funders and institutions for greater access, and whether the FDA Amendment Act leads to legislation in other countries and beyond randomised trials.

These questions also reach to the heart of how academics are acknowledged and rewarded. Hit rates and online profile may soon become as or more important than citations. Whatever the mix of communication models that emerges over the next few years, we need to make sure that science and health care are well served.

---

5 Mayor S. Opening the lid on open access. BMJ 2008;336:688-9; doi: 10.1136/bmj.39526.467951.DB.
Like most nurses who are editors of journals, I had no education related to the craft of editing. I assumed the role as an apprentice and learned what that person thought good editor skills were. As my tenure and independence as an editor increased, I realized how little I actually knew about what it took to be a truly great editor. Seems I was ultimately ‘in charge’ of the product I produced, not an editorial board, not a society, and not the managing editor or publisher.

My search to become a truly competent editor of two nursing journals lead me to superb resources, one of which was the Council of Science Editors (councilscienceeditors.org). Its mission is to serve editorial professionals in the sciences by creating a supportive network for career development, providing educational opportunities, and developing resources for identifying and implementing high-quality editorial practices. Its motto is Education, Ethics, and Evidence for Editors. CSE members include the full spectrum of countries, editorial roles, and disciplines, making it an amazingly broad spectrum organization.

Now a member of the CSE for 19 years, I was initially intimidated. I was on equal footing with editors and other staff (including editorial advisory boards and manuscript reviewers) of journals such as Nature, The Lancet, The British Medical Journal, the Journal of the American Medical Association, the Canadian Pharmacists Journal, American Journal of Veterinary Research, the Dutch Journal of Medicine, Journal of Applied Physics, Journal of the National Cancer Institute, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Aviation Space and Environmental Medicine, The Cochrane Library, and Science to name a few from among the 700 members.

Initially, I was extremely uncomfortable attending the annual meeting. I was immersed in a foreign culture, so out of my element, knowing nothing and quickly finding I didn’t know a whole lot about being a good editor either (although I had done it for 9 years before joining CSE). Being out of my comfort zone thrust me into the role of learner versus expert; I knew nursing but had forgotten what it was like to be a beginner gaining knowledge of a new craft. Over time, membership in CSE gave me the knowledge, tools, resources, and peer mentors that are needed to become a competent and knowledgeable editor.

If you plan to attend the annual meeting (Show Me the Data: The Science of Editing and Publishing) in Pittsburgh in May 2009, let me know - I’ll be there to learn a little bit more!

Suzanne P. Smith, EdD, RN  
FAAN, Editor-in-Chief  
The Journal of Nursing Administration & Nurse Educator  
JONAEditor@aol.com OR  
NEEditor@aol.com  
www.jonajournal.com & nurseeducatoronline.com
As managing editors, we tend to spend most of our time tucked away in the back office of an old university hall, dutifully checking figures, chasing reviewers, and collecting copyright forms. However, a few times a year, some of us do ascend from our academic holding cells and congregate at various conferences to discuss, what else, ethics!

Unfortunately, there are very few really good conferences geared toward the managing editor. In this Tips and Tricks article, I hope to answer some basic questions about finding conferences for managing editors. I also hope to offer advice on how to choose the best conference and how to find funding to attend the conference of your choice.

**How do I find out about conferences for managing editors?**

As is the case in most professions, we are often very busy with our work and consequently don’t have time to look for opportunities to increase our professionalism. As a board member for ISMTE, I have learned that there are a few opportunities out there for professional growth, and conferences are one of the most exciting ways to grow and develop professionally.

Unfortunately, there is actually a real lack of conferences that are suitable for managing editors. However, I have stumbled across a few really great options – they are just a little hard to find. I highly recommend the ISMTE annual meetings. We have one in England and one in the United States each year. At these meetings you will have ample opportunity to network and learn about other opportunities and conferences for managing editors.

There are other societies and conferences that I also recommend looking into. In an attempt to help the new conference-goer narrow down the list, I suggest researching the societies below. I have attended most of these conferences and hope to attend the others in coming years. Please note that this is by no means an exhaustive list! Like attending the ISMTE annual meeting, Googling these sites might help you link to others where you will find even more options!

**ISMTE**
Council of Science Editors (CSE)  
[www.councilscienceeditors.org](http://www.councilscienceeditors.org)
Committee On Publication Ethics (COPE)  
[www.publicationethics.org](http://www.publicationethics.org)
European Association for Science Editors (EASE)  
[www.ease.org.uk](http://www.ease.org.uk)
Society of Scholarly Publishers (SSP)  
[www.sspnet.org](http://www.sspnet.org)
World Association of Medical Editors (WAME)  
[www.wame.org](http://www.wame.org)
Managing Editor Conferences

Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP)
www.alpsp.org
EQUATOR
www.equatornetwork.org
Society for Editors and Proofreaders (SfEP)
http://sfep.net

I also suggest you take a look at http://www.ease.org.uk/links/index.shtml, where you will find a very long list of options. All of these conferences are not suitable for all managing editors, but it is a good place to start.

In addition to society conferences, we also have user conferences to choose from. Most managing editors use manuscript tracking software to aid in the submission and peer-review process. Many of these software programs offer user conferences. User conferences are a great way to learn more about your tracking system, meet the developers, influence ideas, and, most importantly, meet peers working on the same program. Check with your software company to see if they offer something similar.

**How do I know which conference is best for me?**

As it turns out, there are actually quite a few conferences to choose from. However, not all of them are helpful to the managing editor. The question then becomes, which conference is right for me? Since some managing editors copyedit and some don’t, and some have science backgrounds and some don’t, and so on and so on, fittingly, some conferences are right for some managing editors and not for others.

I suggest you carefully read the scope of the society and the agenda for the meeting before choosing your conference. Every session may not be right for you, but if many are, that may be a great conference for you to attend. I also suggest taking a look at who has attended the meetings in the past. This will help you gauge if the content is geared toward the publisher, the editor-in-chief, the managing editor, or all three.

As you are looking at all the options, I would make a list of the ones that interest you the most and then choose your favorite. However, I would also hold on to that list. Some conferences are not offered every year, and some may change their agendas drastically from year to year. Although the sessions might appeal to you one year, they might not the next. On the flip, some conferences keep the same agenda year after year. That proves to be boring after a while, so you can always attend a different conference every year to keep it interesting.

**Do I have to pay for the conference myself?**

The million dollar question! Unfortunately, conference funding is often left out of journal budgets. However, that does not mean you need to fork up the cash yourself. I have a few suggestions here.

First of all, I highly recommended writing it in the journal office budget. The best way to achieve this is by picking a conference that has an agenda wrought with professional advancement sessions. Take this agenda to your society or bean counter and make the argument that it is an investment in the journal. The more you know about your job and the industry, the better the journal runs. **continued on page 30**
COLUMN: Taming Technology

Welcome to the first new EON section to be launched in 2009. Taming Technology is intended to help our readers cope with the ever-changing technical issues that they face in their own editorial offices. Future topics may include website management, Internet searches, usage and citation reports, Excel reports and pivot tables, RSS feeds, and podcasts. Please contact me if you have a topics of interest or would like to author a column for this section.

Kim Sankey
Taming Technology Section Editor
sankey.kimberly@mayo.edu

Manuscript Central Top-Ten Time Savers

by Gwen Baker
MC Client Education Manager
ScholarOne Inc., a Thomson Reuters Business
training@scholarone.com

Saving time is important. It’s the little things that let you save time. I have created a top 10 list of time savers for Admin and Editors for using Manuscript Central. These time savers will allow you to navigate your site more effectively.

1. Using the Asterisk “*” in searches.

The asterisk allows you to do wild card searches in many places in Manuscript Central. You can do wild searches for Manuscripts, Authors and Reviewers. Special hint: Use at least four (4) characters or numbers in your search string and you will get back quicker results.

2. Click your Enter key to start a search.

By clicking the Enter key on your keyboard you will save time scrolling down the screen to find the Search Icon.

3. Export Search Results into a CSV file.

All search results bring up a screen with an Export to CSV file icon in the lower left corner of the screen.
This allows for real time reporting. While you cannot configure what is in the CSV, the exportable results do allow for you to create your own report offline.

4. Use the **Filter Options** in **Advanced Search** to find out the status of an Authors revision.

Choose **Only show manuscripts awaiting revision** to see all revisions that have not yet been started by an Author. You can also use these search results to find where the option to submit a revised paper has expired. Click on the **view details** icon and grant the Author an extension. Note: Many sites are configured that the Journal Admin is the one with the permissions to grant the Author Extension.
5. **Save searches** so you can run them again at a later date.

When you create a saved search at the bottom of your **Advanced Search** page this will allow you to run your custom search again using the **Saved Search** field on your main dashboard.

6. Use the **Scroll-To** option on the Manuscript Information tab to quickly locate information.

This option will allow you to jump to information quickly like Author Supplied Data. As tasks become completed the information moves to the Manuscript Information Tab and the Scroll-To option grows.
7. Send someone an email by clicking on their name.

All names in Manuscript Central are underlined which means they are Hyperlinked in the system. By clicking on a persons’ name from within the details of a manuscript, you can instantly email them. Helpful hint: All emails sent from the details of a manuscript will be logged into the Audit trail - no need to carbon copy yourself on an email.

8. Use External Searches Icon to look up Authors and other valuable information.

The External Search Icon is located on the Manuscript Details Header information.

This search will allow you to search on Manuscript Title, Keywords, Author and Other. These searches can be across Web of Science, PubMed, Highwire and Google depending upon the configuration of your site. It is a great way to find out if Authors have submitted other papers and look up potential Reviewers who are not currently in your reviewer database.

9. Use the Version History box on to view information about Review Details of previous submissions.

On revised papers you will find a box called Version History. It will be located on the lower right side of the task related tab.
This box will have a link called View Review Details. When you click on this tab you will be able to view the Authors response to the decision, the decision letter and all reviews from the original submission.

10. **Enter correspondence sent/received** from outside of Manuscript Central on the **Audit Trail** tab.

On the Audit Trail tab you can add correspondence that is sent or received from outside Manuscript Central. This allows you to copy and paste the information in or add the information as a file attachment. Remember to set your date and time stamps so the information you add shows up in the correct place in the Audit Trail. This is also a great way to keep track of phone calls.

If you have other ideas for time saving using Manuscript Central please do not hesitate to contact me.

---

**Enter correspondence sent/received from outside of Manuscript Central**

- **Date Sent:** 
- **To:** 
- **From:** 
- **Subject:** 
- **File Attachment:**

**Time Sent:**

- **Day:** 
- **Time:**
- **AM/PM:**
- **EST:**

**Body:**

- **Save**

**Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note Title</th>
<th>Updated By</th>
<th>Updated On</th>
<th>Edit</th>
<th>Delete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This document has no notes.

---

Manuscript Central is a trademark of ScholarOne, Inc. ScholarOne is a registered trademark of ScholarOne, Inc.
Terms and Conditions of Use - ScholarOne Privacy Policy - Get Help Now
An editorial office doesn’t stand alone. We are intrinsically linked to our publishers, software vendors, societies, and production teams. We can only do so much by ourselves, and we rely on others — our publication partners — to help us complete each issue. The way editorial offices interact with these partners varies.

Does your society have editorial control over its journals, or does it allow the editorial office complete independence? Do you work closely with your publisher and society to coordinate issues, press releases, and joint statements; or are you (or they) unsure of what they (or you) are planning? Wouldn’t you like to know how other journals manage these relationships and find ways to improve yours?

EON is proud to launch a new section called “Publication Partners” to report on the processes we in the editorial office rarely see or know about; and to investigate how societies, publishers, and editorial offices work together.

We will invite production and copy editors, software vendors, and society staff who have direct input into producing journals to tell us what journal production is like from their end. We would like to hear from any readers/members who want to contribute an article or suggest a topic for this section. If you have an idea, contact me, Jan McColm, at jmccolm@med.unc.edu.
I knew very little about scholarly publishing when I applied for the position of editorial assistant, but the job description seemed to be written just for me. Had I known then what I know today, I probably would have run in the opposite direction. It's been challenging at times, but having recently marked four years at the International Reading Association, I can honestly say that I love what I do.

IRA (no, not “the” IRA, just IRA, thanks) is a non-profit professional association for teachers and researchers of literacy development, with headquarters located in Newark, Delaware, and a branch office in Washington, DC. In addition to publishing, IRA provides professional development opportunities for educators and supports global initiatives and literacy advocacy. Annual conventions have drawn as many as 23,000 attendees.

With a degree in French and German, and a Masters of Education in bilingualism, the logical thing would have been for me to teach. While I was finishing up graduate school, though, I came to the realization that, although I was comfortable working with educators, the idea of standing in front of a classroom for a living absolutely terrified me. By contrast, I was energized by my final seminar on second language acquisition—discussions based on our readings of the most recently published articles. How cool was that!

Fast forward a few years and now I get to read the most recent articles before they’re even published. IRA’s publications include a top-tiered research journal, two practitioner journals, a books program, and an online lesson plan database—all of which are peer-reviewed. The in-house publications staff of about 30 covers the day-to-day operations of peer review, permissions and copyright, editing and production, and design and composition. The journals are highly regarded in the field, with current volume years ranging from 44 to 62 and acceptance rates of 10% to 18%. The current editors-in-chief (EIC; each journal has a co-editorship) are located at universities around the country.

When I began at IRA, paper-based peer review had long been phased out, thanks to a previous editorial team based in Australia. I started learning the ins and outs of peer review with a soon-to-be obsolete customized version of FileMaker Pro. With a whopping two months under my belt (including the Thanksgiving and Holiday breaks), the first of five Manuscript Central (MC) sites went live. As the initial point of contact for authors and new submissions, and using a system no one else in the office had actually ever used before, I encountered ‘situations’ (to put it mildly) on a daily basis for which there were no answers or established procedures. It was not unlike arriving in another country, where you hardly speak the language, and trying to figure out...
how to obtain such survival basics as food and shelter. You somehow find a way to manage. And manage I did.

Happily, ScholarOne held their inaugural MC Users’ Conference that spring. I connected with people who had been through similar experiences, some with the same questions I had, and others, such as ISMTE’s own Jason Roberts, who had ingenious solutions they freely shared and recommendations for best practices. It was so empowering that a couple months later I returned to Charlottesville for a training course that not only helped me to best maximize their product for our unique workflows but also gave me insight to other possibilities and what improvements could be implemented to bring our operations more in line with industry standards.

Despite a major division-wide organizational overhaul and an ever-changing cast of colleagues, I’m covering many of the same responsibilities as when I started—plus a whole lot more. In acknowledgement of the complexities brought about by online peer review, I’ve been upgraded to editorial associate. I now work with two other editorial associates, and in theory we are all supposed to be equally cross-trained.

The reality is that we somehow manage to cover our own individual wide-ranging set of responsibilities and do our best to put out fires on behalf of an absent colleague if needed. We’re very supportive of each other, and maintain a healthy sense of humor. At one point last summer, it occurred to me just how many balls we were collectively juggling and I nearly asked our supervisor to consider changing our titles to editorial octopus to better reflect the work we were actually doing.

My main priority is overseeing the peer-review activities of the two practitioner journals from initial submission to final decision and ensuring that all parties do their part in a timely manner. Educators generally tend to be very deadline oriented, and more than once reviewers have apologetically requested a one-day extension for their review of a manuscript. This sense of promptness in conjunction with the reminders sent by the online system has shortened turn-around times from an average of three months down to six to eight weeks, and in some cases three weeks.

Beyond the day-to-day flow of manuscripts, I serve as IRA’s MC point person. This entails an in-depth understanding of how the system works as well as a general awareness of how each of our five sites was set up. As upgrades are released or as new colleagues require training, I am reminded that it is a dynamic system, ever changing, and one that needs periodic revisiting and occasionally revamping. I assisted with the configuration of the final two sites in our portal, established and maintain written procedures for our in-house staff, re-write the instructions to authors and reviewer guidelines as needed, troubleshoot when glitches appear, and conduct EIC ‘boot camps’ for new editorial teams. Most recently I have been asked to take over the quarterly reporting. Every day is truly different.

And while I don’t yet have an office with a window—in fact my cubicle rather resembles Neo’s in the beginning of the Matrix trilogy—one of the many fringe benefits we enjoy is the
option to telecommute or work four-day weeks. I chose telecommuting, despite living close to the office, as it affords a nice balance between the comforts and quiet of working at home and the sense of camaraderie and ability to have people to bounce ideas off of or chat with.

But the most rewarding aspect of this job for me is the connection with the author base and the reviewers. Some of the most interesting articles come from members of the review board, while others come from up-and-coming authors who end up reviewing in future volume years. And it never ceases to amaze me how much gratitude authors of rejected manuscripts exhibit, appreciative of the feedback from the reviewers and the editors.

During some downtime recently, I got around to cleaning out files left by my predecessor. It was interesting to note just how many of the reviewers of a decade ago are today serving as the Association’s leadership, either on the board of directors or as journal editors. This serves as a reminder to the importance of every correspondence with authors and reviewers, our gratitude for their contributions and service, because that little bit of nurturing and appreciation might just turn out to be the launching of tomorrow’s leadership.

### Calendar of Events

**ALPSP - How To Be a Successful Editor**  
29-30 January 2009  
Oxford, UK  
www.alpsp.org

**ALPSP - The Journal Editorial Office**  
11 February 2009  
Oxford, UK  
www.alpsp.org

**Council of Science Editors**  
1-5 May 2009  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA  
www.councilscienceeditors.org/events/annualmeeting09/index.cfm

**ALPSP - Effective Journal Editorial Management**  
12 May 2009  
London, UK  
www.alpsp.org

**ALPSP - Journal Development**  
24 June 2009  
London, UK  
www.alpsp.org

**ISMTE American Conference**  
August 4, 2009  
Baltimore, MD, USA  
www.ismte.org

**International Academy of Nursing Editors**  
26-28 July 2009  
Chicago, Illinois, USA  
www.nursingeditors.org

**ALPSP - Commissioning Book and Journal Content**  
25 November 2009  
London, UK  
www.alpsp.org

**6th International Congress on Peer Review & Biomedical Publication**  
10-12 September 2009  
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada  
www.ama-assn.org/public/peer/peerhome.htm

**European Association of Science Editors**  
10th EASE General Assembly and Conference  
16-19 September 2009  
Pisa, Italy  
In addition, I recommend asking for the budget line item to simply allow for conference funds. That way, you can conference hop each year. As I mentioned above, I have found that attending the same conference over and over again can be tedious and boring.

Second of all, your publisher, university, department, and/or editor-in-chief often have hidden coffers for such things. Try asking them for money. Just as I suggest above, make the easy argument that attending a professional conference only improves your ability to manage the title and is an investment in the journal. Make the argument specific to the agenda of your conference pick. I have found that many publishers and societies really support this approach.

However, some titles just don’t have the budget. If you work on a journal that really cannot afford a conference, get creative. Offer to present at a conference or work in some other capacity. Depending on the society, presenters often get attendance fees waived and travel reimbursed.

I hope these tips and tricks are helpful. Happy conferencing!