

IN THIS ISSUE

ARTICLES

- **Tearing Down Barriers** 1
Deborah Bowman, MFA
- **Scientific Publishing Professional Certifications: BELS and AMWA** 2
Jan Higgins
- **Conflicts of Interest in Medical Publishing: An Analysis of Existing Guidelines** 4
Rachel Hendrick
- **Lights...camera...action!** 6
Michael Willis
- **Whistling in the Dark** 8
Margot Puerta

MISCELLANEOUS

- **Smile When You Say That....** 11
- **Calendar** 12



Tearing Down Barriers

Deborah Bowman, MFA

Managing Editor

GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

dbowman@asge.org

I read an article online recently about obscure regional phrases. Such gems as “Stew the dishrag,” “Not enough sense to pound sand down a rat hole,” and “Whoopity scoot” were included. This made me think of a phrase I heard for the first time after I moved to Missouri: “I don’t even have a dog in this fight,” usually followed by “but....” It means “I have absolutely no stake in the subject we are discussing, but I’m going to give you my opinion anyway.” It is a phrase that can be quite useful in everyday life, but not when it comes to the ISMTE and *EON*. We can all give our opinions, talk about the things we know, and learn from each other.

Have you ever looked at BELS or AMWA certification and wondered whether it would benefit you? This month Jan Higgins recounts her experiences

with certification. Rachel Hendrick tells us about her PhD work with conflicts of interest and Puerta Margot explains how she redesigned her journal’s website to help them take advantage of new technologies. Finally, Michael Willis tells us how the European Conference Committee works to create a valuable experience for those attending that conference, held this year in Belgium.

Curious? Ok... “Stew the dishrag” means working hard to prepare a meal for unexpected guests. “Not enough sense to pound sand down a rat hole” means the person in question is too stupid to do the simplest things. And “Whoopity scoot” means to do something really fast, right away, lickety split. It’s time for us to all communicate and help each other be better Managing Editors. And let’s do it whoopity scoot.

Scientific Publishing Professional Certifications: BELS and AMWA

Jan Higgins

Managing Editor, *Genetics in Medicine*

When I left my career as a research scientist and took a job as a Managing Editor for a research journal, I was acutely aware that my formal qualifications (BSc and PhD) were very much suited to a research scientist career and not so much suited to a career in scientific publishing. I was also aware that my Editor-in-Chief (EIC) was on a five-year contract and that my predecessor was given the choice of moving from Minnesota to North Carolina, or to leave her position. She, of course, chose to leave but it did bring home to me that I might only have five years before I was looking for a new position.

I therefore wanted to ensure that my résumé was attractive to future employers in scientific publishing and started investigating what “formal” qualifications I might get in that regard (without going back to school full-time!). At that time (2007) I found two possibilities: American Medical Writers Association (AMWA) and Board of Editors in the Life Sciences (BELS). Here, I give you a quick rundown of what those certification programs are, but I encourage you to go to their websites so you can investigate these programs yourself.

Board of Editors in the Life Sciences (BELS) (<http://www.bels.org/>)

This certification program is quite quick and a lot cheaper than that offered by AMWA, though arguably more difficult, as it is an “experienced-based” three-hour exam. You must have a bachelor’s degree or equivalent and at least two years of experience as a manuscript editor in the life sciences to qualify to sit for the exam. A manuscript editor is defined by BELS “as one who is concerned not only with the form but with the intellectual content of a manuscript.” You need three letters from employers or clients describing and verifying your employment. You send all your documentation, and a \$50 application fee, to the registrar and receive confirmation that you are eligible to sit the exam. BELS provides a small

pamphlet to help you prepare for the exam, and this includes information on what the exam sets out to test. As well as the usual grammar and punctuation, they also test for very specific content knowledge such as bibliography completeness and adherence to style, as well as appropriate use of common scientific terms. BELS also tests your knowledge of research ethics and publishing practices, including fair use of copyrighted material and ethical principles and procedures in animal and human experimentation. The practice pamphlet contains 22 sample questions to give you some guidance on what types of questions are asked. Also supplied are the very detailed answers and explanations of why the answer was the best answer for that question. That’s all the study aides you get!

The test is administered two to three times per year at U.S. and international locations. Once you select an examination date, you submit a \$200 examination fee and receive confirmation that you are eligible to sit the exam at that location. The three-hour test contains 100 questions. Half the questions are designated as difficult; the other half are divided between easy and hard (note: I’m not sure the difference between difficult and hard – this is taken from the BELS website!). According to BELS, “correct answers to questions of different degrees of difficulty are awarded different numbers of points, and the examination is graded on a pass–fail basis. Because the questions are weighted for difficulty, there is no way to state the number of correct answers needed to pass. There is no scoring penalty for incorrect answers.”

In 2008, I received confirmation that I was eligible, along with my little pamphlet. I read the 22 sample questions and realized quite quickly that while answering the question: *Bq (becquerel) is most similar to (A) Ci (curie); (B) C (coulomb); (C) cal (calorie); (D) cd (candela)* was a breeze for a PhD-trained scientist, reading a paragraph of text and answering the following: *The second underlined passage (A) is a phrase, not a clause;*

(B) should be set off from the rest of the sentence by commas; (C) is a nonrestrictive clause; (D) is a restrictive clause, was going to pose me a few more problems! As the exam cost \$200, I decided to wait a bit before sitting it. Enter the AMWA certification course.

American Medical Writers Association (AMWA) <http://www.amwa.org>

I should point out that AMWA really offers continuing education for medical writers as well as their certification program. I should also point out that their program underwent significant changes in 2010 and I was enrolled in their earlier program: I am writing below about their current certification. AMWA offers 100 workshops, usually three hours each, also usually with some homework prior to taking the workshop. The workshops are divided into the categories of Essential Skills or four specialty certificate programs: Business, Composition & Publication, Concepts in Science & Medicine, and Regulatory & Research. The Essential Skills certificate requires a total of eight workshops. Each specialty certificate also requires eight workshops (one must be in ethics), and you must have completed the Essential Skills certificate first. So in all, 16 workshops are needed for a specialty certificate. A large selection of workshops is offered at the annual meeting each year, and a much smaller selection at local chapter meetings throughout the country. Six workshops (mostly Essential Skills) are offered as at-home study modules. Clearly, this certification route is a little more time consuming than that offered by BELS, but as I pointed out at the beginning, I would call this continuing education rather than just a certificate. You also can take any workshop without enrolling in the certificate program.

The complete list of workshops is available on AMWA's website, but to give you some idea of workshops offered, topics include Basic Grammar and Usage as well as Coaching Skills for Leaders, Making Effective Presentations, Essentials of Copyediting, Proofreading, and their mandatory

workshop, Ethics in Communicating Science and Medicine. Workshops are usually comprised of 10-20 attendees and very interactive.

I enrolled in 2008 under AMWA's previous certificate program. This was much lighter and only required four Essential Skills workshops and four specialty workshops to be completed within three years. The cost for AMWA certification is quite a bit higher than the BELS exam, but then this is a taught program rather than just an exam. Workshops cost approximately \$100 to \$125 each (for AMWA members), and enrollment in the Essential Skills program is \$150, with \$150 extra for enrollment in a specialty certification program. You must complete all your workshops within six years.

I completed several basic grammar and usage courses through AMWA, which gave me the confidence I needed to sit the BELS exam. I passed the BELS exam in 2010 and earned my AMWA certificate in 2012 (Specialty Editing and Writing under their old scheme).

Was it worth it? Well, I am still in my same position as Managing Editor after six years, as my EIC re-upped for another five years. So I haven't tested whether these credentials have improved my chances of getting another job. I would say, however, that I'm much more confident in my grammar skills compared to where I was six years ago. I've learned an awful lot about publishing and editing and, in the case of AMWA, I'm a member of a large society that has a great local chapter and is a networking resource. (BELS does not have annual meetings nor local groups and is considerably smaller than AMWA.) AMWA workshops have been a great place to meet people and make new contacts both locally and nationally.

I enjoyed the process of continued learning and now am looking at both societies' next level of certification: BELS Diplomate Program and AMWA's Advanced Specialty Certificates. If I ever get around to doing those certifications, I'll report back on how it went!



Conflicts of Interest in Medical Publishing: An Analysis of Existing Guidelines

By Rachel Hendrick
University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

My PhD topic is “Communication Ethics in Medical Journal Publications.” Based in the department of Social Policy’s “Global Public Health Unit” at the University of Edinburgh, it is supported by the *British Medical Journal* and is funded by the UK’s Economic and Social Research Council.

My professional experience of working in academic and medical publishing exposed me to some of the problems that can arise in the field, and the possible difficulties in balancing ethical practice with a successful business, which contributed to my interest in the project.

This research explores the ethical challenges that exist within the business of medical journal publishing, and focuses on conflicts of interest and the management of them. These result from relationships between different actors, which can lead to bias and potentially affect the content of journal articles, with the research being distorted and misrepresented. This can ultimately have an impact on public health, as journal articles presenting medical research impact policy decisions and influence prescribing practices.

Concerns over conflicts of interest have risen to prominence following lawsuits against the pharmaceutical industry. Documents have been made public as a result of these cases and they demonstrate the ways in which medical journal articles, reporting the results of clinical trials, can be used as vehicles to market products, rather than providing honest evaluations of the evidence (Smith, 2005).

A review of the literature, which includes research that has been written based on these documents, has demonstrated the various ways that commercial interests have, at times, spun and shaped scientific discourse so that products

are presented in an unjustifiably favourable light, with benefits emphasised and negative side effects hidden (e.g. Schott et al., 2010). This can be achieved, for example, through the employment of ghost authors (undisclosed medical writers) who write the articles under the direction of the sponsoring company, while guest authors – often prominent academics or physicians – are paid to put their names on the articles (Ross et al., 2008). This allows conflicts to remain hidden.

There is therefore a need for relationships between actors, and the conflicts of interest that result from them, to be managed effectively so that, where possible, bias does not slip into the articles and affect their content. Or, at the very least, if conflicts are disclosed, audiences will be better able to judge the discussion accordingly.

To date, the management of conflicts of interest has been largely handled through a system of self-regulation. Journals have produced publishing policies and guidelines instructing their authors on what constitute conflicts of interests, and explaining how they should be disclosed. Professional organisations, such as the ICMJE, COPE, and WAME have also developed a variety of policies to deal with the conflicts of interest of those involved in the production of articles. However, at least to some degree, these organisations are financially dependent upon commercial industries, and are thus themselves conflicted. This therefore suggests that there are reasons to be cautious about their policies.

I am therefore critically analysing a sample of these guidelines in order to investigate how they both conceptualise and respond to the conflicts of interest that result from the involvement of commercial industries in medical journals. This

involves an analysis of the language used in the guidelines, as well as supporting documents.

I am also conducting interviews with people working in the field, to develop an understanding of what they consider the ethical problems to be, and the ways in which they both identify and handle them. Further, I want to explore how this information is communicated to authors, and gauge their thoughts on the issues and the guidelines.

I am therefore interested in speaking to: managing editors; journal editors; publishers; researchers/authors submitting work to journals; and medical writers involved in developing content. I would also like to speak to those who are involved with producing professional guidelines for organisations such as ISMTE, ICMJE, COPE, ISMPP, and WAME.

It is hoped that this research will ultimately lead to suggestions for a more effective way to manage conflicts of interest in medical journal publishing.

If you would like to be involved in this research, please get in touch at R.Hendrick@sms.ed.ac.uk

To find out more visit: http://www.socialpolicy.ed.ac.uk/student_profiles/current_students/hendrick_rachel

ROSS, J. S., HILL, K. P., EGILMAN, D. S. & KRUMHOLZ, H. M. 2008. Guest Authorship and Ghostwriting in Publications Related to Rofecoxib. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 299, 1800 - 1812.

SCHOTT, G., PACHL, H., LIMBACH, U., GUNDERT-REMY, U., LIEB, K. & LUDWIG, W. D. 2010. The financing of drug trials by pharmaceutical companies and its consequences: part 2: a qualitative, systematic review of the literature on possible influences on authorship, access to trial data, and trial registration and publication. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International*, 107, 295-301.

SMITH, R. 2005. Medical journals are an extension of the marketing arm of pharmaceutical companies. *PLoS Medicine*, 2.

Puzzle Over It

The name of a famous European painter has an unusual characteristic.

1. Change the last letter of his five-letter first name to the letter that comes next alphabetically.
2. Rearrange those letters and you'll get his five-letter last name.

In other words, except for one letter, his last name contains the same letters (in different order) as his first name.

Who is this artist?

The answer will be found in next month's issue of *EON*

Answers to last month's puzzle:

1. Catch Me If You Can
2. Walk the Line
3. The Empire Strikes Back
4. Out of Africa
5. My Fair Lady
6. Double Indemnity
7. Blade Runner
8. Home Alone





Lights...camera...action!

Michael Willis

ISMTE European Conference Committee

Being a member of the Conference Committee is, I imagine, rather like directing a film. Extensive planning leads up to the big event. People and props need to be in the right place at the right time. There is a bustle of activity on the set. And the final cut is very rewarding.

It was in 2009 that I joined the Conference Committee to plan ISMTE's Second European Conference which took place in Oxford in August of that year. We had decided to hold the conference in Oxford, and given that I work and live in the area, it was helpful to have at least one person *in situ* to liaise with the venue and assist with the practicalities around the event.

With very little feedback from the previous year's inaugural conferences, we had to devise an agenda and topics that we felt would be most useful to delegates. Now, with several years' worth of conferences behind us, and with a great set of feedback from delegates at previous conferences, we can and do plan agendas which we know will be of importance for the majority of those attending.

All our committee meetings now take place on Skype. Planning typically begins early in the year, setting the date and a crude outline of the themes and format. That means we can put a "save the date" notice in *EON* and on the website. We'll aim to work up a draft agenda, complete with provisional titles and speaker names, by Easter. After the Easter holiday we shift up a gear to try and secure confirmation of speakers by late April, with a view to publicising full details of the conference around early May. The rest of the behind the scenes work goes on periodically throughout the year, finalising venue requirements, obtaining abstracts and biographies from the speakers, and giving briefs to the workshop facilitators.

Some of the speakers and workshop facilitators for the conference may be invited because they are experts in a particular area. Now in only its sixth

year, the ISMTE is in the happy position of being recognised by publishers and other organisations as having a significant voice within the industry, and people are pleased to accept our invitations to participate either as a keynote speaker or as a workshop chair. Actually, however, a fundamental guiding principle is that we view the conference as a peer-to-peer meeting and try to encourage the involvement of as many ISMTE members as possible, and we feel the ISMTE is serving its membership well when members have the opportunity to lead workshops or present from the front at a plenary session.

Traditionally the European conference has taken up just one day, as opposed to the day-and-a-half of the North American conference. The day used to end with a cheese and wine reception, although this was not well attended: many preferred to leave promptly at the end of the conference. We felt strongly that, since a key benefit of the conference is for delegates to meet and interact with each other, we should dispense with the reception and instead provide a dinner on the evening prior to the conference to which delegates and conference speakers are invited. This has been well received; it's a relaxed occasion, allowing people to "break the ice" and to hear from an invited dinner speaker on a relevant topic distinct from the agenda of the main conference.

The week leading up to the conference is a busy and, I will admit, can be a stressful one. There is never a dull moment, whether it's doing a final check to ensure that the venue staff have the same expectations as those of the committee (correct catering and audiovisual requirements) or ensuring that all the conference materials are safely received. We have been extremely well looked after by the two venues we have used in Oxford, St Hugh's and St Anne's Colleges, and our meetings could never have run as smoothly as they have done without their support and good management. Leslie, our

Executive Director, ISMTE headquarters, has also been extremely accommodating and patient as we have finessed our plans, sometimes very late in the day. We could never have put together these conferences as we have done without her support.

On the day itself there is plenty to do, from welcoming delegates and ensuring they are looked after – I feel that we are very much their hosts for the day – through to seeing that the speakers are also welcomed and catered for, and checking that the audiovisual facilities function properly and catering is provided as arranged. It's good if someone can be photographer for the day, so that we have a record of the occasion for the ISMTE website and *EON*. Unfortunately all this activity does occasionally mean that, as committee members, we have often been on the fringe of some conference sessions – distracted by mundane but important practicalities rather than involved in stimulating discussions – but this is I think the only disadvantage I have felt in being a committee member.

For a couple of years the ISMTE has strengthened its ties with the European Association of Science Editors (EASE),¹ with whom we have a degree

¹ www.ease.org.uk

of overlap in terms of our interests and goals. Our first pre-conference speaker was an EASE committee member, and we have had reciprocal arrangements with the Association for conference registration discounts. This year we look forward to collaborating with EASE in a new venture for ISMTE – our first European conference outside the UK, and a joint conference spread over two days. Working in coordination with the conference committee for another organisation has also opened up new challenges and opportunities.

A final note to anyone who may be weighing up whether or not to join one of our conference committees: When I joined the committee I had never organised a conference, although I had some experience of organising business meetings, and I learned much in the early days from more experienced team members such as Irene Hames and Caroline Black. Lack of experience is therefore no bar to anyone from joining the committee, and in fact joining the committee gives you a wealth of experience. Remember it's a committee, not a one-man band; you will learn from others, and they will learn from you. It can be hard work but it's hugely rewarding.

The Philosophy of Editing

Bi—What Do you Mean?

Her boyfriend promised to call her bi-weekly. Now she doesn't know what to expect.

The problem is that “bi” means both “two” and “twice” according to the dictionary. So does “bi-weekly” mean twice a week or every two weeks? it's not just that no one knows the right answer; it's that both answers are correct; it can mean either! What's a person to do?

The best answer is to avoid those “bi” words (bi-weekly, bi-monthly, bi-annually). Just tell your girlfriend you'll call her twice a week and be done with it. More importantly, if authors in your journal say they tell their patients to do something bi-weekly, make them be more explicit.





Whistling in the Dark

Redesign of a Website: From Concept to Execution

Margot Puerta

Managing Editor, *Molecular Medicine*

Communication technologies are continually evolving. How can journals take advantage of available tools and technology to best benefit their audience? In this column of “Whispering in the Dark,” I’ll take you through the steps I followed to redesign my journal’s website in light of evolving communication technologies.

Concept – I was driving to work listening to one of my favorite podcasts when I got to thinking about our journal’s web presence. Our website, while functional in pushing out information, needed an update. It didn’t engage users in a way that would ultimately benefit biomedical research. We needed a change.

Research – While my Editor was supportive, he was also realistic. We needed data to guide us in our strategy. There were (and continue to be) a number of technologies to choose from with low barriers to entry. However, just because we could utilize these technologies didn’t mean we should. Which technologies would we implement and why? Our Editorial Office consists of a limited staff and jumping headfirst into every available technology would be unwise. We needed a sustainable model. I found a book I liked, *Groundswell: Winning in a World Transformed by Social Technologies* by Li and Bernoff (Forrester Research, Inc.). This book provided basic ideas on social technologies and how to harness them to their advantage. I generated and analyzed an end-user survey in order to gauge interest in various technologies for the journal’s scientific audience. My data indicated our end-users would be most interested in activities that promote categorization, organization, rating, and consumption of information. I translated this into the following technologies: discussion forums to read, rating systems (1-5 stars), short polls, the ability to tag, and sorting of papers by disease.

Pitch to management – Once I had data suggesting the types of new media our users would be interested in I approached my senior management team. I described the need for an improved website based on gaps in the current website, described the research survey results, presented a plan for which technologies to use and why, and the desired new website outcome with some rough estimates for measures of success. I was pleased to receive buy-in from senior leadership.

Form a team – Redefining our web presence was a large project and I needed help. I formed a small in-house team of people with varying skill sets from copyediting and production to design and video. The diverse team member backgrounds provided by the group allowed us to more fully define what we needed from a new website. We held several brainstorming sessions to discuss how the site should function. I then asked each team member to write a one-page description of the new website. This is an invaluable exercise as it encourages team members to describe the vision in their own words. It highlights where the team is in sync and where the team diverges in understanding. We discussed the one page descriptions and came to a unified understanding of the future website.

Request for proposal and external vendors – Next we put together a request for proposal (RFP) to share with vendors. An RFP details the scope of work along with other project details such as cost, timelines, descriptions of services, and technical goals.¹ Our earlier one-page summaries

1 <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/request-for-proposals-RFP.html> Accessed April 3, 2013

came in handy drafting the RFP. We placed as much detail as possible in the request, including preliminary wireframe diagrams. The wireframes helped us visually present how we anticipated the website functioning, basically, a page layout.² Our wireframes were informal PowerPoint slides with boxes representing various webpage page elements. Next we researched vendors and listed candidates for the project. We sent out the RFP and evaluated responses.

Select a vendor – We vetted three external vendors and an in-house team. We interviewed the groups in person where possible and selected a vendor that had a successful track record with other biomedical groups. We reviewed the budget and received senior management approval.

Statement of work and contract – In order to begin the process with an external vendor we needed a statement of work (SOW) from them. A statement of work defines project activities, timeline, and deliverables.³ Again, our one-page summaries and RFP came in handy drafting the SOW. In addition to the statement of work, a contract template was supplied by the vendor to our legal team. After revision, revision, revision, the contract was approved.

And finally...start development process!

Planning document – This was one of our most important steps in the process. The vendor supplied us with a template planning document approximately 20 pages in length. Each team member filled it out individually and we met to review our responses prior to any discussions with the vendor. This was our one-page summary document on steroids. Items covered in the document ranged from team member contact information and needs of the journal to site configuration and business goals. It's extremely important to outline exactly what you want early in the process. This will avoid confusion later. After several meetings with the vendor, I signed off on the planning document.

Communication with the vendor – We set regular meeting times with the vendor and monitored tasks

through project management software. Lessons I learned at this stage – if you don't understand something technical at this point, ask. Seemingly small items may have a large impact on the back end of your website. Additionally, learn to work well with your vendor. While they work for you, they have the potential to be a valuable partner and contribute to a successful business strategy.

Rage against the feature creep – It's very enticing to say, "Wouldn't it be great if the new website could (fill in fancy new feature idea)?" Technology changes rapidly and it's important to evaluate whether you really do need that new feature, and the additional cost associated with implementing it. This is where having your end-user data can guide your decision-making.

Legal documents – Ah, the legal documents section. Have you ever read the iTunes Terms of Service? Or the Facebook Privacy Policy? Or the LinkedIn Community Guidelines? I have. Did you know the Digital Millennium Copyright Act requires that certain items be included on a website? I do (now). My advice here – read over a few examples of the required legal documents (e.g. Terms of Service, Privacy Policy) before meeting with your attorney. If you are lucky enough to have a legal team that will do this all for you, take that option.

Beta test – Serendipitously, my publisher is also a biomedical research institute. I was able to nudge the researchers at the institute to beta test the site (Starbucks cards for feedback – hey, a researcher has to stay caffeinated). This provided invaluable feedback. This group asked questions I did not and pointed out items I had overlooked – being so deeply involved in the project. I compiled a list of "asks" and met with the vendor to review them. To my surprise some of the items were easily addressed at little or no additional cost, while others required more thought and review. Again, be careful of the feature creep and your timelines when evaluating feature requests.

Quality Control – Anyone who has done copyediting has done this. Check every web page, check all the navigation, check all the copy, check all the links, and check all the video. Twice.

Launch – We picked a Friday evening and flipped the switch moving our staging site to our live site. It took about 48 hours to propagate all

2 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Website_wireframe
Accessed April 3, 2013

3 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statement_of_work
Accessed April 3, 2013

our content and I spent the weekend checking the site and making adjustments. In the end, there were no major snags, just high-fives on Monday morning.

As we know, communication technologies are an evolving animal. While the description above takes you through some of the basic steps I took

to update the journal's website to make better use of our content, the work isn't over. In addition to monitoring the site and nurturing membership, I will continue to evaluate vendor upgrades and new technologies that may lend additional value to the journal and ultimately advance biomedical research.



Smile When You Say That....

Sometimes writers are the toughest critics. What follows are insults from writers about other writers.

“The more I read him, the less I wonder why they poisoned him.”
Thomas Babington Macaulay, talking about Socrates

“A queasy undergraduate scratching his pimples.” Virginia Woolf
talking about James Joyce

“I think he is our greatest writer. What’s unfortunate is that our
greatest writer should be a bum.” Pauline Kael talking about
Norman Mailer

“He writes fiction as if it were a painful duty.” Oscar Wilde talking
about Henry James

“He couldn’t blow his nose without moralizing on the conditions
in the handkerchief industry.” Cyril Connolly talking about
George Orwell

“Poor Matt. He’s gone to heaven, no doubt—but he won’t
like God.” Robert Louis Stevenson upon the death of Matthew
Arnold



Calendar of Events

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>

Fundamentals of Journals Finance
June 25, 2013
London, England
<http://www.alpsp.org>

Effective Journals Marketing
July 9, 2013
London, England
<http://www.alpsp.org>

ALPSP International Annual Conference
Sept. 11-13, 2013
The Belfry near Birmingham, United Kingdom
<http://www.alpsp.org>

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

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
<http://www.ismte.org>

Thank You

to our Corporate Sponsors!

Gold Level

Wiley-Blackwell

Silver Level

Origin

Bronze Level

Aries Systems Corporation, BMJ Groups
eJournalPress,
j&tj editorial, LLC, Oxford University Press,
Thomson Reuters

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 newsletter of the International Society of Managing and Technical Editors (ISMTE) and is published monthly. The contents and opinions expressed by the authors do not necessarily represent those of the Society, the Board of Directors, or *EON* Editors, nor does the publication of an article constitute an endorsement on the part of ISMTE of the authors' organizations or companies. Submissions are welcome and can be sent to the Editor at the address below. Submissions may be edited for style and format without the author's permission. Authors must seek permission to reprint any copyrighted material and provide this permission to the Editor.

EON's content belongs to the members of ISMTE. Users may view and download *EON* articles for personal, non-commercial use. Use beyond that allowed by the "Fair Use" limitations (sections 107 and 108) of the U.S. Copyright law requires written permission from the *EON* editor.

Editor:

Deborah Bowman
dbowman@asge.org

Associate Editors:

Meghan McDevitt
mmcdevitt@asge.org

Emily Mueller
emueller@allenpress.com

Susan Scalia
susan@awra.org

Editorial Advisor:

Kristen Overstreet
Kristen.overstreet@mac.com

Section Editors:

Ethics: Ira Salkin
Irasalkin@aol.com

Taming Technology: Lindsey Brounstein
lbrounstein@gastro.org

Whistling In The Dark: Meghan McDevitt
mmcdevitt@asge.org

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.

CONTACT

ISMTE Executive Office:

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

Thank You to our Corporate Sponsors!

Gold Level



Silver Level



Bronze Level



THOMSON REUTERS

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