We hear much these days about how social media is isolating us; I, however, have had the opposite experience. Participating in social media sites has helped me to know when friends need consoling and when they deserve congratulations; in short, it has helped me maintain human connections. In the recent tragedy at the Boston Marathon, many runners were able to reassure friends and family quickly by posting on Facebook. One man wrote, “If any of you know Mark Zuckerberg, please thank him for me.”

We can’t deny the impact of social media on our lives. In this issue of EON, author Molly Greene writes about the nuts and bolts of blogging. Reading her article will take away some of your fears and will give you great direction in starting a blog for your journal. My journal is in the process of joining the trend of starting a blog, and we found Molly’s advice to be valuable in navigating the process. It’s not as scary as you might imagine!

Gone are the days when every journal submission is a straightforward article; most have photos, podcasts, videos, author interviews, and various links. ISMTE member Rachel Russell of the American Mineralogist journal writes about how her journal handles supplemental data and how they keep it organized.

COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) has new ethical guidelines for peer reviewers. In this issue of EON, Irene Hames, author of Peer Review and Manuscript Management in Scientific Journals and COPE Council member, reviews the updated COPE ethical guidelines for reviewers and the reasons for the updates. Don’t miss this important article on ethics, a subject that affects us, our authors, and our journals every single day.
The connections we make through social media are important; those we make through the ISMTE are vital for our professional lives. I hope that EON is helping you to feel connected to other Editors. Please make this journal your own by letting me know what you would like to see in it. Email me at dbowman@asge.org with your ideas or suggestions.

The Philosophy of Editing

Do you feel bad? Or do you feel badly? Of course you know that adverbs are used to describe action verbs, so you can dance beautifully or eat quickly or scream loudly. But when you use a linking verb, such as feel, seem, taste, smell, or look, then you link the subject with an adjective. So the food tastes bad, not badly. The girl seems sad, not sadly. And you feel bad, not badly…unless you are talking about how well your sense of touch is actually working. Similarly, if you say to someone, “You smell badly,” you are saying that his sense of smell is out of whack. If you are trying to tell the person that he needs to use deodorant, tell him that he smells bad.
Blogging can be a powerful tool for business generation. According to a 2012 report by the inbound marketing experts at HubSpot, the average company with a blog generates 55% more website visitors, and businesses that post new content even once or twice a month get much more traffic than those that don’t blog at all.

It takes time to build an online article library, but the time spent is worthwhile; every post forges another path to your website. Per HubSpot, “an average company will see a 45% growth in traffic when total blog articles increase from 11-20 to 21-50, and a 59% increase when total blog articles reach 100 to 200.”

Blogging gets results, and it can be a powerful tool for business generation. The challenge is that companies of all sizes are now aware of the possibilities, and literally millions of blogs spring up every year to over-populate the Internet, eagerly competing for readers.

As a blogger, one of the most significant lessons I’ve learned is that consistently generating great content that benefits your target audience is the core of a successful online strategy. I’ve also learned that getting educated about best practices and establishing an overall plan and an editorial schedule will keep you on track with your goals. Here are some of the basics that apply to most successful blogs:

**Step 1: Define your target audience, determine general blog categories, and create an editorial calendar**

The better you understand the needs of your ideal reader, the easier it will be to write content that will engage them. Understanding your audience’s needs will also help you decide on a topic focus and make it easier to attract them to your blog. Note: A blog’s category list is similar to a table of contents. Categories are broad, such as “Social Media.” Topics that fall under a category are much more focused, such as “Twitter.”

You can use polls, questionnaires, and surveys to solicit article suggestions. Once you’ve decided on a topic, establish an editorial calendar that reflects the days you’ll post as well as what you’ll write about each time. This content calendar will help you “brand” your message and meet the needs of your target audience. Note: Experts say it’s best to post at least twice per week; however, your company’s individual publishing schedule will depend on you. Posting a new article once every week will get results, it just may take a little longer.

Ask colleagues to fill in once in a while with guest posts that compliment your plan. Guest bloggers help defray the time and responsibility of writing every post, and your readers benefit from the knowledge, insight, and expertise of others. In addition, guest bloggers with their own social media communities will share their content – a.k.a. their guest posts – across their networks. Include guests’ bios, headshots, and social media links at the end of their posts, and be sure to have written guidelines for them, such as:

- Word count range.
- Topic ideas.
- Content due/date or deadline range.
- Material to include, such as bio, blurb about their book, headshot, et cetera.

**Step 2: Create a blog post template**

Devising an article template is a method that can help bloggers write and prepare each post in minimal time. Once you establish a basic “look” and layout for your posts and assemble your topic notes and/or resource material, you’ll do less searching for inspiration and more filling in the blanks. This will not be a rigid template, but a general plan that addresses the introduction, image placement, paragraph length, and closing statements. The following represents the basic outline for a tutorial-type post:
Compelling title: Your headline serves the dual purpose of conveying content and grabbing readers’ attention. It will also help with search engine optimization (SEO) if your title contains a keyword or keyword phrase.

Intro with a hook: Your first paragraph will be your hook, designed to compel the reader to continue. If your intro is interesting enough to get people to read the first four sentences, they’ll be more likely to read the entire article.

Describe the benefits: Entice readers with a promise. Tell them how they’ll benefit if they read your post. Explain the issue and how you’re going to help them overcome it.

Resolution: What are the readers’ options for a workable solution?

Implement the solution: Provide practical advice readers can easily follow and describe the steps they’ll take to get there. Demonstrate how they can get solid results.

Conclusion: Tell them what you told them in the body of the post.

Call to action: Invite readers to subscribe! Always include a call to action and ask readers to subscribe to your blog or newsletter email list.

Clearly, you will write faster if you have a solid idea of the article’s overall content and direction before you begin. You can use your template to accomplish this – simply spend a few minutes to jot notes about the points you want to make in the intro paragraph, body paragraphs, and conclusion. Then go back and fill the content in.

Note: In general, blog articles tend to be written in an informal “conversational” style, as opposed to the more formal business writing style you’re probably used to. Your own articles will reflect the brand and message of your company.

Step 3: Format each article to be “scannable”

How a blog post is formatted can influence whether or not you hold your readers’ interest. Although great content should be the core of every post, the way you present information can also affect your blog’s readership and ratings. Incorporating customary operating procedures into each article you write will help you standardize your process and tick all the boxes required for building a successful blog. Here are a few basics you want to be sure to weave into every post, every time:

- Avoid long paragraphs. Reduce large paragraphs into smaller groups of four or so sentences. If you format each post using small paragraphs, you’ll keep more readers on the page.
- Break up text with bold subheads. Bolded subheads will both stop and hold the reader’s eye and define blocks of information for them.
- Use bulleted and numbered lists. Avoid long explanations separated by commas; instead, break strings of data down into bulleted or numbered sections. This method will help the reader scan your article.
- Include links to relevant sources. Linking to pertinent information online is helpful to readers and good for you. Google likes to see articles refer to related content, and such links will build authority for you with search engines. Too many links can be detrimental, so use only one link every 200 words or so.
- Add images. Images break up the copy and provide visual interest. Strive to include at least one good image in every post, whether it’s a graph, infographic, screenshot, photo, poll, or illustration. Note: You’ll need to understand and follow copyright law carefully.
- Post length. Blog posts should be long enough to successfully get your point across succinctly. You’ll read references to blog post length that range from 200 words to 1,200 words; some experts suggest that search engines prefer longer posts because it increases their ability to “read” what the post is about.

Email posts as an excerpt

I recommend that you set up blog posts to be sent to subscribers as an “excerpt” (first couple of
Blogging 101

paragraphs only) as opposed to emailing the entire post. Subscribers who receive the full article don’t need to visit your blog to read it. An excerpt will encourage more actual website visits, which will help boost your traffic stats.

Step 4: Share your blog posts and automate your sharing process

Once your article has been published, you’ll need to “share” the link across your social media platforms and encourage your readers to share it across theirs. Third-party vendors such as Hootsuite, which was discussed in ISMTE’s March newsletter, make it simple and effortless to promote your blog. Your core social networks will probably be Google+, LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, and Pinterest. If you create video content, consider YouTube. Creating and growing a following on at least one or two of these platforms will help grow a blog’s community of readers. Be sure to include social media share buttons on every post page so readers can easily post your content to these sites.

Molly Greene is an author, blogger, and blogging coach. Her nonfiction titles include Blog It! The author’s guide to building a successful online brand, and the self-awareness guide, Someone Worth Becoming (July 2013). Molly is working on a second novel, Rapunzel; her fiction debut, Mark of the Loon, is available at major online retailers. Meanwhile, she blogs about her life, blogging, and self-publishing topics at Molly-Greene.com. Follow and Friend Molly on Twitter • Goodreads • Facebook • Google+
COPE (the Committee on Publication Ethics) provides advice to editors and publishers on all aspects of publication ethics. To help fulfil that remit, it produces a number of guidelines that are freely available on its website http://publicationethics.org/. On 22 March 2013, COPE published its most recent set, Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers, launching them at the annual European Seminar in London. They are available at http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/.

Why are the guidelines needed?

Peer reviewers play a central and critical part in peer review – the process couldn’t function without them – but too often they come to the role without guidance and may be unaware of their ethical obligations. Few researchers receive training in peer review, but it is something many would like to have. For example, in the large international survey on peer review carried out by Sense About Science in 2009 (Sense About Science, 2009; Mulligan et al., 2013), 56% of researchers felt there is generally a lack of guidance on how to review papers, and 68% thought formal training would improve the quality of reviews (73% of those under the age of 36 years). The lack of guidance and training becomes even more surprising when one considers the scale of scholarly journal peer review: an estimated 1.8 million articles are now published every year in about 28,000 peer-reviewed scholarly journals (Ware and Mabe, 2012), so it follows that many millions of reviews are carried out annually. Peer-reviewer reports are central to decisions on what is published and where, and because publication records play a large part in the job, promotion, and funding prospects of researchers, peer reviewers have enormous impact on the careers of other researchers.

Some recent cases of reviewer misconduct have also highlighted the need for guidelines that lay out clearly the expected standards to which peer reviewers should adhere, and what is considered unacceptable behaviour. In 2012 there were at least three cases of “fake reviewers,” where the suggested reviewers provided by authors were not what they appeared to be. Some authors provided either false identities (and emails) which were them or their colleagues, or the names of real people but created fake email accounts for them which they or their associates had access to (see the “faked emails” category on the blog Retraction Watch, http://retractionwatch.wordpress.com/, for the full stories). The reviews were done by the authors and/or their associates under the false identities and returned to the journal. Worryingly, there were not just a few isolated incidents at a single journal (although one did have a large number). The cases involved different journals, different publishers, different disciplines, and a large number of papers. In the case of one author, 28 papers had to be retracted (Oransky, 2012a), with notices that stated:

“The peer-review process for the above articles was found to have been compromised and inappropriately influenced by the corresponding author … as a result the findings and conclusions of these articles cannot be relied upon.”

Suggested reviewers can be very valuable to editors, but it is critical that journals run checks to ensure not only that those people are suitable reviewers without any conflicts, but that they actually exist, and if they do, that their contact details are legitimate. One of the publishers
whom journals have been involved in the above retractions has acknowledged that “the integrity of the peer review process should have been subject to more rigorous verification to ensure the reviews provided were genuine and impartial,” and has updated its guidance for editors to advise that reviewers other than just those suggested by authors should be involved in the review of manuscripts (Oransky, 2012b), which is sound advice. The integration of ORCID (http://orcid.org/) into online manuscript submission and review systems will also help verify the identity of authors and reviewers.

Improper conduct in all types of peer review is generally viewed as unacceptable, and this includes the actions of reviewers. For example, new guidelines from Research Councils UK (RCUK, 2013) note that unacceptable research conduct includes (Section 3, p7):

“Improper conduct in peer review of research proposals or results (including manuscripts submitted for publication); this includes failure to disclose conflicts of interest; inadequate disclosure of clearly limited competence; misappropriation of the content of material; and breach of confidentiality or abuse of material provided in confidence for peer review purposes.”

“Misrepresentation” is also listed as unacceptable conduct in these guidelines, which would include the behaviour by the authors and “reviewers” in the above “faked emails” cases.

As well as providing an ethical framework for reviewers, it was felt the new COPE guidelines would be a resource junior people could use to present to more senior people – such as editorial assistants to editors, and early-career researchers to their group leaders – when they find themselves in situations they have ethical concerns about but which they don’t know how to address or rectify.

The process to the guidelines
We started by setting our aims for the guidelines. They should:

• be comprehensive but easily understood, both internationally and across all career stages
• be a reference and resource for journals and editors in guiding and educating their reviewers
• be suitable as an educational resource for institutions in training their students and researchers.

The draft guidelines were ready late January 2013 and were then posted on the COPE website for a period of three weeks of community feedback. Thirty-six individuals and groups provided comments, many of which were thoughtful and valuable. The draft guidelines were then revised to address the feedback and clarify things that had caused confusion or misunderstanding. A number of issues had to be taken to Council for discussion and decision, either because there were a number of possible options or because they’d proved controversial. The guidelines start with the basic principles to which peer reviewers should adhere and are then organized into sections: expectations during the peer-review process (on being approached to review, during review, when preparing the report) and expectations post review (because obligations don’t stop when reviewers submit their reviews).

What were the main issues in the feedback period?
There were many positive and enthusiastic comments, welcoming the guidelines and stating what a great resource they would be. There were some concerns about the length of the document and that researchers wouldn’t read them, but we felt it important that the guidelines be comprehensive and spell out clearly the ethical issues and requirements. A few points were felt to be too prescriptive and so some flexibility was introduced. For example, it shouldn’t be a requirement for reviewers to declare if they become aware of the identity of the authors during double-blind review; rather they should only “notify the journal if this knowledge raises any potential conflict of interest.” It was also felt it shouldn’t be a requirement that reviewers declare if they’ve already reviewed a manuscript for
Another journal; rather they should “review afresh any manuscript they have previously reviewed for another journal as it may have changed between the two submissions and the journals’ criteria for evaluation and acceptance may be different.”

Other issues came up. One concerned use of the word “timely” because the interpretation of what is considered timely varies so much between journals. So use of this word was carefully assessed and textual changes made where appropriate, e.g. “peer reviewers should only agree to review a manuscript if they are fairly confident they can return a review within the proposed or mutually agreed time-frame, informing the journal promptly if they require an extension.” Another issue was the suggestion that all reviewers should be required to have an institutional email address. This wasn’t added to the guidelines because it is clear there are people actively involved in scholarly publishing and research integrity issues who work outside of the institutional framework. A good suggestion concerned reviewing work from authors not writing in their native language. Such authors sometimes feel there are issues of bias or hostility in the reviews they receive because of language issues. The following was added in response:

“Peer reviewers should be aware of the sensitivities surrounding language issues that are due to the authors writing in a language that is not their own, and phrase the feedback appropriately and with due respect.”

Journals shouldn’t send out to reviewers manuscripts in which the language is too poor for the work to be understood – it’s not fair to either the reviewers or the authors (Hames, 2007, pp38-39) – but from comments I hear from researchers, it’s clear that there isn’t always adequate screening before manuscripts are sent out to reviewers.

What were the controversial issues?

Involvement of junior researchers

The original draft stated “Peer reviewers should not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript without first obtaining permission from the journal.” Quite a few commentators thought that the case of junior researchers should be exempt from this because supervisors frequently involve members of their groups in the review of manuscripts they’ve been sent without telling the journals involved. Even though journals know this occurs (“tolerate it,” as one commentator put it), this wasn’t felt to be ideal and concerns were voiced in the feedback about lack of transparency and appropriate accountability, and a blurring of the boundaries (“if you can delegate to someone in your lab, why not to anyone?”). COPE Council felt that it should be made explicit that permission from journals should be sought by researchers wanting to involve their junior colleagues in reviewing, especially as there are related issues with lack of appropriate credit. When junior researchers review for their principal investigators (PIs) without journals knowing about this, their efforts can’t be acknowledged. They can’t therefore receive any of the “rewards” journals give their reviewers – even the simplest and most usual one of featuring the names of their reviewers in an annual list – or be recognized in their own right in journals’ databases and so build up a reviewing record with journals. This is one of the most common issues I get asked about by young researchers: how can they stop this happening and how can they persuade their PIs to tell journals they’ve helped co-review manuscripts? Hopefully now they will be able to point to the COPE guidelines, which say:

“Peer reviewers should not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript, including junior researches they are mentoring, without first obtaining permission from the journal; the names of any individuals who have helped them with the review should be included with the returned review so that they are associated with the manuscript in the journal’s records and can also receive due credit for their efforts.”

Editors acting as reviewers for manuscripts they are handling in blind review

This was the most controversial issue. The original draft stated that if editors decide themselves to review a manuscript they are handling, for example if they are having difficulties finding enough expert
COPE’s new Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

By Irene Hames

external reviewers and they have the relevant expertise, they should do this transparently and not via an anonymous review, i.e. one that looks as though it has been done by an independent external reviewer. Various reasons were given in the feedback why editors should be able to review anonymously: that cases where it’s difficult to find reviewers will take even longer; if they can’t do it anonymously they may be constrained in their review and not be as rigorous as they would otherwise be; taking away anonymity will discourage editors reviewing and result in delayed or even no decisions for some manuscripts.

But is it ethical? I don’t think so. Reviewers have editors to oversee them and make sure their reviews are appropriate, conflicting interests are taken into account and comments are evaluated and moderated. When editors act as their own reviewers there isn’t anyone to oversee and moderate them. It’s also misleading the authors, who think they’ve received, for example, two independent reviews and a set of editor comments, whereas in reality they’ve received only one independent review and two sets of editor comments. What if there are no other reviewers? When researchers find out about the practice of “ghostwritten” reviews, it erodes trust and confidence in peer review (Vines, 2012). Being an editor isn’t always easy, and there has to be transparency and accountability in all situations. If an editor needs to carry out a proper review of a manuscript they are handling, they should tell the authors this and why, putting their review either in the editorial correspondence or onto the online system, but with their name on it – this means the other reviewers can see this in those journals where reviewers don’t get to see editorial correspondence.

What we ended up with after Council discussion was the following, which recognizes that it is acceptable for editors to act as reviewers for manuscripts other editors are handling at their journal:

“Peer reviewers should if they are the editor handling a manuscript and decide themselves to provide a review of that manuscript, do this transparently and not under the guise of an anonymous review if the journal operates blind review; providing a review for a manuscript being handled by another editor at the journal can be treated as any other review.”

What next?
It is hoped that the guidelines will be widely disseminated and used by a number of communities: publishers in training and helping their editors, journals and editors in guiding their reviewers, and universities and research institutions in training their students and researchers. The guidelines are also very much a “living” document and will be revised at future stages in response to feedback received.

(This article is based on the talk given by the author at the COPE European Seminar, 22 March 2013, to launch the guidelines.)
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Supplemental Data “basics” at American Mineralogist

Rachel A. Russell
Managing Editor, American Mineralogist

Raise your hand if your supplemental data, like mine, is increasing? There is an explosion going on—and not just in supplemental data sets, but supplemental figures, text, appendices, movies, interactive multi-media and whatever the authors think of next. Part of this explosion is caused by various funding agencies and governmental mandates that data should be freely available. So recently, I decided to get organized and revamp some ancient practices. Perhaps this will help you or perhaps everyone will write me with better ideas! (Please do!)

For simplicity of this article, note that in general at American Mineralogist “supplemental data” is what the author says it is. And we do not have “data police” to make them send it to me in an optimal format; I work with what I am given unless it is completely corrupted. And also note that we do not, at least at this time, have the ability to assign DOIs to it. However we assign our own unique ID number to enable internal tracking in editorial and production, and, eventually, to aid the reader’s retrieval of the data. A certain subset of our data (“Crystallographic Information Files”) are reviewed by special reviewers for accuracy; the rest is a part of the normal peer review process.

Finally a little background about American Mineralogist. We are a society journal for the Mineralogical Society of America (MSA) and we self-publish. To be clear, that means we do the whole thing from soup to nuts: help authors submit their papers, help associate editors, reviewers, and editors with the peer review database and process, keep the accepted papers right here for copyediting and layout. We use some tools via Cenveo to provide some tech support for the copyediting; we use Adobe Creative Suite and a whole bunch of other programs to create final PDFs that we deliver for print and for the web. One of our websites is a part of “Geoscienceworld” (GSW) and that is hosted by Highwire Press who turns the PDFs into xml. Over the last decade I’ve seen our workload increase—now there is the need for preprints, which we provide; now there is the need to put “teasers” on our section of MSA’s website, so we do html; now we provide Open Access options for authors who need that, and so on. I am sure everyone is familiar with this pattern of increased work.

The key is to realize that as supplementary data was growing in quantity and importance, my staff and resources were spread thin already. So my challenge is to keep things simple!

Our Goals for Supplementary Data
Whatever the author defines the “data” as being, our goals are (1) to put it in a “universal” format (most often PDF, txt); (2) brand it so readers can find the article connected to it; (3) and add links and footnote text to the article so that readers clearly know that there is supplemental data and how to find it or are able to click on a link. And (4), we want users of the supplemental data to attribute it correctly to the authors and, hopefully to read and cite the article itself.

So far, it sounds simple. In fact, as I struggled to sort things out, it was like magical vines quickly growing back in around me.

So What Do We Actually Do with the Stuff?
1. We assign the ID number when we log in the accepted paper. Each issue has its own tracking chart. By using the year and issue we create unique ID numbers, for example, AM-13-701 refers to supplemental data in the July 2013 issue (the “first” one as logged in but not necessarily as presented in the journal). This is the most re-vamped part of our system, previous
supplementary data had unique numbers but assigned continuously throughout the year using completely different charts. Now it’s the same chart as all the other issue info, and my editorial assistant logs in the supplemental data when she logs in the paper.

2. We download the material from the online peer review system for the accepted paper. This might actually happen just before the paper is accepted formally by the editor to get a jump start. This might happen as above by the editorial assistant when logging in the paper.

3. We hunt down “stealth” deposit material in the copyediting phase: that table labeled “deposit” in the midst of the to-be-typeset files, the appendix snuck in at the end of the text, the material that just won’t fit the space for the manuscript but the author wants deposited instead of deleted. Whoever hunts it down gives it a number and puts it on the chart.

4. Everything is put as much as humanly possible into a “universal format” — txt or PDF. However some material must remain in Excel, and of course .mov’s are what they are, and so on. At this point, this task tends to be mine as I go over each first proof.

5. As I am doing the above, I add branding—a header or whatever is appropriate—as best as possible to each item. For example, at least the deposit ID number, “American Mineralogist,” and the year and issue of the article. Whenever possible the short title or the complete title of the article and the authors’ names (or at least “Smith et al.”) is part of the branding. In the online world, the data could be retrieved without the article, so we want to lead that user back to the article for the whole story of the data. And furthermore, we want that user to know who to attribute the data to. This branding is becoming a best practice (NISO p. 10-11) and, in my opinion, very important in case a user of the data forgets where it came from. I plan to add this step to the information for authors and hope that they add the branding, instead of us.

6. As each paper is proofed, we ensure that each article contains a citation to any supplemental material and that citation leads to a footnote explaining how the reader may obtain the (freely available) supplemental material.

7. Then we deliver the files (carefully labeled) to the MSA Webmaster and he provides us with a link where they will reside for all eternity. (That’s my story and I’m sticking to it.)

8. Thus each issue of American Mineralogist ends up with its own online “supplemental page.” Each paper with supplemental data is listed by title, author, and pages and has a link to the data. We really want the reader—however they get there—to know whose data it is and what article it links to.

9. We link the online articles hosted by Highwire Press (HWP) via GeoscienceWorld (GSW) to the supplemental data on the MSA site using the “maint site tool” of “Data Supplemental Manager.” Note that I am not uploading the data to HWP—that is too expensive and time-consuming for us. But I use this tool to create a link that is clearly visible on each screen of the article and via the Table of Contents. This link also clearly has the article title automatically added when the article is “live.” Importantly, it has the supplemental data ID number, e.g., Deposit item AM-13-701, as the first part of the information.

10. At this point the reader will find the supplementary data:
   a. Via the table of contents both on MSA’s website and GSW’s website, whichever they subscribe to.
   b. Via the Abstract, html, and PDF view on the HWP-hosted GSW site.
   c. Footnoted in the article and cited in the text. If all you have is the print or PDF version of the paper, the footnote provides the url to type in.

Our Short Checklist:

- Is there supplemental data?
- Is it in universal format?
- Is it branded?
- Is it cited in paper?
- Does the paper have a footnote with retrieval info?
- Is the whole issue’s worth of data ready for the webmaster?
However, perhaps 50 years down the road, or at some point, the situation of whether anyone can actually read the old data formats will exist. MSA, the publisher of American Mineralogist, at this time has no data migration plans or funds. What I am hoping is that by that point, Google has a “translate” option, just as for other languages! Get cracking Google!
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EON Committee
Most of us would like to be published, but it’s not always easy to get your work accepted for publication. As a member of the ISMTE, you have a unique opportunity to get published…in the ISMTE publication, EON. We would love to receive your articles of interest to Managing Editors. If you would like to take it a step further and want to be involved in soliciting people to write articles, you are welcome to join the EON Committee. We search blogs, Facebook, conference lineups, etc. (plus our own ISMTE membership) to find people who have interesting and/or useful things to say to you. Sound like something you’d like to be a part of? Contact the Editor, Deborah Bowman, at dbowman@asge.org.
Puzzle Over It

Spring brings thoughts of love and…baseball! Each movie title listed below shows only the first two letters of each word, and one word in each is a common baseball term. Can you hit a home run by figuring them all out?

1. CA ME IF YO CAN
2. WA TH LI
3. TH EM ST BA
4. OU OF AF
5. MY FA LA
6. DO IN
7. BL RU
8. HO AL

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

Answers to last month’s puzzle:

9. Whiplash
10. Brainwash
11. Gatecrash
12. Rehash
13. Squash
14. Balderdash
15. Unleash
16. Succotash

What Did You Say?

“If you can’t explain it simply, you don’t understand it well enough.” Albert Einstein

“The wastebasket is a writer’s best friend.” Isaac Bashevis Singer

“If a sentence, no matter how excellent, does not illuminate your subject in some new and useful way, scratch it out.” Kurt Vonnegut

“Those who write clearly have readers; those who write obscurely have commentators.” Albert Camus

“I try to leave out the parts that people skip.” Elmore Leonard
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ejt 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.

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

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
Thank You to our Corporate Sponsors!
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Interested in supporting ISMTE? Please visit http://ismte.org/supporters.html