This issue is dedicated to the ISMTE North American Conference, held August 6-7, 2013, in Washington, D.C. Seeing old friends and meeting new ones is always the best part of these conferences, but keeping up with everything that is going on in our industry is crucial as well. The conference sessions gave us excellent information about topics we need to be aware of, even if our journals don’t currently participate, such as Open Access and iPad/iPhone journal apps. It is so important that we be engaged and informed; a whole new world of publishing is forming out there, and we have to be ready. Picture a kaleidoscope with the colorful pieces tumbling and interacting, but eventually forming a beautiful picture. That, I believe, is what is happening in publishing right now; the pieces are still tumbling, but eventually they will settle on a scene that will be dramatically different from where it started. You and I can either be part of that final picture or we can fall away in the process. The ISMTE exists to help us remain a part of that picture, and the conferences are an important part of that.

A big thank you goes to the Conference Committee for lining up such great speakers and for coming up with new ideas like the Speed Networking session. Julie Nash and her committee, Sarah Bidgood, Glenn Collins, Diane Drexler, Dr. Sally Gainsbury, Kimberly Rosenfield, and Sherryl Sundell, did a fantastic job.

Start making plans now to attend next year’s ISMTE Conference. If you have to convince your Society or your Editor to send you, show them this issue of EON to see all the great information this year’s attendees gained. See you next year!
Were you there? The 2013 ISMTE North American Conference began Tuesday morning, August 6, with Conference Committee Chair Julie Nash’s welcome, followed by an ISMTE update from President Glenn Collins. If you couldn’t make the conference, enjoy these summaries of the sessions. If you were there, find out what happened at the sessions you had to miss!

TUESDAY

Reported by Meghan McDevitt
Editorial Assistant
GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Rick Anderson, from the J. Williard Marriott Library at the University of Utah, kicked off the conference with a discussion on the impact of Open Access on academic libraries and librarians. He stated that the main goal of the library is to facilitate the scholarly work of students, faculty, and researchers and libraries must consider the consequences and changes brought about by the rise of Open Access. He described the intended and unintended consequences of Open Access.

Open Access (OA) provides free access to scholarly content, increases the pace of research, discovery, and innovation, and makes publically-funded research easily accessible to the public. However, unintended consequences of OA would shift the cost burden from readers (libraries and subscribers) to funders (institutions or authors), possibly cancel subscriptions, and creates the potential for the acceptance of studies containing subpar content with limited peer review or editing.

For libraries, an increase in Open Access journals would mean that less money would be spent on subscriptions and content could be expanded. However, more time might be spent on determining the quality of journals and it’s possible that some funds would be redirected in support of author processing fees (APCs). Although more OA journals would provide students and researchers with a larger quantity of content, consequently, more responsibility would be placed on the researcher to determine the quality of the published content.

Jeffrey Beall, a Scholarly Initiatives Librarian at the Auraria Library at University of Colorado Denver, spoke next about predatory Open Access scholarly publishers. With the rise of OA, predatory publishers have emerged that exploit this model. Article processing charges (APCs) can mean that the more articles a journal accepts and publishes, the more money they make, regardless of the article’s quality. Mr. Beall has begun tracking and investigating predatory OA publishers and has started a blog (http://scholarlyoa.com) to bring this issue to light.

Overall, predatory publishers lack transparency in their processes and prey on young researchers or junior faculty. The influence of predatory publishers can lead to an increase in research misconduct
and lower standards in scholarly publishing including the publication of low quality research.

The next speaker from the OA panel was Roy Kaufman, Managing Director of New Ventures at Copyright Clearance Center. Mr. Kaufman presented five issues to consider when developing an OA business model. First, realize that OA does not mean that content is made available free-of-charge; it still costs money to publish. Second, the OA model shifts the source of revenue from content users to non-traditional sources, such as authors, funding agencies, and content users with commercial needs. Third, an increased importance is placed on managing pre- and post-publication transactions. Fourth, the OA model requires support from intermediaries, such as new types of technology and possibly a company like Copyright Clearance Center that understands scholarly publishing. Finally, measurement and testing is key in developing prices and charges for a sustainable business model.

Our final speaker, Rhodri Jackson, Senior Publisher at Oxford University Press, explained the OA situation in the United Kingdom from the publisher’s perspective. Recent policies have been implemented in the UK to encourage free access to publically-funded research. Currently, there are two OA options: Gold and Green. With Gold OA, there is immediate and unrestricted access to the publisher’s final version of the article, an immediate deposit in other repositories without restrictions on re-use, and authors (or their institutions) are charged an article processing fee. With Green OA, articles are self-archived by the author and are deposited in an institutional or subject repository. Typically, there is no APC payable to the publisher.

Mr. Jackson discussed Oxford University Press’ strategy for supporting sustainable and high-quality OA publications. Their strategy includes a willingness to experiment with new business models, engage with authors, funders, readers, and the community, and establishing fair OA charges and subscription pricing. Their brand, Oxford Open, consists of 13 full OA journals and over 200 hybrid OA journals. Launched in 2005, all content is deposited in PubMed Central.

Some challenges and unintended consequences have arisen with the OA model in the UK. For funders, there is a lack of transparency in payment methods and some OA publishers charge high costs for extra pages or color content. Authors must consider where their funding will come from and may be restricted as to where they can submit their papers. Institutions must consider funding allocation. Despite these challenges, communication and transparency can go a long way in establishing a sustainable OA business model.

Tuesday Morning Breakout Sessions
Session A: Image Manipulation

Reported by Deborah Bowman
Managing Editor
GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

In years gone by, if a speck appeared on a photo, researchers used to run the experiment again. Now they just PhotoShop it out. This becomes a problem when authors use image editing techniques to create an illusion or deception, such as adding details that weren’t there or removing ones that were (fabrication) or making select features appear brighter, darker, or cleaner (falsification).

Lindsey Brounstein from the journal Gastroenterology showed us examples of figures that were manipulated and showed us how easy it is to make these changes when authors have access to imaging programs like PhotoShop and learn how to use tools like Bandaid. By using imaging tools like Brightness and Contrast and Gradient map, it is usually possible to see the alterations, and Lindsey showed us how to do that.

Each journal should have an image manipulation policy, and that means decisions must be made. How often will you screen (all the time, randomly,
or when alerted to possible problems?) and what will your policy be when you find something suspicious? Lindsey advised checking the COPE website for flowcharts to guide you through recommended courses to take. (These flowcharts were published with permission in past issues of EON as well.) Finally, you need to advertise your image manipulation policy so authors are warned that you will be looking closely at their submitted figures.

Session B: The Future of Publishing: The Librarian’s Perspective

Reported by Carolyn Sperry
Origin Editorial, LLC

Jeffrey Beall of the Auraria Library, University of Colorado, Denver, discussed a disturbing trend: the rise in Predatory Open-Access Scholarly Publishing. Predatory publishers often represent themselves as part of the OA movement, and questionable journals often have a very broad scope in order to attract as many articles and thus as much money as possible. Predatory publishers, says, Mr. Beall, are corrupting scholarly publishing as well as OA. To warn authors, he maintains Beall’s List of questionable scholarly open-access publishers: http://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/
To make it onto this list, publishers must engage in deceptive practices and/or show a lack of transparency. For example, red flags on a questionable journal’s website include promises of very quick acceptance; grammatical errors or typos; a hidden or misrepresented location (e.g. the Maryland Institute of Research is based in Bangladesh), and plagiarism. The most successful predatory publishing outfits mimic legitimate publishers.

How, specifically, are predatory publishers corrupting OA publishing?

- Possible increase in research misconduct
- Fake or insufficient peer review
- Pseudoscience is published alongside science; scientists can discern the difference between science and pseudoscience, but the public cannot
- Prey on junior faculty and graduate students
- Lack of digital preservation; content can disappear
- Too many articles being published
- May hurt legitimate learned societies

Predatory publishers add little value to scholarly communication, and aim to serve the authors’ needs rather than the readers’.

Rick Anderson of the J. Willard Marriott Library outlined what scholarly publishing may look like over the next several years. He predicted that Gold Open Access (OA) will probably continue to grow, as it presents an affordable means for publishers to offer OA and because there are really no disincentives for publishers to use the Gold OA model. He anticipates sluggish expansion of Green OA because it is arguably very harmful to publishers, as well as more work for authors. He pointed out that Green OA often functions under some kind of mandate. Continued consolidation in STM publishers is very likely; the journal marketplace will probably continue to contract around very large publishers (Elsevier, Wiley, Springer, ACS, PloS). Independent journals will continue to go out of business.

Mr. Anderson feels that a UK-style mandate (under which research papers must be made free to access within six months of publication if they come from publicly funded work), is unlikely to be passed in the United States any time soon—the US higher education system is quite decentralized, and at this point it is unclear how all this information would be made available for free and who would follow through with making this happen.

Other developments Mr. Anderson predicts are “less likely” are:

- A significant slowing in the rate of journal price hikes. Publicly traded companies must show annual growth, and no meaningful competition means no incentive to slow price hikes.
- Dramatic growth in voluntary author self-archiving (Green OA)

Session C: A Closer Look at Open Access—a Question and Answer Session

Reported by Meghan McDevitt

Attendees of the Open Access breakout session were joined by Roy Kaufman from Copyright
Clearance Center and Rhodri Jackson from Oxford University Press. They fielded many questions about Open Access from the audience.

To open the session, Mr. Kaufman and Mr. Jackson discussed the differences between Gold OA and Green OA. Gold OA, considered the “cleanest form,” is when authors (or their funders) pay a fee to publish their article known as an Article Processing Charge (APC). One free, final version of the article is produced and published in an OA journal. With the Green OA option, an article is deposited in a repository or open archive and the author does not pay an APC. Typically, what is published is not a final version of the article, so a downside to Green OA is that it is hard to know if the article is the originally submitted version, a revised version, or the accepted (and edited) version.

Mr. Kaufman and Mr. Jackson touched on the various permission types, such as CC-BY and CC-BYC, and how it can be complicated by OA publishing. With CC-BY, anyone is able to reuse, modify, or change the content as long as there is attribution to the original author, article, or journal. The CC-BYC license places more limits on use, controlling who can buy a reprint or who can reissue the article. It gets complicated when an article with a CC-BY license contains third party material. This typically necessitates a separate permission line stating that the third party material is excluded from the CC-BY license. It is thought that norms and processes will develop as the OA model becomes more standardized.

Some positive points for the OA model were discussed. Publishers have hit a limit on increasing subscription fees and page limits, and with the constant influx of research and publishable papers, there is not enough room within the traditional model to publish them all. Rejected papers are not necessarily subpar and these should be included in OA journals. Overall, they recommend that traditional journals have OA options because it supports an author’s need for rapid publication and accessibility to published data.

**Panel Discussion: New Metrics to Measure Journal Impact**
*Reported by Carolyn Sperry*

Euan Adie, founder of Altmetric.com, introduced us to altmetrics, which combines traditional metrics with alternative metrics or societal impacts. Altmetric measures online attention surrounding journal articles and datasets, as well as collecting and delivering article-level metrics to journal publishers. He explained that newspapers are rated higher than social media in general, but that all the data has to be examined—for example, a tweet from President Obama would clearly be more impactful than a mention in a hometown newspaper. Context is very important, and humans are needed to analyze data.

Jevin West from Eigenfactor.org described how Eigenfactor uses citations from a vast system to discern what the most informational work is. By analyzing the vast network of citations, the most important research can be identified. Although Impact Factor is important, Eigenfactor strives to show the whole picture, and use the entire network to provide context. Eigenfactor is evolving; for example, it now uses an easier-to-digest algorithm to arrive at its Eigenvalue.

Jayne Marks of the Usage Factor Project detailed her team’s efforts to create a journal-based (rather than article based) measure of how people use and consume—rather than just cite—content. The Usage Factor for journals will enable authors, publishers, librarians, and research funding agencies to see how a journal is used. Full implementation of the Usage Factor is imminent, but a sustainable business model is needed.

**Tuesday Afternoon Breakout Sessions**

For an hour on Tuesday afternoon, attendees chose an Open Forum on Tracking Systems to attend. Present were Suzanne Hopkins from
Thomson Reuters (ScholarOne Manuscripts), Tony Alves from Aries Systems Corp (Editorial Manager), and Anna Jester from eJournalPress. The presenters explained upcoming releases to their systems and took questions.

After that session, the winner of the Poster Contest, Margot Puerta from Molecular Medicine spoke about her poster, Using Social Technographic™ Profiling to Assist in a Journal’s Social Strategy. On behalf of her journal, she sent out a survey to determine what activities their social media followers most often used; for instance, does the person create blogs, post to blogs, comment on posts, or merely read other people’s posts?

Using Social Technographics, Margot divided followers into the categories of Creators, Critics, Collectors, Joiners, Spectators, and Inactives. The higher on the list, the more active the person was, and based on the survey results, she placed the responders into one of the six categories. By compiling this data, she was able to come up with her Journal’s Social Technographics Profile to see where most responders fell.

Margot discovered that most people engaged with her journal were either Collectors or Spectators. With this data, she was able to update her journal’s website with features that those groups would find most appealing.

Well done, Margot! All posters were displayed throughout the conference.

Speed Networking
We tried something different this year: We faced one other person across the table and talked to him or her for five minutes before one side of the table moved down one, giving us another person to talk to for five minutes. For a group of word people, most of whom would probably prefer to curl up in a corner with a book, this was a great way to get to know other people. I hope we do this again next year!

WEDNESDAY
Breakfast with ISMTE Past Presidents

Elizabeth Blalock, immediate past President, and Jason Roberts, original ISMTE President, answered questions from the audience. Topics covered such diverse subjects as possible future EON articles, which way publishing is going, frustrating issues we face, how Open Access is funded, skill sets important to our job, and ethical issues.

General Session:
Translating Science: Sylvia Hagopian of the Problem Gambling Institute of Ontario, CAMH

Sylvia Hagopian, from the Problem Gambling Institute of Ontario, discussed knowledge translation: how to make the messages of scientific research more accessible to the public. If you want to capture the public’s attention, stick with clean,
short, simple messages. Her Basic Communication Plan is BOAKSI:

- Background
- Objectives
- Audience
- Key Message
- Strategy
- Issues

Go where your audience is, and lose the academic writing style! Ask yourself: so what? What is the takeaway message for your audience? For example, if the research shows that “kids who drink two cups of milk daily have healthy levels of Vitamin D and iron,” the takeaway for parents might be “Feed your children no more or less than two cups of milk per day.” People want to understand what the bottom line is or the goal the research points to. Ms. Hagopian emphasized the need to think carefully about the target audience and to adapt the presentation. Consult the intended audience if possible; if the research is meant for pharmacists, ask a pharmacist for feedback.

To really grab attention, consider creating a video and uploading it to YouTube, which is now surpassing Google as a search engine—people love video! Get onto Twitter, and subscribe to relevant Twitter feeds. Snappy headlines help; these days people skim and scan news sites, so you have perhaps three to six seconds to grab a reader’s attention. For example, “Disrupted Amygdala Reactivity in Depressed 4- to 6-Year Old Children” (from the Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry) is obviously not as grabby as “Depression Alters Young Brains” (from the New York Times).

Coordinate the dissemination of information from your organization so that your message stays on track. Before speaking to the media, decide who will answer questions and prepare your message. Telling a story is another great way to make research relatable—profile a person, and make the research relevant to peoples’ lives.

**Wednesday Breakout Sessions**

**Session A: ORCID: Connecting Research and Researchers**

*Reported by Meghan McDevitt*

Attendees of Session A were joined by Laurel Haak, PhD, Executive Director of ORCID, who introduced ORCID, an international, not-for-profit initiative to create an open registry of persistent unique identifiers for researches and scholars. ORCID aims to connect a name to one’s research and professional activities, creating discoverability within and across databases. Researchers create a unique 16-digit number expressed as a URL (similar to an article’s DOI number). The registration process is simple, free, and can be completed in less than a minute.

The ORCID ID can be used throughout a researcher’s career, connecting them to their publications, professional activities, and affiliations. The ID is embedded in a works metadata, independent of platform. In order for the advantages of the registry to be realized, researchers must see the benefits of creating an ORCID ID and create an ORCID account, and other research information systems, such as universities, member societies, and publishers, must adopt ORCID as a standard personal identifier. ORCID aims to become a repository of author information, a single location containing validated information across all publishers and submission systems.

How does this relate to Editorial Office staff? ORCID has issued over 200,000 identifiers since its launch in October 2012 and is gaining traction as a researcher identifier solution. Dr. Haak recommends that editors inform authors about the benefits of ORCID and encourage them to register for an ORCID ID. Member societies, universities, and other institutions can become ORCID members. Finally, we should try to ensure that the ORCID ID is captured, validated, and embedded
throughout our publications. These actions will help ORCID gain stability and become the primary source for researcher identification.

Take advantage of the free webinar “ORCID iDs in the Academic Publishing Workflow: Where are we now?” on September 19, 2013 at 11:00EDT to learn about incorporating ORCID into your production workflow. Register for the webinar here- http://orcid.org/blog/2013/07/30/upcoming-orcid-events

Session B: Management: Managing Time, Managing People, Managing EICs

Brittany White, Senior Managing Editor for J&J Editorial, talked about how to manage your time by planning, organizing, and prioritizing. Self-awareness is an important part of time management; when you understand when and where you do your best work, you can plan your day around that knowledge. Finally, use metrics to help you understand what elements make up your day and to figure out how you can be more efficient.

Jennifer Mahar, Executive Peer Review Manager from Origin Editorial, discussed how to manage the people in the editorial office. She urged us to review our office or society policies and, if possible, our contracts with our Publishers so we clearly understand our responsibilities and our mission and goals. Don’t be afraid to ask about issues like marketing and circulation, even if you aren’t directly responsible for them. Jennifer urged everyone to stay current by joining groups, coming to meetings, and reading publishing blogs like Scholarly Kitchen. Consider bringing an article to meetings to have a discussion about things going on in the publishing world. This will bring in ideas and will also make meetings more interesting.

Finally, Jennifer discussed keeping your Editors happy. This one might take the most diplomacy. We need to be responsive and anticipate their needs, but still be assertive enough to protect our authors, reviewers … and ourselves! When you have to bring a problem to them, it’s a good idea to suggest a solution, if possible. You can more easily manage their expectations by using metrics to help them understand what is possible or realistic. Create a training manual for your Editors and offer refreshers when you see it is necessary.

Session C: Pre-submission Peer Review: An Update on Rubriq

Keith Collier is Co-Founder and Managing Director of Rubriq, an independent peer review service focused on putting time back into research. Keith also leads business development activities for Research Square LLC, a company that owns both Rubriq and American Journal Experts. Prior to joining Research Square in 2012, Keith was a Vice President in the Scientific and Scholarly Research business for Thomson Reuters where he was General Manager of ScholarOne, the leading peer review system for scholarly publishers and associations. Keith has degrees in Business Management and Information Systems from Baylor University and a Masters Degree in Instructional Technology from the University of Virginia.

Mr. Collier presented the audience with what many see as a problem – wasted author time. Authors waste time submitting to journals, wait for the peer review process to be completed, and then find that their paper has been rejected. Then they go through the whole process over and over again until they find the right place to publish.
In a Rubriq video, the narrator estimated that millions of hours are spent each year by reviewers on papers that were ultimately rejected. Authors want to publish in the highest impact journals so they start at the top, but many end up publishing in journals with lower Impact Factors. To get there, authors may end up submitting to many journals.

Rubriq is working to try to solve this problem by offering pre-submission peer review and journal matching services. Authors will pay Rubriq for reviewer opinions and suggestions of possible journals to submit to. In addition to sharing this information with the authors, the reviews can then be shared with journals and publishers who participate in the Rubriq database.

This process generated a lot of questions and discussion from attendees. Some asked if submitters to Rubriq would have a “submit here” button to allow them to submit directly to the journal of their choice. The Rubriq results and the journal submission process will not be integrated into the Rubriq system at this time. Keith said that the challenges to integrating into ScholarOne, Editorial Manager, or eJournal Press are large so this is off the table at this time.

Others asked about how Rubriq will find its reviewers and make sure they are quality reviewers. The incentive to review for Rubriq at this time is payment. Keith said there isn’t prestige surrounding Rubriq (yet) that would draw reviewers without that incentive. Reviewers apply to be included in the Rubriq database. They go through a training and vetting processes. Reviewers evaluate papers based on the Rubriq scorecard.

In addition, Keith introduced a new project – a journal guide. This will be a page where authors, reviewers and other journal subscribers can go to search, rate and compare journals. The site will look much like college search sites, GreatSchools.com, healthgrades.com, or even Yelp.

This would allow authors to compare journals side by side, see the journal’s community rating, and read comments posted by others. Information might include charts comparing journals’ general information, reputation, timeliness, and costs. This project is currently in beta testing.

Attendees raised the issue that some societies or editors may not be willing to release information on acceptance rates or turnaround times to the general public. Others expressed some concern with giving everyone the opportunity to post comments on a public site about a journal. Some thought that this could be a place for unhappy authors to post unwarranted comments about a journal. Keith did note that comments on the site would be moderated.

**Wednesday Afternoon Breakout Sessions**

**Sessions A, B, and C** were again breakouts of ScholarOne, Editorial manager, and eJournalPress, this time covering tracking system reporting tips.

**Session D: Making Journals Mobile**

Gary Spencer from Wiley Global Research discussed reasons to go mobile (iPhone and iPad apps) and explained the difference between Browser-based and Native apps. He made the point that it is more imperative than ever that journal covers be dynamic and visual to attract readers on their mobile apps. More and more people are getting mobile devices, and journals need to keep up.

**Exchange Forum**

This year’s Exchange Forum was an opportunity for attendees to ask questions, discuss hot topics, and share experiences from our lives in the Editorial Office. Topics included how to effectively manage virtual teams, best practices for soliciting submissions, tips for transitioning to a new Editor-in-Chief, collecting author disclosures, best practices for marketing journals to libraries, the benefit of project managing classes, and recommendations for project management software.

Thank you to our Conference Supporters, Copyright Clearance Center, CrossRef, and Technica.

The first annual ISMTE Recognition Award was awarded to Alice Meadows from Wiley at the ISMTE North American conference and will be awarded to Edward Wates from Wiley at the European conference.
In Sheryl Sandberg’s first book, *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead*, she examines the barriers, societal and personal, that keep women from taking on leadership or executive roles in the workplace. Peppered with personal narratives about her own life experiences and examples from recent research, Sandberg doesn’t give specific answers so much as provide a guide to thinking through tough situations. Overall, she encourages women to “lean in” to opportunities, to take chances, and to pursue personal goals despite the challenges.

Sandberg opens with a discussion on what she calls the “leadership ambition gap” in which more men than women aspire to senior level jobs. This leads to a pattern where men aim for and therefore obtain leadership roles while women, more often than not, take a back seat. A related societal barrier is the idea that “professional ambition is expected of men but is optional—or worse, sometimes even a negative—for women.” Sandberg remarks that, for the most part, men assume that it is feasible to have success in their professional life and to find fulfillment in their personal life whereas women feel bombarded with the challenge of finding a work-life balance or being forced to make a choice between a career and a family.

Sandberg touches on the importance of taking risks or agreeing to opportunities even if you’re not sure you’re ready for it and then to learn by doing. This is the best way to continue to grow and challenge yourself. She writes that many women hold themselves back by mentally preparing and making sacrifices for something that has not yet occurred—they “leave before they leave.” Women stop reaching for new opportunities or decline extra work because of a future situation that hasn’t even happened yet.

An entire chapter is devoted to the myth of “having it all.” Adjustments, compromises, and sacrifices are made every day and expecting everything to be done exactly right can only lead to disappointment. Sandberg gives an example of a poster at Facebook that says “Done is better than perfect,” a maxim she strives to live by and recommends.

The overall take-home message is that it’s important for everyone, men and women, to work together to create equality. Women should be allowed to thrive in the workplace and men should be allowed to participate proudly in household and childrearing responsibilities. She encourages everyone to speak out and challenge societal stereotypes in order to create change.

Find out more at www.leanin.org.
Puzzle Over It

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

1. RIHTEUSSS
2. PIEHOL
3. THIHB
4. UILLTI
5. INRAC

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

Last month’s question: Three children are standing in line to get ice cream. The first child in line is a boy and the last child in line is a girl. From this information alone, can you conclude with certainty that a boy is immediately in front of a girl in this lineup?

Answer: Yes

We don’t know whether the middle child is a boy or a girl. If the middle child is a girl, then the lineup is boy-girl-girl. If the middle child is a boy, then the lineup is boy-boy-girl. In both cases, a boy is immediately in line in front of a girl.

Add Your Journal’s Cover!

Have you seen the journal covers scrolling across the top of the ISMTE web site home page and wondered how to get your cover added? Simply email a link to the journal’s homepage where the cover image can be found to website@ismte.org.
Calendar of Events

Seventh International Congress on Peer Review and Biomedical Publication
Organized by JAMA and BMJ
September 8–10, 2013
Chicago, Illinois
Registration now open
http://www.peerreviewcongress.org/index.html
Contact jama-peer@jamanetwork.org

ALPSP International Annual Conference
September 11–13, 2013
The Belfry near Birmingham, United Kingdom
http://www.alpsp.org

Commissioning Content: Working Effectively with Authors and Editors
September 18, 2013
London, United Kingdom
http://www.alpsp.org

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

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

Thank You
to our Corporate Sponsors!

Gold Level
Wiley-Blackwell

Silver Level
Origin

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

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

Be There!
6th Annual European Conference/ISMTE/EASE Joint Meeting
September 23–24, 2013
Hotel Aazaert
Blankenberge, Belgium
http://www.ismte.org
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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

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