For me, organization is key to efficiency. I have post-it note reminders, handwritten to-do lists, and electronic task lists with beeping notifications. If I don’t write something down, there’s a good chance I’ll forget it. And I enjoy crossing off items from my lists as it means I’ve accomplished something, no matter how small, for the day.

For the most part, technology has proved to be a useful tool in keeping organized, from Outlook task lists to synced calendars and apps like Pinterest and Flipboard. Even though we’ve transitioned from hard copy manuscript submissions to completely electronic submission systems, nothing is perfect. Editors still struggle to find and retain reviewers and the issue of name ambiguity and attribution is a hot topic in the research community.

In this issue, Danielle Padula from Scholastica discusses digital...
peer-review platforms and how they can streamline workflows, ease the burden of finding reviewers, and provide built-in analytics. ISMTE President-Elect Michael Willis talks about his efforts to expand ISMTE’s partnership with peer organizations in order to promote collaboration.

Have you heard about ORCiD? The ORCiD iD is a unique persistent identifier that aims to improve the issue of name ambiguity in the research community. Read the summary on the ORCiD Outreach Meeting and learn how universities, societies, and journals are implementing ORCiD integration into workflows.

We’ve heard a lot about altmetrics recently. EON Editorial Intern Anna Demmitt provides an overview of the three most prominent organizations that process altmetrics: Plum Analytics, Impactstory, and Altmetric. Find out which platform works best for you.

Finally, learn about the Chicagoland ISMTE Local Group and if you’re in the area, make sure to attend the next meeting. I hope you enjoy this issue of EON, and I look forward to hearing from you—send me an email at mmcdevitt@asge.org.
Digital Peer-Review Platforms: What They Mean for Journal Editors and Why

By Danielle Padula
Community Development Coordinator
Scholastica, LLC

For authors, finishing a scholarly article and submitting it to a journal is a sprint to the finish line—but for journal editors, the subsequent peer-review process can feel more like an obstacle course. Each day, editors find themselves scaling high piles of administrative tasks, chasing after potential reviewers and jumping through hoops to keep them on deadline. Yet, despite the frustrations inherent in peer review, editors rely on this system to ensure the quality and accuracy of the works published in their journals.

How can editors continue to get the benefits of fact-checking and scholarly collaboration that come with peer review without forgoing speed in publication? One of the most promising solutions is powerful technology. Traditionally, it can take anywhere from multiple months to a year for a journal to reach a publication decision for one article. Today, journals that are successfully adopting technology into their peer-review process are beginning to change the status quo. One example is Sociological Science, which is able to make publication decisions for its manuscripts in only 30 days. Sociological Science has been able to speed up its workflows while managing its peer-review process on Scholastica, one of many digital peer-review platforms. Other popular platforms include Editorial Manager, Open Journal Systems, and ScholarOne.

Since the early 1990s, publishers and independent technology companies have been introducing software to address the challenges inherent in editorial peer review. Digital peer-review platforms now offer many benefits to journal editors including eliminating excess paperwork, automating administrative tasks, and making collaboration easier.
Digital Peer-Review Platforms

While self-hosted software must be installed on journals’ organizational servers and configured and managed by their editorial staff or technological consultants, cloud-based platforms are hosted and managed by software companies on external servers. Like with Facebook or Gmail, because cloud-based platforms are fully hosted on outside servers, users do not have to worry about making updates to their software. New features are released to all users at one time via the software company’s hosting server.

Hosted web-based platforms offer journals many different types of customization options, the
Digital Peer-Review Platforms

extent of which can vary and consequently impact user-training requirements. Some systems, such as Editorial Manager, have hundreds of configuration selections and numerous add-on modules, which, while powerful, also add complex software properties that users must learn. Other systems, such as Scholastica, offer built-in customization opportunities that require little to no training for users to implement. Examples of built-in customization on Scholastica include modifiable email templates and reviewer feedback forms. Scholastica also gives editors the opportunity to label manuscripts with custom keyword tags, similar to tagging and categorizing blog posts on platforms such as WordPress or Tumblr. Editors can then do keyword searches for manuscripts sharing the same tag.

For journals deciding between web-based and locally installed systems, as well as choosing whether to have focused customization versus extensive add-ons and configuration options, key factors to consider are budget and technological expertise. Journals with IT staff may prefer self-hosted software that they can manually install and change with new code. On the other hand, journals wanting to save the time and resources required to host or modify software may turn to hosted web-based solutions that offer a hassle-free technical experience.

In addition to streamlining workflows, some peer-review platforms have expanded their offerings to address the challenges editors face in finding qualified reviewers. In the past, editors have had to rely on professional networks to find reviewers, either contacting candidates they know or seeking suggestions from colleagues. Internet solutions are opening a world of possibilities to improve and speed up this process. Editors can now access scholar databases, such as Thomson Reuters’ Reviewer Locator, either externally or via integration with their peer-review platform, to search for reviewers.

In a more direct approach, Scholastica’s software is set up to mirror real-world scholarly communication with opportunities for users to interact and collaborate. Scholastica users are able to establish fully searchable profiles that include their interests, areas of expertise, preferred forms of contact, and even CVs. These profiles give editors the opportunity to search for qualified reviewer candidates who are using Scholastica. Editors can send reviewer invitations to any Scholastica user, and the reviewer contacts that they accrue will be saved in a table of past and present reviewers.

Another chief benefit that digital peer-review platforms have brought editors is the ability to analyze their workflows with little to no effort. Many software systems include outsourced or built-in analytics. At Scholastica, we provide all users with integrated real-time analytics that track journals’ total number of submissions, manuscripts in progress, average time to decision, acceptance rate, and more. Editors can use these analytics to track the rate and quantities of their manuscript submissions and speed up their editorial workflows.

Regardless of the software solution you choose, digitizing editorial peer review can make for a more productive workday and lead to substantial time, energy, and monetary savings for your journal. The key in harnessing the benefits of digital peer review is to make sure you’re choosing a platform you can easily manage and that offers a complete solution.

If you are interested in learning more about Scholastica’s cloud-based peer-review software and setting up a personalized demo, please feel free to contact Co-Founder Brian Cody at bcody@scholasticahq.com. Or visit Scholastica’s website at www.scholasticahq.com to learn more about our platform and take a tour. We look forward to helping you get the most out of peer review!
Partnership with Peer Organisations

By Michael Willis
Editorial Services Manager at Wiley
miwillis@wiley.com

Since its inception ISMTE has welcomed opportunities to collaborate with peer organisations for the best interests of our members.

By peer organisations, I refer to societies, associations or bodies which share some or many of the interests of ISMTE, whose resources may be of help to our members and who would benefit from our resources. Collaboration may take different forms, depending on the activities and remit of the organisation concerned.

Here are some examples by way of illustration. ISMTE was represented by holding a parallel session at the 2012 conference of the European Association of Science Editors (EASE) in Tallinn. We collaborated with EASE at our 2013 European conference in Blankenberge, for which we also arranged reciprocal discounted conference registration rates for our respective members. This year the Board of Life Science Editors (BELS) has included our UK conference in its list of professional meetings for which the BELS members’ travel award is eligible. Also this year, we look forward to partnering with the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) by way of holding consecutive conferences/seminars in both Philadelphia and London. And Jason Roberts is representing ISMTE in the Working Group of the Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information (CASRAI), developing a robust mechanism for acknowledging reviewer activity using ORCiD identifiers.

But we are keen to explore where further opportunities may exist. Do you represent an organisation which shares some of the goals and interests of ISMTE members? Can you envisage opportunities where your organisation might partner with ISMTE? Are you involved in a project for your organisation which would benefit from the expertise of ISMTE members? If you can answer ‘yes’ to any of these, I would love to hear from you.

Finally, simply by being a member of ISMTE you can be an ambassador for the Society yourself among any peer organisations with which you interact or of which you are a member. If you attend a conference, let your fellow delegates know about us. And if you feel that there is an opportunity for ISMTE to collaborate with a peer organisation, please feel free to get in touch with me.
ORCiD Outreach Meeting

By Meghan McDevitt
Editorial Assistant

GiE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

The spring 2014 ORCiD Outreach Meeting was held May 21-22, 2014 at the University of Illinois at Chicago in Chicago, Illinois. Attendees included ORCiD directors and board members, sponsoring organizations, publishers, Editorial Office staff, academic librarians, university staff, IT staff, and developers. Funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the two-day meeting focused on ORCiD adoption and integration in universities and professional societies.

ORCiD Executive Director Laure Haak kicked off the meeting with a presentation on the background of ORCiD and its goal to create standard unique identifiers that can link and connect data across various entities and organizations. Since ORCiD’s launch in 2011, over 700,000 identifiers have been created with a broad international usage that includes over 50 countries.

Rebecca Bryant, ORCiD Director of Community, spoke next about the many resources available to researchers and integrating organizations. As a community-driven organization, ORCiD openly shares information and depends on volunteer support. Excellent resources are available on ORCiD’s website (http://orcid.org/) including use cases, slide decks, handouts, banners, and newsletter text. Outreach resources are available in multiple languages.

ORCiD Technical Director Laura Paglione presented on technical updates released since the last Outreach Meeting and introduced new advancements that will be implemented by the end of 2014 and early 2015.

Why ORCiD? Perspectives from the University Community

The first panel discussion focused on the benefits of integrating ORCiD in university communities to better link researchers’ work throughout their careers. The session was moderated by Barbara Allen from the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. Panel presenters included Karen Butler-Purry (Texas A&M University), Keith Hazelton (University of Wisconsin–Madison), Neil Jacobs (Jisc), and Yan Shuai (Society of China University Journals [CUJS]).

Integrating ORCiD into university systems would help universities connect students, researchers, and graduates across multiple platforms and provide universities with an opportunity to track the career outcomes of their graduates. Implementing ORCiD at the student level would prepare students for managing their scholarly identities throughout their careers. ORCiD integration would streamline and improve reporting processes to funders and facilitate the transfer of one’s information when changing organizations. Another benefit of ORCiD is that it has the potential to carry over across a variety of platforms, from PubMed, Scopus, and CrossRef to human resource databases and university systems. Finally, ORCiD would be useful for the global research community because it provides a persistent digital identifier that prevents name ambiguity.

ORCiD Integration into Research Information Systems

The afternoon concurrent sessions focused on the more technical aspects of integrating ORCiD into research information systems and repositories and included discussion and demonstrations by universities and vendors. ORCiD has been integrated into various research information systems available to the research community (PubMed, CrossRef, Web of Science) resulting in improved data collection. Connection and integration between
an individual’s ORCiD profile and a university, grant, organization, or publication also reduces the time-consuming process of sustaining up-to-date records. The panel presenters discussed various policies and data flow issues and shared use case scenarios.

**ORCiD at Professional Associations**

How can you tell if a Society member is an author or an author is a member? What happens when a member has multiple user accounts or has changed institutions? Connecting ORCiD with database systems, including manuscript submission, membership management, author/reviewer, and conference databases can open up a whole new level of data integration for scholarly societies. The session was moderated by Bernard Rouss (Association for Computing Machinery) and panel presenters were Scott Moore (Society for Neuroscience), Reynold Guida and Gordon MacPherson (IEEE), and Mary Warner (American Geophysical Union).

Professional associations are starting to integrate ORCiD into their membership databases and submission systems to eliminate errors and provide value to members, such as the possibility of a single sign-on. The Society for Neuroscience and IEEE have implemented ORCiD within their membership database systems to help in situations when members change emails, addresses, or institutions and to clean up duplicate records. Additionally, ORCiD can help identify areas of interest to deliver better, more targeted information to membership. The journals at the American Geophysical Union have begun collecting ORCiD identifiers through eJournalPress when new manuscripts are submitted. The ORCiD information is added to the association database in the hopes of creating a 360° view of their membership.

**Best Practices in the Promotion and Creation of ORCiD Identifiers**

Panelists from New York University Langone Medical Center, Texas A&M University, Boston University School of Medicine, University of Michigan, and the University of Oxford shared their approach and strategy for integrating ORCiD. Discussion centered around the need to clarify author disambiguation, demonstrate the benefits of ORCiD integration, obtain buy-in, and communicate and disseminate the information necessary to generate interest in ORCiD.

The panelists shared examples of their organization’s ORCiD integration strategies. Texas A&M created their own marketing materials tailored to the university community, such as an FAQs page, and provided students with helpful resources from library services. Some organizations required ORCiD registration for all faculty, while others started with students and both opt-in and opt-out methods were discussed. Boston University began with an opt-out strategy for their faculty, which met with little resistance, and hopes to expand ORCiD integration to non-medical campuses in the near future. At the University of Michigan, a taskforce partnered with the research office and medical school to promote ORCiD as an author disambiguation tool. Finally, the University of Oxford’s active research community saw the need for ORCiD integration and has begun the process of implementing an opt-in model for linking an individual’s ORCiD to one’s Oxford profile.

In addition to the many free outreach resources available on ORCiD’s website, most of the organizations have their materials (FAQs, guides) publicly available. The panelists also recommended that it was best to have all the technical systems in place before sending communications to encourage users to register.

The final panel discussion centered on the technical integration of ORCiD identifiers into database systems. Presenters from Chalmers University of Technology, Boston University, and Texas A&M University shared their strategies and recommendations for implementing ORCiD.

**Conclusions**

The ORCiD Outreach Meeting was an excellent opportunity to learn about the newest updates from ORCiD and to hear from organizations who are integrating ORCiD identifiers in unique ways. Great resources are available on the ORCiD website for researchers, publishers, and organizations with information and examples on how to promote and implement ORCiD integration. Additionally, all slides from this meeting are available online (http://orcid.org/content/orcid-outreach-meeting-and-codefest-may-2014).
Assessing the Altmetrics

By Anna Demmitt
Editorial Intern
Editorial Office News

As we learned in the May issue of EON in the article “Altmetrics: A Modern Way to Assess Research and Journals,” altmetrics seek to quantify the impact of research output in a more comprehensive and timely manner than traditional citation analysis. By measuring article views and other indicators of the attention, altmetrics aim to reveal the extent to which a particular research product is being used to advance subsequent research. Three of the most prominent companies that process altmetrics are Plum Analytics, Impactstory, and Altmetric. This article will give a brief synopsis on what each has to offer.

As described in the EON article from May, Plum Analytics markets an impact dashboard product called PlumX. The data are summarized in a widget that displays five types of metrics: usage (downloads and views), captures (bookmarks, Mendeley readers, etc.), citations (PubMed, CrossRef, etc.), social media (Facebook likes, Tweets, etc.), and mentions (Facebook or Reddit comments, Amazon reviews, etc.). Notably, the research outputs (referred to as “artifacts”) are not limited to journal articles, but include dissertations, books, videos, patents, datasets, software, posters, and presentations. In addition to
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Assessing the Altmetrics

The level of attention given to a particular research product by comparing it to other research products with similar audiences and modes of engagement. For example, one article might be flagged simply as having been “saved” by the public (via a Delicious bookmark), while another might be labeled as “highly saved” by scholars because it is at the 94th percentile in terms of the number of times it has been saved into Mendeley libraries, compared with other publications from the same year. Like Plum Analytics, Impactstory tracks altmetrics related to a variety of research products beyond journal articles. Impactstory differs in that it sees its web-based tool as being as applicable to individual researchers as to funders or repositories. For instance, Impactstory makes it easy for researchers to set up “impact profiles” that list research outputs along with their associated engagement metrics (Figure 2 for example). Setting up a profile is free (though there are limitations on the number of items that can be included) and easy (adding research products is as straightforward a typing in a PubMed ID or other unique identifier) and the altmetrics data are downloadable. Impactstory, which is set up as a not-for-profit corporation, emphasizes that it ranks the level of attention given to a particular research product by comparing it to other research products with similar audiences and modes of engagement.

Consistent with its name, Impactstory emphasizes the importance of understanding the story the data tell. To provide context, Impactstory

Figure 2.

the summary view, PlumX allows users to drill down to artifact-level metrics; for instance, if the artifact has Mendeley captures, it’s possible to click through to Mendeley to see demographic detail on the readers who have added the artifact to their libraries. Unique to PlumX is the “sunburst” view, which is designed to quickly identify those artifacts within a collection that have oversized impact (Figure 1). In addition to publishers, natural customers for PlumX include academic institutions, which might wish to track usage of institutional repositories, to create profile pages for their researchers, or analyze research output as part of assessment exercises.

Consistent with its name, Impactstory emphasizes the importance of understanding the story the data tell. To provide context, Impactstory

Figure 3.
Assessing the Altmetrics

operates with open metrics. This means that their code is open source and the data are open where permissible by providers’ terms of service.

Altmetric, well known for its multicolored altmetric “donuts,” targets its product to publishers, librarians, managers of institutional repositories, and researchers. In contrast to Plum Analytics and ImpactStory, Altmetric does not seek to track a wide variety of research products, instead focusing exclusively on journal articles. However, like the other two services, it assesses these articles by gathering indicators of attention from across the Web, such as mentions by news outlets, blogs, online forums, social media, as well as captures in Mendeley and CiteULike. Uniquely, Altmetric awards a numerical score, which is a count of online mentions, weighted to favor stories from newspapers and mentions in blogs above more ephemeral materials such as Tweets and Facebook mentions. Like Impactstory, Altmetric does provide context, reporting the percentile and absolute rank of the score in comparison to all articles in its databases, all articles of a similar age, or all articles in the same journal. A number of publishers have incorporated the Altmetric donut into their websites, including Nature Publishing Group, BioMed Central, and Springer (see Figure 3 for a donut corresponding to a stem cell article in Nature that inspired some skeptical buzz and is now under investigation for fraud). Users of Scopus (Elsevier’s citation database) may also have noticed the Altmetric donut appearing beside search results. For those looking to crunch and compare altmetric data across articles and publishers, the company offers the Altmetric Explorer, a web app that is marketed to editors, among others, to evaluate social media campaigns. In addition to these paid products, Altmetric offers a bookmarklet, which can be added to the browser toolbar to quickly bring up the Altmetric donut of essentially any journal article that can be viewed online.

While Plum Analytics, ImpactStory, and Altmetric are not the only ventures designed to measure attention related to scholarly publishing, they have made substantial progress in raising the profile and ease of use of altmetrics. Editorial offices looking for better audience engagement with the content they produce would do well to turn their own attention to these emerging metrics.
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Local Group Meets in Chicago

By Karen Parks
Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

In the fall of 2013 I was asked to work with ISMTE Executive Director Leslie McGeoch to organize a local group in the Chicago area. On December 4, the ISMTE Chicagoland local group met for lunch in Greektown. At that meeting we made some decisions on how to go forward.

We established a schedule for future meetings (last Wednesday of every other month, 5 pm). We decided an after-work gathering would better accommodate our schedules and, for a little variety, we would determine the next location at each meeting. We have met four times in three different restaurants. There is no cost to attend our meetings (except for food and drink at the restaurant) and non-members are welcome.

The meeting format is very informal. We start with a couple of suggested topics to discuss and then we let the discussion go where it will. Everyone brings something to the discussion and, hopefully, everyone takes something from the discussion that they can use in their work. Some topics we have discussed are social media, Open Access, plagiarism, and ORCiD. We encourage attendees to suggest topics for discussion, ask for advice, and air concerns about work-related issues. At our next meeting we plan to talk about the transition to new Editors/Editor-in-Chief, and the peer-review process.

Come share your thoughts and experiences at our next meeting on Wednesday, July 30, starting at 5 pm, at Athena Restaurant in Chicago’s Greektown neighborhood. Contact ISMTE (info@ismte.org) or Karen Parks (karen.k.parks@sbcglobal.net) to be added to the mailing list for meeting notices.

ISMTE Member Corner
Welcome to our newest members!

Laurie Smith
American Chemical Society

Ena Lupine
ICOM

Christine Dymek
Kaufman Wills Fusting & Co Editorial Services

Susan Zaid
Academy of Management

Deborah Meyer
American Society of Echocardiography

Andrew Moore
Wiley

Susan Debad
Wiley

Sofia Dorsano
World Allergy Organization

Alexandra Hay
British Society for Immunology
What’s Driving them Crazy!

Usually EON is filled to the brim with practical suggestions about improving the work of editorial offices. That’s not the case here. Instead, this list of pet peeves takes a step back and looks at the things that drive authors and reviewers nuts in their interactions with editorial offices. It’s not especially pleasant reading, but the hope is that knowing what our “customers” really think (but usually don’t say) can help all of us improve our game.

Comments are based on paraphrases from conversations, or, when indicated with quotation marks, are verbatim from emailed responses. Respondents were researchers from a variety of fields, including clinical medicine, physics, engineering/computer science, and computational biology, and ranged from graduate students to tenured professors.

Authors

• “I think 4 reviewers makes the probability of acceptance almost impossible. The editors should avoid 4 reviewers as there is typically no way to address that many concerns.”
• “It can be frustrating when [the revision letter] suggests increasing the scope of the analysis—we usually know that we could include more things of interest, but don’t have the resources or manpower to do so.”

Reviewers

• Editors need to use their discretion. If the editor doesn’t step in, you get sent back a paper that doesn’t address your comments. So you send back the same comments as you wrote for the first review. It’s a waste of time for reviewers.
• Getting a paper to rereview that had really severe revisions, and having an unreasonably short time to reevaluate it. You have no idea how long it takes to do a thorough (re)review.

Collected by Liz Bury, Emily Fay, and Nijsje Dorman from the AJKD Editorial Office
Calendar of Events

COPE North American seminar
August 13, 2014
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
http://publicationethics.org/
ISMTE members attending the ISMTE conference receive complimentary registration to COPE seminar

ISMTE North American Conference
August 14-15, 2014
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
www.ismte.org
EASE and COPE members receive ISMTE member registration rate

ACES Editing Boot Camp, Chicago
August 22, 2014
Chicago, Illinois
www.copydesk.org/

ACES Editing Boot Camp, Nashville
September 4, 2014
Nashville, Tennessee
www.copydesk.org/

ALPSP International Conference 2014
September 10-12, 2014
London, England
www.alpsp.org

6th Conference on Open Access Scholarly Publishing
September 17-19, 2014
Paris, France
http://oaspa.org/

ISMTE European Conference
October 13-14, 2014
London, England
www.ismte.org

ACES Editing Boot Camp, Nashville
October 30, 2014
Palm Springs, California
www.copydesk.org/

Thank You
to our Corporate Sponsors!

Platinum Supporter
Wiley-Blackwell

Silver Supporters
ACS Publications
American Institute of Physics
Origin Editorial
Wolters Kluwer Health

Bronze Supporters
Editage, eJournalPress, J & J Editorial, LLC,
Thomson Reuters

Interested in supporting ISMTE?
Please visit http://www.ismte.org/?page=CorporateMembership
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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 US Copyright law requires written permission from the EON Editor.

ISMTE Executive Office:
310 W. Lake Street, Suite 111 Elmhurst, Illinois 60126 USA
ISMTE new phone number: (+1) 630-433-4513
ISMTE new email address: info@ismte.org
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