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**A Fond Farewell**

By Meghan McDevitt

Editor

*EON*

Sitting down to write not only the last editorial of the year, but also the last editorial of my tenure as *EON* Editor provided an excellent opportunity for reflection. In the almost five years I have been involved with the ISMTE, the society has grown in leaps and bounds, expanding to over 1,000 members, establishing conferences in three continents, cultivating connections with peer organizations, and accomplishing many other achievements, all in the name of empowering Editorial Offices around the world.

*EON*’s growth mirrors that of the society. We joined Crossref in 2015, adding DOI numbers to articles that are deposited to the Crossref website. Through our partnership with Editage, monthly Editor’s Choice articles are translated into simplified Chinese, furthering our mission to engage with authors and Editorial Offices in the Asian-Pacific region. As part of our recent rebranding campaign, *EON* will be getting a redesign in 2017 to become digitally optimized and interactive. Stay tuned!

It really does “take a village,” and there wouldn’t be an *EON* issue each month without the team behind the scenes. Nijsje Dorman and Liz Bury have been steadfast collaborators since day one, helping with proofreading and editing, inviting authors, submitting files to production, and much more. A number of section/column editors have kept content coming in over the past few years, including Edwina Thorn, Lindsey Brounstein, Sherryl Sundell, and Stephanie Kinnan. Along the way, I was never without the helpful guidance of past *EON* Editors, Deborah Bowman and Kristie Overstreet. Many thanks to our production vendor, Sheridan, for their support and sponsorship of *EON*. Finally, my sincere appreciation goes out to *EON*’s contributing authors who took the time...
to share their thoughts, opinions, and experiences with the ISMTE community.

This jam-packed issue is a true example of just how much the ISMTE has evolved. Read about the 9th annual European Conference held in Brussels, Belgium this fall. Don’t forget to save the dates for our upcoming 2017 conferences in Beijing, Denver, and London! Speaking of conferences, it’s not too early to start thinking about submitting an abstract for the annual poster session. Shari Leventhal has the details on page 25.

In other society news, Kristie Overstreet continues our series on the results from the Core Competency Survey, taking a look at Editorial Office reports and reporting. There are also brand new resources for Editorial Office reporting on the website. ISMTE Local Groups continue to meet all over the world and new groups, including Kimberly Retzlaff’s group in Denver, Colorado, are getting off the ground. Join a Local Group today or start your own!

Technology has driven and pushed the industry far beyond what we could have imagined 10 years ago. Editorial Offices have experienced transitions to online editorial submission systems and other publication platforms as well as increased awareness of and interest in publication ethics, transparency and openness, and peer review management. Tony Alves breaks down three main Internet security threats we should keep in mind when working online or when working with services provided over the Internet. Alongside the Open Access movement is a move toward open data. Meredith Morovati writes about Dryad, an open data repository, and how journals might create policies surrounding data access and sharing. Technology also provides new tools that allow us to become (hopefully) more proficient in our work. Judy Naylor discusses Trello, an organizational web tool, in this month’s Taming Technology article.

Handling errata and retractions are just another part of the day in the life of a Managing Editor. Sometimes, however, errors are made on the publisher’s end and a retraction is issued that has nothing to do with the authors or their conclusions. Adam Etkin and Ivan Oransky explore these types of retractions and call for a better way to distinguish them. Finally, learn about AMERBAC, a Mexican society for biomedical Editors, in this month’s Peers in Review column.

Producing EON each month has been challenging and yet so rewarding. I have enjoyed interacting with and getting to know so many people in the scholarly publishing community, and I greatly appreciate having had this opportunity. As we move forward into 2017 and celebrate the ISMTE’s 10th anniversary, it’s amazing to look back and see what has been accomplished. Let’s look forward to the next 10 years—who knows what they will bring.

NEW! Editorial Office Reporting Resources

Best practice in Editorial Office management requires benchmarking the journal’s performance by collecting and analyzing the appropriate data and providing those data in useful reports for editors, societies, publishers, editorial boards, and the Editorial Office to use for goal setting and for ensuring that set goals are met.

The ISMTE Education Committee collected information from their experiences and from the June 2016 Core Competency survey to create the list of the top five reports that every Editorial Office needs to create on a regular basis.

Two new reporting resources are now available on the ISMTE website.
Plenary—Current Political Landscape
Reported by Alice Ellingham, Co-Founder, Editorial Office Ltd

James Perham-Marchant, Director, Government and Academic Affairs, EMEA, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., gave a lively and interesting opening keynote for the conference, breaking the area into three topics: The Open Science Policy Agenda, Digital Single Market, and Brexit. After providing an interesting insight into ‘How Brussels Works’, he highlighted how the political landscape is implementing the different Open Access policies while science is already moving beyond open access to open science. The Open Science Policy Platform (OSPP) has a mandate of developing open science policy which includes flexibility and collaboration without imposing unnecessary burdens on the science community. This is a significant challenge and not one that will happen quickly. Topically, Perham-Marchant also spoke about Brexit and the impact on science in the United Kingdom and the rest of Europe. The road ahead is one of dialogue and investment in infrastructure and tools requiring joint action from many stakeholders, including publishers, institutions, and governments. Overall it was a very apt and interesting start to our Brussels meeting.

Morning Breakout Sessions

Session A: Open Data—Clinical Data Sharing
Reported by Duncan Nicholas, Director, DN Journal Publishing Services Ltd

In this session, Dr. Christopher Baethge, Chief Scientific Editor, Deutsches Ärzteblatt International, spoke about the data sharing policies of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), and asked the group how journals can involve themselves in data sharing.

Although the ICMJE advocate for data sharing and are optimistic about its potential benefits to research communities, Baethge suggested that ‘we are not yet in the phase of being able to tell how well data sharing will work’.

Baethge gave some examples of a lack of adherence to national open data policies, such as the study published in JAMA in June 2016, showing out of 1,000 papers registered in ClinicalTrials.gov, only 400 had made data available in the Clinical Study Data Request data-sharing repository.

The group had several interesting, detailed discussions on topics such as whether authors are deterred from submitting to journals with data sharing policies; problems in meeting both institutional and funding body requirements; ownership of data, and rights regarding reuse; and...
whether primary authors of data would ideally be requested to review a ‘secondary’ paper that used the original data—and be able to review it objectively. Another comment was that new culture of open data will reduce the reliance on traditional pre-publication peer review, to focus on post-publication review, reanalysis, and an open conversation around data. And finally, Irene Hames suggested that open reuseable data could enable Masters students to be given ‘famous’ datasets to analyse as practice, and perhaps make new discoveries from.

Session B: Copyright Reform
Reported by Edward Wates, Vice President & Director, Research Content Management, Wiley

René Viljoen-van Rensburg presented this session on European copyright. The aim of this session was to provide participants with a broad overview of current EU copyright policy, with particular reference to the Commission’s Digital Single Market Strategy (DSM).

In a lively presentation, Viljoen-van Rensburg began with a very brief introduction to copyright legislation, starting with the Statute of Anne in England in 1710 leading to the current more than 10 European Directives governing copyright. Of particular relevance was her discussion about the role of licensing, since this is an issue that affects Editorial Offices on an almost daily basis.

It is perhaps no surprise that copyright legislation has failed to keep pace with the changing environment, so the aim of the EU copyright review is to ‘create a seamless area where people and business can trade, interact legally, safely, securely and at affordable cost.’ This then forms a key part of EU strategy, whose aim is to facilitate a digital single market for Europe.

However, the details of this are inevitably complex, so Viljoen-van Rensburg spent quite a lot of time going through the implications of the relevant provisions under the proposed new directive (see slide seven of her presentation).

Finally, she reminded us all of the directive concerning implementation of the Marrakesh Treaty, which requires publishers to make ‘accessible format copies’ available to ‘visually impaired persons’ or ‘persons with print disabilities.’

Session C: Data Mining
Reported by Michael Willis, Senior Manager, Peer Review, Wiley

In this hugely information-rich world, finding and making sense of the data you need can often be impenetrable and inordinately time-consuming. Dr. Peter Murray-Rust of the University of Cambridge demonstrated the value of projects such as Wikidata. This collects data in a structured format that can be read and edited by humans as well as machines, enabling data to be ‘enriched’ by being linked to other data effectively and meaningfully. He then presented some of the software engineering research undertaken by his department to extract and process scientific data in the fields of chemistry, materials science, and physics. Given that research methods are often written in a fairly formulaic style, it is possible for computers, having mined the text of research documents, firstly to recognise and make sense of the terminology, and then to extract from these documents information of particular use to other researchers—and to do all this far more quickly and more efficiently than a human can. He demonstrated a specific example, ChemicalTagger, which has the potential to analyse chemical syntheses automatically and on a vast scale.
ISMTE European Conference 2016

Publishing Tools Panel
Reported by Meghan McDevitt, Assistant Manager of Clinical Publications, American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

This panel presentation informed conference attendees about various publishing tools currently available. **Redfish Systems** is a file/asset management system that includes a fully integrated tracking system. It allows email integration and can automatically link emails to specific users or manuscripts. Full integration with peer review systems can include payment, online hosting, typesetting, and more.

A new way to work together in the cloud, **Overleaf** provides real-time collaboration for users working on a document or project. Overleaf is even working with publishing systems to help streamline submissions, creating direct submission links that allow users to submit manuscripts from the platform directly to the submission system.

When it comes time to publish their work, researchers often come across numerous barriers to publication not least of which includes frustrating rules on file formats. Developed by the Collaborative Knowledge Foundation, **PubSweet** is a publication framework that uses HTML collaboration for Web-based publishing systems. Flexible and configurable tools are available for authoring, editing, and production.

**Publons** offers reviewers a way to track, validate, and receive credit for the reviews they complete. Increasingly integrated into editorial systems, Publons can automatically update reviewers’ dashboards with verified completed reviews. Editorial Offices are provided with a journal dashboard showing journal review policy and completed reviews. Depending on journal policy, reviews or other details can be made open after article publication.

Tuesday, November 1
Open Review Panel
Reported by Claudia Welburn, Account Manager, Editorial Office Ltd

Moderator **Edward Wates**, Vice President and Director, Content Management and Technology Research, John Wiley and Sons Ltd., introduced the panel and **Phil Hurst**, Publisher, Royal Society, opened with a presentation called “Open Peer Review: a Publisher’s Perspective.” His presentation covered why publishers are exploring the need for open peer review, some statistics about what authors and reviewers think and some challenges that will be faced. Hurst showed a chart that showed a strong and clear preference for a “yes” to the question of submitting authors opting for open peer review in *Royal Society Open Science*. He also listed some challenges in a pros and cons format for open peer review.

**Adrian Aldcroft**, Editor, *BMJ Open*, spoke about the different models of peer review and how an editor should consider these. He also spoke about what is the purpose of peer review; how this is different depending on each journal; and also what are the options (double-blind, single-blind, open, or is there something new out there?). Aldcroft also explained about any factors that might disrupt the process such as professional or personal bias, and considered the question of whether open peer review solves the problem. In posing the question of what evidence there is for the superiority of open peer review, Aldcroft gave us food for thought. Ultimately, however, he does consider that the reviewers are trying to help authors improve the quality of their paper.

The panel discussed all of the pros and cons for open peer review. The final speaker, **Dominika Bijos, PhD**, Research Associate, University of Bristol, had some interesting points from the author’s point of view, mentioning that as a researcher, all the author members of the open review panel.
needs is to have their work published with constructive feedback. To have their work published under open review also allows them to develop skills to become a reviewer for their peers.

The discussion was very interesting and to hear the viewpoints of a publisher, Editor, and author made for a great discussion.

### Breakout Sessions

**Session B: Editorial Office Research (Parts One and Two)**

*Reported by Tracy Ronan and Karen Baulch, Editorial Assistants, Editorial Office Ltd*

This was a good interactive session with Jason Roberts, PhD, Senior Partner, Origin Editorial, that engaged with the audience in opinion, feedback, ideas, and exploration. The session was focused on the new reporting deliverables available from ISMTE but also stimulated discussion on the use, data analysis, and presentation of statistical information.

Based on a consensus, the ISTME has defined a top five most commonly used Editorial Office statistics/reports. The initial concept for the sessions was built on the aim to provide best practice reports to take account of the key aspects of report design, apply correct statistical methods, recognising potential confounders in data, define key parameters and appropriate comparisons, and determine the most instructive visual display for data.

The concept was born from there being no conversation among Editorial Offices previously about a standard way to report—even with fundamental reports such as submissions received. The question is then “what happens when you want to look deeper.”

The session detailed ways in which ISTME wanted to provide standard tools and templates to Editorial Offices that could still be customised to fit individual journal’s needs. These would be prepared initially by vendors of editorial management systems, and then provided at the ISMTE website for users to download.

The session explained that once implemented, the ISMTE site will make supporting documents available on how to run the reports.

The reports to be delivered are a best fit based on feedback received by ISMTE to date and the initial five reports will be:

1. Current year submissions vs. previous year
2. Acceptance rate for current year vs. previous year
3. Countries/geographical reports of origin of submitted and accepted articles
4. Time from submission to first decision
5. Time from submission to final decision

The key in all the above reports will be the showing of relevant and different visual presentation, that is bar and line/radar charts.

All the above are key to a successfully run editorial team. There are so many ways to report data and workflows but being clear and precise along with your audience being visually satisfied with the information placed in front of them are key considerations. With all these data and research

![Image](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

Jason Roberts, PhD, presented two sessions on Editorial Office reporting.
available, it’s knowing how to decipher the important and constructive parts that will provide useful long-term reporting.

In all, these two sessions were an enjoyable and constructive addition to at this year’s European ISMTE conference.

Session C: Should You Consider Transitioning Your Journal to Open Access?
Reported by Duncan Nicholas

In the context of the conference theme of ‘Becoming More Open,’ this session was posed as less of a question, and more of a practical session in how to transition a journal, and the various aspects to consider when doing so.

The session, led by Dagmar Meyer, PhD, Policy Adviser, European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA), was based on the recently published Solomon, Laakso & Björk (2016) paper ‘Converting Scholarly Journals to Open Access: A Review of Approaches and Experiences’, and presented some of the key themes to consider and prepare for when ‘flipping’ a journal.

It covered the motivations such as increased readership, submissions, and published articles, and potential citation increases and income. Meyer addressed some of the challenges involved, such as the time-consuming preparation, communicating policy changes, and subscription and backlog management. Finally, some scenarios of transition were covered, from larger publisher titles to smaller society journals.

It was an interesting session, and Meyer encouraged everyone to read the Solomon paper, which goes into extensive detail.

Session D: Should You Become More Open in Review Processes? Pros and Cons
Two different reports on this session are provided

Among the breakout sessions in the morning, Elizabeth Moylan, Senior Editor for Research Integrity at BioMed Central, guided participants through the discussion of more open review processes. Three main questions formed the basis for her presentation: what is open review; does open review work; and are there other ways to “open up”?

Firstly, it is important to define open peer review. One question is to ask whether it is more important to know who reviewed or the content of the review. In the strict sense open peer review means knowing who reviewed a paper and publishing the comments, as several major publishers and journals do. Open review is said to be ethically superior, show a lack of important adverse effects, be feasible, and have “the potential to balance greater accountability for reviewers with credit for the work they do.”

But does open review work? In a randomized trial in 1999 and again in 2010, van Rooyen et al. found that authors knowing reviewers’ names had no important effect on the quality of the review itself, whether a paper was recommended for publication, or how long it took to review, but it did significantly increase the likelihood that reviewers would decline the invitation. Research using the Review Quality Instrument (RQI) in several journals also determined that the reports from author-suggested reviewers were of comparable quality to that of non-author-suggested reviewers, but that author-suggested reviewers were significantly more likely to recommend acceptance; also, the quality of open peer review reports was

---

higher than were single-blind reports in one journal but no different in another.4

Confidentiality appears to be a deciding factor in open peer review. Here, editorial stewardship is required. Will reviewers just write more “confidential” comments that need to be managed? Journals that practice open peer review also have different ways of handling it and field-specific differences do exist: for some journals, reviewers sign their reports, for others not. Some journals offer an “opt in” and others offer cross-reviewer commenting.

Other ways to open up include collaborative peer review, in which a paper is openly discussed among reviewers but a single decision letter is sent and publishing reviewer names is optional; interactive peer review, in which review is single-blind and the published article reveals the names of those reviewers who endorsed publication; and portable peer review (cascading), where the reviews can accompany the paper to another journal. Better technology is needed for this to work well.

Ultimately, future research will reveal the benefits and limitations of open peer review. It is a process that, like open access, will take time to evolve.

Reported by Sherryl Sundell, Managing Editor, International Journal of Cancer

Elizabeth Moylan, Senior Editor for Research Integrity at BioMed Central, explained the ambiguity associated with open peer review, as there are different types:

- BMC and BMJ Open publish the reviewer names, previous versions of the paper and review histories.
- Frontiers publishes the reviewer names but not their reports.
- EMBO publishes the reports but not names.

The need to invite more reviewers in order to get two or three to agree is a problem for journals that operate open peer review, but Moylan believes it is not an insurmountable one.

One of the main challenges in the lack of functionality to cascade papers (and therefore reviews) easily between publishers.

eLife encourages authors in the decision letter to submit the reviews to other journals with their manuscript, but it is likely that they need the reviewer’s permission to include their name.

A study in The BMJ identified the following negative effects of open peer review: higher refusal rate from reviewers and an increase in time taken to review. A BMC study compared the quality of open vs. blinded peer review and found that open reviews were 5% higher quality (not significant).

Other options:

- Reviewers sharing their reports with other reviewers, although reviewers may be influenced to change their opinion. The eLife model may be preferable as reviewers need to submit an initial review first, and then once all reviews are in they discuss the manuscript via a forum built into eJournalPress and reach a decision.

Frontiers operates interactive peer review, which is single blind, with authors and reviewers interacting. The reviewer names are not disclosed with the reports, although they are published with the article if it is accepted. It is unclear what effect the process has on the editorial turnaround times.

BMC has launched a journal on research integrity and peer review.

---


Audience participation is a key feature of ISMTE conferences.
Moylan believes that all research should be deposited on a preprint server so that the whole review process, and cascading from journal to journal, is transparent. Readers will then be able to see how a paper has changed between original submission and publication.

Reported by Katherine Baron, Operations Manager, BMJ

Plenary—Open Communication
Reported by Alice Ellingham

Jon Tennant, PhD, Royal School of Mines, Imperial College London, provided us with a lively start to our afternoon on day two with an insight into his view on ‘Open Communication’ within the world of science research. He spoke at length about his journey through the ‘Open World’ from the initial frustration with paywalls to his calmer (but still passionate) view that researchers and publishers are often having very similar conversations, but with a wide difference in language.

Jon went on to discuss the broadening of open access, discussing the benefits of opening up the entire process, including reviews, revisions and editorial comments so that every piece of data input can be read and built upon thereby increasing the value of publications. Many new publications are already experimenting with more open processes (EMBO, PeerJ, eLife, Nature Communications, Frontiers) and ‘no one has died yet.’

With a brief touch on the Impact Factor and a plea to break the chain by supporting DORA (Declaration on Research Assessment), Tennant completed his excellent plenary with several key messages emphasising that graduates entering research today have grown up in a Web-dominated era where open and free information is a normal expectation. Scholarly communications still have some way to go before there is full openness in all parts of the publishing process.

Session B: PEERE in a Nutshell
Reported by Michael Willis

PEERE is a collaboration of researchers, journal Editors, and publisher stakeholders funded by the European Cooperation on Science and Technology (COST). This EU-wide undertaking has funding until 2018 and its purpose is to facilitate, through support for networking activities such as workshops and conferences, evidence-based research into the so-called ‘black box’ of journal and grant peer review. Dr. Marco Seeber of Ghent University, and a member of the PEERE group, described the some of the projects undertaken by PEERE. These include exploration of motivations for peer review, attempts to determine standards and quality in peer review, and the effects of different peer review blinding models on peer review/editorial decision outcomes. The paucity of journal peer review data has been a hindrance to much research undertaken in this area, with much of the research conducted so far using agent-based modelling and simulation to explore peer reviewer behaviour. It is then of great significance that three of the major commercial publishers (Elsevier, Springer Nature, and Wiley) have expressed their willingness to contribute data to the project.

Session C: Writing Better Emails—A Practical Approach
Reported by Alice Ellingham

Claudia Welburn, Account Manager, Editorial Office Ltd, led a light-hearted, but informative session on writing better emails. During this discussion and example-based workshop, we discussed the best way to plan, write, and sign off of an email. Frameworks for success, connecting with the reader, and insight into how the recipient will read the email provided a solid base for the session.

There was lively discussion on the perceived level of politeness (aka ‘Britishness’) of some signoffs as well as some much liked (and much loathed) trends within emails. Hopefully everyone took some practical points away to help their daily emails.

Session D: Publication Standards
Reported by Gill Smith, Co-Founder, Editorial Office Ltd

The breakout session run by Jigisha Patel, PhD, Associate Editorial Director, BioMed Central, explored several aspects of ethics within publishing.
Highlighting several cases with the group Jigisha opened discussions on identifying ethical concerns (reuse of data, author disputes, etc.) and the potential processes to handle these instances and, hopefully, reach a resolution.

Whilst each case must be considered individually the group acknowledged that the COPE guidelines proved an essential resource for the publisher/Editorial Office to follow however all agreed that caution should be observed before any declarations relating to publishing ‘notes of concern’ as these are permanent records associated with the author.

**Conference Wrap-up**


You can view handouts and conference materials from the meeting online at the ISMTE website.

Save the date for next year’s European Conference in London, 9–10 November 2017.

*Editor’s Note: Photos courtesy of Meghan McDevitt.*
Discovering Our Roots: Dropping the Ball on 2016: Another Year Older, Another Year Wiser?

By: Stephanie Kinnan
Editorial Assistant

GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Well, it’s been quite a year. You can say that again. Well, it’s been quite a year. We’ve seen 366 days of spectacle, triumph and tragedy, and peace and unrest all over the world. As the year comes to a close, we find it’s time to reflect on the events that have made 2016 one of the craziest years yet. Oh yes, we stood by and watched as Britain decided to say “Bye, Felicia” and Brexit. An Oompa Loompa made a run for the White House and, cue ominous music, actually won. LochteGate took over the Olympics. Sorry to outshine you, Phelps. “Jeah!” And, not to be outdone, the Chicago Cubs broke a century-old curse, perpetuated by a goat, to win the World Series by a hair, or more appropriately by a rain delay. Yes, it certainly has been some year, but here are some of the highlights and lowlights that you may have missed with your head buried deep in all that drama.

1. An emoji, yes folks, an e-m-o-j-i was announced as the word of the past year. That’s right. That little laughing guy with tears in his eyes beat out every word in the dictionary to claim the top prize. Has the whole world gone mad? Am I the only one who is not seeing any letters in that face!? 😂

2. Speaking of dictionaries, ’Merica and YOLO were officially adopted into the dictionary. Why? You may ask. Well, because you only live once, and this is ’Merica, that’s why!

3. In breaking literature news: Harry Potter has a new book, and a new movie, and a new play, and okay, that’s probably not something that has escaped your notice, although your one-track Hamilton-focused mind may have missed that stage debut. I guess Potter really is the boy who lived and lived and lived…


And on that prophetic note, let’s ring in the New Year and see what madness 2017 has in store!

The “Discovering Our Roots” column is looking for contributors. Are you interested in writing for this column or do you have an idea for an article? Contact Stephanie Kinnan at skinnan@asge.org
Imagine you’re a researcher who is one of 10 candidates being considered for tenure, or a promotion, or perhaps a new job which would significantly advance your career. Now imagine that those making this decision eliminate you as a candidate without even an interview because your record shows you’ve had a paper retracted. But in this particular case, what the decision makers may not be aware of is that the paper was not retracted because you made an honest mistake—which, if you came forward about it, really shouldn’t be a black mark anyway—or even because you did something unethical. It was retracted due to publisher error. Like Han Solo and/or Lando Calrissian, you’d find yourself in utter disbelief while saying “It’s not my fault!”—and you’d be right.

Retraction Watch has reported on several “retractions” that were the result of publisher error. Usually this comes in the form of duplicate publication. Perhaps an unedited version was published due to an administrative miscommunication. Maybe a production glitch caused the same paper to appear in consecutive issues of the same journal. Possibly a journal was transferring the article to another journal produced by the same publishing house and inadvertently published it in both journals. Then there are a few cases in which a journal rejected an article, published it anyway, and then retracted it.

Granted, the percentage of retractions of this type that we know about is very small, but the potential negative implications for the researcher are enormous. While the retraction notice may make it clear that the authors were not at fault, unfortunately the reality is that often these notices may not be read by those who need to see them, or by the time they’re seen it’s too late.

In any industry, even the best make mistakes. It happens and frequently no one is to blame. Nevertheless, those in STEM publishing can and should do better. There are complex problems we are all trying to solve and deal with, but this should not be one of them. The most frustrating aspect of this scenario is how obviously and easily it can be avoided: Simply don’t call it a “retraction.”

Call it a “publisher error,” which is what it is. Or find something else to call it, preferably without using the word “retraction” or its weasel-word synonym, “withdrawal.” Just don’t say that the article has been “retracted.”

It’s silly really, that this is even something that needs to be addressed. The industry has adopted or created solutions to difficult problems such as plagiarism (iThenticate), article identification (Crossref DOIs), user disambiguation (ORCID), funding requirements (CHORUS), and more. Let’s not create problems where there isn’t one. Simply say it like it is. If it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, don’t call it a vulture. If you’re a publisher who needs to remove a paper due to your own error, it’s not a “retraction.” Don’t call it one.
Internet Security Concerns in Scholarly Publishing

By Tony Alves (ORCiD 0000-0001-7054-1732)
Director of Product Management
Aries Systems Corporation
talves@ariessys.com

Security should be a constant concern when working on the Internet. Every organization has mission-critical systems and processes that rely on the Internet in some way, such as membership services, e-commerce, inventory control, data exchange, email, etc. Keeping all of these systems safe from hackers and keeping them up and running without disruption is an essential part of any organization’s IT operations. Publishers are no different, and in fact, many publishers rely on online systems for just about all aspects of their business, from content acquisition, to content preparation, to quality control processes, to distribution and e-commerce. Some of these systems are housed within a publisher’s data center, and others are housed by vendors and by software-as-a-service providers. As the Director of Product Management at Aries Systems, I recognize that security and reliability are top priorities for our clients, and all software development projects consider security and reliability as a matter of course. This article is a very general overview of some of the issues that Editorial Offices should keep in mind when working online and when working with vendors who provide services over the Internet.

There are three general online threats faced by organizations with operations dependent on the Internet. A common but not widely known threat is a “denial-of-service” (DoS) attack, which is an attempt to slow down or take down a computer or network by overwhelming it with requests. It is somewhat analogous to people trying to crowd onto an elevator without first letting people off. A “distributed denial-of-service” (DDoS) is when an attack comes from many, often thousands, sometimes millions, of unique IP addresses. For example, the October 21, 2016 DDoS attack on the Internet services company Dyn included tens of millions of IP addresses flooding Dyn’s servers, which made websites including Twitter, Reddit, Amazon, Netflix, and Spotify unreachable. Protection from this sort of attack usually includes mechanisms for analyzing and identifying data packets before they enter the network, and then filtering those packets so that only legitimate traffic gets through. In many jurisdictions, DoS attacks are highly illegal, and in the United States and Europe perpetrators can be arrested and imprisoned.

A second and more well-known threat is the hacker. Hackers are generally trying to steal data, often valuable user data such as names, emails, Social Security numbers (in the United States), passwords, and credit card numbers, though sometimes hackers are just trying to cause mischief by disrupting workflow, deleting data, or revealing embarrassing information. Hackers access data by gaining unauthorized entry into computer networks and by watching unprotected data traverse the Internet. Some recent high-profile hacks include the 2013 theft of credit and debit card numbers from 40 million Target accounts, the theft of username and password data from 500 million Yahoo users (which happened in 2014, but wasn’t revealed until September 2016), and the email hacks of Sony in 2015 by the North Korean government and the Democratic National Committee in 2016 by the Russian government.

A strong and effective firewall is used to keep hackers from penetrating a network, and is also used to battle DoS attacks. A highly effective method of securing a network is to have a “default-deny” policy. This means that the firewall administrator identifies the allowed network services, and all other network services are denied both entry and exit to and from the network. A default-deny policy is used at Aries Systems, and though this adds significant overhead to network administration, it is far more secure than the “default-allow” approach where the administrator lists network services that are not allowed, and everything else is accepted.

Hackers also use viruses and malware to wreak havoc or steal data. One of the largest malware attacks took place in July of 2015, when a security hole in Adobe’s Flash product, used heavily in advertising, allowed hackers to hijack computers and render them unusable until a ransom was paid. Virus detection software is an absolute necessity for any computer connected to the Internet, and virus detection software should always be kept up to date. Good antivirus software from reputable vendors try to keep up with new threats, and most will have automated ways to keep the software installed on your computer current. Antivirus software should be deployed in various places, such as on network servers, email servers, and on people’s desktops. At Aries Systems, all manuscript files are scanned for viruses upon receipt on the Web server and any infected files are quarantined and reported. In addition, the submitting author is notified of the violation so that he/she can cleanse the virus at the source. To protect data as it moves across the Internet many websites and services use “Secure Sockets Layer” (SSL) protocol when transmitting data. When a user sees “https,” this indicates that SSL is active and the user can be assured that best practices are being employed to protect their communications.

A third and often overlooked threat is the disgruntled staff member, especially someone who has access to computer systems, network administration, and proprietary data. This is perhaps the most difficult threat to combat, since it is really a threat from within the organization, and the tools for prevention will often impact people’s productivity and even be perceived as a slight or an insult to some individuals. Although a disgruntled staff person can do a lot of damage to an organization’s credibility, outright destruction and theft is less common since, unlike DoS attacks and hacking, the perpetrator is usually a known person.

Some best practices that can cut down on risk include facility access control and intrusion monitoring. Strict authorization protocols, such as limiting staff access, logging all access as it occurs, and routinely reviewing those logs, are basic strategies. There are of course high-tech ways to limit access, such as passcodes, keycards, and biometric recognition (such as eye or fingerprint scans). It is highly recommended that a “dual-factor” strategy be employed, for example, at Aries Systems both a passcode and a biometric scan is required to enter any data center, and this access is automatically logged. It may seem obvious, but all third parties and contractors should be escorted and shadowed whenever they enter data centers and places where sensitive data is stored. Also, limiting access to passwords and security settings, forcing regular changes to those codes, and limiting the ability for people to act on others’ behalf are additional best-practice precautions.

Scholarly publishing is a global endeavor, requiring 24/7 access to services and data. People are working around the world, which means that people are working around the clock. With tight deadlines, with point-of-care services, with just-in-time inventory fulfillment, with print-on-demand, etc., it is no longer acceptable to have access limited to just business hours. All of this means that “continuity of service” isn’t a convenience; it is a must-have. Some organizations, including Aries Systems, handle this by maintaining mirrored systems, often housed in geographically separate locations. Real-time mirroring or “hot mirrors,” which means that that all data centers are operating as exact replicas of each other in real time, is an ideal way to ensure continual access to data and services. When planning this sort of dual hosting facility, it is good to consider having multiple standby power sources, such as multiple generators using different fuels, and multiple Internet service providers so that Internet connectivity is not dependent on just
one or two carriers. Data backup of all systems is also an integral part of a continuity-of-service plan. A rigorous backup policy includes regular backups (continual, hourly, daily) to some sort of storage medium, like magnetic tape, hard disk, or optical storage. Sending the backup media off-site, or using a remote backup service over the Internet, keeps the data safe in case of data center destruction. An important consideration is to be sure you have the ability to actually extract the data in a usable format if necessary. Aries Systems sends backup media, which contains the system’s software and customers’ data, to a commercial storage facility, and maintains the capability to completely restore the system in a remote location if necessary.

Secure computer systems and data integrity are part of guaranteeing continuity of service, especially if the organization handles sensitive data like credit card information or patient data. Organizations should regularly test their security protocols, both on a systems level and on a physical-plant level. The most common network security test is the “penetration test,” which is an attack on a computer network designed to gain access to the system, thus revealing security weaknesses. Although Aries Systems does not handle credit card data, there is plenty of valuable data housed on Aries’ servers. Therefore, penetration tests are regularly undertaken, and the results are reviewed. This then allows the IT team to design strategies for reinforcing any identified weak points. If a vendor is handling financial information, it is important that the vendor conforms to the “Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard” (PCI DSS) also referred to as “PCI compliance”. Details on this can be found at www.pcisecuritystandards.org.

As mentioned, security is not just about protecting computer networks, it also includes securing physical equipment and limiting access to data centers. It is also important to maintain written protocols, to review those protocols on a regular basis, and to find ways that those protocols and processes might be circumvented, either intentionally or by mistake.

Security is a broad topic with many nuances and varied approaches for mitigating risk. The preceding is just a cursory look at some of the considerations made by organizations that maintain computer networks and services that house data and provide essential services to customers. Publishers are particularly reliant on software systems and the Internet to conduct regular business. What’s more, publishers are also handling huge amounts of data, which is often being sent or streamed across the Internet, and publishers are engaged in e-commerce at every level of the publishing process. This means that security and system reliability are absolutely essential to publishers. There are many dangers, traps, and outright attacks out there in the wilds of the Internet, and it is important that security be the number one priority of the publisher and the publisher’s vendors and partners.

Ira Salkin Scholarship: Accepting Submissions 1 January 2017

The essay topic for 2017 is “Expectations of the Editorial Office to police publication ethics—how it has changed during the past 10 years.”

The submission deadline for entries is 31 May 2017.

The author of the winning essay will receive:

- Complimentary registration at a meeting of his/her choice
- $1,500 USD toward travel/accommodation
- Essay published in EON

More information and submission instructions can be found online. Questions? Contact scholarships@ismte.org.
Introducing AMERBAC

By Maria del Carmen Ruiz-Alcocer, MD (International Affairs Director, 2015-2017, AMERBAC) and Norberto Sotelo Cruz, MD (President, 2015-2017, AMERBAC)

Editorial groups are very diverse and represent the wide range of tasks and duties and areas of competence that define us. Yet, we have much in common and, to be sure, our goals intersect in many places. Thus, as part of ISMTE’s mission to enhance the editorial profession, promote professionalism among editors, and interconnect the community, we thought it would be of interest to our members and readers to become acquainted with other editors’ organizations all over the world.

ISMTE collaborates with several editorial societies already and this has proven to be mutually productive. In the “Peers in Review” column, our peer organizations are invited to introduce their society in a short article. With these articles we hope to lend additional support to our ongoing collaborations, forge new streams of cooperation, and continue to strengthen our roles as editors in scholarly and academic publishing.

For more information on ISMTE’s peer organizations, please contact Board of Directors member, Sherryl Sundell.

We appreciate the ISMTE’s invitation to participate in EON’s “Peers in Review.” The aim of this article is to contribute to the ISMTE’s mission to improve the profession of editing in the field of healthcare and the relationship between similar associations for mutual benefit as well as to strengthen the quality of editorial work.

The Asociación Mexicana de Editores de Revistas Biomédicas (AMERBAC, for Mexican Association of Biomedical Journal Editors) is a nonprofit association founded in 1997. AMERBAC holds meetings in Mexico City twice a year.

Since its founding nearly 20 years ago, AMERBAC seeks to facilitate the editorial mission of its members. To do this, AMERBAC tries to make available to editors international standards in the field of biomedical publishing and discuss them in their meetings.

Another important task is to seek training opportunities that allow new editors to receive a solid training to enter the fascinating world of publishing, and for editors who are already in the profession, to provide the latest tools for their continuing education. We also are committed to inviting authors to familiarize themselves with editorial tasks in order to improve their manuscripts.

AMERBAC welcomes as members: editors, authors, translators, and anyone interested in the professional biomedical editing work from anywhere in the world. Our members are from different professions: physicians, nurses, veterinarians, dentists, and so on. We have very young members but also very experienced editors. This diversity allows us to know different problems faced by editors and at the same time, approach differently the same problems.

AMERBAC seeks to disseminate international norms and standards emanating from the various associations. That’s why we have been making a constant effort to have a presence in various international events.

AMERBAC has been involved in the Congress of Peer Review since 1997 in Prague and then in Barcelona, Vancouver, and Chicago. It participates in the activities organized by the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME), which has permanently accepted us and has also accepted, at different times throughout these 19 years, our invitation to participate in some of our meetings. In our 15th Anniversary Conference we had the participation of experts from the editing field who came from the United States, Italy, Spain, and Brazil, among others.
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In addition, on behalf of AMERBAC, we were in Delhi last year for the first WAME conference.

With the European Association of Science Editors (EASE) we have developed a Mexican chapter and collaborate with great enthusiasm in the Spanish translation of abstracts of articles published in European Science Editing. We have had a presence at the Bath, Split, and Strasbourg EASE conferences.

With the Dr. Antoni Esteve Foundation (Barcelona) we had a very successful educational experience both in Spain and in Mexico City.

Now we want to be part of generating new collaboration opportunities that will allow editors to produce material of high scientific quality, participate in national and international forums to share experiences with colleagues from other countries, as well as contribute to find common solutions to commonly identified problems, for example, training programs.

We consider it very important to focus our attention on the training of editors, taking advantage of existing technologies that allow us to reach many people in a short time all over the world. We think this is one of the most common worries for associations, so we need to analyze the different ways to address the problem because there aren’t many programs; for Mexican editors it is very difficult to attend a training course in another country and in another language. So maybe we need to review the best options and translate them into Spanish as well as maintain our close relationship with the Dr. Antoni Esteve Foundation to develop a “common” program to train editors.

AMERBAC awaits with great enthusiasm that this article will be the first step to start a very productive and satisfying experience for both ISMTE and AMERBAC and of course, an excellent way to reach editors (both those new to the role and experts), translators, authors, publishers, and all who are interested in joining the world of scientific publishing.

To learn more, visit the AMERBAC website.
I am excited to be able to provide some background about data publication and why I think this topic deserves your attention. I have now been the Executive Director of Dryad since the fall of 2014. I have a background in association and board management, but I also have a previous history working in the publishing field, mainly with academic publishers in journal departments. When I was in publishing, Open Access (OA) was not yet a business model. It was not until shortly after leaving the industry for a time, that OA journals started to appear. Fast-forward to 2016 and the organization for OA publishers recently celebrated its 100th member and the spate of OA journals continues to grow rapidly with mega-journals such as PLOS, Scientific Reports, and PeerJ. What a difference a decade makes.

At some point, OA moved from “new trend” to real business model. I’m not sure if this graduation was due to a specific moment in time or it was the result of a slow realization that what was new and noteworthy had over time become accepted by most. Open data has not quite had this moment except that in some cases and in some fields, it absolutely has.

Open data is making data that underlies scientific research openly to anyone who wishes to access it. Data are at the core of science and if we are to be able to reproduce research, then it goes without saying that we need to access that research. Moreover, the open data movement is the desire to fix something we have known for a long time: that informally sharing data between peers doesn’t work. If you saw David Crotty’s recent post in The Scholarly Kitchen, you may have gotten a kick out of the cartoon that sadly reflects common experience when a researcher wants to access data.

Data Policies
Another way of looking at this is problem is with a more serious lens and provides a stark contrast of challenges surrounding open data versus OA publishing. If a scholarly article is not open, you may still access the information in a library or by paying. But if data is not formally archived in a repository, it could be lost forever. Think of that. This is a very serious issue for science. If data are not archived and linked back to the article, then 17% of all data that science is based upon will be lost every year. It was this very realization and concern that gave the founders of the Joint Data Archiving Policy (JDAP) their passion. This simple clear-cut policy stated:

[J]ournal requires, as a condition for publication, that data supporting the results in the paper should be archived in an appropriate public archive, such as [list of approved archives here]. Data are important products of the scientific enterprise, and they should be preserved and usable for decades in the future. Authors may elect to have the data publicly available at time of publication, or, if the technology of the archive allows, may opt to embargo access to the data for a period up to a year after publication. Exceptions may be granted at the discretion of the editor, especially for sensitive information such as human subject data or the location of endangered species.

JDAP was adopted in a joint and coordinated fashion by a group of editors in the evolution and life sciences fields in 2011. The result was that no one was penalized unnecessarily—the journals had a consistent policy and so authors were encouraged to comply. In 2011 there were some specialized and community repositories in place to fill some of the needs. Dryad was created to serve the data that fell outside the scope of those existing repositories and to continue to support the
Open Data: Repositories and Policies

community. Since then, Dryad has been focused on data that links to and supports scholarly literature, and Dryad is committed to curating the data and providing it openly. Now, just five years after this policy, open data is a point of pride for many in the field of evolution and life sciences and beyond. What a difference a lustrum makes.

Now with requirements from funders for open data, policies on how to handle data are becoming common at various journals and large publishers. Policies are being spread through large publishers like Springer Nature and through Wiley’s data sharing service. Elsevier even went as far as to acquire start up repository, Mendeley data, as its preferred repository to safeguard the data associated with Elsevier articles. The result? If you don’t have some kind of data policy, you are lagging behind the times.

So what is in a data policy and how do you go about making one? Well, there are many answers to this and some are starting to point a light on the lack of standardization in policies across journals and publications. I suspect that standard policies such as those from Springer Nature will become the norm eventually. But, some fields will always have unique needs. For instance, archeology and museum studies have many samples that might be destroyed during the research. Therefore, methods and notes might be the most important to preserve.

There are some very basic building blocks to a policy. For instance, many instruct researchers to archive at the time of manuscript submission. Essentially this requires an author to indicate where the data are when submitting a paper. What data should be preserved can usually be described as that data which support the arguments in the paper. This is not all data collected. And, generally, open data is easier to provide than closed. Dryad publishes nearly all our data under a CC0 license and there are many reasons for this. But, the main reason is that CC0 does not actually affect the legal status of the data, since facts in and of themselves are not eligible for copyright in most countries. And, publishing data under CC0 does not relieve you of the requirement for citing data.

Citing Data

More and more editors are focusing on practices of how to cite data. This is an essential area that publishers and editors can get on board immediately. The Joint Declaration of Data Citation Principles have been widely endorsed and work is ongoing to provide more instructions on how to adhere to these principles. But, the main tenets of these principles are:

- importance;
- credit and attribution;
- evidence;
- unique identification;
- access;
- persistence; and
- specificity and verifiability.

Under these principles, data are considered important scholarship in their own right that deserve credit and uphold the arguments in a paper. Data need to have persistent and unique identifiers that will outlive the lifespan of any single author or article and should include metadata that are both human understandable and machine readable.

In fact, Crossref recommends that the data are to be cited in the reference section of the article itself. This is commonly referred to as self-citation. And, other citation placement can look like these examples. This is very similar to the citations that editors already handle daily that point to other articles or sources. But, care will have to be taken to make sure that you don’t strip out what looks like an orphan citation.

The adoption of open data has from similar desires surrounding OA. And, while some of it may seem technical and complicated, starting with a basic policy and stringent checks on citations is an appropriate place for editors and publishers to start.
Readers of a certain age may recall using index cards when revising for exams—in my case green cards for biology, blue for chemistry, and pink for German—or for storing references during a PhD. The brainchild of the 18th-century naturalist Carl Linnaeus, most famous for his work on categorizing species, index cards were his solution to the problem of data storage. Using individual cards for each species meant that data could be stored, searched, and reorganised easily.

Fast forward many years, and index cards have made a reappearance in my life—this time in digital form. The digital medium brings added advantages—the index cards can be shared in real time, allowing you and your team to organise any task; everything is centralised and activities and correspondence are saved in one place, streamlining workflows. Welcome to the world of Trello!

At the most basic level, a Trello board is a webpage with a series of lists (columns) each containing an unlimited number of tasks or ideas (cards). Cards are moved across the board from left to right as they progress through the lists.

Anything can be organised using a Trello board—let your imagination run wild! In the workplace it could easily be used to manage editorial content or a website redesign, to track commissioned content or to organise a conference or board meeting. We’re currently using it to keep track of all our ideas for improving the journal and updating policies.

A board used to organise the content of a newsletter might look like this, with columns headed: Ideas; Researching; Commissioned; Editing; Graphics; Ready to publish; Published.

You can view a variety of sample boards online.

Adding a card to a board is easy. Simply give it a meaningful title and add a more detailed description if you wish. Clicking on a card opens it up, giving you the opportunity to populate the card details. You can add:

- (coloured) labels, which act like keywords; cards can be filtered on these
- checklists for cards that require subtasks
- due dates if there is a deadline associated with a task
- attachments from local drives or cloud storage services, e.g., Dropbox and Google Drive
- images
- videos
- weblinks
These features alone would be sufficient for any individual seeking to become more organised, but Trello makes collaboration easy. You can invite team members/employees/collaborators to join Trello by entering their email address. Once this is done they are listed as ‘members’ and you assign them to a task by dragging their avatar onto a card, or simply add them to a task so they are kept in the loop. Any correspondence about a task can be sent through the ‘comments’ box, and by @ mentioning a member of your board they will be notified of the new comment via the app, email, desktop notification, or their mobile (individuals can manage their settings to receive Trello alerts instantly, periodically, or never). Members can comment back and forth, and start a discussion with multiple people simply by @ mentioning them, with the bonus that the correspondence is all stored with the card—no more scrolling through email trails (with incorrect subject fields!) to find the message of interest. Like the audit trail in online manuscript submission systems, the activity feed shows the history of actions that have taken place on a card and creates a timeline of events as progress is made.

Once you’ve set up Trello you can copy cards, checklists, lists, and boards, as required, or you can create standard templates for easy re-use. The search function is advanced and you can save searches. Cards can be filtered on any combination of labels, members, and deadlines, so although everyone has an overview of the whole project they can easily drill down to view, for example, only the cards that they have been assigned to or those that are due imminently. There’s no limit to the number of cards you can add to a board and all deleted cards are archived so can be retrieved at a later date if the need arises.

Over and above the basic functionality there are ‘power-ups’ created by Trello staff or other partners. For instance, the calendar power-up shows all the due dates on a board in a calendar view and you can enable an iCalendar feed, while the SurveyMonkey power-up allows you to attach surveys to cards.

Within settings you can amend the permissions on a board to designate administrators and grant or remove commenting permissions. Trello can be used by multiple users at the same time and any changes are instantly synchronised across all platforms, so users can keep Trello open all day without the need to save or refresh. It’s supported by most browsers and there’s an app for Android, Windows 8, and iOS devices, so you can access Trello wherever you are.

How much does this cost I hear you ask? Nothing at all! The features described above are all part of the free Trello package. An upgrade is available to Trello Gold ($5 per month or $45 per year) which gives you access to a wider range of features, including the ability to upload files up to 250 MB in size, choose your own background for the board, and access a larger range of stickers and emojis. Personally, we’ve found the free version of Trello to be more than adequate.

If you want to learn more there are many online resources, videos, and sample boards to get you started. I hope this has inspired you to take a look at what Trello has to offer—it has certainly earned a permanent place on the desktops of our office staff.
ISMTE Core Competency Survey Results: What We Need in Regard to Reports and Reporting

By Kristen Overstreet (ORCID 0000-0002-4417-3611)
Managing Editor / Senior Partner
Origin Editorial, LLC
Chair, ISMTE Education Committee

In June 2016, ISMTE sent a core competency survey to all of its members (780 people at that time) and received 188 responses (see details here). The information from that survey is being used by the Society to determine how we can develop educational materials (e.g., conference sessions, educational resources, training webinars) to meet the needs of the members. In this article, part of the series in EON focusing on the survey results, I will focus on needs in regard to reports and reporting.

According to the survey, more than 71% of us produce reports for our journal(s) and determine the content of these reports, often including the Editor(s)-in-Chief in our decision-making processes. We submit these reports most often to our editors (Editors-in-Chief, 80.6%; all Editors, 60.4%), followed by our societies (48.5%) and publishers (45.5%). Therefore, producing reports is an important part of the job for many of us.

How do we know what’s needed, how to provide it, and what is best practice in the area of reporting?

The survey questions and answers provided some information on where we are currently with reporting. Answers to several open-ended questions highlighted report training needs; for example, we asked the following questions:

“What educational material and/or resources would help you perform your job better?”

“What do you need to be more successful in your current role?”

“What part of your job would benefit from additional training, information, or support?”

All of these elicited answers and comments about needing more training in reporting. These comments are a nice segue into some new resources now available and coming soon from the Education Committee.

Not yet informed by the survey results, the Education Committee had added a reports resource to its to-do list in the spring of 2016. There were two parts to the reports resource: a list of the Top 5 Reports that should be provided to an editorial board for the annual meeting, and webinars from Editorial Manager, eJournal Press, and ScholarOne, showing how to create these reports in the individual systems. The Education Committee discussed on a call and by email which of the reports should be included in the Top 5 and determined to include the following (the figures are taken from the new best practices resource):

- Submissions for the current year, compared to the past two years and breakout by article type (Figure 1)

Figure 1. Example of Report for Journal Manuscript Submissions by Article Type and Year

Note. Data are for original submissions only. Commissioned articles have been removed from the data.
- Acceptance rate for the current year, compared to the past two years and breakout by article type (Figure 2)
- Countries/geographical regions of origin of submitted and accepted articles (Figure 3)
- Time from submission to first decision for externally reviewed and not externally reviewed papers, broken out by article type (Figure 4)
- Time from submission to final decision for externally reviewed papers, broken out by article type (Figure 5).

Figure 2. Example of Report for Acceptance Rate by Article Type and Year

Note. At least 80% of the manuscripts in each included year had received a final decision. Commissioned papers were removed from the data.

Figure 3. Example of Report for Geographical Regions of Origin for Corresponding Authors

Note. Africa includes Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa; Asia includes China, India, Japan, Turkey, Uzbekistan; Europe includes Austria, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Spain; Latin America and the Caribbean includes Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Saint Lucia; Northern America includes Canada, United States; Oceania includes Australia, Micronesia, New Zealand.

Figure 4a. Example of Report for Time from Submission to First Decision with External Review

Note. Date of submission was the date the manuscript was received in the Editorial Office. Data are for manuscripts submitted during the given year.

Figure 4b. Example of Report for Time from Submission to First Decision with External Review

Note. Date of submission was the date the manuscript was received in the editorial office. Data are for manuscripts submitted during the given year. Data shown are for submissions that received a decision of accept (e.g., Letters to the Editor) or reject (e.g., does not fit the journal’s scope). Submissions that received a revision decision without external review are not included.

Figure 5. Example of Report for Time from Original Submission to Final Decision

Note. Date of submission was the date the manuscript was received in the Editorial Office. Data are for manuscripts submitted during the given year and sent for external peer review.
These reports include information that most of us provide to our editorial boards on a regular basis. Determining the Top 5 turned out to be the easy part of this process; determining how best to report this information was the hard part. The committee discussed parameters for the reports such as comparing the current year to at least two previous years to establish if a trend exists; breaking out article types; using the United Nations’ classifications for geographical regions, as recommended in Willis and Blalock¹: breaking out internally versus externally reviewed submissions when determining the time from submission to decision; etc. After writing up the instructions for preparing these reports, it became evident during the Committee’s review process for the instructions that we needed the advice of a statistician for reports two, four, and five.

In July 2016, the ISMTE Board of Directors approved funding for a consultation with a statistician. We were just wrapping up our discussions with the statistician as I was preparing this article for EON for a November 11th deadline. The consultation was very helpful and our instructions now include how to properly report the data as well as specific instructions for how to create the reports in Excel. Reports four and five require standard deviations to properly report the data and the various online submission systems are not able to provide this in their reports; therefore, some may choose to download their raw data into Excel and prepare their reports according to the best practice resource instructions.

On behalf of the Education Committee, I am happy to announce that the best practice resources for creating the Top 5 Reports for your editorial board are now available on the ISMTE Resources page. Dr. Jason Roberts, Senior Partner at Origin Editorial, presented a session at the ISMTE European meeting in Brussels on November 1st called “Editorial Office Research” Parts 1 and 2. Those who were able to attend were treated to a sneak preview.

Additionally, ScholarOne has completed the webinar for reports one through three, which is also available from the Resources page. I cannot thank Gwen Baker at Clarivate Analytics, formerly the IP & Science business of Thomson Reuters, enough for all the skill, time, and energy that she devoted to this project. She is an excellent trainer and the webinars will be a valuable resource for ISMTE members for creating reports in the ScholarOne system.

Further, Aries has promised that their webinars for the reports will be ready by the time you read this article. We owe a big thank you to Sebastian Atay and Michael Hambloch for their extraordinary efforts that will benefit Editorial Manager users.

Finally, eJournalPress is interested in providing webinars for creating the reports in their system, and I hope we will have those available early in 2017.

Circling back to the survey, another response to survey questions related to reporting was a request for a resource for understanding iThenticate reports. The Education Committee will consider this topic for a future resource. Additionally, the Committee plans to create a list of five additional reports that are helpful for journal management as well as more resources for creating the reports.

In conclusion, as noted in the core competency survey, reporting is a significant part of our role in the Editorial Office. We need to benchmark our personnel/staff and our journal’s performance and compare that over time to identify positive and negative trends requiring our action and that of the editors and editorial boards. I hope these resources will help you in your efforts.

The ISMTE Board of Directors and Poster Committee are proud to announce that the poster submission site for the 2017 ISMTE conferences is now open. Previous poster sessions have been an enormous success and have enabled attendees to share their unique Editorial Office experiences in a fun and engaging format.

New! Poster presenters will receive a $50 discount to the meeting of their choice. Details will be provided once the committee has determined which proposals have been accepted for poster presentation.

Poster topics from the 2016 conferences included, among others:
- Reliability of author-recommended peer reviewers;
- Highwire’s new product, Impact Vizor; and
- Benchmarking Editorial Office time for manuscript handling

First-place winner, Stephen Cavanaugh, Origin Editorial, Managing Editor, The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine, presented his poster, “Reliability of Author-recommended Peer Reviewers,” to North American meeting attendees in August 2016, illustrating how author-recommended reviewers are not more likely to provide favorable reviews than other reviewers.

Stephen explains why participation in the poster session is a valuable experience. “Why should you submit a poster abstract for an ISMTE meeting, and go to the trouble of creating a poster? Because it will force you to move beyond your hunch about how something is working in your day-to-day work with reviewers, authors and editors and drill down into the facts. Assumptions will be tested and new insights will be gained. And when you present that information to others, whether that is during poster sessions at the meeting or from the podium, you will also be rewarded with the feedback from your colleagues who have also been thinking about these issues, not just to give you a thumbs up, but to help you discover even more avenues for investigation and pondering,” said Stephen.

Submission
Are you interested in presenting a poster at next year’s annual conferences? The first step is to submit a proposal that includes your poster’s title, objectives (three things someone will learn from your poster), and an abstract of 200 words or less (abstracts can be structured or unstructured). Poster proposals with or without outcomes will be considered. However, outcomes must be included within the completed poster. Mentors are once again available to help you develop your proposal and poster. Authors interested in this opportunity can state as such on the proposal submission site and you will be contacted by one of our mentors. Submit your proposal online by Friday, March 3, 2017.

Review
The ISMTE Poster Committee will review and judge your poster proposal based on three criteria: originality; significance and relevance to the field; and practicality and applicability. If your proposal meets the bar for acceptance, the chair of the Poster Committee will contact you with instructions by the end of March for how to prepare and submit your poster for the conference presentation. When all posters are received, the committee will determine the winners of the awards.

Presentation at Conferences

ISMTE will provide you with a template to help you design your poster. Although not mandatory, we encourage that you attend either the North American, European, or Asian conference so you can talk about your poster with other attendees at the designated time. See below for details on complimentary registration to present your poster at one or all of the meetings.

Prizes

New prizes this year! The first place winner will receive complimentary registration to all three meetings, and the second place winner will receive complimentary registration to the meeting of their choice. Complimentary registration can be used by the submitting author or transferred to a colleague who would present the work instead. The first place winner can attend some or all of the meetings and transfer the others to colleagues.

All poster abstracts will be published in an online supplement to the August 2017 issue of EON. The online link is freely available as a reference and all posters will be posted to the ISMTE website.

Also new this year! Audience members will have the opportunity to vote for their favorite poster, and the audience-choice winner will be highlighted in a future issue of EON.

Please carefully consider if you will have the time to develop a poster from your proposal, if it is accepted for poster display. Accepted poster proposals are expected to be developed into subsequent posters for display. Notifications will be emailed in April, with a provided poster template, and you would have approximately two months to develop your poster. For questions, please contact Shari Leventhal via email.

Don’t delay! Submit your proposal now!
Ever wonder what compelling editorial discussions sound like when they’re punctuated by cheers from fans watching the Chicago Cubs in the seventh game of the World Series? Well, let’s just say that the first meeting of the Denver ISMTE Local Group will be hard to top from that perspective. But I have high hopes for the group and expect our future meetings will be just as exciting, even with fewer whoops and hollers in the background.

Back in September 2016, Kristie Overstreet, ISMTE past president, asked me to help organize a local ISMTE group in the Mile High City, and I was happy to oblige. We held our first meeting on November 2 at a local restaurant in the Lowery area—I didn’t realize at the time I booked the venue that Game 7 of the World Series would be on in the restaurant during our meeting. But the cheering supported our conversation nicely and made us feel we were on the right track—as if, somehow, the cheering fans knew when we’d hit on a good point.

The meeting began with a round-robin of introductions and descriptions of current roles and organizations, and we talked about who we know and which conferences we’ve attended before. We also shared our goals for being a part of a local ISMTE group. In brief, we want to have access to helpful resources, discuss publishing issues and considerations, and share our experiences and stories with each other.

For the discussion portion of the evening, we talked about the purpose of journal editorials. For background, I passed the only article I could find that was really to the point: “What is a good editorial?” which was published in *MSM Mens Sana Monographs* in 2006. So, what is the purpose of an editorial? The consensus of our group is, it depends on the publication. However, we agreed that aside from the intent—whether, for example, it’s to provide a venue for the editor to state an opinion or reflect on a key topic or whether it’s to function as a marketing piece—the editorial should satisfy reader’s needs, be anchored to the issue’s contents, be brief, and be conversational in tone.

After our lively discussion of journal editorials, we agreed to meet once a quarter going forward. The next meeting will take place sometime in the first quarter of 2017. We haven’t agreed on a venue yet, but intend to send out options with the meeting invite and select the date and location by consensus of those who can attend. If anyone would like to be added to the email distribution list, contact me at kretzlaff@awwa.org or Kristie at Kristen@origineditorial.com.
**EVENTS**

**Calendar of Events**

2017 PSP Annual Conference  
February 1-3, 2017  
Washington, D.C.  
http://publishers.org

Researcher to Reader Conference  
February 20-21, 2017  
London, England  
https://r2rconf.com

Introduction to Journals Publishing  
March 1, 2016  
London, England  
www.alpsp.org

ISMTE Asian–Pacific Conference  
March 27-28, 2017  
Beijing, China  
www.ismte.org  
*EASE and COPE members receive ISMTE member registration rate*

SSP 39th Annual Meeting  
May 31 – June 2, 2017  
Boston, Massachusetts  
www.sspnet.org

ISMTE North American Conference  
August 10-11, 2017  
Denver, Colorado  
www.ismte.org  
*EASE members receive ISMTE member registration rate*

8th International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication  
September 10-12, 2017  
Chicago, Illinois  
www.peerreviewcongress.org

ALPSP Conference  
September 13-15, 2017  
Noordwijk, the Netherlands  
www.alpsp.org

ISMTE European Conference  
November 9-10, 2017  
London, England  
www.ismte.org  
*EASE members receive ISMTE member registration rate*

---

Thank You  
to our Corporate Members!

**Platinum Supporter**

Wiley

**Silver Supporters**

ACS Publications  
American Institute of Physics  
Origin Editorial  
Wolters Kluwer Health  
Nature Publishing Group

**Bronze Supporters**

Aries Systems Corporation, Editage,  
J&J Editorial, LLC,  
Oxford University Press (OUP),  
Thomson Reuters, Technica Editorial,  
Editorial Office Ltd, Elsevier  
Compuscript,  
Taylor & Francis

Interested in supporting ISMTE?  
Please visit our [Corporate Support page](http://www.ismte.org)
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