JEQ Editorial Board Meeting Minutes, 19 October 2011—Annual Meeting, San Antonio, TX

Notes (Ann Edahl)

3. ME report, as written

4. Ed report, as written

5. Environmental issues/environmental perspectives editor update, Andrew Sharpley

--EI papers down from 2010 (4 to 1).

--Intent is to fast-track certain papers ; more flexible paper—not a strict review, not a technical report.

--Challenges—invited papers often do not pan out. Authors sometimes agree, then it goes nowhere. Possible solution: try to find ones that are at least partway done. Perhaps reduce page charges for this paper type?

--Suggestions from the floor:

   --SY: Perhaps a point–counterpoint system; i.e., get two authors for two separate papers for a hot topic (e.g., climate change). Same science, different interpretation. For incentive, give a deadline by which it will be published and explain that if only one is ready, that one will be published.

--AS asks board for suggestions for names of people to review books.

6. Digital Library, Mark Mandelbaum. Power Point presentation.

Primary goal is a full-text digital library, including books. Will include author bibliography pages with clickable references; search results would be across all society content; a "tabbed" or guided navigation.

Can save searches in a virtual binder that can be sent to colleagues/students (e.g., as a syllabus)

Will include third-party publications' metadata and full text via arrangements with other societies and publishers.

Needs a single, integrated taxonomy of key words; classify all items under this taxonomy, resulting in greater precision in searchers. Staff, volunteers, librarians will do this. Has a library advisory committee already, from university, corporate, and government libraries.

Benefits: Goal is to provide digital library to members at low cost or free; increased online exposure, which should result in new members from increased international exposure; online first articles that will be fully searchable and citable. Financially: should get significant revenue from library consortia, government agencies, corporate R&D departments. Additionally, having everything, including books, available and fully searchable, will lead to greater innovation and discovery.

Comments/questions from the floor:

Q: Any idea of the cost to a university?

MM: Full content, on the order of $3500 to $4000 per institution, depending on size of the consortium. The more university libraries in the consortium, the lower cost to individual institutions.

Q: Is this a license?

A: It is a license, a subscription that is annually renewable.

Q: What about overlap with other services (e.g., Scopus)

A: Such services (e.g., Scopus) include only metadata; the search is just the top-level metadata. Ours would be full-text.

Q: Will Web of Science find us?

A: Yes. All the content will be indexable and indexed, e.g., Scopus, Agricola, Web of Science.

Q: What about an industry group or an individual?

A: Model for industry TBA. Will develop a metric; may be based, e.g., on annual sales.

Cost for individual members to be determined by the boards. Possibilities include free or available at an incremental rate above the membership fee.

Q: Would search be available to all, as it is now?

A: Yes

Q: All our books?

A: Yes. They will be broken down and digitized at the chapter level.

Q: Format for Kindle, iPad?

A: Yes

Q: Books: Potential for people to share PDF with others and post. Can content be protected? Is this a problem?

A: In MM's experience, this didn't happen too often at ACM. Some spidering activity was discovered and stopped. In reality—can put a notice of do's and don'ts. For institutions, China and other countries have gotten better. Can ask institutions to sign a license agreement to protect the data. Other safeguards can be put in place to protect the data.

Q: For old-school people who like books, there is an implication here of getting rid of books completely. Also, financially, how to make sure that JEQ and others get their fair share back?

A: MM will propose a model to the boards for the equitable distribution of the money. One possibility: reduce/get rid of page charges. Another: make digital library free to members.

Regarding books, certain book (e.g., edited compilations) are usually read at the chapter level and lend themselves to the digital library. Monographs are different, yes. More likelihood of downloading an entire book. We are going toward the electronic age.

7. Editors-in-chief comments:

Sally Logsdon:

--Needs volunteers for digital library taxonomy development to look at draft of list that will be created by an outside firm. Soils volunteers are set. Asks for names for Agronomy and Crops to give to Warren Dick.

--New official appeal process now in place. First appeal to editor; second to editors in chief. That decision will be final.

--Capturing content from the meetings. Asks board members to focus on this. Notes that JEQ is already good at this.

Warren Dick:

--Asks all journals for continued emphasis on reviews and issue papers. JEQ good at this. EICs are putting together a special committee across all societies to focus on this. Will meet on a regular basis. Needs a JEQ person to be a part of this group. Also, keep an eye out for ideas for themed issues.

--Looking into publishing databases in our journals. Seems to be a need for this. How to capture in a citable publication. WD and others will be testing this. Asks for suggestions for a particular JEQ paper that might be good for such testing.

Q: Where would the databases go? Would it be peer-reviewed?

WD: Hopefully, the digital library. Committee will be dealing with this question. Maybe some organizations won't allow this; what software to use is still up in the air. Yes, would need to be peer-reviewed. Criteria to be ironed out via testing.

Q: Water Resources Research has "data papers"

A: Yes, somewhat similar to that.

8. Manuscript Tracker

--Changes:

      -Checklist now in front page for authors

      -Separate area for abstracts; abstract is sent with letter of invitation to review

-AEs now getting copies of author email reminders

-Actively searching for plagiarism (upfront). Will add notice in instructions to authors that papers are screened for plagiarism. (Papers marked for plagiarism in JEQ have usually been self-plagiarism, often the Materials and Methods section.)

--Working to change:

-Automated email to reviewers after acceptance or rejection

--Editor/TEs getting AE report cards (timelines/workloads)

--Add decision to thank-you letter to reviewer

9. Changes made to Instructions to Authors

-Now states that we prefer $\leq$ 8,000 words

-Defined structure for abstract

-200-word limit for Conclusion (now a subhead of Discussion)

- To do: add notice regarding screening for plagiarism; add statement regarding the appeals process

10. Reminders to AEs and TEs

-AEs should edit out unacceptable comments (e.g., disrespectful comments) from reviewers

-Keep reviewers' identities anonymous

-Keep timeliness in mind

-Ask authors to reduce length when appropriate. Suggest use of supplemental material.

-Use SI units

-Identify high-quality papers

- When released, say more than "look at reviewers' comments." Explain why release is suggested and what can be improved.

-New AEs: DC will be sending information out shortly.

-Poorly written papers: release if entire manuscript is badly written (poor English). Send back for revision if only some sentences are bad (e.g., science is clear and good, but writing is unclear). Don't spend the time to rewrite it yourself, but be clear in the letter to author what needs to be fixed.

Q: Is AE in the loop with the appeals process?

A: Yes, DC will keep TE in the loop; TE will keep AE in the loop.

11. TE comments:

Enzo Lombi: Can we have information split in MT at the TE level, i.e., by section, regarding timelines., etc. DC: This is in the AE report. EL thanks his AEs.

Scott Yates: Good, smooth year; thanks to the AEs. When looking in MT at how his AEs perform (e.g., d to completion, AE acceptance rate), results from MT don't always seems to be what he thinks it should be. Are the calculations interpreted correctly?

Had one problem paper: 2 authors worked together; 1 no longer wanted his data used but the other still used it (without proper citation). The AE caught it because she asked the previous author to be a reviewer. What if it had gotten through? DC: Embarrassment is the main thing. Warren Dick: Journals such as *Science* retract articles on a fairly regular basis. Can retract it so that online at least, it would be clear that it's been retracted.

Rory Maguire: Thanks AEs for their hard work. Asks AEs to watch for the occasional strange paper (e.g., an author resubmitting a paper with no changes that had been asked for as part of the previous submission. This was caught.

Asks AEs to talk to organizers of symposia at the meetings that they feel would be a worthwhile and good fit for JEQ. DC seconds this.

12. Comments

a. DC asks for nominations from TES for outstanding AEs (6 total) and AEs for outstanding reviewers (6 total) by 1 January 2012.

b. Young scientists. AE mentoring program to bring young scientists in. Mentored AEs (usually mentored by a TE) would be assigned only 2–3 papers a year. Asks for names for nominations from the board.

13. Open forum

Warren Dick: perhaps send out an appeal to membership to get special papers?