Editors' Update

Issue 18

Your network for knowledge

ELSEVIER

Welcome to a new issue of Editors' Update. In the Internet age, what guidelines are in place to protect copyright? Conversely, how can editors be certain they have obtained the appropriate permissions to use another author's work? In this issue of Editors' Update, we explore the complex issue of copyright, and include helpful information every editor should know. Learn, also, how Elsevier's online Journal Publishing Agreement and tools like EES are helping editors ensure legal compliance as well as convenience.

Hans Kort, Elsevier Associate Director Academic Relations

Strategy & Policies

Plagiarism –
how is copyright protecting you?

Copyright is defined as the sole right to reproduce a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work. Academic work, such as the manuscripts, journals and papers published by Elsevier, is also subject to copyright and Elsevier asks all of the authors whose work it publishes to transfer their copyright to Elsevier itself.

"We have looked at the administrative issues surrounding (multiple) authorship – such as the protection and enforcement of copyright, and the prevention of plagiarism – and our legal analysis shows that it's much preferable for Elsevier to retain the ownership of copyright, in countries where this is permitted, in order to deal with potential infringements," explains

Mark Seeley

continued from page 1

Mark Seeley, Senior VP and General Counsel of Elsevier. "If we didn't own the copyright on the work we publish, we'd have to involve the author in any disputes and keep going back to them every time we wanted to reproduce the work, for example online."

Journal Publishing Agreement

Until recently, all Elsevier authors were asked to sign a Copyright Transfer Agreement (CTA), but this has recently been replaced by a Journal Publishing Agreement (JPA). "We make revisions to the agreement on a regular basis – at least once a year – so the JPA should not be viewed as a completely new agreement, but merely an update of the CTA," Seeley continues. "The most recent changes clarify certain questions about authorship, the funding status of research, posting policy and posting for commercial purposes. Issues such as these go beyond copyright and this is the reason for the change of name. It's simply more accurate."

The latest improvements include more precision about the definition of various versions of manuscripts and how authors can use them. "I think it's universally agreed that the final published version of a manuscript – including the peer review, copy editing, formatting and pagination – should be the authoritative version, but authors can still publish earlier versions of their work on their own and institutional websites, for example," Seeley says.

The JPA also enables Elsevier to protect its revenue streams, which are required to fund other parts of the business and the publishing process as a whole.

Author-friendly policy

Elsevier's policy, for a number of years, has been that authors are permitted to publish their manuscripts, including editing resulting from the peer review. "We ask them not to use the final published version of the manuscript, however, so that everyone knows that the Elsevier version is the authoritative version," Seeley

continues. "Lots of publishers don't allow the incorporation of peer-review changes and insist that manuscripts are deleted from other sources over time. We've spent time talking to authors about what's important to them, however, such as using their manuscripts in teaching and passing on their work to research colleagues. We have tried to accommodate their wishes as far as possible and I believe we're also clearer about what is and isn't permitted than most other publishers."

Avoiding plagiarism

Put simply, plagiarism is the practice of passing off someone else's work as your own. In practice, however, this can be difficult to monitor. "Elsevier can provide

> "It must be a collective effort. If an external editor suspects plagiarism, they should contact the appropriate Elsevier publishing editor immediately."

support to help avoid plagiarism," Seeley resumes. We're working with the CrossRef organization to see if submitted papers can be checked against papers previously published using text–recognition software."

Another method of combating plagiarism is to formulate clear policies and supply guidance on the issue. In 2005, Elsevier issued a 'headline' statement on EES, which stipulated that all papers submitted should:

- be the authors' own original work, not previously published elsewhere;
- reflect the authors' own research and analysis in a truthful and complete manner;
- properly credit the meaningful contributions of co-authors and co-researchers;
- not be submitted to more than one journal for consideration;
- and be appropriately placed in the context of prior and existing research.

"In September 2006, we established the Ethics Helpdesk as a pilot project to act as a resource, and provide advisory support to editors and their coordinating Elsevier staff (publishing editors) in addressing queries about issues such as plagiarism, authorship disputes, multiple submissions and research misconduct," says Seeley. "This has already generated a Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) manual, which covers authorship complaints, plagiarism, multiple publication, the misappropriation of research results, research errors and fraud, and research standards violations, among others. Of course, many of our editors deal with issues such as these on a regular basis, but it's still useful to bring together all our standard procedures in one place, not least of all for external editors and new members of staff."

Who's responsible?

In the first place, it is down to editors to identify possible instances of plagiarism and to initiate possible action. "Our editors are experts in their chosen fields, so they are in the best position to identify possible misuses of work," Seeley continues. "Elsevier will, however, supply tools to support editors in any investigation that may be necessary. Our publishing editors will assist in the process and we're also prepared to provide legal support, if needed.

"It must be a collective effort, so if an external editor suspects plagiarism, they should contact the appropriate Elsevier publishing editor immediately. The pilot shows that the publishing editor is the first resort for editors in these issues and the Ethical Helpdesk is there to support publishing editors. We're also moving towards placing the SOP manual, with all its tools and procedures, online this summer, making it easily available to all of our external editors and publishing staff."

Case scenario

While some of the ethical issues raised during the publishing process can be quite blurred – ranging from the use of false results to prove research, to questions about the correct identification of multiple authorship – cases involving plagiarism are reasonably straight forward to deal with.

"An author who is perhaps new to publishing may have copied small or large portions of someone else's paper in their own. Once the possibility of plagiarism has been raised, the first thing we do is ask the editor to contact the author for an explanation. In some cases, the allegations are unfounded and no further action is necessary. At the other extreme, when plagiarism is proven to have taken place, we will issue a retraction, stating the reasons why. Unfortunately, when this sort of thing happens, it receives a lot of media attention, but thankfully cases aren't very common and we very rarely have to remove an article completely.

"I must also stress that correctly attributing portions of work to the rightful author completely negates the possibility of being accused of plagiarism, so there really is no excuse for not doing so. Nevertheless, there have been some issues raised about whether authors are fully aware of standard procedures and their responsibilities, so we felt it was important to produce the SOP manual to provide clear guidelines."

Cultural differences

It has been alleged that the traditions of originality and plagiarism are not as well understood in certain parts of the world as they are in others. "I have heard rumors about lapses in China, for example, but I haven't come across many actual cases," says Seeley. "I suspect that most academics and researchers in China, and elsewhere, are well aware of the rules and conventions on copyright and plagiarism."

The traditional concept of plagiarism covers not only passing off someone else's text as your own, but also their ideas. The scientific convention is that you should identify and credit your sources but, while it's inappropriate to pass off someone else's ideas as your own, that shouldn't preclude discussion of those ideas. "The most important message to get across," Seeley concludes, "is that if you attribute the borrowed work correctly, you have nothing to fear."

> **Useful links (click below)**
> **Ethics Helpdesk**
> **Publishing Ethics**
> **STM Guidelines**
> **CrossRef**
> **Academic Use of a Journal**

Online Publishing

Protecting copyright in the Internet age

Content providers are in the middle of a period of significant change as search engines transform the search and discovery process for content. Over the past few years, Elsevier has chosen to work with several search engines, including market leader Google. Just as importantly, Google has chosen to work with Elsevier in addressing previously identified issues. By actively working with Google as a partner, Elsevier is making strides towards its goals of providing wide dissemination of authoritative content while also protecting copyright.

Scott Virkler

In May 2005, the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM) sent a letter to Google's CEO expressing concerns about "Google's cavalier attitude towards the intellectual property rights of our members". These concerns centered around the Google Print for Libraries program and were threefold: "that

Google intends to (1) digitize our copyright-protected works without our consent, (2) retain a copy of our digitized content for Google's own commercial use, and (3) deliver a copy of the digitized content to the participating libraries".

This episode highlights the difficulties

in protecting copyright in an age when millions of Web searches take place every day. Individual authors have no chance whatsoever of being able to monitor the correct use of their work and very little power to take action when their copyright is breached. Elsevier is actively working with industry groups, search engines and others to address these issues.

Copyright ownership

Consequently, Elsevier has long urged its authors to transfer the copyright on their work to Elsevier itself, for several reasons. "From Elsevier's perspective, having the copyright allows us to protect the value add we provide in the publishing process," explains Scott Virkler, Vice President Web Search Strategy. "In exchange for securing the income stream associated with the journal/article, we take on the obligation to manage the aggregation, coordination and publishing of the authoritative content in print and online. This model allows us to ensure the availability of the content over time and without it, we wouldn't be able to fund those processes in the long term."

From the author's perspective, a major advantage of transferring copyright to Elsevier is that it enables the company to ensure the widest possible dissemination of the authoritative work and that this version remains available over time. "Our efforts with Scopus on the Web have revealed that only one third of web citations can actually be found and are available," Virkler continues. "The problem is particularly extensive in universities, where servers tend to come and go over time due to changes of location, technology and infrastructure. Some of the articles available on Elsevier websites are more than 100 years old and the intention is that they will always remain available."

Working together

Referring back to the Google situation, Virkler says that, in general, Google continues to use its own interpretation of copyright laws, but is now much more willing to work with Elsevier as a partner. "Google is an aggressively competitive company and tries not to let the market dictate its direction, but when in competitive situations it does tend to be much more accommodating," he says.

"In 2006, Microsoft launched its Windows Live Academic Search website and reached an agreement with CrossRef that addressed many of the organization's concerns about copyright. Google also entered into an agreement with Elsevier, which not only allows for protection of Elsevier authors' work, but also ensures

the authoritative version, hosted by Elsevier, is the first-ranked result in Google Scholar for similar results. This is good for everyone involved - users, authors, Elsevier and Google - as the authoritative version of a journal or article receives preference over other versions in Google's search results."

"Of course, we should not underestimate the benefits of working with Google, which are mainly increased usage and exposure," Virkler continues. "We all go to search engines first when we need information, so it makes sense for links to Elsevier content to be included in Google search results, and those of other search engines. Interestingly, however, the increase in usage of Elsevier material through external search engines is not always very high – only 5% in some cases – because Elsevier does a very good job of disseminating

> "Individual authors have very little power to take action when their copyright is breached by a large web-based corporation."

information through its existing partners and its own publications and websites, such as ScienceDirect."

External partnerships

Elsevier works with various free and subscription-based external search engines to ensure the wide dissemination of its publications. "We work with dozens of subscription-based search engines and the free search engines fall into two categories," Virkler explains. "There are the extremely large consumer search engines - Google, Microsoft and Yahoo - and then there are specialized vertical search engines for specific market sectors, such as Healthline, GlobalSpec (engineering) and PubMed (health). We will continue to expand our cooperation with specialized search engines over time and are willing to work with any free search engine under the agreement conditions we have with Google and Microsoft. This is all part of our mission to ensure that content is discoverable

Who gets what?

Elsevier's agreements with Google and other external search engines give them access to the full article text, but only for indexing

purposes. This enables the search results to better match users' search queries, while ensuring that the search engines do not display more content than they are authorized to. "Part of the value we bring to the publishing process is making sure our partners use material correctly," says Virkler. "It would be impossible for an individual author, or even most companies, to monitor all the different sources of information available, but Elsevier can spread and absorb the costs within its overall budget."

The level of content accessible by users is typically governed by subscriptions. Anyone can see the abstract of an article, but further access depends on the subscription status of the IP address range of the server through which the search is performed. "If it's a subscribing university server or that of another subscriber, users can gain access to the full article'" Virkler continues. "For non-subscribers, there is always a pay-per-view option and we are also testing a variety of new models, including making the full text available online for free after a certain period of time, for example 12 months. We're constantly looking for new methods to balance the revenue equation and the publishing equation, while achieving the widest possible dissemination of articles."

One of a kind

"Elsevier's agreements with the major search engines are one of a kind, as far as we know, and certainly unique within the STM community," Virkler concludes. "Only a handful of publishers around the world have agreements that even come close. The reason for this is the scale on which we operate. Other publishers, even global ones, simply don't have the same quality and quantity of exceptional content. Elsevier's scale and quantity of exceptional content is unique and it enables us to ensure the widest possible dissemination of our material through a variety of partners, while maintaining the authors' rights, especially copyright."

Useful links (click below)
STM Documents & Statements
Scirus
Cross Ref

Strategy & Policies

Ways to use journal articles

When online article submission began in 2001 at Elsevier, it soon became the preferred medium for submission by authors. This led ultimately to the recently launched online and interactive Journal Publishing Agreement (JPA). Starting at the end of January 2007, Elsevier began rolling out the JPA and the Short License Agreement (SLA), replacing the previously used Copyright Transfer Agreement.

Helen Gainford

"The online JPA and SLA have been developed in consultation with Elsevier's legal, corporate strategy and operations departments, and contain more information and definitions than the Copyright Transfer Agreement," explains Helen Gainford, Director, Global Rights. "They also clarify Elsevier policies and the rights retained by authors. The JPA outlines other policies relating to the publishing process and requests information relevant to this process, for example information on certain funding agencies. In the application, authors are also requested to confirm the article does not violate any existing copyright, as well as the originality of the work."

Launch rollout
For the initial JPA Online launch in January, 10 Elsevier Science & Technology (S&T) journals were targeted. By mid-March, around 270 journals had signed up to the JPA Online, with 500 journals being added per month. By end May 2007, all Elsevier-owned journals will be using the JPA Online. So far 90% of authors have completed the JPA online and the response time is as quick as five days. Since the JPA Online launch, Elsevier has received over 14,000 forms from authors.

"Previously, the Agreement was sent to the author as a PDF file, which had to be downloaded, scanned, filled in and then scanned again or faxed or posted back to Elsevier – a laborious and time-consuming process that also required massive manual paper files to be stored," Gainford continues. "The electronic format of the interactive JPA Online has made this process considerably more manageable, efficient and environmentally friendly."

[*"The electronic format of the interactive JPA Online has made the process considerably more manageable, efficient and environmentally friendly."*]

In addition, today authors retain a wider set of rights than ever before after being published in one of Elsevier's journals.

Authors' rights
When accepting the JPA, Elsevier's journal published authors' rights include:

- Permission to post personal manuscript versions after publication on institutional or personal sites, thus making the work more widely available.
- Permission to make copies (printed or electronic) for classroom teaching or personal purposes.
- Permission to present the article at a meeting or conference and distribute copies of the article to attendees.
- Permission to include the article in part or in full in a thesis or dissertation published by authors.
- Permission to use the article in part or in full in a compilation of the authors' works.
- Permission to use the article to publish other derivative works, including book-length formats.
  - The retention of patent or trademark rights as well as the rights to any processes described in the article.

If the author wishes to use the paper in a way that is not detailed on the JPA then they can request permission via the **Global Rights Department** and in most cases permission would be granted without a fee.

Copyright for book authors
Elsevier has a different copyright policy for authors of book chapters. "This is mainly because the impetus for writing a book chapter is different, the need to have the article published is not the same," says Gainsford, "but also because the way in which books are used is different from journal issues and articles and the investment in publishing a book is higher than it is for producing a journal issue."

Contributors to Elsevier books are sent a

continued from page 5

Contributor Agreement, which is more detailed than the JPA. Contributors also receive the agreement prior to writing the chapter rather than after, as is the case in journal publishing. In addition to requesting copyright transfer, the Contributor Agreement also provides contributors with a date on which to deliver the article, guidelines for the contribution, for example length of chapter and, if applicable, what compensation they will receive for writing the chapter. Often, this is a complimentary copy of the work but sometimes it could be a one-off fee. The rights retained by contributors to a book are also different. They are permitted to post a summary of the chapter online and to use up to 10% of the chapter in teaching materials.

Useful links (click below)
Copyright.com
More info on copyright

Supporting Editors

Behind the Scenes...
New developments to editorial research tools

Peter Brimblecombe

Professor Peter Brimblecombe is a very upbeat editor. This came as some surprise in light of the gloomy environmental outlook and the fact that he's renowned for his interest in air pollution and its effects on health and heritage. In fact, the historical aspects of this work are the subject of a book, The Big Smoke, focusing on pollution in Britain from medieval to Victorian and Edwardian times. But as he explains on his home page, "…throughout history we have found it easy to regard ourselves on the brink of an apocalypse. The present environmental crisis appeared to be part of the sequence of apocalyptic challenges humans are condemned to face. I find the historical perspective an antidote to environmental gloom."

Editor's Update enjoyed talking to Professor Brimblecombe about the highlights of his career thus far, the size of his carbon footprint, and how he is using EES and Scopus to grow Atmospheric Environment, a relatively old, extremely well-established, large journal that publishes in excess of 8000 pages annually. We caught up with him while he was in New Zealand on a Fellowship and started by asking him about himself.

A short history
"I was born in Australia but spent my high school years in New Zealand (in the 60s) and studied Chemistry at the University of New Zealand in the 70s where I did a PhD on the aqueous chemistry of sulfur dioxide in the atmosphere," he reports. "I've long been interested in atmospheric chemistry and these days am better known for my work in air pollution and how it affects both indoor and outdoor heritage." Brimblecombe has been in his current position as Professor in Atmospheric Chemistry at the School of Environmental Sciences at the University of East Anglia (United Kingdom) for more than 30 years. "Obviously, I didn't arrive there as a Professor; I've been a Professor since the 90s," he clarifies.

Positions worldwide
"Highlights of my career so far have included my first university appointment in Fiji in the late 70s where I taught inorganic chemistry and quantum physics, oddly enough! In fact, working in diverse places continues to be a highlight. I tend to travel a lot for conferences, meetings and research, and I've done numerous sabbaticals in the US. I worked at the Institute of Atmospheric Physics in Arizona looking at the solubility of gases in water and later at the Water Resources School there, researching the way gases behave in snow packs. He also spent time studying the ancient atmosphere of the earth at the Space Physics Research Laboratory at the University of Michigan. I've also taken sabbaticals at NASA's

Ames and Langley research centers, working on atmospheric chemistry problems. At the moment I'm enjoying a three-month 'Erskine Fellowship' at the University of Canterbury in New Zealand. It's a geographic school and I've been frightening the students with chemistry formulas," he jokes.

Crime, cinema and pollution

One of the topics the visiting Professor was asked to speak to the students about is how pollution appears in cinematography and crime fiction. "I'm quite well known for such excess," he says. On his home page, he states: "Environmental pollution is not merely a matter of environmental chemistry. The smells have to be smelt. Painting and poetry can be as informative as a scientific description when trying to understand the complexities of environmental problems. Recently, I have been thinking much about the representation air pollution in cinema." For the NZ students he discussed the film Blade Runner and how pollution is used as a metaphor. "Without going too deeply into the symbolism, it's worth noting how air pollution is portrayed in both film and detective stories. For example, Sherlock Holmes fiction wouldn't be the same without the London fog."

Who is he when he's at home?

On a more personal note, Brimblecombe reports that he has a wife, but no pets or children. His wife too is concerned with pollutants and is involved in environmental issues, working as a recycling officer in London. "We're supporters rather than campaigners for the environment. We're very careful about composting and recycling, we support the second-hand consumables market and we watch food miles. One of my biggest worries is all the flights I take - my carbon footprint must be the size of an English county," he says, "so I try to run teleconferences as much as possible. It's still difficult to persuade people to

use the technologies available. I'm aware of the offsetting schemes but am not convinced this is the entire answer. Back on the subject of transport, I don't own a car, although my wife tells me I own 11 bicycles!" Brimblecombe's hobby, evidently, is cycling, specifically an unusual form of European cycling called Audax, although he says these days he hasn't much time for it.

Number one in air pollution

For the past 17 years, Brimblecombe has edited Atmospheric Environment, a very large Elsevier journal. "We produce about 40 issues per year. We tend to get about 1,500 submissions per year. And we have a relatively high rejection rate - in excess of 50 percent. It's not an easy journal

> ["Environmental pollution is not merely a matter of environmental chemistry. The smells have to be smelled."]

to get published in," he says. "It's very prominent in its field - probably the major journal that deals with the science of air pollution. There are a number of other journals that deal with atmospheric science and atmospheric chemistry but our focus is primarily air pollution and that makes us quite distinct. We don't only publish the science; we also occasionally publish policy papers. We also publish papers on indoor air, which is not, technically speaking, an atmospheric science, but this underlines our focus on contemporary air pollution issues."

So what concerns does a very well-established and large journal have? "One of our goals is to maintain coherence across such a large number of papers," Brimblecombe says. "Many journals might have been split up by the time they have grown this large. Maintaining quality across such a large paper flow is also important. Unfortunately this means

maintaining a high rejection rate. And a very large number of referees and an active referee database. I'm also concerned about ensuring that subject areas that become less important fade away while we introduce new subjects even before they become prominent in the field. These concerns are not specific to this journal, I'm sure other editors will agreed with this general principle of publishing," he adds.

Citation challenge

A distinctive feature of this journal is that it is multi-disciplinary. "However," Brimblecombe explains, "multi-discipline journals tend to suffer because they have lower citation rates than specialist journals. Although we're the most successful journal of air pollution and our citation rate is pretty high and hovers about three, it's not the same as The Lancet's would be. We continually worry about what that means. We're promoting the journal as important despite the fact that the citation rate is sometimes viewed as low. But we get a lot of authors raising this matter," he says.

Pros and Cons of EES

There are two editors, two editorial offices and three editorial assistants working on the production of Atmospheric Environment. The team has been using EES for about two years now. Brimblecombe reports that the assistants use EES daily, he however, tends only to use it when there's a problem. "The great advantage of EES for me is that my team can tell me to look at a paper on EES, and it doesn't matter where in the world I am, I can go and see the problems and advise them," he says. "However, one of the toughest things we've found since using EES is losing a sense of personal relationship with the reviewers and the authors. We find ourselves continually editing the stock letters because we prefer to send individualized correspondence. We find we get rapid responses from referees when we personalize emails. It's been a challenge for us to adapt our procedures to a system that's been standardized for across Elsevier."

New EES features

Editors' Update gave the team at Atmospheric Environment a sneak peak at the features' upgrade to EES to be launched soon. A complete overview of the features' upgrade can be found by **clicking here**.

Following is a shortlist of the changes editorial assistants Michele Raychaudhuri and Karen Sturges from the Norwich office said they found most important:

- Greater choices of letters available.
- Line numbers are to be automatically added to all PDFs. Referees often complain about the lack of line numbers.
- When revised manuscripts are submitted the response to reviewer comments are now to be separated from the manuscript.

Strategic Scopus

Scopus is the tool that Brimblecombe says he uses most often. "It's our prime tool for referee selection," he confirms. "We use it for strategic planning too. We look at how the journal's doing and where papers are coming from. At the end of the year I can go back and do a search in Scopus to understand how the journal is changing, see what kind of papers we are getting, and what fields of research are growing or declining. At the moment it is still quite tedious to use Scopus to evaluate whether a subject or sub-discipline is growing or declining. If there were a specific tool for this I'd find it most useful," he hints.

"We also use Scopus to evaluate past papers. We go back and assess papers we thought were going to be highly cited, to see if our predictions were correct. We've found that our predictions were terrible! We tended to see highly innovative papers as the ones that would be cited well, but in fact they were not. Really innovative papers are three or four years ahead of their time, so they don't get cited for five or six years. Papers that are a little more boring get more citations because they're in the flow of the moment. Scopus is very valuable for evaluating our efforts and plans," he concludes.

Strategy & Policies

Reporting Back...
the Brussels Declaration on journal publishing

Michael Mabe

The Brussels Declaration is a joint statement emphasizing the work of STM publishers to support the research community but within a financially sustainable framework. It highlights publishers' support for academic freedom, the role they play in disseminating knowledge, their management of the peer review process and the economic realities they face. "It's a core set of principles stating what we stand for, what we believe in and what we think should be taken into account," explains Michael Mabe, CEO of STM. With the declaration, STM publishers are "nailing their flag to the mast" as he puts it. They can use it in their discussions with researchers, authors, editors, administrators, journalists, politicians, civil servants and other stakeholders in STM publishing.

Proactive not reactive

As digital technologies have advanced, those who believe publishing is only about the distribution of content have made proposals that would bypass or undermine the important contribution of STM publishers. These include registration of discoveries, peer review, active dissemination and the archival record, all of which scholars have repeatedly emphasized as essential. The principle threat lies with the mandatory deposit of authors' peer reviewed manuscripts directly into publicly accessible institutional and subject repositories, creating a duplicate free access channel that depends upon the services of the journal for its value (mainly peer review)

while simultaneously undermining its ability to recover costs. These proposals – the "nobody-pays model" – lie at the heart of the lobbying of the open access movement with the Budapest and Berlin Declarations. Until recently, these proposals had forced STM publishers into a reactive posture of responding to other people's views and criticisms about the way they operate. "We thought it was time to make a statement that reflected the publishing community's position," says Mabe. "One of the problems with any kind of media debate is that you're only able to make a few headline points. You're not really in a position to make a more considered statement."

The declaration is based on discussions that have been going on at European Union level for some time. Mabe sits on the Scientific subgroup of the EU's High Level Expert Group on Digital Libraries. One of the ongoing discussions within the subgroup has been the need to reach consensus about STM publishing. "Each party brought to the table a set of principles that they believed was essential to their position," Mabe continues. "We slowly looked at what we agreed on and areas where we disagreed." As the subgroup put together these principles, Mabe realized that they would be an ideal starting point for a more public statement by STM publishers and he began discussing the idea with Graham Taylor of the Publishers Association in the UK. "We saw that it would have considerable benefit within the context of the European Commission Conference on Scientific Publishing in the European Research Area in Brussels on February 15 and 16." Mabe and Taylor were able to get an initial group of publishers to sign up to the Declaration and they formally presented it to EC Research Commissioner Janos Poto nik during the conference.

Broad geographic support

To date some 45 major publishers of all types, commercial, university press and learned society, have endorsed the Declaration along with 12 trade associations. These represent over two thirds of all the journal papers published each year and over half of all the STM journals in existence. They also represent a broad geographic spread that extends across Europe, North America and the Far East. "It's a very large coverage, indicating the position publishers find themselves in," Mabe adds. Although most of the major players have signed up, he expects a steady trickle of new signatories as smaller publishers and societies become aware of the Declaration. It is also drawing support from the wider publishing community beyond the STM arena. "It's surprising how much the general principles apply," he says. "For instance, I don't know of any scholarly publisher that doesn't support academic freedom."

> ## "We thought it was time to make a statement that reflected the publishing community's position."

Although the publishing community has embraced the Declaration, the open access lobby has been typically skeptical. Peter Suber who edits the Open Access Newsletter says that the Declaration "reads a lot like the start of a public relations campaign." Others say that it underlines the publishing community's vested interest in maintaining the status quo. Statements like these do not address the key concerns of publishers about the future of the scholarly record. "It would be a wonderful world if everything could be available for free, but regrettably we don't live in that world."

Playing with other people's money

One thing Mabe is adamant about is that STM publishers are neither for or against open access but are strongly pro innovation. STM supports any business model - open access, subscriptions or electronic licensing - as long as it leads to sustainable support for the STM infrastructure that publishers provide. The problem is that some of the alternatives proposed by the open access lobby are unproven in economic terms. "It's other people's money you're playing with," says Mabe. That means the money of universities, members of learned societies and shareholders. Anyone investing these funds has a duty to do so in an evidence-based way. As STM publishers see it, in pushing one-size-fits-all solutions the open access lobby is asking them to gamble on business models that may prove unsustainable in the long term. "The Brussels Declaration is not about self-interest," Mabe stresses. "There are much broader issues here to do with the survival of journals, the peer review system those journals support and the health of the STM publishing system worldwide."

Now that the Declaration has been published, Mabe hopes that it will raise the level of the discussion about STM publishing and stimulate research into the various business models that have been proposed. A study commissioned by the Publishing Research Consortium has already shown that when relatively small proportions of research are freely available online (e.g. via deposit of author final manuscripts in repositories), librarians cancel related journal subscriptions sooner than anyone thought. There will be more investigations like this and Mabe believes the results will further support the evidence-based position taken by STM publishers. In any case, the Brussels Declaration is the start of a more proactive approach by STM publishers to counter misconceptions about how they operate. Mabe concludes, "We need to come up with more pithy and accurate ways of describing our work so that more people understand the unique added value that publishers bring."

Useful links (click below)
STM information

Developments in Supporting Editors
New release of EES: v5.0

As a result of feedback from all Elsevier Editorial System (EES) users, and in an effort to enhance your user experience, the EES site will be upgraded to version 5.0, commencing later in the (Northern Hemisphere) summer.

In the week prior to the upgrade, and depending on your journal, either your Journal Manager or one of our Customer Support agents will contact you via e-mail. This e-mail will contain important information regarding the new features of version 5.0 and a brief note about downtime. Also included will be a link to a page briefly describing the new features. As a preview, below is a list of some of the features designed to improve your EES experience.

Some of these features will be available automatically. Others are optional and, after the upgrade, your Journal Manager or a Customer Support agent will again contact you to discuss the suitability of these features in greater detail.

- New look and feel for Editor Pages
- Hyperlinks included in PDF
- Increased safeguards to protect Reviewers' identities
- Authors may Suggest/Oppose Reviewers via new submission step
- New 'Respond to Reviewers' submission step allowing more structured response for authors
- Line Numbers can be included in PDF
- Limits can be set on length of manuscript titles, length of abstracts, no. of keywords, etc.
- Reviewers can log in faster and get straight to their assignments

- New flags can be added to call attention to submissions

If you have questions about the upgrade, please contact your Journal Manager or a Customer Support Agent.

New EES Self-Help Options
A new, enhanced user web-help system was launched on 27th March for all journals on Elsevier's Editorial System (EES).

This self-help site allows Editors, Reviewers and Authors to find answers to EES queries themselves, without the

> "Since the introduction of EES, the complete editorial process (submission to decision) has been reduced by an average of 9 weeks."

need to contact Customer Support. Prior to launching this new self-help feature, we worked with a group of Editors who provided extremely valuable feedback on the prototype and tested the system prior to going live. The self-help project team is collating information to also address non-EES related questions.

Customers can search for answers, browse through Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) or use online interactive tutorials. All Editor functions in EES are now available via these interactive tutorials;

these are proving to be a very helpful learning tool for new Editors or Editors needing some assistance in EES (please click **here** for direct access to the tutorials).

The self-help feature is accessible through each EES site by clicking on the 'Help' or 'Contact Us' links at the top of each page. The feature is also accessible via Elsevier.com. Please click **here** for more information.

Feedback and comments on the self-help feature should be directed to **customerfeedback@elsevier.com**

Improving the review process.
A new campaign launched recently for S&T Editors aims to improve the review process. Editors of health science journals can also benefit from tapping into our resources to help find, support and keep good Reviewers.

1. We can support you in meeting Reviewers' needs
We regularly survey Reviewers to get a better understanding of their motivations. Findings from our Reviewer Feedback Program suggest that Reviewers value feedback, recognition, relevant manuscripts and more information on Reviewer policy.
- 90% of Reviewers would like to be able to see the final decision and other Reviewers' comments. Your

www.elsevier.com/editorsupdate

publishing contact can ensure that this functionality is switched on in EES for your journal.
- Click **here** for the training tutorial.
- Recognition & Rewards
- Reviewers receive 30-day access to Scopus as a reward and to help facilitate their review.
- Later this year, Reviewers will have access to full text of referenced articles through ScienceDirect via EES. This means that Reviewers will be able to click on the references listed in the manuscript and will be brought to the full text article.
- If you wish, your publishing contact can help arrange an annual listing of Reviewers in the journal and certificates for Reviewers, both of which are small but powerful ways of acknowledging Reviewers. A template of the certificate can be found **here**:
- Reviewers tell us that they appreciate information about the review policy of a journal. Your publishing contact can work with you to create or update a policy for your journal. A template reviewer policy, which can be used as a starting point, can be found **here**:
- To help ensure that Reviewers receive relevant papers, your publishing contact can advise you about cleaning your EES database of Reviewers and assigning keywords.

For more on the Reviewer Feedback Program findings and for Reviewer comments, please click **here**:

2. We can support you in improving the speed and quality of reviews
Since the introduction of EES, overall review times have been reduced, in some cases by more than 50%, and the complete editorial process from submission to decision has been reduced by an average of 9 weeks.

In EES you can
- Set up reminders for Reviewers and customize Reviewer letters to include deadlines, guidelines and information

about where they can get help, e.g. Scopus; and
- Specify Reviewer questions, which are customizable by manuscript type, and develop a manuscript rating scale, to help ensure consistent and thorough review.

3. We can support you in finding relevant Reviewers
We appreciate that finding Reviewers can be challenging. Here are some of the ways we can help:
- Via the Scopus search bar in your EES assignments page, you can search Scopus to identify potential Reviewers, link to their published work and citation histories, see who their co-authors were and set up citation alerts to keep up to date with who is citing which research.
- Later this year, we will link the submitted manuscript to the full text of the articles it references.
- With just one click in EES, you can automatically search the Internet for article-title related topics via Scirus, and be brought to a list of the author's published articles in Scopus. Click **here** for the training tutorial.
- Your publishing contact can help you create a Reviewer classifications list for your journal, from which Reviewers indicate their areas of expertise and use this to search for matches with the manuscript classifications.
- Within EES, you can build a database of relevant Reviewers by assigning classifications and adding keywords or notes to the people notes field, search for Reviewers matching the manuscript's keywords or classifications, automatically un-invite Reviewers when they don't respond in sufficient time, and set up automatic alternate Reviewer invitations.

4. We can support you by providing a submission, peer review and editorial system that is easy to use
From our Feedback Programs, we know that Editors and Authors are more satisfied

with EES than online editorial systems offered by other publishers, and 85% of Reviewers are happy with EES as a Reviewer platform.

To make sure that EES users get the best possible support:
- You can at any time request EES refresher training, which can be tailored to your specific needs.
- We recently launched an enhanced EES user self-help site, which can be accessed through the "Help" link on your journal's EES page or **here**.
- We are continually developing our suite of online **training tutorials**.
- We have a 24/7 **support team**.

To continually improve and upgrade EES:
- We are developing EES to become your complete editorial and peer review management workbench – EES now includes access to Scopus, automatic science-specific Internet searches via Scirus and will shortly directly link through to the full text articles on ScienceDirect.
- We are currently upgrading to EES version 5.0. The additional features and functions include enabling authors to suggest relevant Reviewers, and the inclusion of line numbers in PDFs. To see the full list click **here**.

Supporting Editors

Forum results
Results from the Editors' forum:
Submissions from developing countries

In the last issue of Editors' Forum we asked how you deal with submissions from developing countries (e.g. Bangladesh, Cambodia, Mozambique)?

We asked you to choose from three statements:

a) I treat them like any other paper I receive. If they do not meet the standards of my journal, I reject them.

b) I take into consideration the fact that they are from developing countries and do my utmost to get them published. This can include giving the author feedback on language, style and content.

c) If I see potential, I will contact the publisher and recommend the author be sponsored for e.g. language editing before considering the paper further.

The forum discussion generated over 180 responses indicating that this issue is important to many editors.

The majority of respondents (54%) indicated that their sole or preferred approach to papers from developing countries was to treat them the same as all the other papers they receive, that is, option (a). In some cases this was due to time pressure or an overload of submissions, but in many cases this was an ideological choice: "there can be no such a thing as 'Third World' science"; an obligation to maintain standards for subscribers or a feeling that it "is not my responsibility to develop science in developing countries". However, many

editors who chose this option indicated that they (and their reviewers) often went the extra mile to provide comprehensive feedback to these authors even if they rejected their papers.

Those who chose (b) (19%) often reasoned from the point of view of editorial responsibility: "as editor you have to serve too", "[we] also have an educational role"; and future-directedness: "people from these countries are an important part of the future scientific infrastructures of the planet"; a number of you reported that you found this route personally rewarding.

There were also voices who spoke out against this option: "it amounts to [a] kind of 'social engineering' of the peer review process," remarked one respondent; but for a number of editors this question of inclusion lies at the very heart of one of the things they are trying to achieve with their journal or is central to the field being comprehensively represented: "it's not just about having good data, or good ideas, it's about participating in particular communities of discourse and writing", "[our journal] focuses on developing countries and one of our objectives is to promote readership and authorship in [these] countries."

The least chosen (individual) option was (c), selected by thirteen percent of respondents and many more of you

expressed in principle enthusiasm for this route and/or requested further information. Currently, there is not a formal scheme in place for such sponsorship, but since so much interest was expressed we are exploring how such a program might work. We will keep you informed as to any developments within Elsevier regarding such a program. In parallel to this, the Elsevier Foundation is exploring how it can help to contribute to, and support the advancement of, science and medicine in these countries more broadly by supporting third party organizations that help scientists develop skills and knowledge. Any input or recommendations on this matter would be appreciated.

Combination responses were also common, the most frequent was (a) and (b): "editor[s] feel…the need to uphold principles according to (a). On the other hand it's against [their] grain to brush off a scientist who has worked hard, often under very unfavorable conditions…and, later on [can] enrich the journal with somewhat different views and subjects."

A number of editors pointed out the need for a diversity of publications with differing policies and impact factors so that papers from these countries can get published, albeit not necessarily in the highest impact journals.

Strategy & Policies

Forum question

This issue has focused on copyright, how it protects intellectual property and what steps can be taken if it is breached. As an integral part of the publishing process what is your view of copyright?

a) I prefer a liberal copyright policy. The more I can make use of my published article (within the constraints of the policy), in print and on the Web, the better.

b) My main objective is the visibility and accessibility of my article, within the constraints of the policy. This includes exposure in e.g. search engines.

c) While both the above are important, the highest priority for me is that my intellectual property is protected against plagiarism or illegal copying.

To add your comment to the Forum click here.

If you would like to read the online versions of these articles, or would like access to more information relevant to editors, please go to www.elsevier.com/editorsupdate