



## Wiley-Blackwell Publishing News

December 2010 - Number 30

### Contents of this Issue:

Your Starter for Ten: An Interview with Allan Adler, Vice President of Legal and Governmental Affairs at the Association of American Publishers (AAP) and John Tagler, Vice President and Executive Director of the Professional and Scholarly Publishing Division of the AAP .....	2
Thomson's New Book Citation Index .....	7
Scientific Data Management: How the European Union is Responding to the Challenge.....	8
If You Build It, Will They Come? How Researchers Perceive and Use Web 2.0 .....	9
Ease of Access to Journals Articles for Researchers .....	10
Scholarly Communication: The Future for Academic Authors .....	10
Library Discovery Services – A Better Way to Find What You're Looking For .....	13
Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID) Update .....	14
Converting Journals to Online Only.....	15
Recent Wiley-Blackwell Events for Societies and Journals .....	17
Wiley Online Library – Update on New Alerting Functionality.....	19
The Scientific Sense of Humor .....	20

---

[Your Starter for Ten: An Interview with Allan Adler, Vice President of Legal and Governmental Affairs at the Association of American Publishers \(AAP\) and John Tagler, Vice President and Executive Director of the Professional and Scholarly Publishing Division of the AAP](#)

<http://www.publishers.org/>

**1. Allan and John, can you tell our readers about the main activities of the AAP and particularly its Professional/Scholarly Publishing division?**

**JT:** I'll be happy to lead off with information about the PSP division. We have a little over 130 members. What is interesting in the AAP context is the diversity of the PSP membership. We have large and small commercial publishers but the largest group is made up of society publishers – ranging from quite large to quite small. And there are about three dozen university presses as well. What has always struck me about scholarly publishing – and for most of the PSP members we're talking about scientific, technical and medical publishing – is how little understanding there is in all sectors about how this type of publishing works. This is true not only of the general population but also legislators, agency officials and academic administrators, all of whom can have a potentially important impact on the future of scholarly publishing. Which brings me back to your question about our activities. Education and communication have been and continue to be a high priority for PSP. Now, the topics that we're addressing in both of these contexts have changed considerably in the past decade but education and raising awareness remain fundamental.

**ARA:** Let me add a point about AAP's PSP Division and what I always reference as the twin foundations of publishing in the U.S. – the protections afforded to freedom of speech under the First Amendment, and the protections afforded to works of original expression under copyright law. When one hears about "society publishers" or "scholarly publishers" – let alone "scientific, technical and medical publishing" – it tends to conjure up an image of a genteel or staid community that one would not expect to be willing to jump in with both feet to battle the federal government over alleged censorship or incursion on the free exercise of intellectual property rights. Yet, PSP members have proven time and again that they have the grit and determination to stand up for their rights and underlying principles of law that are fundamental to the enjoyment of those rights. A good example was a 3-year lawsuit in which the PSP Division led a coalition of publishers' and authors' groups in successfully challenging – and changing – regulations of the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control that purported to require publishers to apply for government licenses in order to engage in certain basic publishing activities regarding with works originating in countries subject to U.S. trade embargoes.

**2. How have these activities changed in recent years?**

**JT:** The single biggest change is the migration from print to digital. It started about 10 - 12 years ago with journals moving online and now the remainder of the scholarly record is following suit. So there is a heavy emphasis on everything e-related. PSP offers an active program of conferences,

seminar and webinars, and the topics that we've addressed in the past couple of years involve data mining, citation analysis, online advertising, social networking, online usage statistics, electronic health records and others. These are topics that weren't on our horizon a decade ago. The possibilities are limitless and the response from members and non-members who attend our programs is very encouraging.

There is a growing emphasis on another issue that surprises me – and perhaps it shouldn't. We find that the publishing community – all intellectual property rights holders, in fact – are challenged to defend copyright. The digital environment has brought about the perception that online equals free. Perhaps it's because people think there is little or no cost involved in electronic publishing. Perhaps it's because people can so easily circumvent copyright rules in the online environment or there's the perception that copyright holders really aren't serious about protecting their property. Or perhaps it's because some people – and I don't believe it's universal – like to get away without paying . . . they see it as a conquest. But it's a tricky situation because nothing good comes for nothing. Or it may for a while but ultimately the piper must be paid. The perception of free information is also short-sighted because anything that is going to meet acceptable standards of quality, integrity and sustainability costs money. And in the absence of quality control and the gatekeeping function, there's a high risk of retrieving rubbish – and there's already too much of that on the Internet.

**ARA:** In focusing on the digital revolution and its impact on book publishing, government officials, the news media, and the general public often fail to understand that book and journal publishers are not a homogenous community but rather a highly sectoral one in which products, markets, distribution channels and business models differ greatly from one sector to another. While much of the attention today regarding the shift from print to digital formats focuses on educational publishing and trade publishing, it was the journal publishers from the PSP community who first established a viable online business presence through subscription models that have grown increasingly sophisticated in their use of technological innovations to serve their readership.

### **3. The recent AAP press release on [government mandates](#) makes a robust defence of the value added by publishers like Wiley-Blackwell – what's been the response?**

**JT:** Surprisingly, there has been little feedback. It's hard to know what that means. On the positive side, I'm glad that the points raised in press release were not excoriated by the free public access zealots or at least I don't know of any. Does silence mean assent? Or does it mean that nobody is listening and minds have already been made up? What is important, however, is to go on record to state your case. The issues are clearly articulated and nobody can say that the PSP publishers didn't speak up.

**ARA:** Unfortunately, our battles with the federal government over this issue continue unabated as the library community and its ideological supporters within the federal government and the private sector wilfully continue to deny the significant investments that produce "value added" by journal publishers, in the form of their peer review and manuscript acceptance policies that provide quality assurance for the content they publish, even as these champions of their own peculiar approach to

“open access” deliberately seek to expropriate that value without compensating or even recognizing the rights of the publishers. How else can one explain their dogged efforts to gain control over the government-funded researcher’s final manuscript **after** peer review and **after** acceptance by the journal for publication as a journal article, so they can make it freely available to the world online?

**4. In your testimony to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform you sought to make a clear distinction between research that is funded by public money and the means of disseminating the output of that research, was this understood?**

**ARA:** It’s unclear. We made the same arguments before the House Subcommittee that we had made in comments submitted in response to a notice from the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, which impliedly sought to expand to other research-funding agencies of the federal government the basic elements of the NIH Public Access Policy we have been fighting for some six years. Perhaps OSTP heard us, since the process to move toward issuing a government-wide policy on public access to federally-funded research seems to have slowed down. From our point of view, the issue is not difficult to understand: the researcher manuscripts that become peer-reviewed articles published in scholarly journals are not themselves funded “research,” nor are they “deliverables” required to be produced for the funding agency under the terms of the grant that funds the research; instead, they are separate works of original expression that report on the funded research, and are written with the express intention of publication in relevant peer-reviewed journals to describe and explain the process, findings and significance of the funded research that has been conducted by the authoring researcher.

**5. What could societies do to support the lobbying efforts of publishers?**

**JT:** I would like to see societies educate their members about the publishing process. Publishing is a cornerstone of most professional societies, particularly those whose memberships consist mainly of researchers and practitioners. It’s a tremendous service to members both as authors as well as readers, and most members wear both hats during their professional lives. But publishing costs money. Many people conveniently think that with electronic publishing the costs have essentially vanished. That couldn’t be farther from the truth. Holding a printed journal or book in one’s hands is something tangible. But viewing text on a screen is difficult to quantify. With all the bells and whistles that continue to be added to digital platforms – not to mention how the users have benefitted from the tremendous convenience and efficiency that 24/7 online access offers – members need to understand that this all comes with a cost. Societies need to get this message across to their members but I think there has been a reluctance to discuss the money issues – maybe it’s seen as unsavoury or unprofessional. But knowledge and understanding is critical. If publishers don’t articulate their side of the story, then society members will assume that we have no defense or rationale to how the publishing arms of their organizations are run.

Within PSP we are putting the finishing touches on a presentation that can be used by member publishers for educational purposes. First of all, publishers need to be sure that their staffs understands the issues involved in scholarly and scientific publishing and can be effective communicators of the value added in the publishing process. This is particularly true of staff who

are customer-facing especially those involved in sales, marketing, editorial, exhibits and product development roles. They also should understand the complexities of building and maintaining an electronic platform. A well-informed staff can have a tremendous impact in one-on-one interactions, and this is incalculable in the bigger scheme of things.

But this presentation should also be used to educate the constituencies, with whom publishers work – society partners, editors, editorial boards, etc. We want it to be a ‘big-picture’ approach so people better understand the breadth of what’s involved in scholarly and scientific publishing. I think there’s a lot of piecemeal knowledge but I wonder how many people have put it all together.

**ARA:** Amen to all that. And the same education efforts should be targeted at the government officials and news media who have little understanding of this publishing sector and misconstrue the nature of its activities to justify laws like the NIH Public Access Policy.

**6. I believe that there’s evidence of piracy based on the contents of PubMedCentral – how widespread is this?**

**ARA:** Well, as we explained in our testimony before the House Oversight and Government Reform subcommittee, there is evidence that domestic companies in China have been acquiring electronic copies of copyrighted U.S. scientific journal articles from government and university libraries and reselling them through online websites to legitimate producers’ primary customers. U.S. publishers and scientific societies face estimated annual losses of \$80-100 million as a result of such theft, so we have been working closely with U.S. trade agencies to address this problem. In the past year, we have found evidence that companies in China are reselling and distributing, without authorization, journal articles downloaded from NIH’s PubMedCentral Database – material produced by U.S. publishers at their own expense. In that context, the NIH policy is contributing to digital piracy.

**7. What do you see as the next stages in this debate with the Federal government?**

**JT:** I think the educational process needs to continue. We feel we have made some inroads but now we must build on the foundation we have laid, and the last thing we should do is step away feeling that we’ve stated our case. It needs to be reinforced and channelled more widely. And more people need to understand and support the role of the publisher. Publishers have been too complacent for too long. We’ve assumed that there is a wide understanding of the value we add and the importance of protecting intellectual property. In March 2010, AAP organized our first “Lobby Day” where a delegation of more than 50 publishers, comprising Heads of House and top management from 16 AAP member companies, converged on Capitol Hill. With support from AAP staff, the publishers visited 33 Congressional offices, speaking with Senators and House Members and their staffs about our most pressing public policy concerns. There was scant representation from the PSP community but in fairness the event was organized in conjunction with the AAP annual conference which has heavy attendance by trade, higher education and K-12 publishers while PSP holds its annual conference several weeks earlier. Hence we were slightly outside the planning process which came together quite quickly. But in 2011, the PSP members will have more advance notice and need to present their perspectives in this critical forum. AAP can create the opportunity but the members have to step up to the plate as well.

**8. On a related topic, your role involves leadership of the AAP's Copyright Committee - what are its key challenges?**

**ARA:** The key challenges of the Copyright Committee are to understand and respond to rapid developments in technological innovation – as well as the cultural perspectives they foster – that impact products, markets, distribution channels, business models and consumer preferences within and across different sectors of the publishing community. It is from the constant stirring of these matters that the ongoing public policy debates over the efficacy and propriety of current U.S. copyright law arise. In particular, the frequently fractious relationship between advocates for freedom of speech and adequate copyright protection and enforcement are areas of ongoing review and discussion at Committee meetings, where PSP community members are represented along with trade, educational and other publishers, all of whom hold important interests on both sides of these issues. “Fair use” is an especially difficult issue for some AAP members both because it is a legal doctrine that evolves fitfully from one judicial decision to another and because publishers find themselves at different times to be asserting or refuting fair use claims.

**9. You were heavily involved in the Google Book Settlement – what are the main implications for authors, readers and publishers? What influence do you think Google will exert over scholarly publishing in the future?**

**ARA:** I'm afraid that's too big a subject to tackle in this context. It would require an interview all to itself to do it justice. Suffice it to say that AAP believes the settlement would be a win-win-win situation for authors, publishers and their readers as it would make hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of out-of-print works discoverable and accessible for purposes of research, entertainment and potential commercial exploitation.

**10. What's next for the AAP and PSP?**

**JT:** I think we've alluded to AAP's future direction a number of times in our discussion since changes in the industry are woven into the fabric of our everyday lives and thinking. Tom Allen, AAP's President and CEO, in addressing a group of publishers recently, talked about the 'seismic' changes the industry is undergoing. In an interview in this spring's PSP Bulletin, he noted, "I had the impression that publishing was a mature business. Well, it's anything but mature. There are huge changes every month."

The biggest challenge the industry faces is that most people don't really understand what publishing is – it involves a vastly greater amount of activity than printing, which is what I think many people believe defines publishing. Ironically, in the digital world, printing is among the least significant functions the publisher performs so there's a perception gap – if they don't print then what do publishers do? With Tom's leadership during the last 18 months since he joined AAP, we are looking to educate a wide range of audiences about the publisher's role and the value added in the publishing process. This dovetails with the need to increase recognition of the importance of copyright in the minds of the public, the media and legislators. All of which is heightened by the digital environment where it is difficult to comprehend – and too easy to overlook – what goes on behind the scenes to deliver quality, sustainable, user-friendly intellectual property to the screen

and why copyright protection is critical to this process. So we have our work cut out for us as we try to create better awareness and appreciation of the publishing industry.

Thank you.

*Interviewed by David Nicholson, Journals Publishing Director, Life Sciences*

---

## Thomson's New Book Citation Index

At the Frankfurt Book Fair in October, Thomson Reuters announced the launch of a book citation index to complement their existing citation index products, such as the Science Citation Index and Conference Proceedings. The Book Citation Index will be launched in the second quarter of 2011 and will be an integral component of Thomson's Web of Knowledge.

In an interview with *Information Today*, Jim Testa, Vice President for Editorial Development and Publisher Relations at Thomson, commented on the reasons for developing a book citation product:

*'With Book Citation Index, we are rounding out our citation coverage of core research literature [...] We know that [books] are extremely important in the social sciences and the humanities. But they are also important in the sciences. Social scientists use them heavily and cite them heavily. We want to make sure that we best serve that community by complementing the other two forms of publications—serials and proceedings—in the book arena as well. That's our primary goal.'*

Thomson are planning on indexing around 25,000 titles at launch, with coverage going back to 2005 for STM content, and back to 2003 for social science and humanities titles. They will consider scholarly books with full research articles with references for inclusion, such as books in series or monographs, scholarly biographies, graduate and advanced research textbooks, and similar. Titles in languages other than English, as well as undergraduate textbooks, reference works including encyclopedias, atlases and bibliographies, will not be considered. The footnotes, bibliography and references will be indexed for each book.

In addition to recognizing the importance of book publication, particularly in the social sciences and humanities, adding books to the Web of Knowledge will enable the research community to gain a much more complete picture of the universe of scholarly citations. Although citations from books will not be included in journal impact factor calculations, citations will be visible in Web of Science, providing much enhanced analysis of the citation networks between all types of scholarly literature, and enabling significantly greater understanding of the impact of books than has been possible up until now.

The Book Citation Index should also massively help increase discovery of book content, which is still relatively hidden in comparison to journal articles, as each citation will include links back to the publisher's platform. With over 9000 online books available on Wiley Online Library, Wiley-Blackwell is well-positioned to take advantage of this increased exposure.

*Duncan Campbell, Associate Director, Journal Digital Licensing*

---

## Scientific Data Management: How the European Union is Responding to the Challenge

On the 6<sup>th</sup> October 2010, a report entitled '**Riding the Wave: How Europe can gain from the rising tide of scientific data**' was formally presented to the European Commissioner for Digital Agenda, Neelie Kroes.

This report is the result of a series of brainstorming sessions by a group of experts, as well as a process of wider consultation. The brief was to provide a vision of how scientific data and data infrastructures could look by 2030 – giving some outline scenarios and challenges – and to provide some initial guidance on the strategies that will be necessary to realize this vision. The EU has accepted the need to take active steps in order to harness the exponential rates of data production and consequent tasks of collection and storage that are emerging as key scientific and technical issues for the future. As the preamble states, the 'resulting actions that we propose will affect all areas of research, not just big science'. This includes 'the humanities, publishing, and bio-diversity in addition to large international science facilities'.

Although this report specifically deals with the EU constituency, it has global significance because the EU is looking to prove the case for placing data management at the centre of its scientific agenda. This has already caused ripples throughout various research funding agencies that are ultimately under its jurisdiction: the UK Research Councils, for instance, are now implementing mandatory data management plans as part of grant proposal requirements. As many researchers are increasingly working within international partnerships, this is likely to affect many regions. Furthermore, in the near future, articles publishing research funded by these bodies will have to include data statements within the article indicating where the data produced by the research are stored and how they can be accessed. This development is likely to affect all journals that publish research originating in whole or in part from the EU region.

The report is passionate about the benefits of developing a culture of openly available data infrastructures that are discoverable, used for the common good, and, above all, trustworthy. It recognizes that achieving this will require much investment, training, and innovation. Attitudes of scientists, policy-makers, and the public would all need to change, as would the systems of incentives and sanctions built around scientific careers. One stark turnaround is the identification of a new type of professional to join scientific investigations: the data scientist. Currently data collection and management are viewed as a 'blue collar' roles that are not plugged into the academic cycle of grant awards, publication, and professional accreditation. According to 'Riding the Wave' this urgently needs to change.

Similarly, the current low priority given to the long-term storage and curation of data is earmarked for transformation by way of greatly enhanced funding, as well as the introduction – and enforcement – of the data management plans mentioned above.

Many of the report's findings and recommendations are likely to have a positive effect on future scientific funding and output – simply by encouraging researchers and institutions to be better organized regarding data production, storage, and sharing. However, although it always refers to the

desirability of ‘open access *to data*’ (my italics) the European Commission’s ongoing interest in Open Access as a publishing model sits alongside ‘Riding the Wave’. (See, for example, the [Publishing and the Ecology of European Research](#) or PEER Project, through which the EU is investigating the effects of large-scale repository-building within a controlled study. A number of scientific publishers – including Wiley-Blackwell – are participating.) As a result, as a company and as part of the scientific publishing industry, we need to engage with this policy debate.

The Riding the Wave group has delivered its report and disbanded. However, others such as [GRDI2020](#) have picked up the challenge. GRDI (Global Research Data Infrastructures) is working on a roadmap for the next 10 years that will progress the EU towards its 2030 objectives. Parallel to this, the [ISCU](#) (International Council for Science) is gathering intelligence about data in order to produce a major report at its triennial meeting next summer.

As an organization, we are actively working with policy-makers as well as our partners (readers, authors and, crucially, societies) to gain insight into this rapidly changing landscape and – where appropriate – protect the legacy of decades of knowledge-building that journals publishing represents. In order to best accomplish this, we need to ensure our stakeholders are well informed regarding key issues and upcoming developments, and also encourage dialog with them in order to better understand the changing shape of research output, new requirements made by funding bodies, and the frustrations – or revelations – brought about by emerging technical innovations. As well as engaging with ISCU in the run-up to their meeting, we are monitoring further activities in the EU. Neelie Kroes greeted the submission of ‘Riding the Wave’ with the announcement that she plans to table a communication on scientific information in 2011, the goal of which will be to ‘raise awareness of the opportunities represented by scientific data as well as setting out a plan for future developments’. This communication potentially has profound implications for future research infrastructure policies. We will continue to monitor these developments on behalf of our stakeholders and partners, and welcome their input on data-related issues going forward.

*Fiona Murphy, Executive Journals Editor, Life Sciences*

---

## [If You Build It, Will They Come? How Researchers Perceive and Use Web 2.0](#)

[This report](#) was published by RIN (Research Information Network) in July, but does not seem to have attracted much comment, perhaps because the findings did not indicate radical change.

The study indicates that a majority of researchers are making at least occasional use of one or more Web 2.0 tools or services for purposes related to their research: for communicating their work; for developing and sustaining networks and collaborations; or for finding out what others are doing. But frequent or intensive use is rare, and some researchers regard blogs, wikis, and other such forms of communication as a waste of time or even dangerous. Researchers do not see Web 2.0 tools and services as comparable to or substitutes for other channels and means of communication.

Current take up of Web 2.0 tools and services is relatively low (39% of those surveyed are not using them at all) and, contrary to popular perceptions, differences between various demographic groups are

relatively small. High usage is positively associated with older age groups and those in senior positions. Junior and younger researchers, however, are more likely to be frequent users of social networking.

There are Web 2.0 enthusiasts but there are two major barriers. First, lack of clarity as to what the benefits might be and fragmentation of user-base; second, perceptions of quality and trust. A significant minority of researchers believe, however, that peer review will become unsustainable over the next five years, and nearly half (47%) expect that it will be complemented by citation and usage statistics, user ratings, and comments. Formal attribution of authorship may be uncertain.

In conclusion, there is little evidence to suggest that Web 2.0 will, in the short to medium term, prompt the kinds of radical changes in scholarly communications advocated by the open research community. For most researchers the established channels work well; and, critically, they are entrenched within the systems for evaluating and rewarding researchers. Web 2.0 services are likely to continue to evolve as supplements to – not replacements for – established channels of communication between researchers.

*Bob Campbell, Senior Publisher*

---

### Ease of Access to Journals Articles for Researchers

Across the world, researchers in all disciplines rate journal articles as the most important type of information. They can get access to them, indeed 93% of the 3800 respondents found access “very easy” or “fairly easy”, but there is more to be done. So the publisher/library system works well for journals but, where publishers are not involved, eg data sets, data models and algorithms, access is more difficult.

These are the main conclusions of a new global study released by the Publishing Research Consortium (PRC) see link:

<http://www.publishingresearch.net/>

This study extended globally the survey approach developed for an earlier UK study, see link:

<http://www.publishingresearch.net/documents/SMEAccessCompanionReport.pdf>

As you might expect there are marked regional differences in ease of access. 97% of respondents in North America reported very or fairly easy access to journals. This figure drops to 94% for Western Europe, 91% for Asia Pacific, 88% for Latin America, 85% for the Middle East, and 78% for Africa.

*Bob Campbell, Senior Publisher*

---

### Scholarly Communication: The Future for Academic Authors

Most authors have only recently grappled with e-books and the potential for online delivery of their text. Academic journals have been delivering digital content from online platforms since 1996. Most

such journals are still available as print-on-paper because of continuing demand from some subscribers but the e-version now dominates, especially in STM (science, technology, medicine).

Authors submit their articles over the internet, peer review is organized over the internet, there is even a system that checks for any duplication (and thus possible plagiarism) over the internet called CrossCheck, and editorial decisions are made more quickly by a networked team of editors operating across the world. If the article is accepted the author can track progress through production and check page proofs over the internet, and after publication can monitor the impact of the article as measured by citations, usage data, and blogs.

The first peer-reviewed journal was founded by the Royal Society in 1665. Its core functions were described in correspondence by the Secretary of the Royal Society, Henry Oldenburg, as: registration, quality assurance (peer review), dissemination, and archiving in perpetuity. These functions have remained much the same although it could be argued that there is now a fifth: providing citation data which are used as a measure of the quality/impact of the article and thus the status of the publication, and by inference the status of the author and even their institution. The average number of citations received per paper published in that journal during the two preceding years – the Impact Factor – is accepted as an indication of the status of a journal.

NOP/Elsevier conducted a survey earlier this year on which publishing objectives are most important to authors. “To disseminate results and further knowledge” came first, “to further my career prospects” second, and “to secure funding for future research” third, with “to establish precedence and protect intellectual property” last. Well aware of authors’ objectives, publishers have used the internet to speed up the peer review process and make articles accessible at an earlier stage; some will even provide access to the accepted version before copy editing, while many will provide “early view” to the published version before it has been compiled into an issue or published in print. And as Impact Factor attracts authors, editors are striving to drive this up by encouraging much-cited authors to submit their work.

As the worldwide investment in research has risen so has the journal publishing industry. The size of the research community has increased steadily by around 3-4% per annum; the number of articles published each year has likewise grown by 3-4%, over the last three centuries with some minor fluctuations. Currently there are around 2,000 publishers producing around 23,000 journals. Each year, around 5,000 new editors are taken on and around 400-500 new journals launched. The system involves around 125,000 editors and 350,000 editorial board members, processing around 3.75-4 million referees’ reports.

The industry has invested more than £1.5 billion in electronic platforms – probably £2 billion in total when associated activities like developing tracking and editorial systems are taken into account. The investment continues as publishing systems continue to be enhanced. The successful transition to a digital system has come at some cost but it has vastly improved access and discoverability for the academic community. According to a study by the Royal Society (*The Scientific Century*, 2010) the UK – with only 1% of the world’s population and 3% of global funding for research – produced 7.9% of published papers; these scored 11.8% of the world’s citations with 14.4% of the world’s most cited papers.

An important element in scholarly communication is the learned society. Some self-publish, and indeed are major players, while many partner with commercial publishers or university presses providing the subject knowledge and editorial policy and organization. These arrangements usually give the societies and thus the community that supports the journal, income which is then used by the society to subsidize meetings and other services provided by the society.

In the early 1990s journal publishing was caught in an upward price spiral. Inflation, investment in technology and rising submissions, and compensation for cancelled subscriptions, were forcing prices up – leading to further cancellations. A typical British university might have subscribed to around 5,000 titles. Then online delivery platforms were launched enabling publishers to license access across their whole list at little extra cost. By 2008 a British university would typically have access to around 15,000 titles, and through digital licensing the cost per view or download has steadily dropped. Through various philanthropic schemes, developing countries can access journals over the internet at little or no charge.

Two new publishing models emerged under the general heading of Open Access (OA). The main origins of OA were the view that as the author gets the career benefit from publication s/he should pay rather than the readers/librarians; and the view that as the taxpayer had usually paid for the research, the research community, and indeed the public in general, should be entitled to access the published outcome. (Unfortunately some research funders do not appreciate that although the taxpayers may have paid for the underlying research, they have not paid for the publication of that research). In addition, users of the internet expect wherever possible to access information without charge.

Model 1 (the 'Gold Road') is based on the author paying for the value added by the publisher. There are, however, concerns that it creates a barrier to authorship, and payment from the author rather than the reader could lead to lower standards, but this model has enabled publishers to launch new titles at a lower investment as they don't have to build up circulation (which can take 5-7 years to cover costs). It is not necessarily a simpler model as Gold Road publishers have to administer and collect payment from potentially a million and more authors rather than 5,000 libraries and universities. Around 2% of articles published appear in Gold Road OA journals with perhaps another 5% offered as delayed OA: free access 6 to 12 months or longer after publication.

The second model is known as the 'Green Road'. It might be described as "no one pays" and thus is unlikely to be sustainable. The basic idea is that in response to the demand for public access, research funders mandate grantees to post articles for free access, on publication or after an embargo period. There are two obvious problems with this policy. Making available copies for free access will undermine the economic base of the publication. If much of the contents of a journal, albeit in an inferior version, can be found over the internet within, say, six months of publication why should a library continue to subscribe? In addition, once the publisher taken the article through a process of selection and improvement supported by peer review, it has a copyright interest in the final version. Not sufficiently widespread yet to undermine paid circulations, the Green Road could become a serious problem: we could land up with several versions of an article available on repositories with no proper stewardship, and libraries will be more inclined to cancel subscriptions.

The current situation may seem unclear. As for the future, e-science (the use of distributed networked resources to store, share, and analyze immense data sets) and global investment in research are generating what has been described as a deluge of data. Journals act as the main gateway to these data and yet are only growing at 3-4% per annum. New data sharing systems may evolve which could lead to new forms of scholarly communication ranging from social networking to powerful data infrastructures based on international standards that complement journals which will continue with their role as outlined by Henry Oldenburg. The role of journals in providing metrics for quality and impact) will also evolve as funders seek more feedback on research output from the huge global investment in research. For authors the old adage “publish or perish” will become “publish and be measured – or perish”.

*Bob Campbell, Senior Publisher*

*Cliff Morgan, VP Planning and Development*

*This article originally appeared in the December 2010 issue of The Author, and is reprinted here with their kind permission.*

---

## Library Discovery Services – A Better Way to Find What You’re Looking For

Imagine you're an undergraduate (or a graduate student, or a professor) at Harvard (or Cambridge, or the Sorbonne, or anywhere, really). Your library subscribes to thousands of e-journals and thousands more e-books, hundreds of databases, and still has row upon row of shelves holding strange things called 'books'. Confronted by this overwhelming choice, and with your essay due tonight, where do you start? You go to Google, of course.

Now imagine a world where that's not the case, where users actually start their discovery with a search engine provided by the library itself, and which directs them to the most appropriate content for their search that the library has available, rather than to the mixed bag of results that Google throws out. The last couple of years have seen the development of so-called 'library discovery services', such as [Summon](#), from ProQuest's Serials Solutions business, EBSCO's [Discovery Service](#), and Ex Libris' [Primo Central](#), all of which aim to put the library back at the center of search and information discovery.

This isn't a new idea, of course; there have been all kinds of attempts over the last decade to provide a more integrated library search experience across the huge range of electronic resources libraries currently provide access to – through A-Z journal lists, federated search tools, and of course the library's OPAC (online catalog). What all these suffer from, in comparison to web-scale search tools such as Google, is not only the fact that they are incomplete (OPACs don't include database information, federated search tools can only search a limited set of metadata, etc), is that they don't provide the user with easy access to the full text. This is exactly what Google provides, no matter whether an article or database entry is best suited for a user's needs, no matter where it comes from, no matter whether or not it has been selected or purchased by the library.

Mike Buschmann, Senior Product Manager with Serials Solutions, and responsible for developing *Summon*, comments that “Multiple studies have shown that users, despite understanding that the high-quality, credible content they need for their research is in the library, consistently end up searching the

web because it is irresistibly simple, easy, and fast. We built *Summon* to meet the expectation of speed and simplicity to the digital front door of the library, in order for users to easily discover the full breadth of the high-value content in a library's collection."

Library discovery services aim to index all the content a library has access to electronically (either by indexing the full text or just the metadata), as well as integrating records for print holdings and other content-types that are still available in physical form, such as maps, microform, photographic collections, and so on. The crucial difference between this and previous search tools is that library discovery services don't search the library's locally-held resources one-by-one; instead, they index and search a centrally held database of publisher content, thereby allowing more complete indexing, much faster searching, and more complex integration of result sets. In addition, rather than seeing multiple results for the same article if it's held in several different databases or abstracting and indexing services, these search tools display a composite result for each item. Linking from the list of results to the full text of an article is also controlled by the library through their link resolver system, so a user is directed to the most appropriate full text copy a library holds, generally the version of record on the publisher's own platform.

This looks likely to be a huge benefit to publishers; according to research carried out by ProQuest at Grand Valley State University in Michigan, one of *Summon*'s early adopters, using *Summon* has "had a significant impact on how students were connecting to content and the type of content they were using [...] for example, in the first four months, Academic Search Premier saw a usage increase of 92%, General OneFile increased 179% and ABI/INFORM rose 354%." In addition, "GVSU's top 100 journals showed an average usage increase of 48%, while the top 1000 had increased usage of 82%".

Wiley-Blackwell already works with a large number of abstracting and indexing services, such as Thomson Reuters' [Web of Science](#), Elsevier's [Scopus](#) and the National Library of Medicine's [PubMed](#) service. We believe that exposure to A&I services, whether in print or online, increases discoverability of Wiley-Blackwell journals, and drives usage of content on Wiley Online Library. Library discovery services have the potential to offer a major leap forward in terms of enabling end-user access to electronic content, and we're looking forward to working with them to ensure that Wiley-Blackwell content is represented in these services, and that our online journals and books derive maximum benefit in terms of discoverability and usage from our participation.

*Duncan Campbell, Associate Director, Journal Digital Licensing*

---

## [Open Researcher and Contributor ID \(ORCID\) Update](#)

Launched late in 2009 as a collaborative effort to solve the problem of name ambiguity among contributors to scholarly research with a system that assigns them unique identifiers, the Open Researcher and Contributor ID ([ORCID](#)) initiative has made significant progress in its first year of activity. Since all the communities within the world of scholarly communications—universities, libraries, societies, publishers, and funding and governmental agencies—have a strong interest in correctly identifying contributors, much work has gone into studying the spectrum of use cases to ensure that the solution will serve everyone well. ORCID is being designed to integrate with other name identifier

schemes, not replace them, providing a “big tent” that can accommodate the needs of all scholarly communities.

ORCID has recently completed a [survey](#) of its approximately 150 participating organizations, to help clarify their priorities for what the service should be, including the scope of the information registered in the system for each contributor. Building on this, we have applied for a small grant to fund an in-depth market survey in early 2011, working with a consultant to speak with targeted international communities in order to inform the finalization of the business model. We hope to implement the business model in the second half of the year, with the production service launching as a dues-paying membership organization in late 2011 or early 2012. The plan is that there will be no cost to authors and other contributors with ORCID IDs, and no fee for adding information to the system.

ORCID has been incorporated as a non-profit membership organization, and will apply for 501(c) (3) status as a charitable organization during 2011.

The Board of Directors has finalized a set of [10 guiding principles](#), defining, among other things, the meaning of the term “open” with respect to the way ORCID data will be made openly available.

The organizational structure of ORCID and the range of its participants reflect the breadth of its mandate. Its bylaws require that the majority of Board members represent non-profit organizations; the initial Board comprises 10 non-profits and four for-profits. Major societies such as the American Psychological Association, the Association for Computing Machinery, and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) are participating, and inclusion of the researcher perspective is ensured by the [Board](#) presence of Liz Allen of the Wellcome Trust, Martin Fenner of the Hannover Medical School, and Salvatore Mele of CERN.

ORCID seeks the active participation of researchers. Individuals can sign up as participants at <http://www.orcid.org/memberorg-form>, which gives access to the ORCID wiki, where all of the project documents are available, without obligation.

On a technological level, the ability to disambiguate names automatically is challenging: even if 90% accuracy can be achieved automatically, it is costly to achieve accuracy for the other 10%, but closing that gap is an important goal. An alpha prototype of the ORCID system is available to participants; the technology for the eventual production system is still being analyzed.

*Craig Van Dyck, Vice President, Global Content Management  
Member, ORCID Board of Directors and Executive Committee,  
Chair, ORCID Business Working Group and ORCID Audit Committee*

---

## [Converting Journals to Online Only](#)

For some time now, Wiley-Blackwell has been publishing selected journals in online only format, where market needs do not require a print option. With feedback from librarians, researchers, and students

showing that they are using print less and less, for 2011, we have chosen a pilot group of 44 Wiley-Blackwell owned titles to convert to online only. This pilot will enable us to monitor the effects of dropping print for a significant number of titles, and to assess whether this approach can be successfully extended on a scalable basis to other journals.

### **Why online only?**

There are many benefits of online over print – for librarians, users, societies, publishers, and others.

For example, in many cases the online version of the article includes a number of enhancements that are not available in print, such as supporting information (extra tables, datasets, videos, etc.) or extended experimental protocols that would be too long to publish in print. Wiley-Blackwell is also taking this process a step forward via our Content Enrichment framework, which aims to make content richer and more available to researchers via links to external databases, toolsets, taxonomies, etc.

Being able to reach the widest possible readership is essential in order to increase usage and build citations. Providing access in the most convenient format to readers is, therefore, critical. In some cases, this requires repurposing content so that it can be viewed on hand-held devices, amongst other applications.

Additionally, the online version of the article is increasingly becoming recognized as the Version of Record. This is partly because the publication history can be captured electronically and incorporated into the article's metadata. This provides the opportunity to enhance, amend, correct, update, withdraw, and even retract the article where necessary. Hence it is important that readers know which version of the article they are looking at. (Further work on this is being developed via CrossRef's CrossMark initiative - <http://www.crossref.org/crossmark.html>)

Of course, this additional functionality has a price tag, but the substantial cost of investment can be offset to a certain extent by reducing costs in other areas; the savings in print and distribution costs is helping us to release the necessary funds for the development of online enhancements.

Reducing our carbon footprint also remains a key target for all of Wiley through our Corporate Citizenship initiative (for further information, please see [www.wiley.com/go/citizenship](http://www.wiley.com/go/citizenship)). Converting these 44 titles to online only will achieve a reduction of 94.5 tonnes in our carbon footprint.

### **Other Issues**

*Print copies.* Although the journals will be published online only, we retain the ability to provide printed issues for specific needs such as conference copies or other marketing requirements. These will be provided using digital printing technology, suitable for such short print runs.

*Copyright deposit:* Deposit copies for copyright libraries, for example, can also be provided electronically, and new guidelines have just been received from the Library of Congress for registering copyright in online only journals.

*Value Added Tax (VAT):* VAT remains an issue for customers in the European Union, where electronic subscriptions are subject to this tax. Of course, this cost can be recovered if the organization in question

is registered for VAT, but this represents an administrative burden. However, some librarians have volunteered that this is offset to some extent by the reduction in labor required to handle storage of print issues.

*Archiving:* Wiley-Blackwell meets its long-term archiving requirements via our participation in the CLOCKSS initiative (<http://www.clockss.org/clockss/Home>) and as participants in Portico (<http://www.portico.org/digital-preservation/>).

*Back issue:* A small number of journals have some revenue through the sale of back issues (fulfilled in most cases by our backstock agent, Periodicals Services Company, for issues older than three years). However, in most cases, loss of this revenue source is not significant enough to offset the gains from a reduction in the costs of printing and distribution.

*Member copies:* For many society-owned titles, the printed journal can be a vital component of the membership benefits. For this reason, this pilot project does not include any journal with a significant membership component. However, given the potential revenue and other benefits of moving to online only, we expect to be discussing this issue further with our society and other publishing partners, with a view to better promoting online content to members, as well as identifying other membership benefits.

## **Conclusions**

Early evidence indicates that, as well as meeting changing market needs, the cost savings delivered as a result of moving to online only will release funds to invest in strategic journal development, and to increased readership and usage. While print will continue for some journals for the foreseeable future, we have every reason to believe that the current pilot will be successful, and that we will be identifying further candidates for conversion to online only.

We will be reporting on progress with this online only initiative in future issues of Publishing News. In the meantime, if you would like more information about this or are interested in discussing moving your journal(s) online only, please contact your Journal Publishing Manager.

*Edward Wates, Global Journal Content Management Director*

---

## **Recent Wiley-Blackwell Events for Societies and Journals**

### **US Executive Seminar**

Wiley-Blackwell's 2010 Executive Seminar took place at the National Press Club in Washington, DC on December 10. Bringing together over 100 senior society executives and journal editors, the theme of the day was *New Business Models and Opportunities in Scholarly Publishing*.

The keynote speaker, Jonathan Zittrain, Professor of Law at Harvard Law School, spoke on *The Future of the Internet and How to Stop It* – a fascinating look at the opportunities and threats of the digital world for publishers. Peter Wiley gave the opening remarks, and other speakers included Kim Armstrong (CIC), John Eielson (OC&C), and Bill Park (DeepDyve) on *New Business and Pricing Models*; Paul Danter (Mobile IQ) on *New Technology and the Next Generation of Devices*; Bradley Gernand (Institute for

Defense Analyses), Evelyn Jabri (American Chemical Society), and Renee Wilmeth (Sigma Theta Tau International) on *The Future of Print and Opportunities of Online Publishing*; Steve Miron (Wiley-Blackwell) on *Expanding Markets/New Opportunities – Spotlight on China*; and Bill Davis (American Anthropological Association), Robert Fulcher (American Society for Bone & Mineral Research), and Elizabeth Nolan (The Optical Society) on *Open Access Opportunities*.

Feedback from attendees was very positive, with the seminar rated 3.65 out of 4 overall. As usual, people especially appreciated the opportunity to network with peers and colleagues, as well as with the Wiley-Blackwell team. Typical comments included: “Intellectual stimulation. Relaxed atmosphere. Great Wiley people.” (John O’Keefe, Canadian Dental Association); and “Excellent. Best use of time for me. Excellent topics and discussions.” (Richard J. Wenning, SETAC).

The Seminar was videoed and we will be making an edited version available online in early 2011 – more information to follow.

### **Managing Editors Seminar**

On November 1, Wiley-Blackwell held the first in a new program of seminars for journal managing editors (MEs). Over 40 MEs, most of who work on society-owned journals, gathered in Oxford to take part in a day-long seminar. The program was put together by a Program Board comprising Bob Campbell, Liz Ferguson, and Edward Wates of Wiley-Blackwell, together with Kim Clube (Royal Astronomical Society), Lindsay Haddon (British Ecological Society), Carol Huxley (The Physiological Society), Emily Jesper (Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists), and Carole Sutherland (Association of Child and Adolescent Mental Health).

The diverse agenda featured sessions on Recruiting, Managing and Communicating with Editors and Editorial Boards, Copyright and Publication Ethics, and New Publishing Initiatives, as well as breakout sessions on a range of topics, from *Understanding and Improving Impact Factors* to *Combating Plagiarism*, and *Recruiting and Retaining Editorial Office Staff*. The small group format of these sessions allowed for more interaction and resulted in lots of lively discussion about best practice and personal experiences!

Feedback overall was positive, with the MEs rating the overall quality of the seminar 3.48 out of 4. Typical comments included: “I thoroughly enjoyed it and I got the strong impression that everyone else did too”; “Very well organized and structured”; and “Brilliant. Really useful and with the great bonus of seeing friends at WB and meeting peers.”

Next up is a similar event in the US, to be held in our Hoboken office in spring 2011. The long-term goal is to roll the program out globally, hosting an ongoing program of events in Wiley offices worldwide as a way of interacting with this group of key stakeholders on a regular basis.

*Alice Meadows, Associate Director – Client Development*

---

## Wiley Online Library – Update on New Alerting Functionality

Since the August launch of Wiley Online Library we have continued to build on and improve the new website. Monthly releases are planned going forward, scheduled for the middle of each month. Each of these releases will include new features and fixes to any problems on the site. In the initial months post-launch we concentrated on fixes but since November we have begun to add new and improved features including the following enhancements to E-Alerts.

### **1. New options for Early View and Accepted Article alerts:**

For journals that include Early View and /or Accepted Articles, alerts for these articles are now being sent out weekly as a default; registrants can then choose how often they receive these alerts going forward (daily, weekly, monthly, or never i.e., they only receive the table of contents alerts when an issue is published).

### **2. Citation alerts**

The December release includes the option to receive an alert when an article is cited, using CrossRef Cited-by Linking data which includes citations from over 200 publishers. This allows researchers to keep up-to-date on the latest developments with the research or find out when their own articles are cited. When viewing an article, readers will see the new **“Get Citation Alerts”** option in the **Article Tools** menu. If they choose this option they will receive an email alert whenever that article is cited somewhere. To use this option they must be a registered user and logged in.

### **3. Advertising on E-Alerts**

In early December we rolled out new advertising functionality enabling us to include advertising on the right-hand side of our e-alerts, extending advertising campaign options for those journals that allow advertising. Initially e-alerts are being populated with blank advertising spaces and a few test advertisements, to help gather the important data needed by advertisers (e.g. how many people viewed each advertisement). In early 2011 we will start to make these advertising positions available for paid advertising, as well as for society messages and other non-commercial use, allowing both advertisers and societies to communicate directly with the readers and users of journal content.

### **4. One-click unsubscribe**

To unsubscribe from e-alerts users will now only need to click on **Unsubscribe** in the footer of the relevant alert(s). Previously it was necessary to visit the site, log in, and unsubscribe in My Profile.

We hope you and your readers find these new options useful. Further enhancements to the site are planned – for alerting and other features – and we will provide further updates in future issues of Publishing News. Meanwhile you can keep up-to-date on all the news on Wiley Online Library via our [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#) and [LinkedIn](#) sites.

*Lorna Berrett, Associate Director, Web Communications & Marketing*

---

## The Scientific Sense of Humor

A light-hearted look at peer review, taken from the Wiley-Blackwell journal, *Environmental Microbiology*, and [covered](#) by BBC Radio 4's Today program, the UK's premier radio news show.

*Our referees, the Editorial Board Members and ad hoc reviewers, are busy, serious individuals who give selflessly of their precious time to improve manuscripts submitted to Environmental Microbiology. But, once in a while, their humour (or admiration) gets the better of them. Here are some quotes from reviews made over the past year, just in time for the Season of Goodwill and Merriment.*

- Done! Difficult task, I don't wish to think about constipation and faecal flora during my holidays! But, once a referee, always and anywhere a referee; we are good boy scouts in the research wilderness. Even under the sun and near a wonderful beach.
- This paper is desperate. Please reject it completely and then block the author's email ID so they can't use the online system in future.
- The type of lava vs. diversity has no meaning if only one of each sample is analyzed; multiple samples are required for generality. This controls provenance (e.g. maybe some beetle took a pee on one or the other of the samples, seriously skewing relevance to lava composition).
- Very much enjoyed reading this one, and do not have any significant comments. Wish I had thought of this one.
- It is sad to see so much enthusiasm and effort go into analyzing a dataset that is just not big enough.
- You call the sample fresh water; this is confusing as it is saline water.
- The biggest problem with this manuscript, which has nearly sucked the will to live out of me, is the terrible writing style.
- The abstract and results read much like a laundry list.
- The information in the tree figs. is pretty inscrutable.
- There was little I could think of to improve this nice paper.
- Ken, I would suggest that EM is setting up a fund that pays for the red wine reviewers may need to digest manuscripts like this one. (*Ed.: this excellent suggestion was duly proposed to the Publisher. However, given the logistical difficulties of problem-solving within narrow time frames, combined with the known deleterious effect of transport on good wine, a modification of the remedy was adopted, namely that Editors would act as proxies for reviewers with said digestive complaints.*)
- The statement that glycolipids and phospholipids 'may play an important role in stabilising the outer membrane' is odd because this they definitely do in all Eubacteria.
- Merry X-mas! First, my recommendation was reject with new submission, because it is necessary to investigate further, but reading a well written manuscript before X-mas makes me feel like Santa Claus
- Alfachetoglutarate.
- I have to admit that I would have liked to reject this paper because I found the tone in the Reply to the Reviewers so annoying. It may be irritating to deal with reviewer's comments (believe me, I know!) but it is not wise to let your irritation seep through every line you write!
- The authors still confuse relative abundance of a transcript in a community transcript pool (which is what they are measuring) with upregulation or downregulation of genes (which they are not measuring).

- One might call this not only a skillfully executed paper but also well-rounded and thorough, with unique aspects of microbial systematics and biochemistry. The experimental work with chemostats is excellent. I have little to offer other than praise and a few minor comments.
- Season's Greetings! I apologise for my slow response but a roast goose prevented me from answering emails for a few days.
- I started to review this but could not get much past the abstract.
- Hopeless – Seems like they have been asleep and are not up on recent work on metagenomics.
- This paper is awfully written. There is no adequate objective and no reasonable conclusion. The literature is quoted at random and not in the context of argument. I have doubts about the methods and whether the effort of data gathering is sufficient to arrive at a useful conclusion.
- Stating that the study is confirmative is not a good start for the Discussion. Rephrasing the first sentence of the Discussion would seem to be a good idea.
- The main emphasis in the title is the use of a widely used method. This is not very exciting news. The authors are not to be blamed here. Based on titles seen in journals, many authors seem to be more fascinated these days by their methods than by their science. The authors should be encouraged to abstract the main scientific (i.e., novel) finding into the title.
- A weak paper, poor experimental design, comparison of sequences using different primers, no statistical analysis possible, carelessly written, poorly thought through.
- There is a great deal of freely available genomic data in the world and the authors would be much better off training themselves on that while waiting for genomic data to be generated for their system.
- This is a long, but excellent report. I had considered asking for EMSAs, but these will not significantly improve the study. It hurts me a little to have so little criticism of a manuscript.
- Always dear EMI takes care of its referees, providing them with entertainment for the holiday time in between Xmas and New Year. Plus the server shows, as usual, its inhuman nature and continues to send reminding messages. Well, between playing tennis on the Wii, eating and drinking, I found time and some strength of mind to do this work.
- At the risk of appearing unkind, the authors' main selling point for this paper seems to be that it is the biggest soil pyrosequencing project so far. I fear we are entering a phase of repeating all of the studies carried out over the past 15 years, but now using pyrosequencing.
- I agreed to review this Ms whilst answering e-mails in the golden glow of a balmy evening on the terrace of our holiday hotel on Lake Como. Back in the harsh light of reality in Belfast I realize that it's just on the limit of my comfort zone and that it would probably have been better not to have volunteered.
- I suppose that I should be happy that I don't have to spend a lot of time reviewing this dreadful paper; however I am depressed that people are performing such bad science.
- The presentation is of a standard that I would reject from an undergraduate student. Take Table 1: none of the data has units or an explanation. Negative controls gave a positive signal, but there is no explanation of why and how this was dealt with; just that it was different.
- This is as solid a write up as I have seen, many spend much more time and space to say considerably less. It is a perfect example of a compact report.
- The ecological theory invoked appears more as an afterthought than the true driving ambition of the study.

- This paper is afflicted by the same problem of many others re omics: one mutant is made in gene X, authors compare the corresponding transcriptomes and produce a list of genes that go up or down, plus various pages of discussion. Period. Nice, but a bit insufficient, I am afraid. Authors may be invited to go beyond a mere description and document experimentally at least some of their predictions.
- I found the manuscript to be well performed in all aspects, from the experimental design to the writing of the manuscript. I wish all manuscripts I review were of this quality.
- I usually try to nice but this paper has got to be one of the worst I have read in a long time.
- Well, I did some of the work the authors should have done!
- To my knowledge the most comprehensive IVET analysis ever done; huge workload, meticulously executed research, concisely presented.
- I feel like a curmudgeon, but I still have problems with this paper.
- Sorry for the overdue, it seems to me that 'overdue' is my constant, persistent and chronic EMI status. Good that the reviewers are not getting red cards! The editors could create, in addition to the referees quotes, a ranking for 'on-time' referees. I would get the bottom place. But fast is not equal to good (I am consoling myself!)
- I have accepted to see this one, but I still have 2 EM manuscripts whose reviews I have to complete (they will be done by tomorrow). Please be a bit benevolent with the deadline!
- Landmark paper on *P. putida* physiology.
- The lack of negative controls. . . . results in the authors being lost in the funhouse. Unfortunately, I do not think they even realize this.
- Preliminary and intriguing results that should be published elsewhere.
- It is always a joy to review manuscripts such as this. Well-conceived, well executed, well edited. Clean. Pristine. From start to finish.
- Reject – More holes than my grandad's string vest
- The writing and data presentation are so bad that I had to leave work and go home early and then spend time to wonder what life is about.

*This list first appeared in Environmental Microbiology 12:12 (December 2010) and is reprinted with kind permission.*

---