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Sign Posting

Prioritise Late Submissions
Sign Posting

• Submissions are placed in folders subject to their current status and the type of action they require next.

• On the Editor Main Menu page users can see the folder names and the number of submissions in those folders.

• In version 14.0 we introduced colour-coded signposts which enable editors to see at a glance which folders contain submissions which require attention most urgently.

• The publication can define the time thresholds for each status to highlight submissions by priority:
  - On Schedule
  - Needs Attention
  - Late
### Editor 'To-Do' List

#### My Pending Assignments (107)
- New Submissions (20)
- Revised Submissions (2)
- New Submissions Requiring Assignment (1)
- Revised Submissions Requiring Assignment (0)
- Incomplete Submissions (2)
- New Invitations (10)
- New Assignments (8)
- Submissions with Rescinded Decision (2)
- Submissions with Required Reviews Complete (9)
- Submissions Requiring Additional Reviewers (11)
- Submissions with One or More Late Reviews (2)
- Submissions with Active Discussions (45)

#### Reviews in Progress (27)
- Reviewers Invited - No Response (11)
- Submissions Under Review (26)
Sign Posting

- Colour-coding extends into the folders, where Editors can see which individual submissions require attention as priority relative to the configured time thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Manuscript Number</th>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Sections/Category</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Initial Date Resubmitted</th>
<th>Status Date</th>
<th>Corrected Revisions Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Details]</td>
<td>M00040-D17-00020</td>
<td>Special Issue Q63</td>
<td>Testing again</td>
<td>John Doe, PhD</td>
<td>Mar 14, 2017</td>
<td>Mar 14, 2017</td>
<td>With Editor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Details]</td>
<td>M00040-D17-00022</td>
<td>Original Study</td>
<td>A Study of Spring</td>
<td>John Doe, PhD</td>
<td>Mar 16, 2017</td>
<td>Mar 16, 2017</td>
<td>With Editor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Details]</td>
<td>M00040-D17-00023</td>
<td>Original Study</td>
<td>Snowflake</td>
<td>John Doe, PhD</td>
<td>Mar 16, 2017</td>
<td>Mar 16, 2017</td>
<td>With Editor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sign Posting – To Configure

- In Policy Manager, under General Policies, select “Configure Warning Thresholds” to set the “Needs Attention” and “Late” thresholds.

- Then in Role Manager update each Editor Role for which signposting should appear and check (enable) the box next to “View Warning Status Signposts” under General Searching and Viewing.
Automated Editor
Summary Reminders

A helpful reminder for your Editors
Automated Editor Summary Reminders (AESRs)

- These are reminder emails sent to Editors at regular intervals that summarise an Editor’s assignments from 3 key folders in the Editor’s To Do List to help remind editors of what needs doing and what to prioritise.
- In version 14.0 the AESRs were enhanced and can now provide information from up to 11 assignment related Editor Main Menu Folders.
- Both the folder summary and the details report can include folders from the Editor’s To Do List and the Subordinate Editor’s Pending Assignments sections.
- The details report also pulls in information on review status.
- Easier to read and more visually appealing.
- For Rich Text (HTML) emails the new format uses the same colour coding as the editor signposting.
Automated Editor Summary Reminders (AESRs)

• The Email recipient can see at a glance which folders have assignments that need attention or are behind schedule.

• The emails can be configured to show a folder summary and/or submission lists.

• Folder names can be listed in the letter as deeplinks that will log the recipient into EM and go directly to the folder.

• A plain text version of the AESRs also available – no colour coding or enhanced formatting.

Dear Sam,

Here's a summary of various folders from your Editor Main Menu. Folders marked with red or amber require attention.

Folder Summary as of March 3, 2017

- New Invitations (2)
- New Assignments (1)
- Submissions with Rescinded Decision (1)
- Submissions with Required Reviews Complete (7)
- Submissions Requiring Additional Reviews (4)
- Submissions with One or More Late Reviews (2)
- Reviewers Invited - No Response (11)
- Submissions Under Review (14)
- Group by Editors I Assigned (2)
- Group by Editors with Current Responsibility (2)
- Group by Manuscript Status (2)

You may click this link to log in and go to your Editor Main Menu: Editor Main Menu

Regards,

ACME Journal

• The HTML AESR showing colour coding, enhanced formatting and deeplinks.
Automated Editor Summary Reminders (AESRs)

- Submission lists show the contents of Editor folders including details such as title, author(s), abstract and review status.
- Submissions also have a colour-coded outline to indicate whether submissions need attention.
Automated Editor Summary Reminders (AESRs)

Merge Fields

• In the new 14.0 enhancements there are 2 new merge fields for use only in AESRs:

%EDITOR_REMINDER_FOLDER_SUMMARY% - pulls in folder summary
%EDITOR_REMINDER_SUBMISSION_LISTS% - pulls in submission list

• The Enhancement also introduces two similar merge fields for use in any letter to an Editor whose Editor Role has the "Receive Assignments" permission:

•%EDITOR_ASSIGNMENT_FOLDER_SUMMARY%
•%EDITOR_ASSIGNMENT_SUBMISSION_LISTS%

• These two any-letter fields summarise information from all 11 assignment-related Editor folders (excluding the New Invitations folder if the recipient Editor role does not have permission to receive invitations for assignments)
Automated Editor Summary Reminders – to configure

• To configure the enhanced AESR functionality, log into Policy Manager and, under General Policies, select “Configure Warning Thresholds” to set the “Needs Attention” and “Late” times (otherwise the colour-coding in the emails will reflect the default).

• Next under Email and Letter Policies, select “Edit Letters” to edit an existing letter or create a new one in the Reminder Family.

• If you are not already using the enhanced AESR merge fields these will need to be added into the letter body.

• Finally, go to Configure Automated Summary Reminders (under Editor Assignment Policies) to set up the reminders for Editor Roles with permission to receive assignments.

• Check the boxes for folders to include and indicate (by selecting a radio button) when to include the folder's information: always, only if items need attention, or only if items are late. These designations correspond to the color-coding.

• To include Author List and/or Abstract check the applicable boxes.
Decision Phrases

Speak with the same voice
Decision Phrases

- In previous version of EM Editors who routinely made the same comments during the decision process had to repeatedly type or cut and paste those comments every time they submitted a decision letter.

- For high-volume publications this can be time consuming (and error-prone).

- Editors may use different language.

- The editor Decision Phrases enable publications to provide a consistent voice when communicating decisions with their authors.

- Saves Editors time.

- First publications create a pool of editor Decision Phrases for their editors to use.

- When editors are on the “Submit Editor’s Decision and Comments” page they can select any, all or none of the configured decision phrases to include in the letter.

- Phrases selected by the Editor populate a new merge field: %EDITOR_DECISION_PHRASES%
Decision Phrases

On Submit Editor’s Decision and Comments

Editor Decision Phrases

Select Phrase
- Editor Decision Phrase 1
- This allows you to create short snippets of text or longer sections of explanation for the body of the decision letter.
- They are also displayed when viewing the Editors recommendation.
- This is a very good paper which would benefit from some small changes prior to publication.

Confidential Comments to Editor

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article:

AW Demo 14.0

Dear %TITLE% %LAST_NAME%,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers’ comments are appended below.

Editor Decision Phrase 1

This allows you to create short snippets of text or longer sections of explanation for the body of the decision letter.

This is a very good paper which would benefit from some small changes prior to publication.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript.

Your revision is due by %DATERevision_DUE%.
# Decision Phrases

In View Reviews and Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Eddie Editor (Editor)</strong></th>
<th><strong>(Editor) Edit Editor Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Submitted:</strong></td>
<td>Feb 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status Date:</strong></td>
<td>Oct 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong></td>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Disposition:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editor's Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Editor Manuscript Rating (1-100):</strong></td>
<td>(1-100) View Manuscript Rating Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Assignment Completed:</strong></td>
<td>Oct 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elapsed Days:</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editor Decision Phrases:**

- This allows you to create short snippets of text or longer sections of explanation for the body of the decision letter.
- They are also displayed when viewing the Editors recommendation.
- This is a very good paper which would benefit from some small changes prior to publication.

**Editor's Comments to Editor:**

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article:

Reviewer, Reggie Reviewer: Is there a financial or other conflict of interest between your work and that of the authors?

YES __ NO __
Decision Phrases – how to configure 1

- In Policy Manager, go to the Editor Decision Phrases section.
- Click the link to the “Configure Editor Decision Phrases” page and on this page click “Add Editor Decision Phrase” to open a pop up window.
Decision Phrases – how to configure 2

• Enter the phrase, save and continue to add more phrases as needed.

• Create new or edit existing Editor Forms where the phrases will be used (a link to the Create Editor Forms page is on the Configure Editor Decision Phrases page and in Policy Manager).

• Click “Add Editor Decision Phrase” to open pop up and check the appropriate phrases for the Editor Form and click save icon.

• The selected Phrases will then appear on the main form page.

• Finally, navigate to the Editor Form Configuration page and match the Editor Form to the appropriate Role and Article Types.
Decision Assistance tools

Meta

Does this submission fit your journal?
Decision Assistance tools – Bibliometric Intelligence Analysis (Meta)

• In version 13.1 Meta’s Bibliometric Intelligence Tool was integrated with EM to help Editors to better identify which submissions may be the best “fit” for the publication.

• Bibliometric Intelligence Analysis aims to predict the “Eigenfactor” of a manuscript over a 3-year time period by giving it an “Article Trajectory” score from 1 to 1000.

• A second algorithm produces a “Publication Match” score in % which identifies how closely a submission matches papers already published by the journal.

• A report PDF is produced containing a detailed analysis of results.

• This allows the editors to triage the handling of papers and to make informed decisions based on their predicted success and compatibility with the publication.

• More information: https://medium.com/@meta_6493/enabling-editors-through-machine-learning-81b528b496ce#.hdnr9h4ub
Decision Assistance tools – Meta

- EM can be configured to transfer the Author/Editor PDF directly to Metaα’s Bibliometric Intelligence tool through an API.

- Once configured, Editors and Publisher Roles can be given permission to send the Author/Editor PDF to Metaα from EM.

- The Author/Editor PDF can be sent from a submission’s ‘File Inventory’ page, or an Editor carrying out a technical check can send the Author/Editor PDF from the ‘Technical Check’ page.

- Once the PDF has been deposited with Metaα, EM will automatically check back for the completed report, and will display the scores and a link to download the report PDF once available.

- Publications may also configure individual Article Types to carry out an automated deposit of the Author/Editor PDF with Metaα at key points in the peer review process.
Decision Assistance tools – Meta

• Submissions where the Author/Editor PDF has been sent to Meta$^\alpha$ for analysis will display a ‘Bibliometric Intelligence Results’ Action Link in some folders; on a custom Details page (if configured); and in Search Submission results.
Decision Assistance tools – Meta.

To Configure 1:

- In PolicyManager, go to the page ‘Configure Bibliometric Intelligence’. Set any color-coding that is desired. By default all scores will be in black text, so this configuration is optional.
Decision Assistance tools – Meta.

To Configure 2:

• To trigger automatically, in PolicyManager, go to Edit Article Types, and click Edit next to an existing Article Type name (or click the ‘Add’ button to add a new Article Type).

• Select the desired trigger points to automatically send the Author/Editor PDF to the Metaα Bibliometric Intelligence tool.
Editor Specific Configuration Options

Personalise your view
### View All Assigned Submissions - mary mary

This page lists all submissions that have been assigned to an Editor, for which the Editor’s decision has not yet been made. This includes submissions with invited reviewers, submissions out for review, submissions requiring a decision, and submissions which have a subordinate Editor’s decision but not a decision from the top Editor in the decision-making chain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Manuscript Number</th>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Section Category</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Initial Date Submitted</th>
<th>Status Date</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Editor with Current Responsibility</th>
<th>Review Status</th>
<th>Editor Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View Submission</td>
<td>DEMO.2017.0007</td>
<td>RapidTestIn</td>
<td>Tea is Essential to Life</td>
<td>Andy Author</td>
<td>Feb 23, 2017</td>
<td>Nov 22, 2017</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>mary mary</td>
<td>2 Agreed 1 Late</td>
<td>(more...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Submission</td>
<td>DEMO.2017.0002</td>
<td>RapidTestIn</td>
<td>Test Title 2</td>
<td>Amy Author</td>
<td>Jan 18, 2017</td>
<td>Feb 21, 2017</td>
<td>With Editor</td>
<td>Eddie Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saved Searches
For speed and convenience
My Reviewer Preferences

Personalise Reviewer Suggestion and Display
My Suggest Reviewer Preferences
My Reviewer Display Preferences

Reviewer Selection Summary - Submission DEMO.2017.0007

Reviewer Search

- Search My Publication
- Search for Reviewers
- Reviewer Discovery from PIVOT
- ProQuest Community of Scholars

Review Settings

This Submission will move to the 'Submissions with Required Reviews Complete' list once all reviews have been completed. Automatically un-invite Reviewers who do not respond to an invitation within 7 days. Automatically un-assign Reviewers who do not complete a review within 14 days.

My Reviewer Display Preferences

Classifications

- Show only Classification matches with manuscript
- Suppress Classifications
- Show all Personal Classifications for the Reviewer candidate

Selected Reviewers

Invited Reviewers and Linked Alternate Reviewers

Anna Walton (Reviewer) 
Agreed Date: Nov 29, 2017

Rosie Reviewer (Reviewer) 
Agreed Date: Nov 23, 2017

Sort the Candidate Reviewer list in order of importance by:

1. Ascending Reviewer Name
2. Number of Matches to Manuscript Classifications (Most matches displayed first)
3. Board Membership (Board Members listed first)
4. Average Review Rating (Highest ratings listed first)
5. Total Number of Completed Reviews (Highest number displayed first)

Update Order
Assign Only Specific Editor Role Permissions

Editor Role Permission – Allow Assignment of Only Specific Editor Roles
Assign Only Specific Editor Role Permissions

• You may wish to allow your EiCs to be able to assign an Editor role to subordinate Editors but not to be able to assign other editor roles with more permissions, such as Admin etc.

• You can restrict the Editor roles that can be assigned by an Editor in Role Manager.

• This helps the admin as the Editor can assign a role to subordinates.
Assign Only Specific Editor Role Permissions

- Configured in Role Manager, Editor Roles, Edit “Editor” or “Editor in Chief” role.
- Under Viewing and Editing People Data.
- Can select one or use ctrl + click to multi select more than one editor role.
Reviewer Discovery

Increase Your Reviewer Pool
Reviewer Discovery

• Journals need to find reviewers in a timely fashion.
• A journal’s reviewer pool is often overburdened and journals can spend a lot of time searching outside of the reviewer pool.
• RD uses ProQuest, a well-curated database of biographic and bibliographic profiles on approximately 2.5 million scholars and researchers (including e-mail addresses).
• RD allows these profiles to be matched against the title and abstract of a submission, based on how closely the topics reflected in the title/abstract correlate with the PQ scholar profiles.
• Increases and refreshes the journal’s reviewer pool and also helps to find reviewers for more niche submissions.
The resulting records are displayed in one of three ways:

- A Pivot Candidate
- A Candidate that is a potential match in the publication
- An unambiguously matched (Confirmed) publication user.

Up to 100 results can be displayed.
Reviewer Discovery

Assign Reviewer Role

All Reviewer candidates must be assigned a Reviewer Role before being invited to review. Please assign a Reviewer Role to the people who do not yet have roles. You can also check 'Do not use this Person' if you decide not to invite them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Selected As</th>
<th>Reviewer Role</th>
<th>Do not use this Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hirofumi Tachibana</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cancel  Assign Reviewer Roles

Select Reviewers - Confirm Selection and Customize Letters
Submission DEMO.2017.0007
Andy Author
"Tea is Essential to Life!"

You have selected the following people as potential Reviewers (more...)

Reviewers to Invite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Days to Review</th>
<th>Do Not Invite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate Hammer</td>
<td>Reviewer Invitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change Selections
Cancel  Confirm Selections and Proceed
Reviewer Discovery - Configuration

• To enable the Reviewer Discovery feature, contact your Aries representative.

• Once this feature is enabled, the new “Reviewer Discovery from ProQuest Community of Scholars” search option is available for Editors with permission to Invite/Assign/Propose/select Alternate Reviewers (in Role Manager).
Reviewer Discovery – Recent Update in v 14.0

- New in v14.0 an enhancement adds an option to the existing “Set Duplicate E-mail Policy” page in Policy Manager.

- This option helps to prevent Editors from registering a new user via the ProQuest tool if the user already has an account within the EM site.

- When enabled, if editors attempt to select the Reviewer Discovery candidate (which proxy-registers the person with an email address that already exists in the system) if there is a matching email address in EM there will be a warning message which asks the editor to select the existing EM-registered user instead.

- If there is more than one match all are shown and the editor can choose which one to use.
Reviewer Discovery – Recent Update in v 14.0

- If the user selects the possible EM match, (s)he proceeds through customising the letter, amending the due dates etc. in the usual way.
- If the user selects the Reviewer Discovery Candidate that person is proxy-registered behind the scenes.
- Also cosmetic/visual enhancements to simplify and improve user experience.
- The reviewer candidate that is already registered in EM is now shown above the RD option to help encourage use of the current EM option.
- The department (if available) and email address of the EM match are displayed as if they are not shown it may give the editor the false impression that the data is missing from the user record which may prompt them to choose to use the RD entry.
Reviewer Discovery – Configuration

Prevent Duplicate E-mail Addresses for Reviewer Discovery

When a Reviewer Discovery candidate is returned from the Pivot ProQuest Community of Scholars database, the system checks to see if the ProQuest e-mail address already exists in the EM database. If a matching e-mail address is found in EM, both the ProQuest record and the EM record are displayed for the Editor, and s/he can choose which person to use. If the Editor selects the ProQuest record, the person is proxy-registered in EM and a people record with a duplicate email address is created. This setting allows you to determine whether Editors are allowed to select and use a Reviewer Discovery candidate that may already exist in EM, thereby creating a duplicate account with the same e-mail address.

Select ‘Yes’ to prevent the Editor from selecting and proxy-registering a person that may already exist in EM on the Reviewer Discovery Results page.

- **Yes**
- **No**

- In Policy Manager, Registration Policies, **Set Duplicate E-mail Address Policy**.

- Select “**Yes**” under Prevent Duplicate E-mail Addresses for Reviewer Discovery.

- If “**No**” is selected current behaviour is retained.
Duplicate Submission check

Am I seeing double?
Duplicate Submission check

Helps publications easily identify duplicate submissions where either an author has submitted more than one paper by mistake or a co-author has also submitted the same paper:

- A green D symbol shows if the author of a submission has submitted another paper within the previous X days (X is configurable).
**Duplicate Submission check**

- Enhanced Duplicate Submission Checking calculates a score as %:
  - Article Title Similarity – 40% of the total score
  - Author Similarity – 30% of the total score
  - Abstract Similarity – 30% of the total score

- Also a 'Duplicate Submission Check Results' link will be displayed to users with permission. Clicking the link will display a list of similar submissions.
Duplicate Submission check - Configure

• In Policy Manager, Submission Policies, Configure Duplicate Submission Check.

• In Policy Manager, Submission Policies, Edit Article Types.

Configure Duplicate Submission Check

- If the Author has submitted a new manuscript within the number of days set below, a symbol will appear next to the Author’s name in the Editor folders New Submissions, New Submissions Requiring Assignment, Direct-to-Editor New Submissions and New Assignments. The Editor can then click the Author’s name to see information about prior submissions.
- If a manuscript with a similar title, list of authors, or abstract has been previously submitted, a 'Duplicate Submission Check Results' link will be displayed to users with permission. Clicking the link will display a list of similar submissions.
- You may select a minimum score used to select which potential duplicate submissions are displayed on the 'Duplicate Submission Check Results' page.
- You can highlight scores that exceed a configured threshold.
- An overall 'EM Duplicate Score' will be calculated, based on a weighted average of the Article Title (40%), the list of Authors (30%), and the Abstract (30%).

Alert me when:
- The same Corresponding Author has submitted a paper in the past 30 days
- A similar paper has been previously submitted.
- Only display potential duplicate submissions that have an EM Duplicate Score that is ___% or more
- Highlight the EM Duplicate Score when it is ___% or more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity Check</th>
<th>Duplicate Submission Check</th>
<th>Bibliometric Intelligence Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Send Reviewer PDF on Initial Submission
| Check for duplicate submissions to Editorial Manager
| Send Author/Editor PDF when Transfer Complete link is clicked |
| Send Reviewer PDF on First Revision
| Send Author/Editor PDF when new Submission Received
| Send Author/Editor PDF when First Editor Assignment |
| Send Reviewer PDF on Final Disposition to Accept |
| Send Author/Editor PDF on Final Disposition to Accept |

You must also set up Automatic Transfer to a checking service on the Configure Similarity Check page. Editor and Publisher roles can be configured to send files by Automatic Transfer from the File Inventory or Technical Check pages even if you do not enable the options on this page.

You must also enable the check for duplicate submissions on the Configure Duplicate Submission Check page.

Select one or more trigger points to automatically send the Author/Editor PDF to the Bibliometric Intelligence analysis tool. Editor roles can be configured to send the PDF from the Technical Check page even if you do not enable the options on this page. Editor and Publisher Roles can be configured to send the PDF from the File Inventory page even if you do not enable the options on this page.
Duplicate Submission check - Configure

- In Role Manager, General Searching and Viewing, View Duplicate Submission Check Results.
Flags

Visual Reminders
Flags

• There is a dedicated session on Flags.
• There are two main types of flags that are useful for Editors:
  ❖ People Flags
  ❖ Submission Flags
• Only visible to those users with permission.
• Can be set to be shown in the History.
• Hovering over the flag tells you what that flag means.
• You can also search on flags.
In Policy Manager, General Policies, Create Customized Submission Flags.

In Policy Manager, General Policies, Create Customized People Flags.

You can Add, Edit or Remove Flags.

Choose an unused flag icon.

Name your Flag.

Editorial or Production?

AMD Field?

Display in History?
Flags - Configuration

- In Role Manager, Editor or Publisher role, Edit Role, **Flag Icons**.
- Can be set up so different Editor and Publisher Roles have different permissions, for example, the Associate Editor could be set up to View Flags only and the Editor in Chief or Admin could be set up to View Flags, Turn Flags on or off and see Flags in the history.
Questions?