



Summary of the 2016 Editorial Manager User Group Meeting

By Jocelyn Koller (ORCID [0000-0003-3072-7537](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3072-7537))
Marketing Specialist
Aries Systems Corporation

The fourteenth annual Editorial Manager User Group (EMUG) Meeting, hosted by Aries Systems, was held at the Taj Boston hotel on June 16 and 17. The event was the largest gathering of EM users to date, attended by 153 users and staff.

As a new member of the Aries team, and a first-time EMUG attendee, I was unsure of what to expect as the early risers began stopping by the registration table first thing on Thursday morning. But, as the name badges were picked up, the room filled with a palpable energy. Each attendee seemed visibly excited for the meeting ahead. Many attendees stopped to enthusiastically greet their account coordinators, fellow EM users, and other staff populating the grand ballroom foyer of the Taj. Addressing the group in his annual opening welcome remarks, Aries founder and CEO Lyndon Holmes said, “This is your meeting,” encouraging attendees to make the most of the next two days by asking questions and speaking up about their experiences with the system.

Next, Director of Product Management Tony Alves dove right into his session, “Overview of Versions 13.0 & 13.1.” Alves spoke at length about new and upcoming features of the system, often pausing to ask the room, “How many of you have been looking for this feature?” The number of hands raised varied from one contented user to an animated group of more than 20. New features that seemed to be the most anticipated included the following:

- Warning icon displayed when the author list has changed
- Integration of the CRediT taxonomy
- Customized text on the PDF build page
- PDF watermarking
- Flexible PowerGrids now available in new locations (including the Production Status Grid)

- Ability for Editorial Office staff to view all versions of the PDF, both the author/editor and reviewer versions
- Automated reminders for invited authors
- Support for books workflows

Directly following the overview presentation from Alves, the room broke into 12 small groups for the much-anticipated annual “Feature Workshop” session. Within groups, two Aries staff members facilitated discussion among users, many of whom arrived with multi-item wish lists to help shape future releases. These discussions further highlighted each journal’s unique workflow and differing needs within the system. Perhaps the most exciting part of the discussion was when multiple users eagerly agreed on an idea. In addition to seeing this comradery within the user community, I enjoyed hearing feedback from a few attendees who felt that this time to speak to Aries staff was so valuable because they knew the suggestions would lead to tangible improvements in future releases (Figure 1).

Example “wish list” items for Aries development pipeline arising from EMUG Feature Workshop session. Aries invests more than \$6M per year in new technology and features.

- › Ability to reject papers at submission
- › Additional reminders for authors on incomplete or need approval submissions
- › People-based correspondence history
- › Copy existing letters for use as templates
- › Editable people information page
- › Ability to preview batch email before sending
- › Tech check enhancements, including templates by article type
- › Ability on edit letters to use a global find/replace
- › Reviewer reminders for partially saved reviews
- › Editor due dates and reminders

Figure 1. A sample listing of popular ideas that came out of the Feature Workshop.

New at EMUG 2016, users interacted with a voting poster, which also spoke to the kind of feedback-focused data being collected during the meeting (Figure 2). This treasure-map-themed poster was hung in the Taj's rooftop terrace during lunch on both days, where attendees could place their voting stickers next to the “treasure”—the most valuable ideas for new or improved features suggested by attendees of European EMUG 2016's Feature Workshop session held in January in London. The item with the most votes was enhanced reminders and alerts.



Figure 2. Treasure map poster with voting stickers from attendees.

The first day of the meeting ended with keynote speaker Kent Anderson, CEO of Redlink, Inc. Anderson spoke about the changes and trends within the scholarly publishing industry, especially where funding is concerned. “It is always about the money,” Anderson began, explaining how funding of research, university presses, and libraries is being cut in many instances. Quoting Fred Dylla, Anderson stated, “The number one issue in public access is the public funding of science.” At the same time, Anderson noted, “we have a volume issue.” Anderson explained that there are now more scientists producing more papers, which is crowding the field and making truly valuable content more difficult to find. (Anderson's presentation, and all EMUG presentations, are available at www.ariessys.com.)

Many of the latest trends in scholarly publishing were explored during the meeting, and attendees seemed strongly engaged. Attendees heard from John Inglis, co-founder and executive director of Cold Spring Harbor Labs and [bioRxiv](https://www.biorxiv.org/) (a preprint

server launched in 2013, and one of the newest EM Ingest Service partners) during “Workflow 2020 & Submission Partners.”

Simon Thomson of the Gates Foundation's [Chronos](https://www.gatesfoundation.org/Chronos) initiative also spoke during this popular session. “The goal of Chronos is really to decrease the time and money to publication,” Thomson explained. Chronos, another newly added EM Ingest Service Partner, integrates with submission platforms to support the open access publishing endeavors of those who have received a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and will provide users with a complete listing of—and streamlined submission to—journals compliant with the foundation's open access policies.

During the popular “Decision Support Tools” session, Elizabeth Caley, chief operating officer of [Meta](https://www.meta.com/), and Tim Houle, a co-creator of [StatReviewer](https://www.statreviewer.com/), spoke to attendees eager to learn more about the tools their organizations provide. Caley discussed Meta's bibliometric intelligence tool. Houle explained the benefits of quality statistical analyses, and spoke about the possibility of integrating directly with submission systems in order to provide an additional automated review from StatReviewer.

Similarly, the adoption of the Contributor Roles Taxonomy ([CRediT](https://www.creditt.org/)) initiative was discussed by Patrick Hannon of Cell Press during the session on “Reviewer and Author Recognition.” Hannon gave a historical overview—from conceptualization to implementation—of the [CRediT initiative](https://www.creditt.org/) and contributor roles. Hannon noted that in a small survey completed with the first users of CRediT (a pilot group of Cell Press journals) 36% of respondents felt it was very likely that CRediT would help them gain more recognition or even obtain a promotion; 76% responded that they found the taxonomy extremely useful in accurately reflecting the contributions of all authors.

Continuing the discussion on recognition, Alice Meadows, director of community engagement & support at [ORCID](https://www.orcid.org/), explained that “ORCID's vision is a world in which all who participate in research, scholarship, and innovation are uniquely identified and connected to their contributions and affiliations across disciplines, borders, and

time.” Meadows noted that while the largest percentage of ORCID integrations so far have come from research institutions, the second largest (17%) have come from publishers. “Enter once, reuse often,” said Meadows, explaining how this single-entry process will save authors and reviewers time and minimize frustrations.

While the guest speakers provided invaluable information to attendees, another highly rated session was the “UI Workshop,” which was new to EMUG this year and run by Kristin Mahoney, release coordinator and documentation specialist with Aries’ Product Management group. “We were looking to have a discussion with users about a specific area of Editorial Manager,” Mahoney said. “People in the workshop said they would like to have more workflow guidance (visual cues, visualization of progress, better feedback) as well as a better organized workflow (combine submission steps, fewer clicks to complete actions). The users who attended the workshop had some fantastic ideas and gave us valuable insight to areas that might need improvement.”

Closing the meeting on Friday afternoon, Vice President of Sales and Marketing Richard Wynne presented “[The Road Ahead – A Sustainable Model for Scholarly Publishing](#).” Wynne asked the assembled group: “What business are journals in?” After numerous audience guesses, Wynne explained his belief that journals are in the business of assertions. “We can improve the return on the research investment if the assertions are more reliable,” said Wynne. Further reinforcing discussions from throughout the meeting, Wynne noted the importance of new technologies and integrations such as ORCID, [CrossRef](#), [CRedit](#), and [Ringgold](#) and said, “The inclusion of persistent identifiers and taxonomies is a key stepping stone.” He concluded the meeting by encouraging journals to retool for the assertions workflow, rather than the content workflow.

Though it was the largest EMUG yet, next year’s Boston meeting promises to be even bigger still—stay tuned for more details. The European EMUG will take place on January 12 and 13, 2017 in London.

Save the Date—Peer Review Week 2016



The 2nd annual Peer Review Week will be held from 19th to 25th September 2016!

Peer Review Week is a global event celebrating the essential role that peer review plays in maintaining scientific quality. The event brings together individuals, institutions and organizations committed to sharing the central message that good peer review, whatever shape or form it might take, is critical to scholarly communications.

This year’s theme is **Recognition for Review**, exploring all aspects of how those participating in review activity — in publishing, grant review, conference submissions, promotion and tenure, and more — should be recognized for their contribution.

Join the conversation on Twitter [#PeerRevWk16](#) and [#RecognizeReview](#)

For more information about Peer Review Week, please visit www.peerreviewweek.org.