

2013 JRRD Editorial Board Meeting Webinar Transcript
July 24, 2013 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. EST

Hanna, please put all attendees in mute mode. Presenters put yourself in mute mode. And I'll wait till I see that happen. We're recording, so you're good to go. OK.

I'm going to go ahead and get started because we have a lot to cover within this two hours. First of all, welcome everybody to the 2013 JRRD Editorial Board Meeting Webinar. The team and I spent a lot of time trying to figure out the best way to host this meeting to allow it to be interactive yet informational, and this is what we've come up with.

Hanna, next slide please.

These are the Webinar Housekeeping Notes. Currently, you are muted. At the end of each section, we will open it up for questions if there are any. During the talks, if you would like to present a question, you can either raise your hand, or type a question. If Hanna is able to answer the question, immediately she'll send you a reply, and if not, she will save them, and at the end of each section, you will be unmuted to be able to ask your question, and if more people would like to participate, they can raise their hand, and they can also be unmuted. I think that's about all. What we're going to do here is during the question period and at the introductions for each of the speakers, the webinars, the webcams will be on, so you will be able to see us, but during the talk, we found that the webcams can be a little bit distracting. So, during the actual presentations, speakers will turn off their webcam, which is what I am going to do now.

Next slide, please, Hanna.

OK, today, in this webinar, we are going to be focusing a lot on the then and now. We're celebrating our 50 years of publication this year with our 50th volume, and we, in order to celebrate this, we have created the then and now project to highlight research publications from 48 to 50 years ago compared with current date thinking. We have 10 Then and Now publications corresponding to the 10 issues from nationally and internationally recognized rehabilitation specialists.

Next slide, Hanna.

But before we talk about that, I'd like to say "thank you" to VA Central Office, because we were honored to receive a "shout out" on "HEY VA!" This is something that if you are within the VA system, when you turn on your computer in the morning, or whenever you turn on your computer, you'll receive notifications from the VA, and this particular notification went out to all people affiliated with Central Office. And it spoke about our Then and Now project, and the first article written by Dr. Lucille Beck, who is head of the VA Prosthetic and Sensory Aid Service, where she featured a commentary on 65 years of progress in that service, and it was compared back to the original article that you'll see in the next slide.

Next slide, Hanna.

On this first slide, you'll see here "Twenty years of progress....An editorial", originally written by Dr. Robert Stewart, along with a commentary by Dr. Beck. In Issue Volume 2, the original article was by Edward Peizer, et al, and the commentary was provided by our own Dr. Rory Cooper. The third volume

of this year was an article by Anthony Staros, again with commentary by Dr. Stephen Gard, one of our own.

Next slide, Hanna.

For Volume 4, an article again by Peizer with commentary by Dr. Ron Triolo, one of our own. The next two articles, next two issues, volume 5 and 6 feature guest editors, Dr. Joan Sanders and Dr. Jaap Van Netten and Klaas Postema, and there will be four more following.

Next slide, Hanna.

The concepts we're going to cover today are thus - going to talk about the JRRD mission and the JRRD global significance. After that section, I'll follow it up by some of our editorial stats, our policy updates and your final opportunity to vote for artwork from the National Veterans Creative Artwork project to grace the covers of the 2014 issues of JRRD. Following those discussions, Mr. Dave Bartlinski, our webmaster, will give you our latest web stats. Mr. Tristan Horrom, one of the copy editing team, will discuss our recent problems, as well as our solutions, to some of the plagiarism issues we've encountered within the past year. Ms. Maryn Rosenberg, the JRRD managing editor, will discuss our forays in with the GPO Bookstore and Zinio. Ken Frager, our public affairs officer, will discuss our social media enterprise. Finally, I will follow up with our new initiatives. We'd like to extend at this time, a very special thanks to Hanna Gribble as the webinar coordinator, and she's the one who will be taking your questions and holding them until the appropriate time.

Next slide, please.

JRRD Mission and Global Significance.

Next slide, please.

The JRRD Mission. I reiterate this at the beginning of every JRRD editorial board meeting. Our mission is "To responsibly evaluate and disseminate scientific research findings impacting the rehabilitative healthcare community." So recently I was asked, "Why does JRRD need to be an international publication?" To answer this question, I will briefly discuss salient points from two recently published articles.

Next slide, please.

But before I discuss the international implications, I'd like to point out that after more than a decade, JRRD can finally be located from the VA main page. If you type in "JRRD" in the search box on the main page of the Department of Veterans Affairs, this is the page you will see. And we are quite pleased that we are now officially a searchable item within the VA infrastructure.

Next slide.

The first article I'd like to discuss is by J. Adams, from a recent *Nature* publication entitled, "*The fourth age of research.*" In this article, he talks about how research has progressed over the centuries, starting with research by an individual, with communications between individuals comprising mainly of letters,

progressing to research through an institution, followed by research through national collaboration, and what he considers to be the present day state of affairs, research driven by international collaboration.

Next slide, please, Hanna.

The second article, by C.L. Smith from the journal of *Collaboration*, an Elsevier publication, takes a look at the growth in international collaboration from 1996 through 2008 with respect to their proportion of national publication output. This figure shows the growth in international collaboration for selected countries, and the countries are in the key box to your right, and the proportion of national output that this represents from the timeframe I had previously mentioned. The dash in each of these graphs, each of these little squiggly lines effectively, represents the starting point of 1996. The arrow represents the data point at 2008. What you see here is that the proportion of national publication output produced in collaboration with other countries tends to generally increase over time. And you can see here, for the United States, that it's gone from 50,000 to close to 100,000, as the percentage of collaboration with other countries increases. So therefore, international publication and international collaboration create greater growth, and leads to increased quality as measured by the number of times a particular paper is cited. What does this translate into? It translates into increased recognition, prestige, and in rehabilitation, our field, utility to other researchers and ultimately to patients.

Next slide, please.

Back to the article by J. Adams, and what he did. Mr. Adams took a look at the *Web of Science* articles published between 1981 and 2012, which comprised 25 million papers, and he tallied the author addresses by countries. He then proceeded to calculate the balance of international and domestic research collaboration for the U.S., U.K., Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, and then he probed the relative citation impact of purely domestic vs. international research in publications.

Next slide, please.

This is one of the graphs from his article, and this slide shows that articles with papers with at least one author from another country are cited more than purely domestic work. And in this case, he's comparing 2001 and 2011 for the US and the UK. So, what you can see here is the increase is due to international collaboration.

On the next slide, please Hanna.

His findings are that domestic publication output across STM, which, throughout this talk today, STM is Scientific, Technical and Medical publications, has flatlined in the U.S. and Western European countries. The rise in total annual publication output for each country is due to international collaboration, while the percentage of papers that are entirely "homegrown" is falling. In emerging economies, like China, and we reported on this last year, domestic output is expanding as increased research dollars are going into heavily domestic programs.

Next slide please, Hanna.

So what does this mean for JRRD? In 2003, the "Then," we had 20 different countries submitting to JRRD. Now, in 2013, we have 36 different countries. JRRD has become an international leader in rehabilitation publication in large part due to submissions from articles with authors from other

countries. And one of the things that we'll be emphasizing throughout this talk is that the global rehabilitation research that we publish is very beneficial to our veterans.

Next slide, please.

Another thing that we're going to take a look at with respect to "Then and Now" and country of origin is access. We have been recently, since 2011, been able to track JRRD web online access by countries. Mr. Bartlinski, our JRRD webmaster, will be speaking a bit more about this later. But briefly, in 2011, 91 countries came to the JRRD website to access content. In 2013, we are up to 190 countries. Again, this reflects the need for international collaboration and international research.

Next slide, please.

The Take-Home Message. JRRD's role as an international publication is vital in rehabilitation research so that the publication truly reflects the most cutting edge research on behalf of veterans as well as people around the globe. I would like to point out that, while we tend to think of veterans as being primarily home-grown kind of thing, they're in the United States, there is the foreign feed program, which supports veterans in other countries, who have service-connected disabilities. And they are serviced, not by VA's but by local doctors and facilities around the world. And one of things that we are able to see is that a lot of our research is downloaded by major medical institutions in countries around the world. So, therefore, JRRD is VA money well spent.

Next slide, please.

At this point, I'm going to turn back on my webcam.

Hanna, have we received any questions on any of the salient discussion points that I have presented? No questions so far, and it doesn't look like anybody's hand is raised, so...

OK, then we will proceed. I am going to shut off my webcam.

OK, proceeding onward. Editorial Stats, Policy, & Veteran Artwork, the next section to be covered.

Next slide, please.

Hold on, we just got a question. Dr. Triolo asks, "Has the JRRD impact factor increased in proportion to the number of countries listed?" Hi, Ron, I'm going to actually be showing that really, really soon, as part of the Editorial Stats, and I think you'll be able to see that, overall, our citations have gone up substantially in the last decade. You'll see that very soon. Thank you. It was a great question. Any others, Hanna? Doesn't look like it. Ok, ok.

We're going to be focusing a lot on "Then and Now" to be able to give people frames of references, frame of reference for how far we've come. The JRRD reviewer database which, the JRRD reviewer database these days is comprised of people who review for us, as well as people who have submitted articles for consideration. And a lot of times these people are oftentimes asked to become reviewers themselves. In 2002, there were approximately 225 reviewers in the paper file. In 2013, we have over 5,000 active reviewers in the Manuscript Central database. That's quite a substantial increase and we keep adding additional reviewers every single year.

Next slide, please.

We've also seen a dramatic increase in submissions between then and now. In 2003, we received 145 initial submissions. In 2012, we received 248. Our projection for this year is 300+. Now, please note that these are only initial submissions. Between various revisions for this past calendar year, 2012, Lloyd and I handled more than 750 papers. So, as a note to all of you, you'll forgive me if I don't remember exactly which paper you're talking about. So, Lloyd is very insistent on always knowing the number, and there is obviously a reason for that.

Next slide, please.

Our rejection rates have also continued to climb. Rejection rates are somewhat variable depending on the timeframe from when they were calculated. In this particular case, for 2012, it was calendar year 2012, and for 2003, it was the first year that JRRD was in Manuscript Central, and again it's a calendar year. And this includes all submissions, even revisions, and as you can see here, our rejection rate has practically doubled within a decade and, but again, that just slightly, I mean the numbers vary just a little bit depending upon the timeframe calculated, so you can realize that if you're calculating over a calendar year, you are not just calculating the papers that were submitted during that year, but you're also calculating based on papers received in the previous year. That's why the rejection rate is a little bit variable. Nevertheless, we are rapidly approaching 60% rejection.

Next slide, please.

Likewise, the Impact Factor has also doubled. In 2003, we were .7, in 2013, we're 1.4. The 5-year impact factor for the first year that this was accessible through the JCR was 1.785. This year it was 2.357. Many years ago, in 2008, our website was offline for a year, and that year off is still affecting, slightly, our 5-year impact factor, although it no longer affects our 2-year impact factor. So, we're quite pleased to see that the impact factor is steadily increasing as it should be, and to answer your question, Ron, it's hard to know exactly what the exact contribution of international, versus national is, but you will be able to see from the next two slides, that this is affecting our citations.

Hanna, next slide.

This is a graph from SJR, which is the scientific journals' ranking. This comes from SCImago. And SC Imago is an algorithm that was developed from Google page ranks. In this particular graph, what you see are citations tabulated during the previous three years for JRRD, and other clinical medical based STM publications and this has been seen as the minimal time for the tail of research, although for JRRD and other rehabilitation journals, the tail actually extends out to 6 years. Nevertheless, people citing JRRD have grown substantially, while JRRD authors citing their own JRRD Self Cites has remained constant. So, the "Then" is hovering over 2002, 2003, which is around 300, the "Now" is slightly above 700. But more importantly, what you can see is the Self Cites, the little maroon bars have more or less, remained constant.

Next slide, please.

Again, another graph from SJR, and this graph shows a journal "citable" versus "non-citable" documents. This is done also in 3-year increments, although they're averaged over 3 years for articles published in

JRRD, again. So while you can see here is while the number of citable articles has substantially increased, the number of non-citable items has more or less remained constant. And so that, that's really important because that means that what we're publishing here is all fully accessible from PubMed, and is fully citable. We're not publishing a lot of commentary, we don't have, we don't have any fluff, and we don't have any of the other content that is available in some of the top-tier journals. Nevertheless, one of the things that you will see when Mr. Frager, our Public Affairs Officer, talks, is how we are making forays into getting other material that are related to JRRD content out through our social media. So, we'll look forward to seeing that. So more people are citing JRRD and more articles are citable.

Next slide, please.

I think this quote speaks volumes over the progress we made. This quote came in not too long ago and was one of the ones that had the team chuckling. And, the quote said, "Sheesh – this is getting discouraging. Lets drop back to a lower level journal. Maybe PLOS." I think this quote says a lot about how far we've come.

Next slide, please.

I mentioned the 2014 National Veterans Creative Artwork. This, we have a FLICKR page, and on our FLICKR page you can see the pieces of artwork that are out there for your consideration, and for your vote. After this talk, this presentation will appear on the JRRD website under "Powerpoints", and, or you can directly click off of here and you can link out to the FLICKR page, and then email your 5 choices to Ken Frager by Monday, close of business, if you have not already done so.

Next slide, Hanna, please.

This shows you what our FLICKR page looks like. So, in order to figure out what the number of this artwork, as each artwork has a number or a description, so you can know what to email to Ken. You hover your mouse over the image to get the number or name to create your top 5 list.

Next slide, please.

And finally, our last bit of editorial commentary, one of the things that I routinely do, is to make sure, as a U.S. Government publication, that I try and keep us out of trouble. On the 30th of April, 2013, the U.S. Office of Foreign Assets Control, division of the Treasury Department, mandated that journals can only "publish articles authored by nongovernmental scientists from Iran and other sanctioned countries." Several years ago, under the trade embargo, we were not allowed to publish any articles from Iran or other "axis of evil countries." That band was lifted and now this provision has been put in place. Mr. Tinker checked all JRRD submissions, either under review or in the postproduction queue, and found NO articles that violated these sanctions. Obviously, we will continue to monitor papers as we receive them to make sure we are in accordance with this federal policy.

Next slide please.

OK, I'm going to turn back on my webcam. Hanna, did we receive any questions? No questions regarding your talk. I'm not sure if you answered Dr. Triolo 'cause he's no longer in the webinar. OK. Lloyd passed on a couple of things. Some people were wondering why they're in listening only mode. That's because if too many people's microphones are open at the same time, it slows down the amount of data that's

being transferred through everybody's internet and it makes everybody's internet really, really slow. So, I just sent out a chat message but also please remember that if you do have a question at any time, you can either type it into the question panel and I'll respond to it immediately, or I'll make sure that whoever's presenting gets to it, or on the side of your little Go to Webinar panel, there is a little button that has a hand on it. If you click that, it'll, I'll get a notification that your hand is raised and I will make sure that you get unmuted and get the chance to ask your question. So, just a reminder there.

Thank you very much, Hanna. Anybody else have any questions before we transition to our web stats? It doesn't look like it. Thank you. I'm going to turn off my webcam. Mr. Bartlinski will now speak to you. Most unfortunately, he does not have webcam access, so you won't get to see Mr. Dave today, but, you'll get to hear his voice and his story. My webcam is off, and I'm going into mute mode.

Good afternoon everyone, my name is David Bartlinski and I am the Department of Veterans Affairs Rehab Research & Development Service & JRRD's webmaster.

And I am going to briefly talk about JRRD's website performance Then & Now and what we are predicting for the future.

Next slide, please.

First, the Rehab Research & Development's and JRRD's website are hosted by the Austin Information Technology Center and all analyzed data I will show you today is provided by WebTrends which is also hosted and maintained by AITC and Google Analytics.

Next slide, please.

This graph illustrates JRRD content downloads from 2004 through 2013.

As you can see, we're continuing to increase our downloads from year to year while marching towards 10 million.

Last year at this time we projected out through the end of 2012 estimating to finish the year with 7.4 million downloads and I'm happy to report we finished the year with over 9.6 million.

This large increase is partly due to a spike in traffic in May and June. However, based on trends we have observed over the past years and the current data we have so far, we are estimating to finish 2013 with 9.5 million downloads.

Also, note there is no data for 2008 because JRRD was offline.

Next slide, please.

Now, back in 2011 when we were first able to track and collect location data on our website visitors, we were being accessed by 91 different countries.

Next slide, please.

And now, at my last check, we're being accessed by 193 different countries.

Next slide, please.

In 2010, we made a large effort to increase the amount of content we had available online.

Now we're really starting to see remarkable results.

This slide outlines some of the supplementary materials that are available only online.

In 2010, we began to distribute video provided by authors as supplementary material through YouTube, and in 2010, we had 3,337 views, and now, in 2012, we have over 9,000.

2010 was the first full year of data that we have on the use of our RSS feed and we averaged 1,481 views per month in that first year. And now, in 2012, we are averaging over 8,000 views per month.

Also, our PowerPoint image slides and slideshows took off when we first made them available in 2010 and averaged over 2,000 views per month and now we're averaging over 7,000 with a total of 85,779 downloads in 2012 alone.

JRRD At a Glance that accompanies each article that we began making available translated into Spanish in 2010 greatly surpassed our expectations in popularity. And, now in 2012, they were viewed over 260,000 times.

We also recently began making the same At a Glance content available translated into both traditional and simplified Chinese and to date, we have had over 6,000 views.

Our podcast was also accepted into iTunes in 2010, and had nearly 10,000 views resulting in almost 8,000 episode downloads in that first year.

Now we have over 17,000 views resulting in 26,861 episode downloads

Next slide, please.

This slide illustrates further JRRD's website performance overall Then & Now, showing increases from 2010 through the end of 2012.

Average visits per day have increased by 500 and the average visit duration or the amount of time that a visitor stays on our site has increased to nearly 50 minutes, telling us that the majority of our visitors are staying on our website to read full articles.

Page views have also shot up to over 7.1 million or 19,000 per day.

Website hits reached an astonishing 30 million in 2012. That's 84,000 per day or roughly one per second.

Our mobile device traffic has increased to 6 and a half percent. Partly due to the increase in popularity of mobile devices but also our push to make sure that our content is available on all platforms.

Next slide, please.

JRRD's Web Site Traffic Sources. Google remains #1 source of all referrals, and I don't think that's going to change anytime soon. PubMed also remains the largest second source of referrals of any scientific technical and medical journal indexing service. And direct traffic or any traffic that is not the result of another site linking to us accounts for 15%.

And now the main VA website, which links to us, accounts for 4%, up from last year, possibly due to the increased exposure, and then other alternate search engines kind of round out the top ten.

Next slide, please.

Going forward, we're going to continue to look for ways to increase our Web site traffic, and we're going to push all of our content for worldwide dissemination. We're going to continue to create and repurpose JRRD content for the Web. We're going to continue to enhance our user experience, and as we go, we're going to adapt our efforts to what Web site trends and data suggest.

I want to thank you all very much and ask if there are any questions. It doesn't look like there's any questions. However, Dr. Triolo did come back. Stacie, do you want to talk about, or can you revisit the impact factor later while he's here, or do you want to do that now? It's up to Dr. Triolo. Ron, did I answer your question? Hold on; let me unmute him real quick. OK, Dr. Triolo, you're unmuted. No, Stacie, we can revisit this later. I don't want to interrupt the flow of the presentation. OK. We're going to definitely have an open discussion at the end to allow people to bring things forward. Just be sure that you put up your hand so that Hanna knows to unmute you. Sure. OK. Great.

Next slide, please, Hanna.

At this point, we're going to turn this webinar over to Tristan Horrom, one of the copy editing team, and our plagiarism sleuth, who will discuss the findings on plagiarism.

Alright. Hello, all. I am Tristan Horrom. I'm one of the technical writer editors here at JRRD, and I am responsible for checking all of our articles for plagiarism before they move forward in the production process. So, I'm going to give you a brief overview of our plagiarism policies for 2013.

So, if you can go to the next slide, please.

Alright, the way we check for plagiarism every article is run through the iThenticate, which is a plagiarism detection program, during the production process before the article is edited. Any paper in which plagiarism is found will be immediately rejected and we'll follow the Committee on Publication Ethics procedures. Those procedures might include communicating with department heads or funding sources, if necessary. For cases of self-plagiarism, where using text or data, or whatnot that have appeared in a paper by the same authors, the author is contacted and given four options depending on the nature of the duplication. Those options are to paraphrase the text and add a citation to the original, to put matching text in quotation marks and add a citation to the original, to refer to the original publication without repeating the text, or to include a properly cited appendix with the relevant text for online publication. Now, which step we take with each author depends on what has been copied, the original source, and any other extenuating circumstances. So, with some authors, we allow them to rewrite sections and proceed to publication. Whereas, for other papers, we need to remove the

duplicated text and we just use a citation to where it was originally published. Then, after an author has sent a revised manuscript, the article is run back through iThenticate to check to make sure that the changes are sufficient.

Next slide, please.

Since the last editorial board meeting, I have run 130 articles through iThenticate. Of those articles, 13 were found to have some form of self-plagiarism or duplication. Luckily, we did not come across any direct plagiarism of other sources. So, we'll keep our fingers crossed that that trend continues. Of those 13 articles, most we were able to work with the authors to keep, resolve the problem and move forward and still publish the articles. We did have one article that we rejected after checking with iThenticate because we found what we call "salami-slicing" of the research. Basically, after looking at the paper, we determined, Stacie and I did, that the article was using the same experiment, or the same research, from a previous article and just parching it to get more publications. So, the article did not seem to be adding anything new that the previously published article had not presented, so, therefore, we rejected it. We will continue to check everything we publish beforehand to make sure that we are only providing the highest quality articles.

Go to the next slide, please.

Last year, we published an editorial in issue 49(8) detailing our new policies, and how exactly we check for plagiarism, and dealt with it when we found it. The link to the, to that article is at the bottom of this slide, and so for any more information that article covers most of what we are doing. So, I'll turn it over to questions now. Dr. Jutai has a question, so Dr. Jutai, you are now unmuted. Go ahead. Hello? If you want, you can go ahead and just type it in, if you're having problems with the microphone. He says, "Regarding self-plagiarism, how is it determined in multi-authored papers?" When we run an article through iThenticate, any matches that we find, it will give me a link to the article that's been matched. So, then I go into that article and compare it to the manuscript we're looking at. I look at the author list for both papers. And, if I find that some or all of the authors were the same on both papers, then we consider it self-plagiarism, rather than plagiarism of others. Let me add a comment to that. It's, it's somewhat rare, it's somewhat rare, that any two papers that will come in will have the exact same author list. So, when Tristan, and then Tristan or I, take a look at this, as long as we find some sort of general concurrence of the same authors, or especially a PI, we will consider that "self." Does that answer the question? So, basically, we look at each article that comes up as a flag in the iThenticate checker on a case-by-case basis. Once I, we see that there might be matching, we look into the actual articles and the matches and make that assessment ourselves, rather than relying on the program to tell us what percentages. Yeah, cause people often ask me when we go to STM conferences, what percentage do we use? There is no, like with a lot of universities, they, they set a percentage. Your paper cannot have more than 25% similarity with another paper. We don't do that. What we do is we take a look at the amount of duplicated material itself, and we run from there. In some cases, especially if you are doing an experiment that is very, very similar to a previously published one, you're going to have words that overlap and what we do is that we take a look at those words, and what they're referring to, and we go forward from there. Oftentimes, the words cannot be changed, especially if they're within a methods section. Other times, as Mr. Horrom referenced, we give people the option of doing four different things. And, primarily, we see these problems within methods sections, and sometimes within introductions. We give people options for how to fix it. But just know that when this happens, leaving it "as is" is not going to happen. We have to be very, very careful because other publications own copyright. At JRRD, because we are a government publication, unless an author specifically takes out

copyrighting, again this has to be a non-governmental author, and up until this point in time, no author has ever specifically asked for copyright, we have to be very careful that we are not infringing on the copyright of any other publications. OK, he said that, yes, thank you, it answered his question, so we can continue. Thank you, Tristan.

Hanna, next slide.

OK, at this point, we're going to turn the talk over to Ms. Rosenberg, our managing editor, and she's going to report on new dissemination tools.

Hi, excuse me, Hi, I am Maryn Rosenberg, and I am the JRRD managing editor. I'm going to talk to you for a little bit about our GPO Bookstore and Zinio dissemination programs, and I am going to turn my webcam off now and continue the presentation. So, our question here was how can we make our digital content available as broadly as possible? How can we make JRRD articles easily accessible through mobile devices, the iPad, the iPhone, Tablets? As you can see from this slide, it can be pretty complicated. There's issues. There are Apple-operated systems, there's Androids, we now have the Windows phone, and coming up pretty soon, there's going to be HTML5. A lot of these things have different requirements, different screen sizes, different resolutions. So, what we decided to do is we talked to the Government Printing Office. They handle our printing. And they have a partnership with a company called Zinio. And we decided to go and partner with GPO and Zinio.

Next slide, please.

So, what is Zinio? Zinio is the world's largest newsstand. It is a digital magazine website and application. They were founded in 2001, and are based in San Francisco. They've got more than 5,000 brands from more than 1,000 consumer publishers. They are in 206 countries, and 33 languages. But, what was exciting for us was that they are available on almost all devices. They are available on your PC, on the iPad, on the iPhone, on all of the different screen sizes on the Android. They're available on the Windows 8 and starting in January, they're going to be available in HTML5, which is an interesting development, and you can read a little bit about it. It won some awards for the "Best Global App" and "Best App Ever," and the Huffington Post said, "To see magazines done correctly, look at Zinio."

Next slide, please.

In January 2012, we started publishing JRRD with Zinio. And this is a screen shot of the reader application on a PC. It is a similar look and feel on the iPad and even has a similar look on your iPhone. And what Zinio has done is created containers for each of the devices so that you download the application on your device and it has a container that allows you to turn the pages, it allows you to click links, it displays the content. And notice each reader is optimized for the settings for that individual device.

Next slide, please.

We also have for our content, not all content has this, but we've asked them to create for us, XML reflow, which allows users with smaller screens, on your iPad, on your phone, to switch between a high-quality layout view and a text-only reflow. So, there's just a little button at the bottom of the screen that says "text" and you press it and it goes straight to just plain text, and you scroll down all the way through from the beginning to the end of the text.

Next slide, please.

So, Zinio is a fee-based service. JRRD is available as individual articles for \$7.99 for an individual paper. A one-year subscription is \$59.99. And we have just opted into their new program which is really cool, called ZPass, and any user can opt to get 3 magazine titles a month for \$5.00 a month. You can switch them up, you can, you're not stuck for a year with any particular title. So, for the same price, \$60.00, as a subscription, a one-year subscription to JRRD, you can get three titles. So, we're pretty excited about that. JRRD hard copy is also available through the Government Printing Office Bookstore for a fee. And that hard copy fee is \$133.00 a year and you get shipped to you from the Government Printing Office, a hard copy of each issue of the journal. We do not keep this money. This isn't money that stays with us. It goes back into the Government Printing Office book sales program. So, but the point that's exciting is there are people who are purchasing this content. For the convenience of getting it where and when they want it, I think the hard copy is probably individual subscribers, maybe in other countries, so we're, we're pretty excited about that.

And next slide, please.

This last slide is just to highlight that we are again in the forefront. JRRD is mentioned in this blog as the first Federal government publication to appear on Zinio, out of the Department of Veterans Affairs' Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development (JRRD). So we were excited to get sort of a mention in the bigger world of things. And that is all I have, so I will turn my camera back on if there are any questions. It does not look like there are any questions. Nobody has a hand raised, and nothing was typed in. OK. Thank you guys very much. OK, one of the, before we go to the next section, one of the things I want to point out is this is a real transition for JRRD. Like Maryn mentioned, people are effectively purchasing containers, but what's more important is people are buying what is technically free content. Over the past couple of months, you might have noticed that you received with your hard copy, a postage-paid return flyers, indicating that if you wanted to still receive JRRD hard copy, you needed to return these flyers. We've gotten somewhere around 300 response cards, so within the next 30 to 60 days, we will be transitioning our mail list, yet once again. All institutions of higher learning, as well as medical institutions, and things like that, will remain, libraries, etc., will remain on the JRRD hard copy list, as well as those people who have returned their response cards. But the people that did not return their response cards, if they request hard copy, they will first be directed to GPO, and to Zinio, and then, of course, on a case-by-case basis, we will back-add people to the mailing list if they can present, you know, necessary reasons to be added back on. One of the things that we're quite pleased with and I'll talk about it a little bit later at the end, is the strong impact this has had, with respect to government savings and that we have now fully fulfilled the Efficiency and Spending Resolution Act that was mandated by the President, so that we are not wasting government dollars by offering free content that is available online. OK, at this point, I'm going to turn the presentation over to Ken Frager, our public affairs officer, to discuss our social media outreach.

Hi there, hopefully you all can see me and hear me. I am Ken Frager. I am the public affairs officer for the journal, and I'm going to talk about social media, and how we're getting the word out about the articles that are in JRRD in sort of a way that is a bit unique, so we're not just targeting researchers, but the general population, and veterans, in particular. So, I'm going to turn off my webcam.

Next slide please, Hanna.

One of the interesting things about working with JRRD is we're receiving research from all over the place, and it's research that's very important for veterans, who are our primary audience, I'm sorry, our primary audience, but it's also research that's very relevant for the general population, people who are in need of rehabilitation information. So, when we're trying to get the word out, we want to let, not just scientific publications know what we're doing, but also publications like the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the USA Today, publications that are going to reach the general consumer. So, it's a unique, it's a unique way to try to, we need to find unique ways to try to get this information out to people. With 12 articles in each journal issue, we've got a very small number of media outlets that really can understand and convey our stories and the topics that we're covering. So, we use primarily Newswise, which is a distribution service that focuses on science writers. When we send information out through Newswise, we're promoting an entire issue at one time, but we're conveying the message in a, in a much more simplified manner, so we're simplifying the language, distributing it out that way, and then allowing them to contact the authors of the papers directly, rather than coming back through our office. It allows us a way, it expands our audience to much more broad, a much more broad reach. The other thing we're using is social media, and in particular Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and occasionally, Flickr, if there are photos and images that we want to distribute. I found that Facebook and Twitter in particular, are very popular among our veteran audience. People are coming to our site, and they are following us, they're linking to us, and they're asking to receive more information. We've been able to grow our audience in a way that is, it's very friendly, we're able to respond if they have questions, and in a time of fiscal constraint, like we're in right now, this is a very effective and efficient way to do this. We're not advertising, we're not spending money to get the word out about our Facebook page or our other social media sites. We're on word of mouth to do it. We're reaching veterans through the creative arts festivals, through the national summer, national veterans summer sports clinic, and we're developing real close, I guess closer, relationships, rather than just having people try to find us through the VA site directly.

Hanna, next page.

So today, now on Facebook, which seems to be our most popular means of getting the information out, we've got more than 1,000 likes. Likes are sort of, they're not really friends, we're not allowing a lot of friends to connect directly to our Facebook page. When somebody's our friend, it means that they cannot just read what we're posting, but they can also post things to our site. We don't really want to open it up for that, unless it's somebody that we're really comfortable with, or we have confidence that the information they're posting is going to be appropriate and relevant for our audience. But, when somebody likes our Facebook page that means that they're allowing us to distribute our news and our articles, and our information through their newsfeeds. So, if we have, you know, if somebody has 10 friends, not only does our message get to the one person who's requesting it, but it also allows their 10 friends to see it, so it's a very, it's a good way to spread the word. On Twitter, we're following, we've got 160, approximately 160 followers. So, that's again, people who are reading our messages directly through Twitter, and those 160 followers have basically re-tweeted our messages 700 times. So, they're sharing it with their friends, who are then sharing it with their friends. So, we're getting good distribution there. LinkedIn is something many of you may be on, and we are accepting some "friends" on LinkedIn, because it's really a good way for professionals to communicate and to reach each other. And also, again, to reach an audience that's a little more business-focused, or professionally-focused, where I think I find that Facebook is more, more, even more interactive and more social, but LinkedIn allows us to reach a more professional audience for getting, we're started to build a following there as well. So, Newswise, as I said, is our only paid distribution service. We're posting about 15 times a year and each of those posts are being viewed at least 1,000 times. So, you know, I think what we're doing,

we can't really promote an individual article, because it's not really our place to do that. It's more of a place for the researchers directly, and their institutions to promote their articles. But, if we can draw people in, draw the media in, let them know that the information's there, we can help to build, build the distribution that way. Alright, I think that's all I have on it.

Next slide.

Are there any questions? Hanna? No questions about what Ken has put up so far. Dr. Hafner wrote a question about, if Dave wants to get back on real quick, he says that he's noticed that print versions of JRRD are available prior to the online version, "Typically I observe online versions appear prior to print. Is the decision to release print versions first purposeful?" And I kind of tentatively answered that it's because we don't have immediate control over the website. We have to send everything via Austin, but if Dave wants to go ahead and comment more, that'd probably be cool. Yeah, that's partly correct, Hanna. Because we're hosted in Austin, and because we're within the VA's firewall, anything we post has to be checked through their security service to make sure that everything we're posting is (inaudible), so I guess representative of the VA. And because of that, there is sometimes a week, to sometimes three to four days of a delay from when I request for the content that we have written, that we have prepared for the web, to go up on the web. So, I guess that's sometimes set at five days, and sometimes that's a week. In addition to that, recently we've been making an effort to make all of the supplementary materials that we have with each article ready at the exact same time to go live with the actual journal content itself that mirrors the print. So, in the last few months, that's delayed us a bit, but we do believe that having everything packaged together and put up together increases the chance that people are going to look at everything. And then also, we don't like putting back issues up when there's something else. We like to have everything together. I hope that answers your question. We try to (inaudible – three talking at once) Dr. Hafner, I unmuted you, just in case you wanted to say anything. Phil. I appreciate the elaboration. Thank you very much. I'll just add one more point to that, Phil, Dr. Hafner. The web, effectively everything you see on the web, doesn't go into full-swing production until the print has been delivered to the printing office. So, once print is done, then everything you see up on the web, plus everything you don't see up on the web, i.e., everything that goes to Crossref, all the background XML, all the databases that populate what you see on the JRRD website, all go into swing immediately after, by Mr. Bartlinski and Mr. Rodney Baylor. So, I only have two people who, effectively, do everything, and that includes all the podcasting, all the editing of the podcasting, all the At-A-Glances, all of the individual PowerPoints that you see that go along with every figure. That's not done by the authors. That's all done by Mr. Bartlinski and Mr. Baylor. So, there's a lot of background work that goes into this so that is, also has to be, taken into account. Nevertheless, the date that the articles appear online is the official publication date for that particular volume, and that volume. I hope that answers the question. Any others? Dr. Bernardi asks, "Just to be clear, you aren't buying Facebook ads, but are just running a Facebook page for the Journal." I responded that, yes, we just run a Facebook page, we don't, tell me if I'm wrong, Ken, but I'm pretty sure than we don't buy the ads that show up on the sides of people's pages. Is Ken there? Ken has. I'll answer that. We spend no money on Facebook, at all. Yeah, that's what I figured. Um, no, so all of, all of the Facebook dissemination, we post content on our page, and people can share it on their own pages. I don't know if you use Facebook yourself, but every post that shows up, especially if it links to a website or a picture, you can hit a little "share" button, and then that shares it on to everybody that you are personally friends with. That's how we've gotten a lot of friends. That's what I was trying to say, but I couldn't unmute myself. I apologize. Any other questions, Hanna? Nope, that's it. We're going to go on onto the next section. I'm going to turn off my webcam. Now, Hanna, can you go back one? OK, in this section we're going to talk about New Initiatives. During this last section of today's webinar I will focus, once again, on the historical transition

of STM publication, followed by ongoing and upcoming transitions in STM publishing and how it affects JRRD, and what JRRD's doing about it.

Next slide, please, Hanna.

In 1665, Henry Oldenberg created the first scientific journal that replaced letters between scientists. So, this was effectively the transition according to the Adams article that I mentioned early on in the talk of transitioning from the individual to the institution. After World War II, peer and editorial review became common place as a way to compile and enact community-based judgments on scientific contributions as a method of display, and notification, and within the last three decades, recognition. This is effectively the transition from the institution to the national collaboration. In the mid-2000s, web scholarly dissemination became paramount and containers, such as individual journals and publishing houses become less relevant. If you don't believe me, ask any student. A lot of students don't even know that individual journals exist. Open-access journals, data repositories, blog posts, interactive graphics, video, audio, have shifted publication from a paper-based to a Web-native system, and this is facilitating the transition from national collaboration to international collaboration. We've seen this, and this has been borne out by the numbers presented by Mr. Bartlinski, the JRRD webmaster. Indeed, not only the number of website downloads, but the fact that when he said that more people are coming through us through Google, and this is Google and Google Beta Scholar, than through any other mechanism, i.e., going online and searching to see what JRRD has in its table of contents.

Next page, please, Hanna.

So what are the consequences of these transitions? Well, metrics have been used for quite a while to measure scientific output, and those metrics are now changing to something known as alternative metrics, or altmetrics. Altmetrics include views and domain-specific Web enterprises, mentions in social media, citations in open-access journals, like JRRD, recommendations in social media, such as LinkedIn or Faculty of 1000, as well as the standard citation indexes. Altmetrics, according to Science and Nature, who run editorials on this over the past year to year and half will include products. This PowerPoint is a product, so you will have noticed that when there are slides with people's names on them, their researcher ID/ORCID, which I will discuss more later, are on the bottom of those slides. Altmetrics will measure these products emerging from hypothesis-generated research rather than citation indices alone. Once upon a time, and still to this day, at some institutions, whether or not you made the rank of full professor, depended in large part on your publication records, in which case they looked at the particular journals you published in. Journal metrics, i.e., the impact factor, were never designed to calculate or figure out an individual researcher's productivity or the reach that they had within the scientific community that they're, that they're in. H-index, as I mentioned previously, actually measures a person's citation proficiency, as opposed to the impact factor. Impact factor is becoming less and less relevant as more and more people are getting away from the concept of the box, as opposed to the individual article content. And finally, data, once the bailiwick of the individual or the collaborative group, is going to be expected to become part of the public record because in the Web age, "scholarship leaves footprints." Recently, i.e., this week, Dr. Francis Combs, from NIH, just announced a 96 million dollar investment over four years to put big data to work on solving persistent health issues. And those monies would be filtered through Centers of Excellence. This project is referred to as "Big Data to Knowledge" or "BD2K" and will ultimately will make large complex and unstructured data sets more accessible to researchers through software, better storage and improved data sharing, and training. And indeed, NIH has already partnered with Amazon in March, to put 1,000 human genomes on Amazon's EC2 computer cloud, where researchers can analyze that data on a fee-for-use basis, effectively, to

democratize access which previously been held by only a handful of public/private sector labs. Again, this gets back to the fact that “scholarship leaves footprints” and data is no longer yours.

Next slide, please.

So, I’m going to now discuss the Anticipatory Measures to be Adopted by JRRD.

Next slide, please.

This year, JRRD has joined FUNDREF and CHORUS. OSTP, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, under the White House, under the direction of John Holdren, has mandated in February of this year that ALL Federally funded peer-reviewed papers are to be FREELY available within 12 months of publication. Previously, this only applied to NIH-funded, and that is why we have PubMed Central. JRRD is currently in PubMed, and we are working to become part of PubMed Central, so those authors that submit to us, papers that have NIH funding, will no longer have to submit the papers to PubMed Central themselves, so that they can check on those box, check off those boxes, on their grant applications that they have successfully done. This is requiring us to significantly change our post-production flow and go over to an XML workflow, but we are actively pursuing that and we hope that we will have completed that transition to this XML-based workflow by 2014. So, what is FUNDREF, and what is CHORUS? In an answer by the STM publication community, they were trying to figure out a way to meet these federally-mandated guidelines for all publishers. FUNDREF is a response from the STM publication community, at large, to provide a way to index papers by federal grant numbers that support the work. In practical terms, this will work like the digital object identifiers that are already on all JRRD publications, and will be part of the JRRD submission upload process, part of the final production, and eventually reported to CrossRef. Eventually, APIs, which are Application Program Interfaces, will be created across the private and public sectors in response to FUNDREF, which will allow interested agencies or other stakeholders to determine the relation between grant dollars and publication output. So what is CHORUS? Well, CHORUS is an STM publishing response to handle this OSTP mandate, without creation of yet another large database, and without expenditures of additional government funds. It is, CHORUS stands for the Clearinghouse for Open Research of the United States. In practical terms, this is going to build on the DOI, the Digital Object Identifier, FUNDREF identifiers, and ORCID/ResearcherIDs, which I’ll discuss a little bit further on, and utilizes these existing databases to provide a public-private partnership to fulfill the OSTP mandate. Even though JRRD is online and freely accessible from day 1 with no embargoes, nevertheless, we felt it was important to become part of this database so as not to be left out. Because eventually, this database then, I can perceive it to be in the future, to be utilized for other things.

Next slide, please.

There was a news release last week from CrossRef, who maintains the DOI database, that in order to help correct funding, connect funding and publication to improve public access, the announcement of FundRef. And they say here that the registry will include 4,000 worldwide funder names, and the VA is currently part of that funder names database.

Next slide, please, Hanna.

Furthermore, this initiative will allow readers to easily and freely access peer-reviewed publications that result from funding provided by US government agencies. There’s been a lot of talk within the scientific community about people who do research that aren’t necessarily affiliated with established labs -

students, scientists, things like that, and overall, the overarching message that I've taken from these articles is that people that are able to access government funded research are much, much happier than having to figure out how to get through publisher pay walls or the \$30 pay per views or anything else. A lot of times, if a researcher who is not within an institution that has access to a particular journal, comes across a pay wall of some sort, that article will be ignored, it will be neglected, it won't be reviewed by the particular scientist doing the work and that, in some way, impedes the overall progress of science.

Next slide, please.

In addition, JRRD has joined RUBRIQ. RUBRIQ is a commercial enterprise. We have joined RUBRIQ at no cost to JRRD. So, why, and what is RUBRIQ? RUBRIQ is a new process that's out there that provides rapid, double-blinded peer review with a standardized scoresheet. It's an author pays model. You pay \$600 because reviewers are compensated \$100, and they are expected to return their review in a one-week turnaround. Again, I said this is a standardized scoresheet. It is not going to be looking for particulars about the hypothesis-generated research. What does the author get? Well, they obtain the standardized scoresheet review, they get an iThenticate report, so they don't put the \$50 out for the iThenticate report, a ORCID or researcher, or in this case it's ORCID(s), which is the same or similar to a researcher ID, are assigned, if necessary. And, again, that feeds back into the H index. And recommendations are given to the authors for best-fits journals. So what does JRRD stand to gain from this? Well, JRRD will become a RUBRIQ-recommended journal for anybody who chooses to submit their papers into RUBRIQ. And JRRD will also accept RUBRIQ reviews as part of the JRRD review process, which can be shared with managers such as yourself and other reviewers, if requested, because they are fully anonymized. And because JRRD is likely to be part of the recommendation package provided by RUBRIQ, we hope to obtain then authors who may, or may not, know about JRRD.

Next slide, please, Hanna.

Another measure that we're going to be implementing towards the end of this year, with full implementation in 2014, is where we're following the lead of the top tier journals. In this case, it's Nature and BMJ, British Medical Journal. This is related to increased data transparency and reproducibility endeavors. Over the past 6 months, Nature has run a complete series of articles on data transparency and reproducibility errors measured within primarily clinical and biomedical research. So they have suggested, and now mandated in their policies that two things happen. Number one, that if requested of a researcher, that the researcher provide relevant, anonymized patient-level data, if requested. The second, the second change in their editorial policies involves something that they're calling additional data. We're calling it supplemental data. For that, anytime that you see a figure or a graph in JRRD, there will be a link in the Web-only version, that will provide online tables of data behind the graphs and figures. On the right, you see our Table of Contents, our TOC legend, and these are all the little things that we offer in terms of supplementary content. At the very bottom, you see one that says "Supplemental data." So, in a TOC of an article, if you see that, you will know that there is data that accompanies graphs and figures.

Next slide.

This request is backed by VA Directive 0005, entitled Scientific Integrity, which first appeared in the Federal Register on 11/08/2012. And in this in Section 5, Foundations of Scientific Integrity, subsection (b), it states, "To the extent practicable, VA will expand and promote access to the scientific and technological information underlying its policies by making such information available online and in

open formats. As appropriate, this will include data, research citations,and models underlying regulatory proposals and policy decisions.” So therefore data, starting in 2014, that accompany figures will need to be included.

Next slide, please, Hanna.

I’ve been talking a lot about Researcher ID and ORCID. Researcher ID was originally a proprietary nomenclature by Thompson Reuters. Thompson Reuters is the parent organization behind Love of Science and Journal Citation Reports, and things like that. But, in order to maximize the use of this nomenclature and to be able to have it fully utilized for FundRef and CHORUS, it was decided by the STM community to merge them and now it’s referred to as ResearcherID/ORCID. Earlier this year, we adopted that linkage, but I just wanted to point out to all of you what this identifier means and why the members of my copyediting team ask this of you. We’re not asking you just to give you one more thing to think about or do. We’re asking this because this is actually very beneficial to you and your students to have this. Using this identifier, research can manage their publication profile and once upon a time that used to be done by your CVA or resume, but not anymore. They can manage their product profile, like this PowerPoint, or anything else you publish, or do, or your videos, or your audio. You can track your citations and finally, one of the most important things that we consider to be useful of this particular nomenclature is identify potential collaborators from around the globe as they come to you, or you can go to them.

Next slide, please.

In 2003, JRRD had no editorial policies or guidelines, outside of VA Handbook 1203.05. 1203.05 entitled, “Journal of Rehab Research and Development” described JRRD operational details and reporting mechanisms, rather than editorial policies and procedures. Because of this, JRRD examined top-tier STM journals for their policies, attended STM journal conferences and meetings and carefully put together a compilation of the current and most comprehensive best practice utilized by these top-tier journals, much of which we adopted and put into our own code and our own policies. This was done to provide JRRD stakeholders with a clear and consistent set of guidelines for submission, review, plagiarism, conflict of interest, clinical trial registration details, technical editing, and why we technically edit, publishing practices, dissemination methods, etc. Now we have this policy and we pretty much update it every year, so we consider it to be an evolving policy that reflects the most current STM thinking. In 2013, there were two significant additions to our policy. COPE, which stands for Committee On Publication Ethics is an international collaboration of STM journals and we are a member of COPE. And COPE put together Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers, which we have incorporated. COPE also put together a Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors. They’re not only talking about people like myself. They’re talking about people like those of you participating in today’s webinar, and I’ll get into that a little bit more. In addition, we incorporated the VA Scientific-Integrity-Policy: VA DIRECTIVE 0005, which I previously referenced, and I’ll speak more about that. The next round of revision will add the supplemental data descriptions and submission details, the process for requesting and providing anonymized patient-level data, the FUNDREF requirements and submission details, as well as RUBRIQ and CHORUS information.

Next slide, please, Hanna.

This is the COPE guidelines for peer reviewers, and I’m not going to read this slide to you. You can take a look at it, if you like. But basically, it’s a whole bunch of common sense kind of things that you’d like to

see in a review. It's something that I think should, is best shared with students, and with post-docs, and with interns so that they have a basic understanding of what the peer review process should, and should not, contain.

Next slide, please, Hanna.

I AM going to read you this slide, because this is directly relevant to what we all do every day, for you all, when you think about providing me with reviewer suggestions or recommendations, the conduct and best practices for journal editors, which includes all of you editorial board members. Like I said, it's involved with the review process, providing recommendations, or even talking amongst yourselves about a particular article, or with me. Generally, editors should strive to meet these responsibilities. You strive to meet the needs of readers and authors. Oftentimes, you'll come to me and you'll say, "I don't think this is the best fit for JRRD." and we'll have a discussion, or "I think this belongs in another journal. This doesn't really meet the needs of the JRRD stakeholders." and that's very valid. We have to continue to strive to continually improve our journal. We have to work at improving the reviews by ranking the reviews when they come in to you, by providing me with estimates on the quality of the reviews. We have to have processes in place to assure the quality of the material they publish. And we do, through our editorial policies. We have to champion freedom of expression. And we have to maintain the integrity of the academic record. We have to preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards. And finally, we always have to be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies. Up until this point in time, we've never had to do a preclude, which I'm very happy about, and we've never had to publish a retraction. We work very hard, and that's one of the reasons we put into place iThenticate, so that we don't run into some of those problems, although if the problem ever exist, we have the editorial policies in place to guide us with doing those processes.

Next slide, please.

Additionally, the VA DIRECTIVE part provides two Parts of Interest which bear on these previous discussions. The first, which was of great pleasure to all of us at JRRD, under section 5, Foundations of Scientific Integrity, subsection c, part d states, "Publication of the Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development, which covers an area of research of particular interest to Veterans and key Veteran organizations." must recognize. We were very pleased to be part of this directive.

Next slide.

The Second Part of Interest, which is directly related to all of you who are on my editorial board who work for the VA, again under "PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF VA SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY EXPERTS" section a, part 1, it "Encourages the publication of VA scientific and technological findings in peer reviewed, professional, or scholarly journals." And "Encourages VA employees to become editors or editorial board members of professional or scholarly journals." So, congratulations to all of you. You're meeting your directives.

Next slide, please.

To begin to wrap up today's webinar, I'm going to again turn to Dr. Francis Collins, at NIH. He was recently asked to provide commentary on leadership in the federal system. And when I read his commentary, I realized that much of what he said is what the JRRD team is all about, and why we can report to you so successfully today on everything then and now. It is what we do and why we can report

this with pride. We've come far, and with your help, we've helped turn JRRD into an international rehabilitation publication powerhouse.

Next slide, please.

He starts with saying, "Have the right team." I have the best team imaginable. I'm surrounded by intelligent hard-working, insightful, cooperative people, who are never, ever afraid to tell me if I'm wrong. Believe me, they do, a lot. Number 2, "Allow people to grow and they'll surprise you." At JRRD, we encourage, I encourage, and we encourage each other, for ongoing education. There is little within the VA system that can truly help us stay ahead of the publication curve, because we're the only publication enterprise within the VA. So the team takes it upon itself to ferret out low or no cost educational opportunities, including online meetings, webinars, and MOOCs, which is Massive Open Online Courses. If you have never checked out the MOOCs, you really, really should. It's really fascinating, all the different types of educational programs, college level, graduate level courses, that are out there for free. "Encourage risk taking." We take calculated risks at JRRD. We look at what the top tier journals are doing and what works for them, and then within the context of our own budget, we try new things and as you've seen from Mr. Bartlinski's talk, these new things have been wildly successful. Number 4, "Connect everybody to the mission." We're a vertically integrated publication enterprise. What does that mean? It means we do everything in-house except for the print and Zinio. We do everything. This is in direct contrast to a lot of other journals. I worked at Willey for almost 10 years. And, at Willey, while I ran the journal, I was the managing editor for the journal. I had no control over anything outside of the peer review process. At JRRD, it's totally different. Every member of the JRRD team plays an integral and ongoing part of the process. We're all connected to each other, and dependent on the hard work, and continuing efforts of other members of the team. If one fails, we all fail. So, we're very connected. Number 5, "Pursue a calling, not just a job." The JRRD team creates a product which is helpful to people in 190 some countries, and we work it because we know we're making a difference. We've gotten emails; we've gotten letters from people who've told us, "Thank you." These aren't other researchers, these are people. We see it on our Facebook, the people that connect to us. We see it from our veterans. Number 6. "Be realistic about government service." Today we are presenting this webinar from our respective homes. Because of those of you in the audience who work for the VA realize, or in another government organizations, other parts of government, sometimes certain sectors of government service do not necessarily jive well with the needs of a particular service. So we try to stay creative and positive, to legally and within guidelines, accomplish our unique mission. And finally, number 7. "Never forget you have the opportunity to change the world." This is the most important thing for us. We are changing the world. One country, one veteran, one person at a time. We're giving people around the world access to research that they might not necessarily have any other way to get. We're creating a platform for open dissemination of cutting edge research to beneficiaries here and abroad, especially those veterans in the "Foreign Feed Program", as well as the international rehab community. Hopefully, our endeavors will also provide utility to all research stakeholders, to provide them with international collaborative opportunities.

Next slide, please.

So, I want to thank all of you who are participating today from the board. This is really, really important work you do for us, and most of you do it of your free time, and your own volition, and we couldn't do it without you. We thank you for your untiring assistance. We'd also like to thank our support above us, ORD RR&D, Dr. Patricia Dorn, the RR&D Service Chief, for her unwavering support.

Next slide, please.

In Summary. JRRD continues to improve in content, quality, delivery, and outreach. We've begun the transition to a fee-based publication. As I mentioned before, research libraries and other institutions will maintain their hard-copy subscription for free, but we will try, and again this is try, to push people towards GPO or Zinio, or to our complete Web. JRRD stays current on regulation and publication trends. We continue to experiment with alternate modalities for dissemination, and we continually strive to be frugal and resourceful with VA dollars. As a side note, all of our publication, our hard copy print, comes through our GPO contract with the GPO printer. Previously, our GPO contract exceeded \$300,000 per year. But this past year, due primarily to post-production enhancements that the team and I implemented, as well as reduced hard copy, our GPO contract was reduced to under 100K. We've saved over \$200,000 in one year. We're working hard to be resourceful with VA dollars, while striving to provide a 21st century experience. And, that's all I have to say. Thank you all for listening, and we will now open up for questions. Can all of my presenters, if able, put on your webcams? No questions have been typed in and it doesn't look like anybody's hand is raised, but we should probably give it a few minutes just in case anybody is typing. OK. Nancy Bernardi, I'm going to unmute you, ma'am. Thank you and, Stacie, can you guys see me OK? Yeah. Congratulations, this looks wonderful, and since it's my first year, it's really great to get this history and see what you've been able to do. Would you mind commenting on how selections are made about special or single topic issues, and what is in line in that regard? OK. So, on the JRRD website, we have a section with single topic issues, and so the way this usually comes about is an author, usually a researcher, comes to me with an idea, or to Mr. Tinker with an idea. One of the first things we do is we take a look and see whether or not we've published anything within this particular arena as a single topic issue in the past. Secondly, we take a look at what we've published within the past 12 to 15 or so months to see whether or not those kind of articles have drawn any significant interest. Then what we do is we work with the author, and now this person now effectively becomes the editor of the issue, to figure out whether or not, #1, the articles would be of interest to the wide, the wide stakeholders that come to JRRD, #2, whether or not the editor will be able to pull together the articles that would be necessary for a single topic issue, and we try to get anywhere between 12 and 15 articles for a single topic issue, and then #3, whether or not the potential authors would be willing to abide by the fairly stringent, and again this is important, and the fairly stringent, timelines to pull this together. Too often, what happens in single topic issues is things get delayed, and publications that have would occur in a more timely fashion in a multi-topic JRRD publication get strung out of it. So, those are sort of our criteria, but mainly what we do is we try to take a look at what's trending within the rehabilitation community, make sure that no other, none of our other competitors have published something similar recently, and to make sure that what we're publishing is novel. That helps. Thank you. You're welcome. OK, Dr. Sherwood asked if we would be sending a link to this presentation? And I responded to him, but let me tell everybody that both a copy of the PowerPoint that you all saw and a recording of all of us speaking, actually, will be posted online. Yes, that's absolutely correct. It may take a little while, but the entire presentation, like Hanna said, will be online and you all, all of the editorial board members, as well as everybody participating in this meeting today will receive a copy of that link. OK, Dr. Levitt says, "I find it mind-boggling that you could reduce expenses by 2/3. Congratulations!" Thanks, Harry. Dr. Bell says, "Growth of the journal's impact is very gratifying to see. Congratulations to all of you!" Thanks, Morris! One of our editors, Rebecca Torres, says, "How would RUBRIQ affect the JRRD review process?" OK, at this point, we can't answer that question, definitively, because what will have to happen is the author will have to choose to go into RUBRIQ, and pay the \$600, and then the author will have to choose to share their RUBRIQ scoresheet with us. We cannot ask for the scoresheet, but if the author chooses to share the scoresheet, that will be disseminated to the managing editor, and then the managing editor then, in collaboration with me,

will decide whether or not to share with the other reviewers. Please note that the RUBRIQ scoresheet, like I said, is a standardized scoresheet, so it won't necessarily reflect a lot of the things we are looking for within the rehabilitation community. It'll say is this a standard scientific article, does it contain an abstract, you know, things like that. But to be fair, we've recently had to add to the JRRD Submission Instructions, as well as to the Reviewer's Scoresheet, does this article contain an abstract, introductions, methods, you know, results, and conclusion sections, because even though we consider those to be standard items for a research article, many times research articles come in without those requisite headings. OK, Dr. Levitt says, "This has been the most interesting and informative board meeting that I have attended. My only wish is that we could have met in person. I hope this will be the case next year." Us, too, Harry. Dr. Sherwood asks, "Will this set up some union-tended publication bias?" I'm sorry; I don't understand the question, Art. Dr. Sherwood, I'm gonna unmute you. I don't know if you have a microphone, so if you wanna rephrase that, or elaborate it, I'll...OK, am I there? Yep. Hi, Art! Hi, I'm sorry; the typing correction on my iPad changed my wording. I wondered if there was unintended bias created by use of this external review tool so that someone that can afford \$600 would then somehow get a slight leg up in getting their stuff published. No, I don't think so. Again, it's just going to be one more piece of the puzzle and it will not provide them with any incentive, or will not provide them with any advantages, best as I can see. Primarily what the reason that we joined RUBRIQ, like I said, is so that if people come in with rehabilitation content, and don't really know where they want to publish, or what's the best place for them to publish, that RUBRIQ will recommend us. But, I do not see, in any way, affecting our peer reviewed process. Hey, Art, how's Prague? It's great. (laughter). It is. OK, I don't want to forget, we should go back to Dr. Triolo's question about impact factor. Do you want me to return to that slide? Yes. OK. So, Ron, I do believe you asked me what the impact of international collaboration is on the increasing impact factor. And to be honest with you, I can't answer that question directly, and I'm not even sure if, within the context of the search parameters that are available to me via Manuscript Central, if I can accurately tease that out or not, however, this is what I can find out. One of the things that you can tell through Web of Science, which due to technical difficulties, we don't technically have access to at this point in time, you can figure out citations coming in and going out of a particular article and how, what journals those are, and where in terms of globally in the world where they are and once we have our Web of Science access back, I will be able to tease that out a little bit better and get back to you to determine how much that is impacting the JRRD impact factor. Let me go ahead and unmute Dr. Triolo, just in case he wanted to say anything. You are unmuted, Sir. OK, thanks, Stacie, that's helpful. I guess in all, it's a brave new world with all these new metrics, and thinking outside our little boxes, but still, at least helpful for me to know how we stack up compared to our competitors, if you want to think in terms of...sure... you know, the APM&R and PT, and the...mm-hmm...and all the neural engineering and rehab...mm-hmm...so this whole way of thinking is still useful, especially as I advise people about where to submit...OK...but the impact factor is still something I think people understand and kind of latch onto. I guess the other critical thing, and I might have missed this when my network went down, but another factor in people's decisions on where publishes, the turnaround time from submission to publication and...mm-hmm...I don't know if you summarized that in...no, I did not.... How are we stacking up on that metric internally, (inaudible)? OK, to kind of get back to a little bit, I mean, one of the things I can never, ever know is while I share all of this with you, and we're open access, so all of this is obviously shared on my website, the JRRD website, information regarding, as you phrase it, our competitors, is not something I can easily access. So, I can't know, you know, how many downloads they get, or anything. I can know their impact factors, and I can know that sort of stuff, based on the JCR information, but a lot of the other sort of information that leads up to this, I cannot find out, even through Web of Science it's very difficult for me to find out. Now, to answer the question about timelines, which is effectively what you're asking, in general, it takes 6 weeks to 3 months to get an article through the first round of peer review. I will tell all of you, and a lot of you probably noticed this lately, and it always gets more onerous

during the summer months, is that once upon a time you were asked to provide two or three reviewer names. Now, sometimes, Mr. Tinker or I are coming back to you and saying, "Uh, how about a few more names?" I think my all-time high now is 18 reviewers were queried for one particular paper till we got two. It's getting more and more difficult. And, indeed, in my conversations with other editors, and editorial board members, this seems to be an overall general complaint. And it's to be expected because journals are proliferating, and the amount of time that you're being asked to spend in the peer review process, or in some part of the peer review process, is increasing, while the compensation has remained steady, or nonexistent. So, that being said, it's about 3 months. We give people 60 or 90 days to return their first round revision. Most usually take most of that time. A lot of papers after the first revision have to undergo a second round revision so the typical length of time for a paper to get through the first round of review and the subsequent revisions is, more or less, on average about 6 months. Right now, as of this morning actually, Mr. Tinker completed vol. 50-10, the last issue for this year, and these are papers that went through the end of June. So, it is now taking 6 months, or thereabout, to get published from once you are accepted. That being said, because our copyediting and post-production process is somewhat more lengthy than other journals, people actually start to receive queries from Maryn's team, probably starting 3 months out, because we work on several issues at a time, and we discussed this in the past. We tend to work on 3 issues concurrently, different levels depending on where we are. So, we just got 50-5 is going to the printer whilst working on 50-6 and 50-7 concurrently. So to answer you, I would like to see the time from acceptance to production shrunk from 6 months down to 4 months, that'll put us more on edge, but will allow for more rapid turnaround times, and in order to accomplish that, for the next year, I have decided to forego for 2014, publication of any single topic issues, to effectively allow us some catch-up time. That being said, in 2014, we will again begin to look at requests for single topic issues as they come in, but currently, for 2014, there are no single-topic issues on the book. Because, remember, we publish 12 articles times 10, plus or minus a few per issue, and I have a very limited number of people working on my production team, so I really, really can't go much beyond that while maintaining the quality that people have come to expect from JRRD. Have I answered the question? I think Dr. Triolo had more problems 'cause he's offline again. Oh, pooh. I think he got most of that, though. Sandra Gabelli says, "Have you thought requesting, at the time of submission, for 6 suggested reviewers to increase the chance to have an expedited review?" Yes, Dr. Gabelli, yes, we have thought about that. Currently, everybody's supposed to give 2. I can't tell you how many of our authors come in and give 0. Again, we do not have the capacity within Manuscript Central to make this a mandatory fill field, but that is something, Maryn, please make a note of that, and perhaps we can change that up for 2014. That is a good suggestion, because there are plenty of times that we end up having to query the suggested reviewers. Please note that the suggested reviewers, more often than not, decline, but more suggestions are helpful. I will also extend it out there that several of you have come to me within the past couple of weeks/month for some tutoring on utilizing the Manuscript Central process to be able to provide reviewers' suggestions. Remember I said we have over 5,000 people, and while that is true, utilizing the conventional fully and search operators you may not be able to ferret out people that have reviewed for JRRD in the past, but I have a couple tricks up my sleeve, that allow us to pull people out who might, by either accident or on purpose, have declined to put their areas of expertise in there, so they can't be searched. We do have other ways of searching for these people, and if you would like to know these little tricks of the trade, please feel free to contact me sometime the end of this week or next week, and we can set up a personalized tutorial session so I can guide you through that process. Any more questions, Hanna? Nobody's hand is raised, and nothing else has come in. Well, we are at 2 hours, 2:55 right now, coming up on the close of our meeting. I want to thank you all very, very much for participating. I'd like to thank all of my presenters today for their very interesting talks, and I welcome any feedback from any of you. Again, once this is available online, the entire product will be available, and you will receive an email telling you. I look forward to getting any

feedback at all and thank you for your time and your participation today. Hanna, will you close the meeting? Thank you very much everybody. I'm going to shut it down right now. Bye...bye...bye.