Working in Partnership to Support Quality Research

Jayne Marks
Wolters Kluwer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston>

An indexed, print copy of the Proceedings is also available for purchase at:

<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston>.

You may also be interested in the new series, Charleston Insights in Library, Archival, and Information Sciences. Find out more at: <http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston-insights-library-archival-and-information-sciences>.

Jayne Marks, "Working in Partnership to Support Quality Research" (2016). *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference*.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316498>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

Working in Partnership to Support Quality Research

Jayne Marks, VP of Global Publishing, Wolters Kluwer

The following is a transcription of a live presentation at the 2016 Charleston Conference.

Jayne Marks: Good morning, everyone. So, before I get started, first of all, I should say thank you so much for inviting me here and having me come talk at the Charleston Conference. I have to say this is my absolute favorite meeting of the year. I really enjoy it. It is so great to come and meet with people who really get what we do, all of us, the publishers and librarians working together talking about real issues. That is what I really like.

How many in this room, and I want you to be really honest, think that publishers are just after building pay walls and making money? Come on! Three of you? Okay. All right, so I'm in for an easy ride. Now, I know that is a lot of the public perception of what publishers do today. I have been in journal publishing now, I did admit to my colleagues last night, I've been in journal publishing 35 years. I tried a couple of times to get out. I keep being drawn back in. I love publishing. I love academic publishing. I'm now in medical publishing, so I work exclusively in the medical space, and I'm very passionate about this space, but I know that we have a huge image issue. So, what I want to do today is to share with you some of my thoughts about how really at the grassroots, on the ground we work together, and we work together really well, and we support our community of interest.

I don't know how many of you were at James Neal's session just a little while ago; he said two things that really struck me. One I completely agree with that, and one I completely disagree with, so they might surprise you. The first one that I agree with is he said, "We are in a state of constant change." I don't think anyone would disagree with that, whether you're in publishing or academia or librarianship. Everywhere so much is changing so fast that really change is the new normal. We have to get used to that. But, the other thing he said was, right at the beginning, he said, "The community of interest between publishers and librarians is narrow." I'm not sure I can really agree with that because everything that we do in publishing space is for your patrons. That is what we do it for. We do it for your

patrons to make their work out there in the world, to help validate their work, to disseminate their work, to make sure that it is preserved long-term, and I hope that in those senses we have the same community of interest that you do.

Having set that as my context, I want to talk through, well, let me start with my agenda here. Talking a little bit about actually creating and delivering that quality of research to the finished product and then how do we get it out to the widest possible audience and what do we bring to the table? What do you bring to the table? How do we work together? And what I would really like at the end of this session, after I've given my thoughts, is to hear your thoughts on what we could do more of and how we can help each other better.

So, let's start with delivering quality research, and let's start with the authors. The authors are the most important people that we work with in terms of the scholarly research continuum. The authors and the researchers are the people that we need to support the most, and I think that the other thing that James Neal said that I completely agree with is the complexity that researchers are facing today in terms of accessing and publishing their work is really, really complex and hard. And I think the thing where we work best together, and we do a lot of together, is training information, making sure particularly that young authors as they come into the scholarly communication process understand the complexities, understand the choices, there are lots of choices out there. We deliver webinars. We deliver a lot of online information resources, in-person training at a lot of conferences. A lot of what my publishers do who manage journals in our organization, when we go to meetings of our society partners, they'll run sessions on how to get published, how to make sure your work is in the best possible state, where to go and get help if you need help, and how to publish your work. Then we provide support services. I'm sure you do the same thing too. We provide language editing. There are some great resources out there, one of which we partner with, I know other publishers partner with the same, that you can point authors to who maybe haven't published before, or English is not their first

language, and maybe even the scholarly process is different in their country, and they need help in understanding what makes a good piece of research and a good publishable paper.

We provide training courses on the ground in multiple countries to help people to do that. In fact, we have an organization that is part of ours in India that supports emerging markets publishing. If you imagine you are a Nigerian physician, you're doing work on the ground in Nigeria. You want to publish a clinical study that you've done. It's not going to be of interest to a Western journal where the American Journal of, I don't know, say Ophthalmology, has all of the tools and equipment you could possibly imagine to treat a patient, that Nigerian ophthalmologist won't have those. So, you need to be able to understand and to put that in context of the work that he is working in. But the peer review has to be good, and the process has to be the same; it just has to be in context. So, we provide training courses for authors in those countries, and we provide training courses for new editors who have perhaps just been tapped on the shoulder and said perhaps you're going to be the new editor of the new journal of *Nigerian Journal of Ophthalmology*, and they have no idea what to do. So, we provide a lot of those resources, training, there's some great collaborative resources across publishers and librarians to help do that.

And then mentoring young researchers, in each of the publishing associations there are mentoring programs for young publishers. I know there are mentoring programs in a number of different areas for young researchers, a number of our partner societies who own the journals that we publish have mentoring programs for young peer reviewers. For example, there might be a special program that they are able to sign up for, and they can learn how to do peer-review. It is not something you just grow up learning how to do. It's all about training, and it's all about helping us to get to better authors because better authors definitely gives us higher quality of research.

I wanted to put this up as an example. There are lots and lots of examples out there, but I found this one, and I thought this was great. Here there are links to all kinds of resources that the library, this is a library site, that this librarian has put together to show authors where to go and more importantly down here where not to go. What are journals that

perhaps they should be a little bit more careful of? Because I think that's one of the things that we can work together to do is to really help authors to understand when perhaps that offer of a publication isn't quite what they expect it to be. So, that's the other thing we can do. We can help authors navigate this maze of where to publish. We've helped them get their paper into a publishable format. Where are they going to publish it? What is most important to them? Is it prestige? Is it speed? Do they want open access? Is open access important to them? And how is that going to help them? All of those things I think together we can help researchers, particularly young researchers who are publishing their early papers, to understand what the options are, where they should go for-publishing their first paper in *Nature* or *Science* is probably shooting for the moon. It's probably not going to happen, so where do you start? Where do you want to put your paper? And when is it really important to get the speed and where do you go? There are journals that specialize in almost every area of this, particularly including open access, and therefore helping authors to know where to go to navigate that landscape and to understand the benefits, the upsides and downsides of that, I think is really important. If you are a tenured professor publishing your 200th paper, you're unlikely to be worried, perhaps, about whether or not the journal has an impact factor. Maybe you just want speed, and maybe you just want to get that out in the market, and you know that you can get into a journal that's going to get it out fast. But if you're an author on the tenure track, getting into the right journals, because that's the system that we work in, whether we like it or not it, that is important to them.

The last question I think is really important: Is the journal authentic? I want to show you an example that came up, and this an example that came up very recently. So, this author got this e-mail, "Would you like to submit in *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*?" The e-mail goes on. This is sort of the follow-up. You notice that by the time it gets into the e-mail it says *Gavin Journal of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, but the headline is "Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery." Then you go to the website, and the website is suddenly "Plastic Surgery and Modern Techniques." So, what happened there? The real journal is this one, and this is one we publish, and the society came to us and said, "What do we do? There's this plastic and reconstructive surgery journal out there that's not one of ours and is

masquerading as our journal.” I cannot tell you how many times we have people come to us, day in and day out, saying I found the journal of this, or the journal of that, that is pretending to be our journal. They’re very clever. They have covers that look like the covers of the journals. They present themselves in very similar ways, and they do things like this with the e-mail. It is very easy to be taken in by some of these if you are new into the field. And I think that this is an area where we need to do more to help people understand when an offer to publish is really just a Nigerian princess e-mail, and they should avoid it. There’s a wealth of difference between pure predatory publishing and sort of the broad range of open access journals. There’s lots and lots of different journals in between, but there are clearly predatory practices out there that we can help protect our authors from, and I think we can work together on that. How many of you have heard of the Coalition for Responsible Publication Resources? Good. Somebody’s heard of them. So, this, I just highlight here is it is a conglomeration of actually Don Samulack from the Editage Company is working with a group of publishers at the moment to try and put together some resources that will really help people understand when predatory publishing is happening whether it’s bad practices in peer review, whether it’s bad practices potentially in submission, but also just journals masquerading as journals that really are not bonafide journals. So, I think this is an area where we definitely can work together more on.

Peer review is really important, and I’m going to go through these roles. I’m sure you know these roles as well as I do, but they are complex. They’ve actually become in some ways more complex. Authors clearly, they write their paper, they write up their results, and they submit their paper. I’ve put under here interestingly who archives their paper? Because many of the funders put the responsibility for the archiving on the author, but I suspect that many of us in this room would say actually it is librarian that archives it, or publishers would say, “Actually we’re responsible for depositing that paper when it is ready.” So, I think really archiving the paper is somewhat of a shared responsibility between all of us. Manages data is an interesting one, and I want to go back to that one later. The editor sets the editorial policy, whatever that journal’s editorial policy might be, appoints an editorial board to help him or her to do their job, and it might not just be one editor. It may be

multiple editors. They choose the reviewers, and generally speaking, they will make the final decision, and at the very least, they will make the final decision on any potentially controversial papers. The editorial board, on the other hand, they provide a lot of support. They usually do a lot of the reviewing, and they do a lot of promoting of the Journal and helping to get authors to come in. Sometimes different editorial boards will be split into different subject areas, and certain subeditor’s or groups will take different responsibilities. Reviewers, they are so crucial, and this is an area where we don’t, in many cases, we don’t do enough to support editors and reviewers in their work. It is really a crucial role of the reviewer to assess the accuracy, to make sure that the data that is in the paper supports the conclusions and puts that context or the content of what is being published in the context of the broader world and then matches that to the journal’s policies, whatever that journal might be. So, it might be a highly selective journal. It might be a broad-based journal, whatever it is, or they might have published an article on the same topic last month in which case they might not be so interested. So, that’s the reviewer’s role.

What does the publisher do? They provide systems and infrastructure to manage this process in terms of the technology. They, in most cases, fund the editorial office, and the editor might well have an entire team of people that backs him or her up in terms of managing this process depending on the size of the journal and providing support in terms of training, training on how to use the system, bug fixing when the system goes wrong, support for the authors in terms of doing that. More and more I think publishers are finding ways to help thank reviewers for what they’re doing, maybe sometimes offering access to content. In our world, we offer reviewers CME credits, which is, particularly for somebody trying to amass their credits for the end of the year, it is important to them to get those CME credits. So, finding ways to help this process, support this process is something we can definitely work together on.

Archiving is incredibly important. I know it is the key role of the librarian to make sure that archiving happens, but I think it is something that we share in in making sure that it works. There are so many different archiving policies out there. Funders have different policies on how things are published, where they are deposited; it is amazingly complex.

I'm sure from your perspective, but certainly from a publisher perspective, with papers coming in from all over the world under many, many different funder mandates, it is bewildering to keep up with it. We provide, between us, you provide the institutional repositories; we provide the help in terms of depositing in archives, depositing directly into a number of funder repositories, including PubMed Central is probably the most important one. So, in that sense, actually making sure that that process happens and that we support the authors together and making sure that that process happens is important.

I've put up here creating and managing a data management plan. We spent a lot of time scratching our heads within Wolters Kluwer with what does data mean in terms of how do we support it within the publishing process? And this is a personal view of mine; it is not necessarily a WK view. I think we are still thinking about it, but I don't think it is the publishers' role to preserve the data. I think there are services out there that do that. I don't know if it is the librarian's role to manage the data and the data curation and the data sort of storage going forward, I'd be really interested to hear your view. Is it the role of, for example, the NIH? Is that the place where data should be deposited and curated? I think having a data management plan is a really good idea. How that happens is something that I'm very interested in and still not convinced that we have all the answers at all.

And then the last thing, providing archiving services. I think every publisher deposits their content into one or more of the archiving repositories to make sure that we have that long-term preservation and most importantly the long-term preservation of the version of record so that as the record evolves, as authors come back and add or change or amend their paper, maybe not amend but add to it more information, then we need to make sure that all of that is captured and captured for the long-term.

So, that is how we get papers. Now how do we get it out into the world? How do we get in the hands of people who need it? Finding content. This poor man has got his head in the haystack. James Neal was absolutely right: Trying to find the right content in today's world is incredibly difficult. Of course, everybody starts with Google Scholar, you hope, or Google. You hope they go on to the library services, use the discovery services. Often they use social

sharing networks to find the paper they're looking for or to just find papers. I think there are different ways of searching for something depending on whether the researcher knows what they're looking for or just trying to look at the landscape of maybe a new area they want to research. I think there's a lot of different ways to search for content, and I'm not sure we've all quite got it right yet. There are a lot of tools out there, and I think we need to make sure that researchers on the ground know how the different tools work and how they can use them more effectively. How do we help with this process? Metadata consistency, and did I see Todd come in the room? Todd Carpenter? If he's not here, he certainly is really keen on metadata and standards. That is something that we as an industry, in the publishing industry, have to work really, really hard to maintain, because if we don't have consistent standards, and you can't pull that content into your discovery services or other systems that you want to work on. I understand there is a new JATS. First of all, we had to amend everything to take in JATS. Now there is a new JATS, which is the DTD format, so everything has to change. The standards in the industry are crucial, ORCID for understanding who the researcher is and being able to de-dupe researchers. FundRef so that you can as a funder actually understand where the research that you have funded finally gets published. The DOI, just the basic DOI, is critical and then how we use the DOI in linking through CrossRef and CHORUS. How many of you are aware of the CHORUS initiative? Hopefully most of you. CHORUS uses a lot of these standards to help different funders to actually get to the papers that they have helped to fund, so all of those things I think together will continue to evolve. I think we need to do a lot more of that, and it is something that we absolutely have to work on together to make sure that we're really marching in the same direction. And then I mentioned earlier the version of record. I think this is really important, and I think it often gets forgotten in the myriad of ways that people can get to content. Maybe I'm more sensitive to it because in health I think it is really important that the version of record is the one that a physician might use to decide to change their practice, and they need to know whether there've been any updates to that version of record.

Next, discovery services. I'm sure there are more than one other session here, and I know that there is at least one other session at this meeting, and there is usually multiple on discovery services. It is pretty

much a Space Odyssey. There's so much content out there, and there are a number of different discovery services all trying to help you and us and our patrons, our joint patrons, our readers get to content they need. We need to make sure that the solutions are workable, usable, they're transparent, that we partner with them, and that they're trusted. For example, it is really important that a discovery service gives you access to everything and doesn't imply any kind of preference on pulling anybody's content to the top. It has to be what the researcher is trying to find. Linking and data, I mean how are we going to then evolve discovery services to take in all these data repositories that are going to be out there? I can't imagine what that is going to be like. So, actually, and then providing metrics and actually providing measures back to the library about what that content is that's being used. It was interesting that James Neal said, "I'm not going to pay for anything that my patrons don't use." I completely understand that. How do we make sure that when a library patron needs some content that you have that they don't go out to Sci-Hub, for example, to get it because it is easier? How do we make sure that together we work to make it easy to get to content, and I think that is something that we're not doing as well today as we could be.

Really that comes down to the last point: How do we get content together? How do we make sure that content gets into the hands of the users in their workflow? And that is why I do completely agree with James Neal when he says it's workflow tools that are important, and I think it is something that publishers are focused on, I'm sure it is something that you as librarians are focused on as well. So, here's a couple of examples. You've all seen different discovery services. We actually just launched one this year for the hospital space because many—in fact many hospitals don't even have a library. The hospitals who don't have a library really need some way of pulling all their content together so there are different interfaces available for different markets. So, then how do we measure? How do we measure the quality and the usage of the content that we all publish? It is as important to us to know that the content that we are publishing is being used. It is of no interest to me to publish reams and reams of articles that nobody ever reads. The important thing is to get those articles out there and to make sure they're being used. There's lots of ways to do that and we all know Scopus, ISI, Altmetrics; we need to make sure that our users, and dare I say that maybe

even senior people within publishing and senior people within the academic sector, can understand what these metrics mean and most importantly understand what they don't mean. Just because something has an impact factor does that mean that if the usage in your libraries is low is that good or bad? If one person gets to the article they really need to read and maybe it has a high altmetric score, is that good or bad? I think this is something that we haven't figured out yet, and I think we are still learning about how to navigate this sort of maze of different analytics that are coming back to us, and I think that we need to understand how these things are telling us how our patrons want to use the content that we make available to them.

I want to talk a little bit about marketing because that's something that the publishers do, and it's very focused these days on getting the content to the right people. It's much, much more difficult today than it used to be, and this is a slide that I borrowed from my colleague who heads up our marketing department, and he's really talking about how marketing has evolved. Marketing is no longer putting a message down on a piece of paper and mailing it to somebody. We're long past that, so people working in our marketing department had to have these kinds of skills or these kinds of tools to be able to do their jobs better. Analytics, first and foremost, is critical. I do not want to send anybody an e-mail that is of no interest to them because that is wasting their time, and it's wasting our time. So, really understanding the relevance of the content that you have, the message that you have to the audience is critical, and only by using analytics can you figure that out. Social media, I don't need to tell this audience that social media is really an important method of communication, and how we can use that effectively and reasonably to get again content being discussed out there in the market is important. Once you have all this data back, can we use data visualization more to actually be able to show us what is important, what's happening in the content that we are publishing and that we're accessing? Marketing people don't have to be just creative anymore. They have to have technical skills or least within your team, as in the next one, you had to have technical people as well as people who are good and creative. It has to be a team approach today. This one is interesting. I've never heard of "newsjacking" but actually taking advantage of when something is in the news of saying, "Hey, I know this is in the news today," that here in this academic

environment we have some fantastic content that really sets the context of the news that you're reading today. So, I mean I'm sure as librarians you've had people come in and say, "I've heard about the Zika virus." Well, probably not recently, but maybe when it first came out. "Can you tell me about it?" If we as publishers can get ahead of that and give you content sets or give our readers content sets and links to information that is really important to them, I think that is going to—that is something that we can do as a service, and I think that it is going to be very much more helpful, putting information in the hands of people who need it. And soft skills. I think everybody needs that, but here we most definitely within a marketing team today they have to be able to work well together. So, that's in that sense, we use all of those skills to try and get the right information out to the right people.

So, to sum up, I don't know how I'm doing for time, a little bit over, so, this is my summary, really. We can and we do work together to support authors. They are our community of interest, and I think we can and we already provide them information training, guidance. We can do more, and we're always interested in hearing from our library partners on what more we can do there. Preserving and nurturing peer-review is critical. Lots and lots of much, much smarter people than I talk about whether or not peer review is no longer needed, can be superseded, as far

as I can see today peer-reviewed is critical at being able to say, "This paper is something you can trust." And let me tell you, in the medical field, you want to be able to look a physician in the eye and say, "This paper is something you can trust," because if they're going to go out tomorrow and do something different with the patient, you want to be sure that paper is right. I do think we need to make sure that we work together to support our readers and patrons to be aware of what information is out there and what information is trusted information and maybe where they should be a little bit more careful. And lastly, I would just leave with this thought—well I have one more thought, but leave with this. We are in a complex and dynamic environment, and things are changing very fast, and we have to continue to do what we are over these three days, talking to each other in detail about the systems we have, the processes we have, the challenges we face to make sure that we can make our patrons' and our customers' lives better. I'm going to leave you with one last thought, particularly as the editor of this book is in the room, this is a shameless plug for a new book that's coming out toward the end of this month. It is all about academic publishing. It's written for librarians, very conversational style. I should probably own up to the fact that I have a chapter in this book, but, if you're interested, it is published by Mission Bell Media, and it's coming out at the end of November. I highly recommend it, of course, because I'm biased. Thank you. So, questions?