

# At My Desk After CSE, Now What?: Use Cases from CSE 2016

## MODERATOR:

### Shari Leventhal

Managing Editor  
*Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*  
American Society of Nephrology  
Derwood, Maryland

## SPEAKERS:

### Carolyn de Court

Managing Editor  
J&J Editorial, LLC  
Cary, North Carolina

### Graciela Munoz

Editor-in-Chief  
*Electronic Journal of Biotechnology*  
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso  
Valparaíso, Chile

### Keith Gigliello

Senior Manager  
Digital Publications  
American Society of Hematology  
Washington, DC

### Bethanie Rammer

Managing Editor  
*African Journal of Laboratory Medicine*  
Nashville, Tennessee

### Julie Vo

Associate Managing Editor  
*STEM CELLS*  
AlphaMed Press  
Durham, North Carolina,

### Carolyn Unck

Scientific Editor  
King Abdullah University of Science and Technology  
Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

### Simone Appenzeller

Associate Professor of Rheumatology  
*Revista Brasileira de Reumatologia*  
Campinas, Brazil

## REPORTER:

### Julie Vo

Development” with speaker Lauren Fischer. Fischer discussed the lack of a clear career path in the scholarly publishing industry. As an early-career professional, I described both traditional and nontraditional strategies for advancement. Even though I have only been in this industry for 3 years, I feel knowledgeable, involved, and engaged because of all that is offered for professional development in our industry.

**Graciela Munoz:** Each of the sessions I attended at the 2016 CSE Annual Meeting was a unique opportunity to have informal discussions with editors, and to think in depth about the editorial process. Also, I was impressed to see how the editors shared their knowledge, especially in the Short Course for Science Editors and in the session “Demand a Recount: Investigating and Correcting Indexing Errors” with Keith Gigliello and Carissa Gilman. Back at my desk as the Editor-in-Chief of the *Electronic Journal of Biotechnology*, my mind was focused both my journal and the other journals that my university publishes. In short, what we need is to publish not only good manuscripts but also to make them visible to the whole scientific community.

**Keith Gigliello:** I presented a few brief thoughts on public access mandates and described how sessions that I attended at the 2016 CSE Annual Meeting influenced my perspective. Both “Public Access Policy Mandates and How Publishers Are Responding” and “Implementing Standards: Data and Data Exchange in Scholarly Publishing” elicited questions and encouragement for keeping an open mind.

**Bethanie Rammer:** My experience adapting lessons learned from the session “Managing Editor-in-Chief Transitions” to a small, society journal had its positives and negatives. I learned a lot of practical strategies for dealing with the challenges associated with searching for, and transitioning to, a new Editor-in-Chief, although I didn’t always apply what I learned exactly how I expected. The main thing I would tell people is to be ready to adapt best practice recommendations to your own journal’s culture.

**Julie Vo:** I landed in Denver armed with questions regarding a publication ethics inquiry my journal received a few weeks earlier. A science blogger brought an image suspected of manipulation to our attention. After our own initial investigation, we hit a roadblock, so I took advantage of the meeting to ask questions to help solve this, my first ethics case: taking

In the first-ever “At My Desk After CSE, Now What?” session, seven first-time attendees to the 2016 Annual Meeting returned to distill their lessons learned from the meeting in Denver, whether from a session, a networking opportunity, a dinner conversation, or otherwise. Personally, I was motivated by my co-presenters upon seeing the actions they took in implementing what they learned following their experiences at the 2016 meeting and I was grateful to be returning as a presenter in 2017.

Topics covered career development, editorial transitions, strategies to increase journal visibility, and publication ethics. Presentations from these early-career professionals highlighted impactful sessions from the 2016 meeting, and provided practical, hands-on applications in their respective positions back at their desks. Each speaker shares their biggest takeaways and learning points below, helpful not just for other early-career professionals, but for everyone as reminders for how to translate the excitement, enthusiasm, and education from 2017’s meeting into their roles back home.

**Carolyn de Court:** The primary takeaways I implemented were from the session “Insights and Strategies for Career

CONTINUED

a CSE short course, networking, and attending “Scientific Misconduct: Investigating Alleged Misconduct and Educating to Prevent It.” I returned to my desk and performed further image analyses with the help of our co-publisher, and we found no evidence of manipulation. With the case closed, we took the opportunity to reevaluate our workflow and defined a protocol and a detailed workflow for future cases.

**Carolyn Unck:** My presentation described how I learned about predatory journals/publishers at the 2016 CSE Annual Meeting and how I implemented this knowledge at my university. I was introduced to the world of predatory publishers in “Think. Check. Submit—The Impact of Predatory Journals and How to Identify Them.” My follow-up research revealed how the open-access movement was being exploited by the corrupt world of predatory publishers. I created a library guide, an online resource available to everyone at the university that aims to expose predatory publishers by describing how to identify them and why they are a detriment to authors, readers, and scholarly publishing as a whole (Figure 1).

**Simone Appenzeller:** In 2016, I attended a CSE Annual Meeting for the first time. One of the sessions I attended was “Demand a Recount: Investigating and Correcting Indexing Errors,” Keith Gigliello and Carissa Gilman explained how to verify the data calculated by Thomson Reuters. As co-editor of *Revista Brasileira de Reumatologia*, I wondered whether to demand a recount. With no information regarding which articles were citable, we followed the recommended steps from the session on how



Figure 1. King Abdullah University of Science and Technology predatory publishers library guide.

to correct the Impact Factor and reevaluated the journal sections, leading to an increase of the Impact Factor from 0.74 to 0.85.

In this informative session, each speaker shared key takeaways and learning points to help other early-career professionals and remind all attendees how to translate the excitement, enthusiasm, and education from the Annual Meeting to their roles back home.