

Acoustical Society of America

Fall 2016 Meeting Minutes for Committee on Publication Policy Honolulu, HI

Date & Location: Wed., 30 Nov. 2016, 7:00-8:00 am, Iolani 2/3

To:

Members: Keith Wilson (Chair to 2018), Alex Case (2017), Diane Kewley-Port (2017), Alan Wall (2017), Andrew Morrison (2018), Tim Duda (2019), Michael Haberman (2019), Jennifer Miksis-Olds (2019)

Ex-Officio Members: Jim Lynch (Editor-in-Chief), Marcia Isakson (President-Elect)

Guests: Kent Gee (POMA), Charles Church (JASA EL), Bridget D'Amelio (AIPP), Fred Kontur (AIPP), Liz Bury (ASA Managing Editor), Dan Farrell (ASA Webmaster)

Not present: Vera Khokhlova (2018), Roger Waxler (2018), Frederick Gallun (2019)

Committee Charge:

37. COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION POLICY

37.1 Charged with reviewing and suggesting changes in the policy, contents, and format of the Journal and other Society publications, but excluding the book-plus program and Standards, for consideration by the Editor-in-Chief and the Executive Council, and proposing new publications.

37.2 Composed of the Chair and members appointed by the President, and the Editor-in-Chief and President-Elect as ex-officio members.

1. Introductions (Wilson)

2. Publication Policy Committee web page (lack thereof) (Wilson)

Setting up a web page for PP was discussed. Dan Farrell an help the committee set up its own page. The main goal will be to notify the ASA membership of the general topics being discussed. Comments on these and other topics, emailed to the PP Chair, will be invited. Minutes may be archived but only for access by PP members and ASA officers. Several Committee members stressed the importance of avoiding posting specific information about Committee deliberations and decisions, since they may contain privileged information or not officially represent ASA positions.

3. AIPP activities, Scitation changes (D'Amelio, Kontur)

AIPP has been working on the migration to the new Scitation platform for the past 8 months. Diane Kewley-Port (DKP) has been the primary liaison for the ASA. The new platform will go live in mid-December. Still much to do. DKP noted that a message about the transition should be sent to the membership.

Fred Kontur (FK) provided a presentation on open access (OA) and the various publication models. Consensus is that OA substantially boosts article downloads, but impact on citations is a relatively small increase at best. FK pointed out that many US agencies are working on OA

policies, but implementation is often problematic and slow. JASA is currently a hybrid journal. Bridget D'Amelio (BD) mentioned that the fraction of OA articles should remain below 20%-30% to avoid compromising library subscriptions.

AIPP analysis indicates that revenues are predominantly by subscription fees rather than individual article downloads. Andrew Morrison (AM) inquired whether turnaways could be reduced by lowering the article cost from the current \$35. Jim Lynch (JL) concurred that this fee is rather high. It should be determined whether there is a more optimal cost that will maximize revenue from downloads. Alex Case (AC) and Marcia Isakson (MI) suggested that it would be desirable to make better use of multimedia and other capabilities now offered by Scitation.

4. Updates on publications

- a. Editor-in-Chief (Lynch)
- b. *POMA* (Gee)
- c. *JASA EL* (Church)

Reports on individual publications were skipped, since such reports were already provided by the editors at the Editorial Luncheon. JL will send the presentations to Keith Wilson (KW) for distribution to the PP Committee.

5. Expansion of POMA to co-sponsored proceedings (Lynch, Gee, Bury)

Kent Gee (KG) reported on POMA publication charges related to co-sponsored meetings. The Executive Council previously mandated a \$40 charge for POMA papers when the lead author is not an ASA member, in order to help cover publication costs and encourage new members. This policy has been very unpopular, as it results in two separate fee schedules for authors attending the same meeting. KG recommended that the publication cost be built into the registration fee of co-sponsored meetings. When conference proceedings are required for a co-sponsored meeting, ASA would work with the organizers to determine cost. When conference proceedings are optional, the current EC mandated policy should be retained as is. The PP Committee recommended 6-0 that the revised policy proposed the POMA editor be adopted.

6. Page count estimates, page charges and avoidance (Lynch, Bury – see appendix)

JL: Overlength articles are becoming an increasing concern. JASA is trying to discourage long manuscripts, particularly when authors do not pay the page charges. Page estimation has proven challenging. Current policy is that page charges are mandatory if the manuscript exceeds 12 pages when typeset. However, it seems that some authors submit manuscripts that have a high probability of exceeding the limit, and then cut a lot of material at the page proof stage to get within the limits. This ends up not costing the authors anything, but it is expensive for JASA to make major changes at this stage. BD mentioned that other AIPP journals experience similar problems and AIPP is closely examining the issue now. JL is inclined to wait for the outcome of this process. Tim Duda (TD) and others suggested that increasing the page charges more gradually might mitigate the problem. The Committee arrived at no specific recommendations.

7. Proposed revisions to appeals and resubmission policies (Lynch, Bury – see appendix)

Appeals: The Committee discussed the appeal policy proposed by the EiC, which would formalize what has until now been an informal process. (Appeal is first considered by the original AE, and then goes to EiC.) MI suggested removing the clause "However..." in the second sentence. With this minor wording change, the PP Committee recommended 5-0 that the proposed appeals policy be formally adopted.

Resubmission: JASA is endeavoring to encourage her Associate Editors to reject papers when extensive revisions would be needed for acceptance, rather than undergoing a long and uncertain review process. Authors would then submit the major revision as a new paper if desired. But this can lead to problems if authors resubmit what is essentially the same paper. JL indicated that such situations would best be handled by the AE simply rejecting the paper expediently. KW recommended that the Information for Contributors be revised to state strongly that new submissions must differ substantially from previous submissions.

Background for item 5...

Avoidance of page charges and having some kind of penalty

Explanation: We've had two recent requests for reduced page charges, which we ended up allowing those authors to pay for any pages over the 12-page limit rather than all of the pages (paying only for excess pages is only typically allowed for authors who pay for gold OA). Also, not infrequently we've had authors at the page proofing stage drastically cut their manuscript and/or move figures/items into supplementary material to reduce their articles to 12 pages. Jim would like to discuss if we should institute some kind of penalty (maybe \$500) for authors who try to avoid page charges/get around the limit.

Here are some things to consider regarding page charges:

- Adding some kind of statement in the JASA Information for Contributors that even though editors/reviewers might request more information, the authors should keep within the limit if they don't want to pay for page charges. Also, Jim wanted a statement that authors shouldn't use supplementary material to get around the page limit (JASA-EL will start accepting supplementary material soon so this could be added for the JASA-EL instructions as well).

- Estimating the number of print pages isn't an exact science so it might be useful to discuss if there are any rare circumstances where we might waive a penalty fee or page charges entirely.

Background for item 6...

Proposed Appeal Policy

Authors may submit a formal appeal on decisions for rejected papers in writing as outlined below. However, please note that priority is given to new submissions, so we cannot guarantee that our response will be quick.

1. Authors should make an appeal request that the manuscript be reconsidered to the Associate Editor who originally handled the submission. Appeal requests must have clear detailed reasons why the manuscript should be reconsidered.

2. If the Associate Editor's response is that the appeal request is not warranted, authors may make a final appeal to the Editor-in-Chief. The Editor-in-Chief will consult with the Associate Editor who originally handled the manuscript, and may also seek additional expert advice (e.g., a new reviewer), before making a decision on the manuscript. The Editor-in-Chief's response to the appeal will be final.

Even if the Associate Editor or Editor-in-Chief respond that an appeal is warranted, acceptance is not guaranteed, and the reconsideration process may include previous or new reviewers/editors and substantial revision.

Proposed Re-Submission Policy

Unless an Associate Editor has invited re-submission, we encourage authors to submit a formal appeal before re-submitting any manuscript. If authors re-submit without invitation or going through the formal appeal process, the journal will only consider a substantially revised manuscript of a previously rejected submission, and this re-submission would be treated as new submission. Authors should include a cover letter detailing the changes and provide the full history of the rejected submission including the original manuscript number and the name of the original Associate Editor.