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Fall Meeting Dates
The next meeting of the Publications Committee will be October 20 - 21, 2014 (arrivals and meeting 3:00 pm - 5:30 pm and working dinner 7:00 – 9:00 pm on October 20th). The PC meeting will continue on Oct. 21st from 8:00 am – 3:00 pm. The Finance Committee meeting will be held Oct. 21 – 22, 2014 (arrivals Oct. 21st). The deadline for agenda items is September 15, 2014.

Editor Reappointments

Peter Wagner, Editor, JAPPL was evaluated and renewed for a second term, which begins July 1, 2014.
Dennis Brown, Editor, PRV was evaluated and renewed for a third term, which begins January 1, 2015.
Dee Silverthorn, Chair, APS Book Committee, was evaluated and renewed for a second term which begins July 1, 2014.

The Publications Committee interviewed for the Editorship of AJP-Heart and appointed Irv Zucker as the next Editor beginning January 1, 2015. At the fall 2014 meeting the Publications Committee will interview for the Editorships of AJP-GI and PG. The deadline for nominations is August 15, 2014. The Committee will evaluate Sadis Matalon, Editor, AJP-Lung and Barbara Cannon, PRV European Chair at the fall 2014 meeting for a second three-year term.

Journal Statistics

Impact Factor. The 2012 Journal Impact Factors (IF) published by ISI in 2013 has APS Journals generally holding their rankings. Our review journals have performed well, with Physiological Reviews once again ranked #1 in the field of physiology, with an IF of 30.174 and Physiology moving up one position to 3, with an IF of 6.750.
Accepted manuscripts. Time to first decision averaged 19 days in 2013 across all of the original research journals, 3 days fewer compared to 2012. Of note, AJP-Cell time to first decision was fastest at 14.2 days, followed by AJP-Heart at 18.2 days. The average rejection rate for all journals was 54% in 2013, compared to 58% in 2012.

Manuscript submissions. Manuscript submissions in 2013 decreased overall by 3% vs. 2012 for original research articles compared to 2012 and overall, including all manuscript types, decreased by 1% compared to 2012. Year to date 2014 manuscript submission have decreased 4% compared to 2013.

Articles and pages published. The number of regular research articles published decreased by 12% from 3,140 in 2012 to 2,753 in 2013; published invited articles decreased by 6% from 514 in 2012 to 480 in 2013. In 2013 178 articles were published in Physiological Reports. The number of records accepted for AiPS decreased by 4% from 3,096 in 2012 to 2,968 in 2013. Journal pages published decreased by 13% compared to 2012. The number of published pages was 18% under the 2013 page cap limit.

Supplemental data. A total of 190 data supplements were published in 2013, 52 of which were video clips. This represents a 3% decrease in total data supplements from 2012 the number of video supplements decreased by 32%.

Color figures. In 2013, 8457 color figures were published in APS journals of which 5908 were published by APS member authors at no charge to them, so that 70% of the color figures were free to members.

Podcasts. AJP-Heart released 28 podcasts, JAPPL released 4 podcasts, and AJP-Renal released 9 podcasts in 2013, highlighting published articles.

Peer review system. Enhancements to the system are implemented as requested by the EICs, and as needed by staff. These enhancements are ongoing. In 2013, there were approximately 40 enhancements developed.

Publications Ethics

NSF grant. In 2012, the Publications and the Education Departments jointly submitted a successful application to the NSF for the development of modular course materials on publication ethics. The materials are to be used in Responsible Conduct of Research courses in STEM graduate programs. Additional collaborators on the project are the Biomedical Engineering Society (BMES) and the Society of Biological Engineers (SBE). The amount of the grant is $400,000 awarded over a three year period.

2013 Project Progress:

- Draft teaching modules (6) were developed. (Fall 2012-Spring 2013)
- Grant Advisory Board (scientists, biomedical engineers, ethicists, and higher education faculty) met in La Jolla, California for 2.5 days to review the draft materials and suggest revisions. (April)
- Draft teaching modules were revised and prepared for primary field test. (June-December)
- Primary field test of the draft teaching modules was held on January 2014, in conjunction with another APS PST Course.

  - 2.5 day course in Lake Buena Vista, Florida
  - 5 instructors invited to facilitate the field test
  - 43 students applied to participate in the field test
  - 25 early career graduate students selected to participate in the field test
Project Development Timeline:

- January 16-19, 2014: Primary field test of modules
- Spring-Summer 2014: Revise modules in response to field test evaluation
- Fall 2014: Test individual modules in RCR courses at STEM graduate schools
- Winter-Spring 2015: Final revise and widely distribute modules

Ethics Cases. After increasing steadily for many years, the total number of ethics cases arising during peer review and production has plateaued over the past two years: 158 cases in 2012 and 156 cases in 2013. As in previous years, the largest number of cases in 2013 involved figure manipulation (125 cases), followed by duplication of data (10 cases), and human/animal subject protocol (8 cases).

In 2013, 68% of all cases were identified in the accepted stage before manuscripts were sent to AiPS. This compares to 63% in 2012. In 2013, the percentage of cases identified in AiPS was 7% (vs 5% in 2012), and the number identified in the review stage increased slightly (30% versus 27% in 2012). In 2013, 8 cases (5%) were identified after final publication as compared to 6 cases (4%) in 2012. Location of corresponding authors’ institutions of 2013 ethics cases was 56% US versus 44% non-US institutions.

In 2013, sanctions were applied for 7 cases (4%). (See charts below.)

In August 2013, APS introduced screening of all commissioned review articles (excluding editorials and Editorial Focus articles) for textual similarity. On submission, the plagiarism detection software, CrossCheck is used to do the screening. This workflow was introduced to PRV in July 2011 and to Physiology in July 2012. Now, authors of invited reviews in all APS journals have an opportunity to revise minor textual overlap (self-plagiarism) before the articles are sent for review.
Journal of Neurophysiology Trials

Journal of Neurophysiology ‘preprint server trial’. In July, 2009, the APS Council approved the Publications Committee’s recommendation for an 18-month trial for the Journal of Neurophysiology (JN), enabling submission of manuscripts that have been posted previously to a preprint server or other non-peer reviewed website. APS ethical policy considers posting of content to preprint servers as “prior publication”. The trial is a response to the request of David Linden, EIC of JN, for a waiver of this policy for JN in order to remain competitive. This is because “…in recent years it has become more popular for authors, particularly in the computational and systems neuroscience communities, to post full-length draft manuscripts on preprint servers like arXiv (www.arxiv.org) or Nature Precedings (precedings.nature.com).” (J Neurophysiol 102: 2577, 2009.)

The trial was reassessed at the April 2011 and extended for a further two years, and again at the March 2013 Publications Committee meetings. When the motion to make this initiative permanent was approved, in light of the fact that the current editor, David Linden, had requested permission to publish preprint articles, but will be stepping down as editor shortly, the Council approved the Committee’s request with the proviso that that the new editor be asked to revisit the policy and determine whether it is indeed required for JN to succeed.
Communications

The APS Communications Department issued 29 press releases ([http://www.the-aps.org/mm/hp/Audiences/Public-Press/For-the-Press/releases/13](http://www.the-aps.org/mm/hp/Audiences/Public-Press/For-the-Press/releases/13) in 2013. Of these:

- 45% (27 were related to APS journal studies)
- 20% (9 were related to the EB meeting)
- 14% (63 were related to APS news and announcements)

The most popular releases in 2013 addressed aerobic vs. resistance exercise, fish oil to combat cardiovascular and mental stress, and fetal alcohol syndrome-related heart defects.

Special Journal Collections

*Physiology in Medicine.* Eight articles were published in PIM series in 2013 and an additional eight have been commissioned since 2012; see page 24 for the list of articles.

In a May 2011 letter to the APS Editors-in-Chief, the Publications Chair, Hershel Raff, encouraged the Editors and their Associate Editors “to solicit review articles that discuss basic physiology as it relates to the pathophysiology or treatment of disease for publication in your individual APS journals.” Instructions to Authors for submission of such articles were developed (see: [www.the-aps.org/mm/Publications/Preparing-Your-Manuscript#pim](http://www.the-aps.org/mm/Publications/Preparing-Your-Manuscript#pim)).

Annual Reviews Award for Scientific Reviewing

The Annual Reviews Award for Scientific Reviewing was introduced in 2012. The Award is to be given for excellence in providing systematic, periodic examinations of scholarly advances, and provoking discussion that will lead to new research activity. The Award recognizes an APS member who has written scientific reviews and has helped provide an enhanced understanding of the area of physiology reviewed. The successful candidate, chosen by the Publications Committee, is awarded $2,000 and up to $2,000 reimbursement towards travel to attend the annual Experimental Biology meeting to receive the monetary award and a recognition plaque. The Publications Committee has requested the participation of the Editors in recommending candidates for this award going forward, as there has been a dearth of nominations in the first two years.

The 2014 Award recipient is Mordecai P. Blaustein, M.D., Professor of Physiology & Medicine, Director, Center for Heart, Hypertension and Kidney Disease, Department of Physiology at the University of Maryland School of Medicine. The 2013 Award recipient was Frank W. Booth, PhD, of the Department of Biomedical Sciences at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Finance

Subscription sales

In 2012, a tiered pricing model was implemented for journals and the Legacy Content. Tiers were assigned based on the value of the journal for the institution. The goal is to have a pricing variance of 10% between tiers 1, 2, and 3 by 2014. Online Only and Print and Online journal prices for 2013 were set at 0% increase for tier 1, 4% increase for tier 2, and 5% increase for tier 3 and the print-only price increased by 5%. Subscription count increase in 2013 was 5%.
Sales and Marketing
The APS continues to respond to requests from consortia of libraries or multi-site institutions, offering custom pricing for tiers 4 and 5 online subscriptions, if we are not losing subscription dollars by doing so. There were 1718 tier 4 and 5 subscription orders in 2013, and 181 unit sales of Legacy content, the latter, which is sold with a one-time price of $2500 for tier 1, $2705 for tier 2, and $2955 for tier 3. Based on the marketing consultants’ recommendations, which are consistent with our own views, the APS increased institutional sales representation in key territories identified as having growth potential. In 2012-13, APS issued a Request for Proposal for sales agency in Latin America and Europe and as a result, appointed a new agency to cover Europe, Africa and parts of the Mideast and consolidated our Brazil and Central America representation. APS also has sales agency representation in India and China.

E-mail blasts are sent to the APS author database and other lists on a quarterly basis promoting the journals. The journals are promoted at all meetings where APS has an exhibit booth. Marketing consults with the editors for best meetings to attend and behalf of each journal, and specialty meetings are attended where the relevant journals are featured.

The Marketing department filmed the APS Editors in Chief in “Meet the Editors” promotional videos. Several of these videos have been posted to YouTube and the remainder will be posted in coming week – see: http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLW3R7IwluzveOWwvBg1XjeX9Hl3leR3W

Open Access

AuthorChoice. The APS AuthorChoice program was introduced to all APS research journals in July 2007. For a fee of $2000 in addition to other author fees, an article is made freely available immediately and is uploaded by the APS on behalf of the author to PMC to meet funding requirements. We received 39 requests for this option in 2013 (31 requests in 2012 and 34 requests in 2011), which represents less than 1% of all accepted articles during each period. In 2013, 20 requests were from authors who were not required by their funding agencies to render the articles freely available prior to 12 months.

Patient Access. Since November 2005, the public can request articles through the Patient Access link on the journal home pages. An average of 1-2 requests per week have been received in 2013, the same as in the last several years.

NIH policy. At the beginning of 2008, the APS signed an Agreement with the National Library of Medicine (NLM) whereby the APS will deposit articles into PMC on behalf of authors, thus complying with funder policies such as those of the Wellcome Trust. In 2013, the APS updated its Agreement with the NLM to include Physiological Reviews and Physiology for deposits as of January 2013. PMC makes the full text of articles freely available 12 months after publication. The deposits commenced with materials published in July 2008. The Agreement with the NLM includes deposit into the UKPMC (now Europe PMC) archive only. Deposit into any other PMC archives developed requires the publisher to grant permission. The NIH Public Access Policy mandate became law in 2008 (see http://publicaccess.nih.gov/policy.htm).
University of California policy. The University of California announced its open access policy in a press release, which begins by asserting that:

Articles authored by faculty at all 10 campuses of UC will be made available to the public at no charge through eScholarship, UC’s central open-access repository—in tandem with their publication in scholarly journals. To protect the peer-review process, nearly every paper submitted to the repository will be under embargo, unless the author pays the journal publisher a processing fee.

And that

The policy covers more than 8,000 UC faculty...and as many as 40,000 publications a year. It follows more than 175 other universities who have adopted similar so-called "green" open access policies. By granting a license to the University of California prior to any contractual arrangement with publishers, faculty members can now make their research widely and publicly available, re-use it for various purposes, or modify it for future research publications. Previously, publishers had sole control of the distribution of these articles.

The policy commenced for some UC campuses on November 1, 2013 and there is variability with the terms of the UCSF prior policy.

The UC FAQs allow for authors to opt out entirely or on an article basis:

The policy allows Faculty members to opt out on a per-article basis. Faculty members may waive the open access license for each article permanently, or delay appearance of the article (embargo it) for a specified period. If for any reason, the scholar does not want to make the work publicly available, he or she simply needs to submit a waiver request, and automatically receive a waiver letter verifying this choice. Faculty can still choose to deposit the article in the repository if they wish, as long as the agreement signed with the publisher reserves that right.

A letter to Hershel Raff as Publications Committee Chair from L Farley (California Digital Library) and C Kelty (UC) dated 8/29/13 states that:

Under the Policy, articles are deposited in the University of California’s eScholarship repository, an open-access platform developed and maintained by the California Digital Library. The author’s final peer-reviewed manuscript (i.e., the version including all changes made as a result of the peer-review process, but prior to a publisher’s copy-editing or formatting) will be considered the default version for depositing in eScholarship; where the publisher allows, the final published version of the article will be deposited in place of the author’s final peer-reviewed manuscript. Whenever possible, the eScholarship repository will provide a link to the final published version of the article on the publisher’s web site.

The APS reply (from H Raff, M Frank and R Scheman dated 9/17/13) says:
UC tenured-track faculty who are authors of APS articles may deposit their accepted, peer-reviewed manuscripts in eScholarship, UC’s open access repository, as of November 1, 2013 providing:

- No NIH funding is declared in the article (whereby the embargo policy defaults to PMC)
- The APS retains copyright to the article (if not supported by author fees)
- UC will take responsibility for and remove from eScholarship [within 2 weeks of notification by the APS (undersigned) or coauthors] any manuscript accepted by the APS and deposited in eScholarship by a UC faculty member...
  - Who has not complied with the above provisions
  - Who has not reached agreement with coauthors regarding deposit

APS interpretation of specific points of the UC OA policy include that UC would abide by the embargo policy of PubMed Central as applies to the final manuscript deposited by APS in PMC on behalf of the NIH-funded author. In doing so, UC faculty may still deposit the accepted version of the manuscript in the UC e-repository but the content would not be publicly available until after the 12 month expiration of the embargo. That is, authors who are tenured UC faculty would request a waiver to comply with the stipulated APS embargo period. Regarding copyright, as the native copyright owner, it is the prerogative of UC Faculty authors to assign copyright to the APS.

APS received a response from UC in December 2013, which indicates a policy “preference” for no embargo period/leaving it up to the author; does not commit to providing full citations or links to the “publisher version”. This latter point ignores that the ‘publisher version” is the version of record, not just another version and may carry important corrections. APS continues to be in discussion with UC on these points.

**OA developments in 2013.** Legislation continues to be proposed in the US Congress and in Europe that promotes public access to publications resulting from federally funded research, often, without adequate consideration of the high level of resource and value added by publishers. Highlights of major initiatives during the year that affect 2012 developments are:

- **February 2013:** OSTP releases a six-page policy on public access, which “directs each federal agency with over $100 million in annual conduct of research and development expenditures to develop a plan (within six months) to support increased public access to the results of research funded by the Federal Government. This includes any results published in peer-reviewed scholarly publications that are based on research that directly arises from Federal funds, as defined in relevant OMB circulars (e.g., A-21 and A-11). It is preferred that agencies work together, where appropriate, to develop these plans”. Highlights of the plan include that agencies:
  - Shall use a 12 month post-publication embargo period as a guideline for making research papers publicly available
  - Encourage public-private collaboration to maximize the potential for interoperability between public and private platforms and creative reuse to enhance value to all stakeholders and avoid unnecessary duplication of existing mechanisms.

- **February 2013**: Launch of *PeerJ*, open access journal, focused on the biological and medical sciences, and introducing new membership style business model: If an author becomes a member at the time of submission the author receives the least expensive rates available (for example, $99 for the Basic plan – $99 per author). There are other plans – see [https://peerj.com/pricing](https://peerj.com/pricing).


- **June 2013**: CHORUS (Clearinghouse for Open Research for the United States [http://chorusaccess.org](http://chorusaccess.org)) is a response by a coalition of scholarly publishers to the policy memorandum from OSTP Director John Holdren that directs Federal agencies with more than $100M in R&D expenditures to “develop plans to make the published results of federally funded research freely available to the public within one year of publication and requiring researchers to better account for and manage the digital data resulting from federally funded scientific research. As of February 2014, CHORUS has 100 signatories that include the major publishers of STEM scholarly research, including university and not-for-profit presses, scholarly societies, commercial publishers, and service providers.

- **July 2013**: European Commission released a study on open access tipping point, reporting that the percentage of articles published in 2008 that are OA in 2013 is between 42-48%: [http://users.ecs.soton.ac.uk/harnad/Temp/ISSI-ARchambeault.pdf](http://users.ecs.soton.ac.uk/harnad/Temp/ISSI-ARchambeault.pdf). The study finds that the percentage of articles published in 2008 that are OA in 2013 is between 42-48%. Skepticism on the figures expressed from OA activists; see: [http://openaccess.eprints.org/index.php/?/archives/1022-OA-2013-.html](http://openaccess.eprints.org/index.php/?/archives/1022-OA-2013-).


Section 302 of the First Act discussion draft calls for: (excerpted from communication from GATF to members):

- The National Science and Technology Council to establish "policies, procedures, and standards...to enable archiving and retrieving" of peer-reviewed articles and data that result from research funded by a Federal Science agency "in digital form for public availability in perpetuity."

- Free public access to be provided "not later than 24 months after publication of the research article" and agencies "may extend the time period... by 6 to 12 months, in consultation with the stakeholders" if the scientific field and stakeholders would be "uniquely harmed without such extension."
• Funding agencies to "provide for...a searchable archive for long-term preservation and productive use [not defined] of covered material," but are otherwise allowed to link to articles rather than establish a repository to enable access.

• Libraries, universities and OA advocates have criticized the embargo length and reuse terms; see: http://www.aau.edu/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=14863 and http://www.congressweb.com/SPARC/22.

• November 2013: “Journal Usage Half-Life Study” http://www.publisher.org/_attachments/docs/journalusagehalflife.pdf indicated that just 3% of journals had half-lives shorter than 12 months”, the maximum embargo period required by NIH for deposit into PubMed Central. Usage half-life is defined as “the median age of articles downloaded from a publisher’s website. The study was commissioned by the American Association of Publishers and the APS contributed data to the study. Criticisms of the study have a political take; see: http://blogs.library.duke.edu/scholcomm/2014/01/15/half-lives-policies-and-embargoes/ and http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2014/01/14/suber-embargoes-on-publicly-funded-research.

• November 2013: Text and data mining has become central to open access. A statement was issued by STM publishers regarding guidelines and terms for such reuse; see: http://www.stm-assoc.org/2013_11_11_Text_and_Data_Mining_Declaration.pdf A fledgling effort that was received well by the European Commission; see: http://www.stm-assoc.org/2013_11_15_News_Release_European_Commissioners_endorse_STMs_text_and_data_mining_initiatives.pdf.

Reviewer CME AJP-Endo

The APS implemented a pilot program in 2013 offering CME credit to US-based physician reviewers for manuscript reviewing services for AJP-Endo. The APS is partnering on the initiative with The Endocrine Society (TES), which is administering the CME on its behalf. TES has a full CME program for their journals of which administering reviewer CME is a small component; administering CME on behalf of another organization is a new initiative for the TES. An eligible reviewer (US physician) may request to participate and may be awarded 3 AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™ per review, and may claim up to 15 AMA PRA Category 1 Credits™ per year within the American Medical Association Physician Recognition Award (AMA PRA) system. Of the 19 eligible AJP-Endo reviewers, 15 reviewers participated who successfully completed reviewing 19 manuscripts for CME credit.

Our journal submission system, EJ Press, had an existing setup for this activity, which APS customized. The suggestion for rewarding reviewers with CME came from Chuck Lang, EIC of AJP-Endo. The program may be rolled out more broadly to other APS journals that have a reasonable cohort of physician reviewers. See: www.the-aps.org/mm/Publications/CME. However, the APS is seeking another vendor to administer the reviewer CME, as TES has decided that it is not within their mission to administer for non-endocrinology journals.

APSselect

APSselect (http://apsselect.physiology.org/) launched January 2014. APSselect is a monthly collection of high impact original research papers selected by the APS Editors in Chief and subsequently, by an APS
Selection Committee. APSselect originated with a proposal by Joe Metzger to create a virtual journal, highlighting and promoting the top APS original research papers that are published each month across all 10 APS original research journals. The initiative was approved by the Publications Committee at its March 2013 meeting and subsequently by Council at its summer 2013 meeting.

**Selection process.** The process starts with recommendations for consideration by the Editor-in-Chief who nominates two articles for consideration by the Selection Committee, the final arbiter. The Publications Committee plus Christina Bennett comprises the Selection Committee, headed by Joe Metzger (EIC) and Linda Samuelsson (AE):

- Associate Editors recommend articles to the Editors in Chief within the submissions system at the time of acceptance, who in turn, choose and nominate two articles for the Selection Committee.
- A 10-point rating system, similar to that of NIH grant peer review is used by each member of the Selection Committee (1= first choice; 10=last choice) which will be auto-tabulated
- Articles nominated must be the final published version
- An APS staff coordinator, Bonnie Bright, manages the process: to facilitate the nomination and selection processes, to ensure final-published version control

A certificate is awarded to the authors of each selected article. After approximately six months of live operation, the Selection Committee process will be evaluated by the Selection Committee to ensure that outcomes demonstrate good discipline distribution and timeliness.

**Comprehensive Physiology**

The first issue of *Comprehensive Physiology* ([www.comprehensivephysiology.com](http://www.comprehensivephysiology.com)) was published in January 2011 and included the complete latest edition of the printed Handbook, digitized as (“Classic Content”) and 25 new articles. The contract for publication of the work was signed in January 2009 with Wiley-Blackwell, now Wiley.

*Comprehensive Physiology*, edited by David M. Pollock, is published as a quarterly journal. As of December 2013, 654 articles have been invited, of which 240 have been accepted, 33 are in review or revision, and 220 have been published. The invited articles are from 11 of the 13 sections, covering 17 topics; “topics” correspond to a volume of the published, printed Handbook. Details of invited, accepted, and published articles are as follows:

The Editorial Advisory Board was originally composed of the Book Advisory Committee that was in place at the time, and has since been expanded as necessary to cover topics, with Ron Terjung, Chair of that Committee, appointed as the first Editor-in-Chief. He served in that role through June 2013. David Pollock became Editor-in-Chief in July 2013.

The Journal has been accepted in all of the major Abstract and Indexing services including Scopus, PubMed and TSRI (formerly ISI). In February 2013, the Journal was notified that beginning with Volume 1, Issue 1, it will be indexed and abstracted in Science Citation Index Expanded (also known as SciSearch®); Journal Citation Reports/Science Edition; BIOSIS Previews; BIOSIS Reviews Reports and
Meetings. *Comprehensive Physiology* received a “preliminary” Impact Factor (based on one year instead of two) of 0.807 in June 2013. Its first real Impact Factor should be released summer 2013. Although the Journal was accepted into PubMed in 2012, indexing did not begin until July 2013.

Marketing efforts have been implemented by Wiley in conjunction with the APS, including a gap analysis of APS-Wiley library customer and mailing to those APS customers that do not subscribe to the Journal. From April 2014-March 2015, *Comprehensive Physiology* is freely available again to the APS membership. It was freely available at launch in 2011, and now there is significantly more new content. The effort will be assessed at the end of the trial.

**Book Monograph Series**

In June 2011, The APS and Springer signed an agreement for Springer to publish books in its monograph series on behalf of the APS. These series are: Perspectives in Physiology, Methods in Physiology, Physiology in Health and Disease. As part of the Agreement, 33 backlist monograph titles have been digitized and are now freely available to APS Members – see: [http://www.the-aps.org/mm/Publications/Books](http://www.the-aps.org/mm/Publications/Books). The books are hosted on the Springer website and can be downloaded as a PDF or viewed in the reader’s browser.

The first book, “The Rise of Fetal and Neonatal Physiology” by Lawrence D. Longo was published in September 2013. Manuscripts accepted for publication are: “Mechanism of Muscular Contraction: Evolution of Ideas Since the Discovery of Sliding Filaments”, by Jack Rall (Perspectives series); “Development of Aviation Physiology During and After World War II”, by Jay Dean (Perspectives series); “History of Thermal Physiology”, by Clark Blatteis and Jack Boulay (Perspectives series); Role of the Circadian Clock in Health and Disease, by Michelle L. Gumz (Physiology in Health and Disease series) and “Essays on the History of Respiratory Physiology”, by John West (Perspectives Series). Other key elements of the Agreement are:

All new titles are published in print and electronic format as part of Springer’s “Physiology eBook Collection.”

- All ebooks published in the program - both new and backlist titles - are freely available to APS members via login at the APS website.
- The print version of each new title published under the Agreement is available to APS members at the special price of $40.

**Book Committee.** The Book Committee solicits and develops book projects. Sources of topics and authors include EB and other symposia and articles in physiology that may be appropriate for expansion. Current members of the Book Committee: Dee Silverthorn (Chair); John West, UCSD; William H. Dantzler; Penelope Hansen; Robert L. Hester, UMC; Michael G. Levitsky, LSU; Gary C. Sieck, Mayo.
The Physiologist redesigned

The APS newsletter, The Physiologist, was redesigned to update the format and to print in full color. The redesign was launched with the January 2014 issue.

Physiological Reports

Background. Physiological Reports is a general physiology open access journal published in collaboration with The Physiological Society. To fulfill a directive of APS Council, a subcommittee was formed to develop the concept of an online-only open access journal in the field of general physiology. The Journal is tasked to achieve a quick time to publication while upholding a quality standard of sound research that constitutes a useful contribution to the field. In December 2012, the Societies signed a Memorandum of Understanding for joint ownership and collaboration to publish Physiological Reports. A statement was released by the Societies announcing Physiological Reports and setting forth these principles – see: www.the-aps.org/mm/Publications/Journals/Physiological-Reports.

It was agreed to use a “cascading peer review model,” whereby manuscripts considered unsuitable for publication in an APS/TPS journal, but yet deemed to be of publishable value, are “referred” to Physiological Reports, with author agreement –“transfer”. Peer review for de novo submissions is comparable to that for the APS journals, and manuscripts transferred from APS journals to Physiological Reports should require no more than minor revisions, which the author must subsequently address. The Societies subsequently signed an Agreement with Wiley for the publication of the Journal on behalf of the Societies. See the press release at: www.the-aps.org/mm/hp/Audiences/Public-Press/For-the-Press/releases/12/43.html.

Susan Wray, University of Liverpool, is Editor-in-Chief and Thomas Kleyman, University of Pittsburgh, Deputy Editor-in-Chief. Associate Editors are Mrinalini (Meena) C. Rao, University of Illinois at Chicago; Julian RE Davis, University of Manchester; Larissa A. Shimoda, John Hopkins University; Gareth Leng, University of Edinburgh. The Editorial Board comprises 103 members, with plans to have 200+ members. Journal oversight is by a Joint Managing Board, composed of representatives of the leadership from both societies and staff serving ex officio.

Physiological Reports is funded by levying an author processing charge (APC) of $1,500 to be paid by the author upon acceptance. This fee is competitive with the mega journal PLOS 1, which has been the target competitor during development of Physiological Reports and which charges $1,350. There are waivers in place for submissions from countries that cannot afford the fees. As a submission incentive, the first 100 manuscripts accepted were free to the authors. Secondary revenue sources include advertising.

Current Status of Physiological Reports. Physiological Reports launched in March 2013. The first article appeared online in May 2013, and the first issue was compiled in June 2013. Since then, issues have been compiled monthly (at the end of the month). As of January 1, 2014, 178 articles have been
published. The cascading peer review model accounts for ~67% of the total submissions, with ~73% of these articles being accepted for publication (see 2013 cumulative breakdown in table below).

**Physiological Reports publishing statistics (cumulative through May 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referrals (with/without reviews)</td>
<td>70 (69/20)</td>
<td>40 (24/16)</td>
<td>35 (21/14)</td>
<td>108 (94/14)</td>
<td>30 (29/1)</td>
<td>91 (81/10)</td>
<td>79 (69/10)</td>
<td>232 (216/16)</td>
<td>19 (16/3)</td>
<td>166 (152/14)</td>
<td>235 (213/23)</td>
<td>71 (65/6)</td>
<td>306 (281/25)</td>
<td>1074 (985/269)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage transferred</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer acceptance rate</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct submissions</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total submissions</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall acceptance rate</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted/rejected</td>
<td>324/66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published articles</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. time to first decision</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. time from accept to publication</td>
<td>35 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average time to first decision is 10 days; the average time from acceptance to publication is 35 working days. Efforts are being made to shorten this time to meet the original target of 17 working days.

**NIH and NAS hosts meeting on journal role in reproducibility of research attended by APS**

**Experimental Reproducibility Discussions - What can be done to increase experimental reproducibility?**

On June 2, 2014, NIH/AAAS hosted a workshop, for journal publishers and NIH leadership, on the topic of experimental reproducibility. The discussion focused on finding ways for journals to better guarantee that the results published in pre-clinical studies are reliable and ultimately reproducible. However, the recurring question raised at the meeting was: Can journals really ensure reproducibility of research? And the answer to this question was “no”. However, it was agreed that journals could take steps to help ensure that 1) the methodology reported in manuscripts contains more information about how the experiments were performed (randomized, blinded, repeated, etc.) and 2) that the results could be vetted more closely (statistics, sample numbers, interpretations, etc.). One of the key initiatives of the meeting was for the journals to comment on a document called “Proposed Principles and Guidelines for Reproducible Science,” which aims to set a community standard for publishing pre-clinical studies. It was noted that each journal is different and any set of guidelines developed would not fit all journals but they hoped that each journal could support the principles in some way. The APS was invited to send one representative to this meeting. Christina Bennett attended.
On June 4 and 5, 2014, the National Academy of Sciences hosted a roundtable discussion entitled, “The Missing “R”: Reproducibility in a Changing Research Landscape”. The attendees were quite diverse in interests and perspectives, making the discussions quite interesting. It was made clear that the ARRIVE guidelines, which were designed to help authors improve reporting of animals studies, have not worked. It was suggested that the guidelines for the 3R’s (Replacement, Reduction, and Refinement) may have worked against the best interests of the community by allowing authors to run experiments that are not powered for proper statistical analysis and interpretation. What can be done to improve the results from animal-based research? Some answers were: more education of trainees and investigators on proper experimental design, Journals could enforce higher standards of reporting, data should be stored in repositories, pre-clinical studies should be registered (like clinical trials are registered), and IACUCs could better review studies. There was no clear conclusion or directive from this discussion. For more information about the topics presented at the meeting visit: [http://nas-sites.org/ilar-roundtable/files/2014/03/Formatted-Agenda-FINAL1.pdf](http://nas-sites.org/ilar-roundtable/files/2014/03/Formatted-Agenda-FINAL1.pdf) Christina Bennett and Alice Ra'anan were in attendance.

Publications Committee Meeting Discussion/Decisions, April 2, 2014

**APSselect**

The APSselect process, which launched January 2014, was discussed, as were the comments from the Editors in Chief at the EIC-PC meeting. Editors’ comments include:

- All journals should be represented each month in the selections
- EIC rankings are based on the science that they know
- APSselect should also include review articles
- APSSelect should include Physiological Reports
- Reviewing for rankings should be made by simply reading the abstract and introduction

The Committee reiterated its intention to review the process after six months for overall operational workability and subject matter distribution. Another challenge identified was the participation of the Selection Committee members in each voting session, as timing is very tight. It was suggested to increase the membership of the Selection Committee, which will be considered further but not yet implemented. It was agreed that the download data for articles featured in APS select, as gathered by APS and presented by Joe Metzger at the EIC-PC meeting (see chart below) is a good metric to support assessment of the initiative.
On average, users coming from APSselect accounted for 42-43% of traffic for promoted articles. Of the 12 articles promoted Jan – March 2014, 8 were ranked #1 for hits among the other articles published in their respective issues during the month after promotion on APSselect.

**Office expense equitability for original research journals**

The Editors in Chief and Associate Editors of most of the original research journals receive reimbursable compensation for their office expense. Over the past few years, Hershel Raff and Rita Scheman have worked to make reimbursable funds equitable across the original research journals and to smooth out the most extreme existing discrepancies. However, some discrepancies remain, which, to be fair, it is proposed these should be addressed by the Publications Committee, the goal of which is to equitably reallocate the current amount of spend across the journals.

The number of Associate editors appointed for each original research journal is based on manuscript submissions; that is, each AE is expected to manage up to 100 manuscripts in the peer review process. Therefore each AE handles theoretically an equivalent amount of work regardless of the total number of manuscripts submitted to each journal. Having said this, the APS has been flexible in agreeing to additional AEs if an EIC will make a case for it; usually because a specialty area is underrepresented. Consequently, AEs may manage far fewer than 100 mss/year - none manage more.

EIC central office expense is not specifically rooted in a metric, and varies (historic). There is a general rule of thumb that the total office expense (excluding computer expense) should not exceed $150/manuscript, and this holds true. (Not addressed here: Editorial assistant compensation, which varies by the size of the journal and by regional requirements, and honoraria, paid directly to the Editors.

**Recommendations:**

1. For AEs: The average reimbursable for standard office expense (i.e., phone, internet office supplies) per AE is based on equitable allocation and is approximately $1700. The recommendation is to round up to $1800 per AE.

2. For EICs: Allocate central office reimbursable expense for standard office expense (i.e., phone, internet, office supplies) on a per manuscript basis for submissions, which results in $12.00 per manuscript. Also recommended is for the minimum EIC office reimbursable expense to be no less than $5,000.
Decision: Approved; to be implemented for the 2015 budget

Assessment of Journals “fungibles” initiative: guidelines for repurposing reimbursable office expense (updated July 2, 2014)

Background. At the March 2012 Publications Committee meeting (and subsequently revised by the Publications Committee in 2013), the Committee decided to extend uses for existing reimbursable expense for editors and associate editors to a short list of items for a two-year trial to be re-evaluated in 2014. Prior to this, expense reimbursements were limited to office expense; i.e., phone, internet and supplies directly related to the journals. Goals of the EICs and the Committee focused on increasing the visibility of the journals and enabling editors to attend EB and the editorial meetings held there.

Summary of how this trial initiative worked in practice. Mostly, editors worked within the guidelines. Of journals with reimbursable funding, four editors did not repurpose funds at all. In 2013 and 2014 respectively, 18% and 24% respectively of reimbursable expense funding were used for fungible initiatives. Some editors wanted to use the funds differently and for purposes other than what had been agreed extending beyond the bounds of the Guidelines for many initiatives, including making arrangements for these initiatives prior to formal approval.

Further instructions will be included to the Editors in Chief in a final revised Guidelines document for the reallocation of existing office expense.

Publications Committee decision June 2014

The Publications Committee determined that the fundamental activities and spirit of the repurposing of office expense initiative partially achieved its goal of benefitting the Journals and the Society, and therefore should continue with modifications for another two years (2015-16 budget years) as described below. The initiative will be assessed again by the Committee at its March 2016 meeting. The process for fungible initiatives remains essentially the same: All initiatives must conform to the new guidelines, be submitted at budgeting time (September) with outcomes submitted with the reimbursement requests.

After careful consideration of the initiatives taken/requested by Journals in 2012-14, the Committee supports the use of funding only for the following activities for 2015-16 and to be evaluated in 2016:

1. Sponsor one young investigator award ($500) per journal for the best original research paper published in the journal during the prior year.

---

1. Partial support for travel to and lodging at the Experimental Biology and other meetings relevant to your journal.
2. Support/sponsor a symposium at EB, in conjunction with the Program Committee, or at other meetings relevant to your journal, from which articles will be invited for submission to your journal.
3. Sponsor a young investigator award ($500) presented at EB for the best paper published in your journal during the prior year.
The selection should be documented in minutes of a conference call or electronic ballot among AEs and submitted with the funding request. No awards will be given by journals for best abstract at EB (or elsewhere), which is within the purview of the Awards Committee or SAC.

2. Partial support for each EIC and AE of up to $1,500 total for travel to and lodging at the Experimental Biology and other APS sponsored meetings. (These funds cannot be used for travel to a non-APS sponsored meeting.)

3. Each journal can support **one** symposium per year, the goal of which is to generate manuscript submissions for the sponsoring journal.

   The committee felt strongly that there must be a motivated EIC, AE, or designee responsible for achieving this goal. The EIC is responsible for proposing the symposia for sponsorship as described below, and for soliciting speakers, organizing the symposium, and ensuring that the manuscripts are submitted, or may designate a guest editor to do so. EICs may not solicit use of AEs funds to support a symposium. Two types of symposia were defined by the Publications Committee:

   **A. Support a symposium at the EB meeting:**
   a) Speakers should be advised with the invitation that manuscripts based on presentations for symposia sponsored by an APS journal and funded by APS (whether by a journal or a Section), should be submitted to the Journal for peer review at the time of speaker reimbursement. Further instructions to the Editors will be included in revised Guidelines for the reallocation of existing office expense document.
   b) The meeting program must recognize the support/sponsorship of the Journal
   c) Steps for Proposing/Funding a Symposium at EB:
      (a) APS Section-sponsored symposia are developed in collaboration between the journal EIC/AEs and the appropriate section representative. Proposals are submitted to the APS Section for approval. Sponsored in name only by the journal, the symposium is funded by APS central funds just like any other symposium (up to $4000, including registration). EIC/AEs must contact the appropriate APS Section for submission deadline date which will generally be in late winter the year prior to the meeting at which the symposium would be held.
      (b) Cross-sectional symposia are submitted by the EIC/AEs to the Joint Program Committee for approval. Instructions, forms and deadline date can be obtained at: [http://www.the-aps.org/mm/Conferences/EB](http://www.the-aps.org/mm/Conferences/EB). Successful submissions are funded by the APS at $4,000 per session plus complimentary registration for invited speakers and chairs.
      (c) If Step a or b is not successful, the Symposium will be routed from the JPC back to the APS Publications Committee for consideration in consultation with the JPC. If the Publications Committee endorses the symposium, the proposal is resubmitted to the JPC by the EIC and can be programmed by the JPC, subject to room availability. The symposium will be funded through the EIC’s central journal budget – speaker registration fees are not complimentary. Proposals to the JPC are due May prior year.

   **B. Support a symposium at a related-discipline meeting:**
1. Before any commitments are made, the concept and symposium title must be submitted to the Publications Committee for approval (submitted through the Director of Publications and Publications Chair).
2. Organization of symposia will be managed through the EIC office.
3. Funds may not be used to support Editor travel to the meeting.
4. Speakers at symposia funded by an APS Journal should be advised with the invitation that manuscripts based on their presentations should be submitted to the sponsoring APS journal for peer review at the time of speaker reimbursement. Further instructions to the Editors will be included in revised Guidelines document for the reallocation of existing office expense.

General Comments about all reimbursable journal funds

1. Editors who do not use any or all of their reimbursable office expense budget for the above reallocations may use the reimbursable funds for office expenses

2. EICs may not solicit contributions or re-budget from AE-designated budgets for these fungible initiatives. If AEs do not use the funds budgeted specifically for AEs for approved expenses directly related to the journal, then these funds will not be used. The funds are not a grant but intended only for essential journal expense.

2015 journals subscription pricing

Background
In 2012, the APS created a cost effective way for our institutional customers to purchase the entirety of our journal content, and established the “Journals Digital Library”. The pricing structure for the Journals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print + Online</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual and Member increases at 2% across the board. Legacy content follows Tier 3 pricing.

Decision: Approved by Publications Committee, with recommendation to consider multi-year online pricing offer to libraries in future, and subsequently approved by Council in April.

Vice Chair role from 2015

Background
The Vice Chair of Publications role was developed to overlap with a new Publications Chair for two years to help transition the Chair in publications ethics matters. The role was carried out by Kim Barrett for two years when Hershel Raff assumed the Publications Chair in 2011. The Vice Chair role was created prior to the hire of the Publications Ethics Manager now held by Christina Bennett. With the role of the
Publications Ethics Manager firmly in place with Christina Bennett, Hershel Raff queried the Committee as to whether the Vice Chair role is still useful.

**Decision:** The Publications Committee wishes to continue the role of the Publications Chair serving as Vice Chair for two years following his/her four year term to support the new Publications Chair in matters of publications ethics.

**Review of sanctions policy**

**Query to Publications Committee: Should the ethics procedure for addressing serious unethical conduct, via sanctions, be updated or revised?**

**Background**
The APS Publications Department has established a number of proactive practices to reduce the number of manuscripts published with ethics issues. In particular, the Art Department now reviews all digital images in accepted manuscripts for manipulation prior to publication and the Peer Review Department now screens all review articles in all APS journals for plagiarism prior to peer review. In 2013, 87% of all ethics issues were identified prior to publication. Six out of the 7 cases that were referred to the Publications Committee for sanctions discussion involved manuscripts that were either rejected, or their acceptances rescinded, due to ethics issues.

For ethics cases in which authors are determined to be in serious violation of APS ethics policy, the Publications Committee is tasked to review the matter and determine whether sanctions should be imposed. Sanctions include prohibition from serving as an author in, or a reviewer for, APS journals for a period of time and/or notifying the academic institution(s). Concerns have been raised by APS staff, Publications Committee members, as well as journal editors regarding whether it is still necessary for, and of benefit to, APS to impose sanctions on authors.

There are currently 76 authors under sanctions. Twenty-eight were sanctioned in 2013 and 38 were sanctioned in 2012.

The concerns raised in regard to the current process are:

1. The Publications Committee must reach a decision for all authors based upon best efforts by APS to obtain accurate and comprehensive information.
2. All authors may be sanctioned when it is not clear who was responsible for the violation following APS policy that all authors are responsible for the work.
3. Sanctions are confidential within APS and may not have the desired effect on the author; rather it is likely that the process is punitive to APS submissions and strains our relationship with authors.

**Proposed change:**

The following changes to the sanctions process are suggested:
1) Remove the option for the Publications Committee to sanction authors by prohibiting future submissions to, or serving as a reviewer for, APS journals.

2) Maintain the option for Publications Committee to levy sanctions on authors by informing the authors’ institution(s) as is recommended by COPE (http://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts). This way, authors with a pattern of misconduct may be identified and addressed by local bodies.
   a. If the Publications Committee agrees not to inform the authors’ institution(s), authors will receive a letter of reprimand.
   b. If the Publications Committee agrees to inform the authors’ institution(s), the authors will be notified of the decision. APS will contact the institution and inform them of the violation.

**Decision:** The Publications Committee decided to leave the sanctions policy as is.

**Proposal:** Formally agree to allow an Editor in Chief to serve three terms for *Physiological Reviews*.

**Decision:** The Publications Committee ruled to formally establish that an Editor in Chief of *Physiological Reviews* may serve up to three terms, assuming positive evaluations. This was decided for the following reasons:

- *Physiological Reviews* publishes extremely long articles, which often are years in review. A third term establishes equivalent continuity in this regard to other journals
- There is precedent for serving three terms for the previous two Editors in Chief of the Journal.

**Editor in Chief Proposals**

1. **Irv Zucker, EIC, AJP-Heart**
   Request to eliminate submission fees

**Decision:** Tabled. The Committee requests a more detailed justification, regarding negative and positive impact and examples from other journals that do not have submission fees.

2. **Irv Zucker, EIC, AJP-Heart**
   **Proposal:** Request greater flexibility in the APS policies on repurposing editorial office budget funds for exhibiting journal at key meetings (funds would cover travel for journal staffer and exhibit space fees)

**Decision:** The Committee decided against the proposal for the following reasons:

- The APS Marketing Department manages and establishes funds for exhibits and exhibits staffing.
- The APS Marketing Department consults with all EICs prior to establishing a meetings schedule for the following year and in consultation with the Publications Department, sets the schedule
- The Editors’ assistants are, on occasion, invited by Marketing to staff a meeting that is funded centrally by Marketing

3. **Irv Zucker, EIC, AJP-Heart**
   **Proposal:** Name AJP-Heart and Circ the official journal of the Cardiovascular Section, promote and market this on all marketing materials and in banner ads on journal web site
**Decision:** The Committee decided against the proposal, because *AJP-Heart*, like other AJP titles, draws on more than one APS Section and so tying the Journal exclusively to one Section would be limiting and may send the wrong message to other sections. Similarly, such an affiliation may also appear limiting to nonmember authors, who view *AJP-Heart* as a part of the flagship journal of the entire Society.

4. **Paul Insel, EIC, AJP-Cell**

**Proposal:** All Editorial Focus articles should be immediately and freely available

I would like to (again) ask the Pubs Committee to recommend that ALL Editorial Focus (EF) articles (in *AJP-Cell* and other AJP’s) be made **immediately** available (open access) to readers.

EFs represent a form of "advertising"--probably much more effective for scientists than other such efforts currently being used. EFs encourage readers to examine the "target article", to be aware of the sort of content that the Editors find worthy of publication and highlighting, and should stimulate citations. The previous rejection of this idea by the Pubs committee is thus baffling to me, the Associate Editors of *AJP-Cell*, and other colleagues with whom I have spoken. The financial cost for these short (<1000 word/1 figure) News and Views-type editorial should be minimal and the rewards should be large--thus a high "return on investment".

**Decision:** The Committee supported the proposal for Editorial Focus articles to be made immediately and freely available online.

5. **Rick Samson, EIC, AJP-Regu**

**Proposal:** Mechanism to identify previous reviewers on a manuscript

Is there a way that we can tell if a manuscript we receive has been reviewed already at another AJP journal? If so, can we identify the previous reviewers so we can avoid them ignoring our requests to review or having them send back a "huffy" email stating that they have reviewed the manuscript already?

**Decision:** The Committee does not support that it is warranted to identify previous reviewers of a manuscript previously submitted to another (APS) journal for the following reasons:

- It is not necessarily possible to identify a resubmitted manuscript, whose title, content and authorship may have been changed
- There is an inherent potential conflict of interest in disclosing reviewers outside of the review process
- Scientists often get requests to review manuscripts that were previously reviewed for other journals. It is often justified to have the manuscript reviewed by a previous reviewer.

6. **Sadis Matalon, EIC, AJP-Lung**

**Proposal:** "Your Paper Your Way" submission model (found at: [http://www.elsevier.com/connect/your-paper-your-way](http://www.elsevier.com/connect/your-paper-your-way)).

Please see this story below on "Your paper, your way". I came across it when submitting an article in *Free Radical in Biology and Medicine*. The good thing about this is that it allows authors to submit articles rejected by a higher impact journal without changing the style. Of course the papers have to be
reformatted to a uniform format once accepted. However by that time the authors are so happy they simply do not care. When submitting my paper to FRBM I embedded the figures and legends in the text which makes it immensely easier to review and when published (hopefully) in Articles In Press much easier to read and cite. Is there any interest in APS adapting the “Your paper, your way” style? If so I can bring it up for discussion during the Editors meeting in the spring.

**Decision:** The Publications Committee decided against this proposal for the following reasons:

- Existing flexibility for authors who already have the option to submit a contiguous PDF
- Author revision of the format at revision is not an improvement in the process, as it would cause delay to final decision and publication. This metric is a very important one, and it is not wise to add the inevitable delay resulting from the author reformatting the entire manuscript.
- Potential difficulty for reviewers in confirming the paper is the same paper, particularly since we ask for a redlined version on revision. If the entire paper were reformatted, the entire paper would be redlined therefore defeating the purpose of redlining.
- Difficulty/delay in confirming at first submission that the revised paper is complete when elements are in nonstandard order. For example, some journals put the Methods section at the end and others (e.g., PNAS) have most of the Methods as a supplement.
- Figures must be of acceptable quality at first submission for the reviewers, which means that figures may need to be submitted separately.