

EASE-Forum Digest: September to December 2017

You can join the forum by sending the one-line message "subscribe ease-forum" (without the quotation marks) to majordomo@helsinki.fi. Send in plain text, not HTML. Details at www.ease.org.uk/node/589.

Should reference lists include online first and final print information?

Sylwia Ufnalska asked if the ahead-of-print date needs to be given in a reference list or the date of publication was sufficient. The question brought out a number of different opinions. Andrew Davis had never seen the date of first availability being given in addition to the print date while Magda Luz as a reader would appreciate the complete information, ie details of printed publication and the electronic version prior to printing, but thought citation of the print publication should be enough to retrieve the item of interest.

Foppe van Mil was of the view that once an article appeared in a paginated issue of a journal, the date of first publishing ahead of print, as well as the DOI, were no longer required. In his journal, as with many others, the date of acceptance of the manuscript is stated in the printed article, which he considered should be the publishing date. Indeed, Andrew Davis said many people were of the opinion that being available online in advance of printing on paper was not even publishing.

Pippa Smart suggested authors cite articles as at the time they accessed them. In the case of her journal this could either be the citation automatically-generated for an article "ahead of print" such as "Hartley, J. (2017), Some observations on the current state of book reviewing in the social sciences. *Learned Publishing*. doi:10.1002/leap.1115" or the citation that automatically replaced it once the article went into an issue, ie in her example "Hartley, J. (2018), Some observations on the current state of book reviewing in the social sciences. *Learned Publishing*. 30(1), 1-9. doi:10.1002/leap.1115." By contrast, Karen Shashok considered authors should check when the manuscript is revised after review or published after acceptance to see if a reference cited as online ahead of print had been published in print. If such final bibliographic information is available it should replace the online ahead citation.

She also emphasized that the interval between the online date and final print publication ahead can be very long and on the assumption one of the functions of references is to establish priority for the authors, the date of online ahead of print publication certainly needed to be given in the reference list when an article was first submitted to a journal. She referred to cases where the interval had been as much as 2-3 years, citing a posting by Elizabeth Gadd on the London School of Economics and Political Science Impact blog.

James Hartley, who has explained the variety of referencing systems in an article in *ESE*, lamented people have been arguing for a more consistent approach for years but different journals still have different rules.

Defining the period of editorial board service

Eva Baranyiová asked what the forum thought about a publishing house stipulating members of the editorial boards' term "begins with their nomination ...and ends by their resignation or by decision of the Academy." Both Duncan Nicholas and Pippa Smart thought the way in which the term was to end needed to be more precise and suggested that it should run for a specified period. Duncan said 2-3 years was the common. He also thought it should be possible for both the academy and board member to review the position at the end of the term with a provision for the board members to renew their term for another two years if they wished to continue. Furthermore, the "decision of the Academy" should be clarified. For instance, it could be based on the board member's failure to contribute or engage with the journal in a productive way, with the level of contribution defined numerically. Another example of the basis for a decision to terminate might be that a board member breached a code of conduct or ethical standards the academy endorsed, but again the expectations and standards required would need to be made completely clear. Finally, members should be allowed to resign when their circumstances changed.

Pippa suggested a redraft along the lines that their term begins with their nomination by the academy and continues for five years, to be extended on agreement of the academy and the editorial board member, or terminated at any point by either party by giving at least six months' notice. Foppe van Mil explained editorial board members were selected by his journal from its frequent reviewers based on their performance over the previous 3 years. Reviewers' with the best expertise and dedication were invited to join the board for three years.

Using the same word for the same thing

Are the words "instrumentation" and "construct" (or "constructs") interchangeable in the context of surgery for scoliosis? Michael Altus wanted to know. He was editing a manuscript and preferred to use one word for consistency and clarity rather than varying the words used, which alas is a practice common among authors from non-native English speaking countries. However, Ana Marušić, who has worked in anatomy and orthopaedics, thought Michael's two words did not have the same meaning. Instrumentation was a more general term. Different constructs can be used as instrumentation for orthopaedic surgeries. She suggested looking at an article at <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24732847> as an example.

Elise Langdon-Neuner (compiler)

a.a.neuner@gmail.com

Discussion initiators

Sylwia Ufnalska: sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com

Eva Baranyiová: ebaranyi@seznam.cz

Michael Altus: altus@intensivecarecomm.com