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00:00:41.730 --> 00:01:00.570

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Hello again everyone, my name is Thomas Tomoyuki Suzuki. I'm a publisher leading the society general publishing team in Tokyo, and I'm delighted to introduce our final session here at the first ever virtual Japan Wiley Society Research Seminar.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Before we begin, the presentation will be delivered in English with simultaneous interpretation into Japanese, and you can select you preferred language by going to the interpretation option in the menu at the bottom of your screen.

00:01:20.280 --> 00:01:27.480

[Japanese speech]

Tomoyuki Suzuki: All attendees are muted, so please submit your questions for the speaker by typing into the Q & A button at the bottom of your screen.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: If you have any technical issues, please let us know, through the chat feature, and we will do our best to assist you.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: The presentation is being recorded, and we will share the link for the recorded video with you as soon as it's available following the session.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Our speaker today is Steven Ottogalli, who is an Associate Editorial Director at Wiley.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Otto has worked in the scientific, technical, and medical publishing industry for 20 years, including with Elsevier and Nature Publishing Group, where he managed the portfolio of society of biomedical journals publishing clinical and basic research.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Otto works very closely with our local team here in Tokyo, and we are really pleased that he's able to join us today to talk about innovation in publishing.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: In the first day of the seminar, we heard a lot about innovation from the perspective of research integrity and how all of the stakeholders in research have a role to play.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: There is also a lot of innovation happening at Wiley in the actual systems and workflows we use in the publishing process.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: These innovations not only make publishing workflow better for everyone, they also make sure that we have a strong resilient publishing infrastructure for communicating high-quality research now and in the future.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: We will have plenty of time for questions after the presentation, so please submit your questions or Otto as we go along.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: So please join me in welcoming Otto.

00:03:50.670 --> 00:03:51.870

Steven Ottogalli: Great, thank you Tomo.

Steven Ottogalli: Just sharing my screen.

Steven Ottogalli: Can you see it okay?

Steven Ottogalli: Great.

Steven Ottogalli: Thank you Tomo for the introduction, and hello everyone, it's a pleasure to be here with you today at the Wiley Research Seminar. I hope you had an opportunity to attend and enjoy Chris Graf’s presentation last week and that we’ll have a chance to meet at a seminar in person again someday.

Steven Ottogalli: In the meantime, it's so important to stay connected, so we really appreciate your time with us virtually this week.

Steven Ottogalli: I'm going to spend the next half hour or so sharing with you some of the critical investments we are making at Wiley along with our society publishing partners and editors to deliver the support and the services that are needed to publish the highest-quality research.

Steven Ottogalli: These investments are guided by and designed for the needs for researchers, whether they be authors, reviewers, or editors, at every step of the publication process, so from submission of a manuscript to publication of the accepted article.

Steven Ottogalli: The idea that publishers should focus on the needs of researchers, first and foremost, isn't new of course. You've probably been hearing that from Wiley for many years now, because it is our core value.

Steven Ottogalli: We believe that when we are all focused on helping researchers share their best work with more people, everyone benefits.

Steven Ottogalli: And in order to do that, we really want to focus on improving the experience for our authors and researchers at every stage of the publication cycle.

Steven Ottogalli: What is happening right now, though, what this new normal is making clear, is that we still have more opportunities to make publishing work better for everyone and not just for authors.

Steven Ottogalli: The opportunities that we want to focus on today are based on three critical issues that publishers have been facing for some time, but which are becoming even more acute in the current environment.

Steven Ottogalli: In many areas, the pandemic has caused us to accelerate the implementation of new workflows and improvements that we have been developing for some time.

00:06:29.670 --> 00:06:45.540

Steven Ottogalli: The first issue we are facing is economic: Institutions that pay for scholarly content are facing significant budget constraints this year, and it's not clear when the global economy will recover or what that recovery will necessarily look like.

Steven Ottogalli: Even before the economic pressures that are linked to the pandemic, the economics of publishing itself have been shifting to focus more on the article as the main units of content, rather than on the journal.

Steven Ottogalli: If you've been following the industry conversation around open access, for example you'll know that globally, government and private funder policies are consistently moving towards open access.

Steven Ottogalli: That's happening in different ways and at different paces around the world, but there is a general global trend towards a transition to open access, rather than subscription access, to research.

Steven Ottogalli: I won't go into detail on all the drivers of that right now, but at this point I want to say that it's very clear that open access is here and will remain a focus and scholarly publishing.

Steven Ottogalli: It's also clear that we're at a point where open access is not just important if you're based in Europe or in the UK; it's a global trend that we expect to continue to accelerate worldwide.

Steven Ottogalli: The second critical issue that we are facing is a crisis of time.

Steven Ottogalli: It won't come as a surprise to you, I'm sure, that finding peer reviewers is an ongoing challenge for many journals. The pressure on editors to spend time finding reviewers stretches them even more than they already were and balancing their editorial role with other responsibilities.

Steven Ottogalli: The amount of time it takes to review content and spend on journal administrative tasks just isn't sustainable.

Steven Ottogalli: And finally, while we've made great advances in the last decade to harness the power of technology and automation in publishing, in many cases there are systems and processes still in use which take up much more time than they should.

Steven Ottogalli: And actually, time is being taken away from focusing on the quality and integrity of the content itself.

Steven Ottogalli: Journals began to publish content online almost 30 years ago; however, many workflows that were developed for a print environment were left intact.

Steven Ottogalli: In fact, the format and function of research communication itself has not changed much since scholarly publishing began almost 400 years ago.

Steven Ottogalli: Essentially, research is not as reproducible as it needs to be, and this so-called reproducibility crisis has implications for the credibility of research, for the reputation of journals themselves, and for the societies that are associated with them.

Steven Ottogalli: With this in mind, we have begun to actively reimagine and redefine what a high-quality author-focused production process should look like in the 21st century.

Steven Ottogalli: I think most of you will probably say that all of this isn't new, and it isn't. The difference is that now, these pressures are growing, and the likelihood that will continue to experience unexpected and significant change in the future is high—maybe not on the scale we're experiencing and right now, or as we have in the past year, but it will still be significant.

00:10:23.850 --> 00:10:25.410

Steven Ottogalli: But there is good news here, too.

Steven Ottogalli: And that is because these issues aren't new, we've already been working to solve for them.

Steven Ottogalli: As the pressures on the research publishing ecosystem increase, we are scaling up our ability to create and deliver solutions that relieve pressure in the system where it's too great.

Steven Ottogalli: So this means freeing up time for authors to focus on conducting research and sharing their work, and for editors to develop the quality and the integrity of the content they publish in their journals, and for societies to focus on their mission to advance the discipline as a whole.

Steven Ottogalli: As a publishing partner for societies all over the world, Wiley's goal is to provide the best possible market guidance on these issues.

Steven Ottogalli: So we are investing in the present and the future of publishing by developing smarter tools and simpler processes that support the sharing of high-integrity scholarly research from the point an author submits their paper to the moment it is published.

Steven Ottogalli: So now I will present some examples of things we are doing to support research in the publishing process.

Steven Ottogalli: I'll start with a few examples in the pre-acceptance space, so this is before papers are accepted by the journal, and then I'll talk a little bit about some of the great work that's happening in the post-acceptance side of the article workflow.

00:12:00.330 --> 00:12:11.310

Steven Ottogalli: I mentioned earlier that editors and reviewers are under tremendous time pressure. Research output is growing, and there are more articles in the system that need to be evaluated.

Steven Ottogalli: If you think about the journey than an author takes to publish a paper it's not uncommon for authors to submit their article to two or even three journals before it is accepted.

Steven Ottogalli: That means the article will need three sets of peer review and up to 12 individual reviewers, some of whom may even be asked to review the same paper multiple times as it is submitted to multiple journals.

Steven Ottogalli: The author also has to reformat the manuscript at least three different times to meet the formatting requirements of each journal.

Steven Ottogalli: They spend valuable time copying and pasting information from the document into the editorial office submission system and ticking boxes to confirm compliance with all of those various requirements.

Steven Ottogalli: Research suggests that each year authors spend an average of up to 52 hours formatting manuscripts as they submit to multiple journals.

Steven Ottogalli: This really is a wasteful process. Our author surveys show that if there is one thing authors could change about the publishing experience, a simpler submission process with fewer formatting requirements would be at the top of the list.

Steven Ottogalli: With this feedback in mind, in 2019 Wiley launched a free-format submission option.

Steven Ottogalli: So this option offers researchers the flexibility to submit their papers in the format that they prefer.

Steven Ottogalli: The main requirement at initial submission is that the manuscript, the figures, and the tables must be readable by the editors and the reviewers. Other formatting or style preferences are not required at this stage.

Steven Ottogalli: After the article has undergone peer review and the editors assess the manuscript, any formatting requirements are then requested at the revision stage, once the authors know that their manuscript has a strong chance of being accepted for publication.

Steven Ottogalli: This simpler process is good for authors, so they can focus on their research, not on reformatting or formatting requirements.

Steven Ottogalli: It's also good for the journal, because complicated submission requirements can lead authors to choose journals that they know have easier submission processes.

Steven Ottogalli: We're taking this concept one step further with the launch of a new, smarter, simpler submission platform called Research Exchange, also known as REX.

Steven Ottogalli: REX plugs into a journal’s Scholar One manuscripts submission site, so your editorial and peer review workflows remain unchanged.

Steven Ottogalli: Authors can submit a manuscript through the Research Exchange platform, and their manuscript is then export it seamless seamlessly into each journal’s Scholar One submission site for check-in and peer review.

Steven Ottogalli: Instead of requiring copying and pasting, authors upload their files, and the platform uses machine learning to read the manuscript and identify key information.

Steven Ottogalli: That information then auto-populates the Research Exchange system for the author to verify.

Steven Ottogalli: REX is currently live for over 80 journals, with more journals getting ready to go live this year.

Steven Ottogalli: The experience is much better for authors, and it's better for the journal. Simpler submission makes the journal more attractive to authors who are looking for the right outlet to publish their work, and we have received very positive feedback from authors who have used REX so far.

00:16:01.470 --> 00:16:12.990

Steven Ottogalli: Editorial referral and manuscript transfer assistance are another powerful way to reduce the amount of time—editors’, peer reviewers’, and authors’ time—that it takes to publish a single paper.

Steven Ottogalli: Many of your journals may already be a part of a transfer network in which editors refer papers to another journal, and the existing reviews travel with the paper, saving time for reviewers and authors.

Steven Ottogalli: Transfer networks provide a better author experience, they're efficient, and they can help drive more quality submissions for journals in the network.

Steven Ottogalli: For example, articles may be rejected by a journal simply for being out of scope, but the science is good enough to be published in another journal.

Steven Ottogalli: Transfer networks come in different shapes and sizes, but they all give your journal a chance to retain the best-quality published content by driving growth.

Steven Ottogalli: In addition to editor driven transfer networks, we also offer the option to use Wiley Transfer Desk Assistant, also known as TDA.

Steven Ottogalli: This is a tool which uses artificial intelligence to match the content of a paper to the aims and scope of other journals if that papers rejected from the author's first choice.

Steven Ottogalli: Compared to editor referral, TDA happens post-decision, and it doesn't require any additional input from the editor at all, again saving time from the entire ecosystem to help authors find the right outlet and audience for their research.

Steven Ottogalli: Instead of looking through journal scopes and reading multiple author guidelines and other time-consuming resubmission tasks, authors receive an email with a list of suggested journals.

Steven Ottogalli: They click on a link, and the resubmission to the new journalist seamless.

Steven Ottogalli: The receiving journal is under no obligation to accept the referred manuscript, but again, smarter tools like this help keep the flow of submissions strong.

Steven Ottogalli: All of these initiatives—free format submission a simpler and more automated submission experience, and these smart referral tools—they are just some of the examples of the ways we're working with our partners to deliver experiences that are focused on the authors.

Steven Ottogalli: It makes intuitive sense, but I really want to emphasize that what is good for the authors is also good for editors, for peer reviewers, and for the journal.

Steven Ottogalli: This allows the experts of the content to focus on the content, not on the administrative tasks or the duplicated work that some systems perpetuate.

Steven Ottogalli: What happens before an article is accepted is of course just one part of its journey.

Steven Ottogalli: So now, what I would like to share are some of the things we are doing in our content review and content transformation teams to free up even more time to let the experts be experts.

00:19:23.250 --> 00:19:31.500

Steven Ottogalli: The work we're doing to innovate around peer review and the transformation process that an article goes through once it has been accepted is, at its core, about verifying the quality and the integrity of the information, then transforming it into a record—the version of the record that the article is—that is reliable, shareable, discoverable, and usable, and doing all of this as efficiently and effectively as possible so that information can reach the wider world as quickly as possible.

Steven Ottogalli: And just as we have had lots of data that show that authors want the submission process to be simple and painless, we also know that once their article is accepted, they don't want to have to wait months and months for it to be published.

Steven Ottogalli: Long publication times are frustrating for authors, and they can reflect negatively on a journal’s reputation, and they are definitely unfavorable for research.

Steven Ottogalli: Along with our partners, as publishers, we have a responsibility as stewards of research dissemination, and part of that responsibility is to ensure that we're using the best possible publishing tools so that research can be shared reliably and in a timely way.

Steven Ottogalli: Reliability is a key element here. Speed for speed’s sake is not the end goal, but there are there are a number of ways that we can continue to ensure the integrity and quality of research while decreasing publication times.

00:21:09.360 --> 00:21:14.040

Steven Ottogalli: So one of the ways we're doing that is through our in-house content review team.

Steven Ottogalli: Robust peer review is fundamental to ensuring the quality of scholarship, and yet, as I mentioned earlier, editors and peer reviewers are dealing with unprecedented demand on their time.

Steven Ottogalli: In many cases, administrative tasks are pulling them away from the strategic issues that are the best use of their time and expertise.

Steven Ottogalli: In this context, Wiley's dedicated in-house content review team can support editors in the editorial and peer review process and provide a consistent and harmonized approach to the way peer review is conducted.

Steven Ottogalli: Implementing scholarly publishing best practices, our content review team currently manages editorial offices for over 600 journals in a range of disciplines, including many of our society partner journals.

Steven Ottogalli: So, how does it work?

Steven Ottogalli: Well, under content review, each journal has a dedicated two-person team who are responsible for the administrative tasks such as checking in new submissions as well as working with the journal’s editorial staff on development and strategy.

Steven Ottogalli: This frees up the editors’ time and it also helps ensure continuity. For example, the content review team is there to cover for editorial staff if and when they're out of the office.

Steven Ottogalli: Content review services aren't only designed for smooth and reliable journal management, though.

Steven Ottogalli: We're also continuously developing services, best practices, tools, and technologies to improve editorial processes, including the manuscript referrals between journals that I mentioned before.

Steven Ottogalli: We also want to provide more transparency in the peer review process, while ensuring the integrity of research to be published.

Steven Ottogalli: These services and tools provide an opportunity to add value to the content; to streamline later processes in the publication workflow; and to make the lives of editors, authors, and reviewers easier.

00:23:37.080 --> 00:23:44.430

Steven Ottogalli: So all of this makes the publication process simpler, while also strengthening the foundation of research dissemination.

Steven Ottogalli: If you think about the production process as the foundation for sharing knowledge and information, that foundation needs to be built of materials that are both strong and flexible.

Steven Ottogalli: If the last year has shown us anything, it's that we all need to be ready to adjust to potentially sudden and very unexpected changes.

Steven Ottogalli: Well, the publication process for a journal is no different.

Steven Ottogalli: Given the challenges that we're facing right now and that we faced in the past year, it's even more critical that we're able to publish the highest-quality content using simple, resilient processes and tools that are easy to adapt to, if we need to.

Steven Ottogalli: It's also integral to your ability to build and maintain the reputation of your journal and the association itself by reliably publishing the best-quality research.

Steven Ottogalli: The solution to this challenge of flexibility and strength is, increasingly, greater automation in the publication process.

Steven Ottogalli: As I mentioned earlier, automating aspects of the submission process for authors is life-changing for a researcher who historically might have spent hours formatting their manuscript.

Steven Ottogalli: I'm sure, each of us can easily think of an example where we appreciate automation in other aspects of our lives where we don't have to manually complete tasks that are more efficiently and accurately done by smart technology.

Steven Ottogalli: When we discuss automating parts of the production process, I like to think of this in the context of kaizen—this idea of continuously improving business processes and workflows.

Steven Ottogalli: By standardizing and improving processes, we aim to eliminate waste and redundancies in a way that the underlying principles of kaizen were meant to address, with the goal of publishing better and faster without forsaking quality.

Steven Ottogalli: With this in mind, we are designing smarter workflows that enable more automation in the parts of the production process where it makes sense to do so, and to reduce time-consuming manual interventions. So again, this will allow the editors and reviewers and authors to focus on developing the content.

00:26:23.040 --> 00:26:34.980

Steven Ottogalli: Now of course automation itself isn't possible unless the inputs and outputs into a system are efficient. They cannot rely on multitudes of manual steps.

Steven Ottogalli: So over the past few years, we've been refining design options for journals to deliver content in a format that meets the needs of our subject communities, while also being fit for the innovation that the automation makes possible.

Steven Ottogalli: This has been in the planning stages for some time; however, the need for greater automation became more urgent as a result of the pandemic, as new workflows and processes were needed to increase capacity by reducing the amount of the manual work required to produce an article, as it had been in the past.

Steven Ottogalli: Some of you may be aware that we've recently released the latest version of our contemporary journal design, which some of you may know as our new journal design.

Steven Ottogalli: Over half of Wiley journals now use this contemporary journal design, which is available in a wide range of style choices.

Steven Ottogalli: Implementing the new design significantly improves the journal’s ability to take advantage of future innovations and the content enrichment opportunities that are enabled by automation, while also improving publication speed and consistent quality.

Steven Ottogalli: One of the other areas where we're seeing really significant opportunities to improve the author experience is by assessing the level of copy editing for each journal.

Steven Ottogalli: We regularly conduct research to understand what authors are looking for when choosing where to publish their work.

Steven Ottogalli: They consistently tell us that the time it takes to publish is a key consideration.

Steven Ottogalli: And, of course, faster is better.

Steven Ottogalli: Understandably, authors also find it frustrating when their work is over-edited or under-edited, which requires them to take more of their own personal time reviewing the changes to ensure that all of the edits are truly adding value to the final article, while also retaining the author's voice.

Steven Ottogalli: Copy editing is a key aspect of production quality for all of our journals. However, we also know that different journals, editors, and authors have different needs.

Steven Ottogalli: So we offer a range of copy-editing services to meet those different needs.

Steven Ottogalli: Getting the right match for your journal can have a significant impact on your authors’ experience and even on the reputation of the journal.

Steven Ottogalli: The final example I want to share with you is innovating around the production workflow itself.

Steven Ottogalli: Last year, as a way of increasing our capacity to deal with a steep increase in submissions coupled with the changes brought about by the transition to working from home, we launched a pilot with over 200 titles across a range of subject areas to test new leaner production workflow.

Steven Ottogalli: This lean workflow and enabled us to simplify the proofing experience for the authors and decrease publication times in the process.

Steven Ottogalli: An important benefit of this workflow is that it reduces the rounds of proofing that are needed.

Steven Ottogalli: It is an approach that is increasingly standard among other major publishers in journals, so many authors are already familiar with it.

Steven Ottogalli: To date, we've published more than 12,000 articles using the lean workflow. On average, the time it takes to release proofs to authors has decreased by four days; author proofing time has decreased by seven days; and the time it takes to implement corrections has decreased, on average, by three days.

Steven Ottogalli: So, on average, publication time for journals that use this workflow is reduced by about two weeks, and sometimes more.

Steven Ottogalli: I have said this before, I know, but we wouldn't take this approach if we didn't also know that it is good for authors, and out of the more than 10,000 authors who have responded, 80% were satisfied or very satisfied with the process of submitting their corrections using this new proofing system.

00:31:20.070 --> 00:31:31.260

Steven Ottogalli: There are many other examples, but all of these, from redesigning our journals with adaptability and resilience in mind to reimagining the approach to content review, all are designed to deliver the key goals I laid out at the beginning.

Steven Ottogalli: By using smarter tools and simplifying processes, we can free up time for content experts to be experts and actually drive both growth and quality in research output. And when that happens, everybody benefits.

Steven Ottogalli: So thank you so much for your time and attention, and I think we have plenty of time now for some questions, so I'll pass it back over to you Tomo.

00:32:07.980 --> 00:32:11.910

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Right, thank you very much Otto for your wonderful presentation.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: It's great to hear about all of the work that is going to make publishing easier for authors and saving time for editors and reviewers.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: I know we have a lot of people in the audience who are also authors or editors on top of their other jobs so I'm interested to see what questions we have.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: So in the Q&A box, we have one questions. I think it's about free-form submission.

00:32:49.470 --> 00:33:02.670

Tomoyuki Suzuki: It says it's very attractive, not to change format, but the question is how many journals adopt those free-form submission? That’s the question.

Steven Ottogalli: Currently I'm not really sure how many journals have free formats. I would say, probably, maybe around 30 or 40.

Steven Ottogalli: We have recently launched it a couple years ago, and I think more and more journals are starting to adopt it in line with some of the other tools that we have offered, such as the direct submission workflow that that I have mentioned before.

Steven Ottogalli: But for the authors that have used free-format submission, it has really been a big improvement for those authors.

Steven Ottogalli: We've gotten a lot of really great feedback from those authors when we've asked them about their experience.

Steven Ottogalli: And and none of the editors or editorial offices or reviewers have voiced any concern about it. Really, this is a benefit for authors, and it allows them to submit freely.

00:34:02.970 --> 00:34:19.920

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Okay, thank you, thank you. And also, there is one question not coming to the Q&A, but the question coming in the chat box. So I will read the comment.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: So thank you for your fantastic presentation. I have one question: I understand the new system to save time-wasting for editorials However, what are the system to reduce reviewers’ burden? Do you have any ideas? Sorry for that if you have mentioned.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: So it's a question about reducing the reviewer burden. So do you have any ideas for that?

Steven Ottogalli: Well, we do know that many reviewers are being asked to review more papers, as a result of there being more journals launching every year.

Steven Ottogalli: And I would suggest that, rather than saying how we can reduce the burden for reviewers, it might be that journals need to increase their reviewer pool, for example.

Steven Ottogalli: So I think the answer is really enabling editors to be able to find more reviewers for their journals, and this is a very timely question that we're really looking at at Wiley.

Steven Ottogalli: We are aware that editors across all disciplines are really struggling to find enough reviewers for the papers that they handle now.

Steven Ottogalli: And so, because of that, they're asking the same reviewers to review more papers, and that is putting the burden on the reviewers.

Steven Ottogalli: So our content review team has really been thinking about strategies for securing more reviewer acceptances and getting more accurate and large-scale data on reviewer response rates so we can start to track trends and then share that share that with our editors and our societies.

Steven Ottogalli: You know, it also may depend on the subject discipline itself or the size of the community, so there may be a number of reasons why the reviewers are stretched. But one strategy we might suggest to diversify the pool of reviewers for a journal is to invite reviewers outside of one's network, or maybe look at other geographic regions that tend to. . . . That will help maybe increase the invitation acceptance rate.

Steven Ottogalli: This is especially true of author collaboration: As author collaboration becomes more interdisciplinary and more international I think editors would be good to expand the pool of reviewers more internationally, as well.

Steven Ottogalli: Another strategy might also be to invite more early-career researchers to review, so perhaps as part of a rating or review or mentorship program.

Steven Ottogalli: So this takes a bit more time to administer, because it is a training opportunity, but by increasing your pool by inviting a more diverse research reviewer community, that might help.

Steven Ottogalli: And finally, I would also say that I think as more and more journals become a part of these transfer networks that I mentioned and those reviews are passed along from one journal to the next, I think that will also reduce the burden, because we will be able to review more papers once without asking reviewers to review them multiple times.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Okay, thank you, thank you for your questions.

00:37:49.800 --> 00:37:55.110

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Before moving to the next question, I also have the question. I personally have the question about the reviewers.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: It's about the reviewer reimburse. So how can the journals incentivize reviewers to get them to review for their journals more. For example, is there any trend toward paying reviewers or something like that?

Steven Ottogalli: That's also a very good question and ties to the last question. In terms of payments, we are not really seeing a trend towards paying reviewers.

Steven Ottogalli: It has been a topic of conversation for a very long time, but we don't think there is a credible or sustainable way of paying reviewers that really would put an accurate value on their time.

Steven Ottogalli: And, of course, there is also an ethical consideration and the perception that paying reviewers might influence the review itself.

Steven Ottogalli: But recognizing and rewarding reviewers is a fruitful discussion to have, because, ultimately, the review is a part of the paper, and it adds tremendous value to it.

Steven Ottogalli: So, in terms of recognition, Wiley offers recognition services such as Publons, which I think pretty much all of our journals have adopted at this point. We also offer reviewer certificates. Some journals like to publish an acknowledgement list in the journal each year.

Steven Ottogalli: And many journals also offer transparent peer review, so this is a process by which reviewer comments are published alongside the article with the editor decision letters. And if you're interested in learning more about these initiatives, please contact your journal publishing manager.

Steven Ottogalli: But generally, what we have found is that potential reviewers really don't cite the lack of reward or recognition as a reason to decline an invitation to review.

Steven Ottogalli: Generally, what we see as motivators are how well the research in the paper relates to a reviewer’s expertise and whether or not they find a manuscript interesting. So that may also link back to the last question that was asked: so making sure that the right reviewers are being asked to review a paper. These are some of the motivating factors that might draw in more reviewers to accept invitations.

00:40:22.020 --> 00:40:41.880

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Okay thanks. There is another question regarding the reviewer reimburse. Nowadays many open access journals have incentives for these, such as the APC discounts. So how do you think this may increase or decrease the journal quality in the long term?

Steven Ottogalli: Yes, that is a good question. We actually had looked into reviewer discounts for open access journals, but I know we did pilot that with a couple of journals a few years ago.

Steven Ottogalli: The uptake was very low. However, this is something that we're still looking at as part of the overall assessment of reviewer rewards that I had mentioned.

Steven Ottogalli: We are not saying that that's something we wouldn't do in the future, but again I think we really need to look at the reasons why people aren't accepting invitations, really looking at the bottlenecks that editors are facing, and really looking at overall trends. But yes, that is a good idea, and that's something that we are looking at as a possibility.

00:41:31.230 --> 00:41:44.130

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Thank you very much. And the other question is about the paper mills and the predatory journals. Unfortunately, academic publishing is contaminated by low-quality manuscripts from paper mills and predatory journals. Does Wiley or others have any mechanism to automatically find suspicious manuscripts or reference to predatory journals?

Steven Ottogalli: Well, in terms of the manuscripts themselves, and Chris Graf may have mentioned this last week in the presentation, for those who have seen it, but as part of the Scholar One submission system, all Scholar One sites should offer something called iThenticate. So this is a tool that you can submit a manuscript to; the manuscript that’s submitted to your journal can be checked by this iThenticate tool. And what this does is this looks at all the available published research online to see if there is any overlap in terms of plagiarism. So this could be text that is plagiarized from somebody else's paper or even an author reusing some of their own content. So the iThenticate a tool is very good at looking at the overlap in the amount of text.

Steven Ottogalli: We also have some tools here at Wiley that we are developing to look at the integrity of images in a paper to see if there might be some data manipulation or some image manipulation, say, by using photoshop, for example, that may have altered the image in a way that that is favorable to the research findings.

Steven Ottogalli: So some of these things are actually found in the peer review process, but again, what we want to do is we want to take that burden away from the editors and the peer reviewers and then enable those to be caught up front by using some of these tools.

Steven Ottogalli: But when talking about predatory journals generally, we do know that researchers are under increasing pressure to publish publications. The expectation is that a lot of research assessments or maybe even tenure here in the United States, or grant applications, they may be tied to the number of articles that a person has to publish, and so this is increasing the need to publish more. It's this concept of “publish or perish” that you may have heard of before.

Steven Ottogalli: So because of this, there has been a significant rise in the number of journals that have tried to capitalize on this situation, and a major factor leading to these journals that are called predatory journals are unethical behaviors so they really deceive readers about the level of quality, the cost of publication, and the way that the content is reviewed and presented. These are some of the characteristics that are described by a predatory journal.

Steven Ottogalli: So the increase in unethical publishing practices means that organizations are coming together to highlight and combat this situation.

Steven Ottogalli: There are a number of community-led initiatives that researchers and others can make good use of. So there is a resource online called Think. Check. Submit., and this is a tool that was launched by a collective of industry partners, and it helps authors learn how to spot unethical or predatory journals by thinking about what the best practices should be and to recognize red flags around peer review processes. So, for example, looking at the looking at the editorial board and seeing if there are institutions attached to it and what sort of industry bodies that those journals are attached to. For example, the Directory of Open Access Journals serves as a mark of quality among the research community, so I would say if you're submitting to an open access journal, see if it's indexed in the Directory of Open Access Journals This is also called the DOAJ.

Steven Ottogalli: The DOJ has a very strict acceptance criteria, and it is now a core publishing standard in the open access community, so I think that would be a good resource to see if your journal might be predatory or not.

Steven Ottogalli: Finally, I should also mention that as a longstanding member of the Committee of Publication Ethics, also known as COPE, Wiley adheres to industry best practices, and we have a number of resources for authors and editors on our website, and I would also recommend checking out the COPE website—they also have a number of resources there, as well.

00:46:34.320 --> 00:46:38.220

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Right, thank you very much for answering these difficult questions.

Steven Ottogalli: Very long answer.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Any other questions or comments from anybody?

Tomoyuki Suzuki: So I personally have one more question. It's about the pandemic and turnaround time. I think your presentation focuses on how technology and automation can improve publication times. So my question is: Did the pandemic impact publication times in any way?

Steven Ottogalli: Initially, we thought that production times might be impacted by the vendor or Wiley capacity being affected by the virus, and we had plans to mitigate that by transitioning to working from home, for example.

Steven Ottogalli: But this didn't happen. We didn't see any of our employees or employees that are vendors becoming sick because of the pandemic.

Steven Ottogalli: But instead what we saw was that, in certain subject areas, there are huge influxes of submissions and papers that were being accepted into production.

Steven Ottogalli: So there was a big increase in the number of articles that we were producing. And so as a result of that, there were some delays in turnaround times due to the unexpected volume of work.

Steven Ottogalli: And to put this into context: Overall our program saw a 37% increase in submissions during the pandemic. Open access submissions in particular had an increase of around 81%.

Steven Ottogalli: So what we suspect is that the sudden closure of offices and universities, laboratories, and the work typically involved with those actually provided researchers with more time to write and submit and review research articles.

Steven Ottogalli: So it is really impossible to predict, how this might change over time as offices and labs reopen. We do expect submissions and acceptances to return to pre-pandemic levels, but we are prepared for the sustained volume of work, should this end up being the result.

00:49:04.320 --> 00:49:15.990

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Okay, thank you. I'm very surprised to hear that the open access submissions have increased at more than 80%. That’s a surprising number.

Steven Ottogalli: It did, and I think where we saw that mostly… We did see a lot of open access publications especially, as you might expect, in the medical journals and health sciences.

Steven Ottogalli: So a lot of them have open access journals, and the aim of course for those researchers were to publish in open access journals so readers and the general public would have access to that information during the pandemic, so it would be immediately available.

Steven Ottogalli: Having said that, I would also add that Wiley was able to put together a collection of resources and other articles and book chapters related to not only the COVID-19 research that was going on, but also other researcher related to corona viruses in the past. So we put together a collection and a resources site, and we made all of that publicly available for free, in addition to all of these open access articles that had come through as a result of the pandemic.

00:50:20.100 --> 00:50:20.520

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Thank you.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: No more questions?

Tomoyuki Suzuki: We have ten minutes left.

Steven Ottogalli: I'd be really interested to hear, too, some of our listeners’ thoughts on some of the processes that we had mentioned around new journal design or the lean workflow or even just any comments that you're hearing from your communities about some of their needs and what they would like to see for your journals. That would be helpful for us to know.

Steven Ottogalli: And you can either share that feedback with us now or at the email on your screen.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Yep.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: So I think it’s time to wrap up. I think that brings us to the end of the seminar.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Okay, thank you Otto for your presentation and your time with us today. I know it's very early in the morning for you.

00:51:32.250 --> 00:51:42.330

Tomoyuki Suzuki: I also want to thank Wiley colleagues at [Japanese locations] for all of their help to make this virtual event a success.

Steven Ottogalli: Yes thank you.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: I hope everyone in the audience had fun at today's session and found our conversation with Chris Graf last week to be useful, and that it sparked some ideas that will be helpful in your own work with research and publishing.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: We appreciate your feedback on how we can make these virtual events as useful and enjoyable for you as possible, so please take a few minutes to share your thoughts with us in the short survey you'll receive by email or in today's session.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: We will also share the video recordings of this presentation and Chris's presentation last week as soon as we can make them available.

Tomoyuki Suzuki: And thank you again for joining us at the seminar, and you will have a good rest of your evening.

00:52:39.510 --> 00:52:43.620

Tomoyuki Suzuki: [Japanese speech]

Tomoyuki Suzuki: Thank you very much.

00:52:46.500 --> 00:52:47.310

Steven Ottogalli: Thank you everyone.