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Jill Jackson
Manuscript Processing/Publishing Administrator
American College of Physicians
jjackson@acponline.org
Annals of Internal Medicine

- Premier internal medicine journal
- Readership includes the 143,000 members of the American College of Physicians and many more physicians and researchers worldwide
- One of the most highly cited and influential journals in the world
Back in the day ...

Users/Customers

100%
Today
Annals of Internal Medicine
Average Usage

Customer, 40%
User, 60%
Users

- Anyone who comes to our site
- They are usually the larger part of the audience, but not necessarily our intended audience
Who Are My Users?

- Physicians/Clinicians/Allied Health Professionals
- Researchers
- Media
- Advertisers
- Medical/Scientific Societies, Funding and Advocacy Groups (e.g., PCORI)
- Organizations (pharmaceutical companies, law firms)
- Public
Importance

High usage produces:

- Higher sales
- More exposure to other products on our web site
- Data about popular articles
- Awareness of quality, carefully vetted information
Customers

- People who pay for our content
- Identifiable information (demographics)
Who Are My Customers?

- Members of American College of Physicians (ACP)
- Individual Subscribers
- Institutional Subscriptions
- Aggregators (e.g., EBSCO, OVID)
Importance

- Loyalty
- Intended audience
- Drive and create content they are more likely to use
- Identifiable needs
Overlap

Free content

- Accounts for most usage
- No sign-in or registration required
Are My Users My Customers?

Most likely not...

- Broad audience
- We can learn from both groups

But...

- What can we find out about users?
Identifying Users

- Special or free content available to signed-in users
- Drive users to download journal app
  - Apps provide added insight
- Pay per view
  - Interested in the topic
  - Willingness to pay
  - Potential customer
Only Way to Know Your Users ...
Using Data to Grow Your Journal

Esmeralda G. Buchanan
Senior Director
Journals and Book Publishing
American Cancer Society
American Cancer Society (ACS)

- Non-profit voluntary health organization
- Not a member organization

- **Cancer**
  - 24 issues per year / Impact Factor: 5.068

- **Cancer Cytopathology**
  - 12 issues per year / Impact Factor: 3.737

- **CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians**
  - 6 issues per year / Impact Factor: 144.8
Cancer Cytopathology

- Only 20 years old, but dominant journal in the field
- Highest Impact Factor in the field
- Fastest turnaround and decisions
- Reputation for high quality reviews
- Growing Twitter following
- Publishing only the highest quality papers
- Partnered with Wiley
Cancer Cytopathology
Data We Regularly Review

- Submissions
- Turnaround time/time to publication
- Competition analysis
- Editor feedback on submissions quality
- Rejection rate
- Backlog/surplus
- Usage, social media metrics
- Marketing performance
Cancer Cytopathology
Example

Cancer Cytopathology
Time to 1st Decision (5-Year Trend, in weeks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Time to 1st Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cancer Cytopathology

Example

Cancer Cytopathology
Acceptance Rate (5-year Trend)

- 2011: 35%
- 2012: 37%
- 2013: 38%
- 2014: 36%
- 2015: 41%

Monthly publication
Cancer Cytopathology
Factors Leading to Change

- Another ACS journal reduced size and had unused pages
- Conversation with Wiley about increasing submissions to Cancer Cytopathology
- A new competing journal (JASC) was launching
- The EIC wanted to expand but was limited due to page budgets
- We wanted to reinforce our lead in the field
- A strategy meeting took place with all parties
Cancer Cytopathology
Questions We Had to Answer

- Where do our rejected papers end up?
- How far out are we pushing papers in print?
- Are there enough papers out there to maintain steady submissions over time?
- Can the editors help secure more papers if needed?
- Do we need more pages, more frequency or both?
Cancer Cytopathology
Questions We Had to Answer

- Financial viability of adding pages
- What opportunities will it afford us that we don’t have now?
- How many top papers are out there?
Fans of Cancer Cytopathology
What Did the Data Show?

- Editors were confident in the quality of our submissions and in their desire to accept more papers.
- Papers were out there we could obtain and publish.
- We had consistently rising submissions to support the increase.
- We could work out a deal with Wiley to do this without spending any cash.
- If we needed more pages, we could borrow from Cancer.
Cancer Cytopathology
What Happened?

- We decided to increase our frequency to monthly
- We increased our annual page budget to 672 from 436
- We launched two article types (Clinician’s Corner and Cytopathology Help Desk)
- We also increased the frequency of our news section, CytoSource
- We published an editorial from the EIC announcing these changes to help spread the word
Cancer Cytopathology
Data We Regularly Review

Cancer Cytopathology
Submissions (5-Year Trend)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monthly publication
Cancer Cytopathology
Results

Cancer Cytopathology
Published Pages (5-Year Trend)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(672 page budget)

Monthly publication
Cancer Cytopathology

Results

Cancer Cytopathology
Published Papers (5-Year Trend)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Published Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monthly publication
Thank You.

Esmeralda G. Buchanan
esmeralda.buchanan@cancer.org
404-929-6902
How can we reach our audience on social media?

Brittany Gerig Campbell
Marketing Manager
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences
Washington, DC
bcampbell@nas.edu
- Who is our audience?
- Where is our audience?
- What are our goals?
Who is our audience?

- **Facebook:** 26% 25–34 years old
- **Authors:** 59% 40-59 years old
- **Front Matter Readers:** >50% over the age of 40
- **Members:** >50% NAS members for 11 to more than 30 years
Who is our audience?

- Members
- Subscribers
- Social Media:
  - Science Journalists
  - PNAS readers (non-subscribers)
  - General Public
- Authors
Where is our audience?

- Facebook has reached 1.65 billion monthly users
- Twitter has 310 million monthly users
- Twitter has recategorized itself from the “social networking” category to the “news” category
Where is our audience?

PNAS Following as of April 30, 2016

• Facebook: 57,110 likes on the PNAS page
  – Average gain 1,900/month

• Twitter: 41,300 followers of @PNASNews
  – Average gain 1,300/month
What are your goals?

– Define
– Review the analytics
– Lay out measurable objectives
  • Engagement?
  • Growth?
  • Links?
  • Awareness?
What are our goals?

• Drive traffic to PNAS.org
• Increase awareness of new Front Matter content
• Engage with authors and readers
• Value-add to authors/members promoting their PNAS research
The Data

- Analytics in platform
- Clicks
- Conversions

- Other resources
  - Informal feedback
  - Tools such as https://socialrank.com/
Reporting

• To understand data, have to take time to review the data

April 2016

Facebook https://www.facebook.com/PNASNews/

In April, the PNAS page gained 1,842 likes, and as of April 30, 2016 the PNAS Facebook page had 57,110 likes.

Top three Facebook posts were

1. April 21st post linking to a BBC story covering a PNAS article suggesting that IL-33 protein injections could play a potential therapeutic role in Alzheimer’s disease with 1K likes, comments, and shares https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=1015390076785100&id=18262365099
2. April 26th post linking to a Nature story covering a PNAS article on how prion-like proteins might underlie a form of memory in plants with 749 likes, comments, and shares https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=10153900859385100&id=18262365099
3. April 11th post linking to a US News story covering a PNAS article on how scientists have identified a possible HIV vaccine with 627 likes, comments, and shares https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=10153877582040100&id=18262365099
What content should we post?

- What does audience want to hear?
- Who in your organization is posting?
- Vary content: News coverage of research, links to publications, new features
- Not an afterthought, include in promotion plans
- Schedule and plan
## Content Calendar

### January 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karilyn on PPL</td>
<td>Facebook: [Morning] Teaching Resources</td>
<td>Facebook: [Morning] Teaching Resources</td>
<td>Facebook: [Morning] Teaching Resources</td>
<td>Teaching Resources Portal</td>
<td>Teaching Resources Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Facebook: [Morning] Teaching Resources Portal</td>
<td>Twitter: (afternoon) Teaching Resources Portal</td>
<td>Teaching Resources Portal</td>
<td>Teaching Resources Portal</td>
<td>Teaching Resources Portal</td>
<td>Teaching Resources Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*PNAS*

[www.pnas.org](http://www.pnas.org)
Impact/reach

- Web traffic from social
  - Facebook, Twitter, Reddit
  - 2-3% at 50,000+ clicks/mo

- Outliers

- Advertising
Connect with PNAS on Facebook and Twitter

Like our Facebook page at facebook.com/PNASNews

Follow on Twitter @PNASNews
Connect with PNAS on Facebook and Twitter

Like our Facebook page at facebook.com/PNASNews

Follow on Twitter @PNASNews
How do I determine the most effective reminder strategy to ensure the most efficient peer review times?
• PLOS ONE is the largest peer reviewed journal in the world
• Over 28,000 research articles published
• More than 76,000 reviewers completed a review for PLOS ONE
• Academic Editors sent over 358,000 reviewer invitations
• Nearly 135,000 reviews were completed
PLOS ONE Editorial Workflow

QC

Peer Review

Editor Invites Reviewers

Reviewer Evaluation

Editor Evaluates Reviews
Reminder Workflow

- Invited reviewers reminded after 3 days
- Agreed reviewers reminded
  - 3 days prior to due date
  - 1 day after due date
  - 3 days after due date
  - 7 days after due date
  - Custom, dependent on AE/situation
Reviewer On-Time Performance

- Academic Editors can override default time (10 days)
- 65% of requests use 10 day (or sooner) deadline
- 47% of reviews are returned on time
If reviewers received an invitation reminder, were they more likely to fail to submit their review?
52% of reviewers who failed to submit their review were invited and subsequently reminded of their invitation

- Terminated reviews often incur significant delays during peer review
- Consider inviting another reviewer if an invitation reminder was sent and the review is overdue
- Consider using your reviewer statistics to prioritize reviewer invitations
If reviewers got an invitation reminder, were they more likely to be late to submit their review?
77% of reviewers who submitted a late review were invited and subsequently reminded of their invitation.

- Late reviews often incur significant delays during peer review (on average, 7 days in our sample set).
- Consider inviting another reviewer if an invitation reminder was sent and the review is overdue.
- Consider using your reviewer statistics to prioritize reviewer invitations.
If reviewers are given a longer review window, were they more likely to meet their deadline?
50% of reviewers who were given an extended deadline submitted their review on time

- Extending review deadlines resulted in a 3% increase in on-time performance compared with overall performance
- The overall compliance increase did not outweigh timing performance
- Consider limiting ability of Editors to extend review deadlines unless requested as a condition of assignment acceptance
At what point should we give up on a late reviewer?
• 81% of late reviewers submitted their review within 10 days of the deadline
• Just 6.6% of reviewers submitted their review after 30 days
Summary

• Test intuition with data. Challenge intuition with data.
• Experiment. Analyze. Repeat.
• Don’t "set it and forget it"!
• There’s no silver bullet but there is a lot of data to analyze. Encourage junior staff to develop their data analysis skills.
Who in the world is accessing our publications? And how do we target them?

Jeanette Panning, MBA, CAE
Assistant Director, Publications Programs
American Geophysical Union
jpanning@agu.org

ORCID: 0000-0003-3816-9234
Total Full Text Downloads for 2014 & 2015

Full Text Downloads from 2014-2015
(Ordered by descending total number of downloads)
Full Text Downloads Distribution: I
# Full Text Downloads Distribution: II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% of Total Downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>34.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Snapshot of Total Downloads from Nov15-Jan16 by Country
**Full Text Downloads Distribution: III***

* Top 10 Downloading Countries

* From Nov 2015 to Jan 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GRL</th>
<th>JGR-D</th>
<th>WRR</th>
<th>JGR-B</th>
<th>JGR-C</th>
<th>JGR-A</th>
<th>G³</th>
<th>GBC</th>
<th>JGR-E</th>
<th>TECT</th>
<th>JGR-F</th>
<th>JGR-G</th>
<th>PALEO</th>
<th>Eos</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>JAMES</th>
<th>ESS</th>
<th>SW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* GRL: Geophysical Research Letters
* JGR-D: Journal of Geophysical Research - Oceans
* WRR: Water Resources Research
* JGR-B: Journal of Geophysical Research - Biogeosciences
* JGR-C: Journal of Geophysical Research - Solid Earth
* JGR-A: Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres
* G³: Geophysical Research Letters
* GBC: Geophysical Monograph Series
* JGR-E: Journal of Geophysical Research - Earth and Space Science
* TECT: Tectonics
* JGR-F: Journal of Geophysical Research - Solid Earth
* JGR-G: Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres
* PALEO: Paleoceanography
* Eos: Earth and Space Science Notes
* RS: Reviews of Geophysics
* EF: Earth and Space Science Notes
* JAMES: Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics
* ESS: Earth and Space Science Notes
* SW: Space Weather
Full Text Downloads Distribution: IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Interest</th>
<th>% of Countries’ Total Full Text Downloads: January 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engaging Users in China

• Targeted marketing based on popular titles along with the use of social media in China to draw attention to specific content
• Providing marketing collateral and author instructions in Chinese
• Outreach via author workshops held at various Chinese institutions
• Providing support for editorial board members to travel to meetings and workshops in the target country to raise the profile of our content
• Working to expand our editorial boards and reviewer pool to include more Chinese scientists
• Exploring collaborative meetings
Engaging Users in Japan

- Targeted marketing based on popular titles, including promoting top authors
- Outreach via author workshops held at the Goldschmidt and JpGU meetings
- Providing support for editorial board members to travel to meetings and workshops in the target country to raise the profile of our content
- Providing marketing collateral and author instructions in Japanese
- Working to expand our editorial boards and reviewer pool to include more Japanese scientists
- Partnering with the Japanese Geological Union to host a joint meeting in May 2017
Engaging Users in Brazil

• In the early stages
• Have appointed one associate editor in Brazil to help raise profile
• Previously held the Meetings of the Americas in Brazil and exploring future collaborative opportunities
SUMMARY OF GENDER DATA

Gender Ratio in 2015
(Male : Female)

1: # of Members
2: # of Submissions
3: # of Publications
4: # of Reviewers
5: # of Associate Editors
6: # of Editors
Using Data To Monitor a Journal’s Performance

Sarah Tegen, PhD
Vice President, Global Editorial & Author Services
ACS Publications

orcid.org/0000-0001-8618-2666
@sbtegen
S_tegen@acs.org

CSE Annual Meeting
May 16, 2016
Denver, CO
Why Use Data?

• Understand how your publication is doing
  – Editorial metrics
  – Production metrics

• How does it stack up to the competition?

Allows you to make informed decisions
How to Measure Editorial Performance?

• Easier things:
  – Acceptance rate
  – Time to decision
  – Geographic distribution
  – Composition of Editorial Board
  – Impact Factor and Other Quality Measures

• Harder things
  – Where do my rejected manuscripts go?
  – Can I determine which articles will be hot?
  – How do authors and reviewers and readers perceive the journal
  – Are my editors fair?

![Associate Editor Distribution](chart1)

![Accept vs Reject](chart2)
How Can I Measure Production Performance?

• Time to publication
• Downloads/citations
• Open Access purchases
• Compliance with funder mandates

Funding Data Curation

- 44% Data Entered by Cloud Admin
- 32% Author Entry Correct
- 15% Author Entry Corrected by Cloud Admin
- 9% No Funding Data
But Don’t Measure in a Vacuum!

• **Identify the competition**
  - Similar scopes, author, base, types of articles

• **How do they stack up?**
  - Citations
  - Impact factor and other metrics
  - Geographic distribution
  - (Acceptance rates, time to decision/publication)
Then What?

• Don’t keep the information secret
  – Share with Editors, Advisors, Governance
• Use information to set performance goals
• Repeat periodically
Some Resources

• Your own statistics! (ask your service providers for help)
• Web of Science, Google Scholar Analytics
• Origin Editorial, HWP Impact Vizors
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