



## (CPCDS) Committee on Publications and Cheminformatics Data Standards

*Chemistry International*  
Production Overview  
Teleconference  
9:30am - 10:23am EST  
February 19, 2016

### Draft Minutes

\*\*\*\*\*

**IUPAC Attendees:** Hugh Burrows, Jeremy Frey, Wolfram Koch, Bonnie Lawlor, James Liu, Dave Martinsen, Leah McEwen, Fabienne Meyers, Carmen Nitsche, Ethel Rios-Orlandi, Liev Sydnes

**De Gruyter Attendees:** Spencer McGrath, Senior Manager, Journal Management and Development and Joshua Gannon, Senior Manager, Journal Management and Development

Bonnie Lawlor opened the meeting at 9:30am. The objective of today's teleconference was to provide members of the IUPAC Committee on Publications and Cheminformatics Data Standards (CPCDS) and the *Chemistry International* Editorial Advisory Board with an overview of the *CI* production flow. Bonnie thanked Spencer McGrath and Joshua Gannon for taking the time today to review the production process with everyone.

### Production Flow

Josh Gannon walked everyone through the process. He said that there are basically two workflows: one for the feature articles, editorials, etc. that have authors, and one for the "standing" sections (conferences, wires, etc.) that are pulled together by Fabienne Meyers. He described the process for the materials for which there are authors.

In response to a question from Carment Nitsche, it was noted that authors are usually identified and recruited by Fabienne. Fabienne noted that all invited features have a point of origin in IUPAC Division/Committee reports, in an IUPAC project or conference, etc. She collects ideas from doing her work and follows-up accordingly with potential contributors. The initial back-and-forth work is done between Fabienne and the author(s). When the manuscript is completed, it is sent to Josh who then does a light copy-edit for language, style, subject-verb agreement, etc. (no science is touched as Josh is not a chemist). He uses the track changes in Microsoft Word and puts any questions that he may have in the comments section. The manuscript is then returned to Fabienne who reviews it. She may make additional changes, reject edits that she does not believe are required, etc. The back-and-forth continues between Fabienne and Josh as needed. Once the edit process is completed Josh accepts them and removes the track changes.

Following the copy-edit process, the next step is one that has recently been introduced and that is the creation of a rough PDF. Josh puts all of the text for a given article into the format in which it will appear in an issue with all related images attached. Fabienne then goes in and decides what images will be used, adjusts their sizes, etc. This allows both Fabienne and Josh to get an idea of how many pages an article will consume before it is put into the actual production work flow. The number of pages can be adjusted by eliminating and/or sizing the images. This step also allows them to look at how the text flows with the images and make adjustments before the text and images are melded together. It is much more time-consuming to make text changes after the fact because a change can

impact the location of an image and then the copy-editor has to fiddle with the software to get things to fit correctly (unlike most scientific journals, news journals require a delicate balance between text and the related eye-catching images that appear throughout the journal). It is important to get the text finalized before putting it with the images. Once this step is completed it goes to Fabienne. If she is satisfied, she will then request that it be put into article format (this is done in Adobe Creative Suite). This step shows what the final article will look like in the printed issue and in the online PDF. The formatted manuscript then goes to the author(s) who can make changes. Fabienne also has a last chance to make aesthetic adjustments. At this point the “standing” sections (which have been created by Fabienne) are also available for her edit. The standing section edits go more quickly because it is just between Josh and Fabienne.

At this point in the process other people become involved. This is when the mailing labels will come in from the American Chemical Society (ACS) and IUPAC. A De Gruyter production editor will get involved with the XML conversion to create the HTML web version that is viewable on the website and Josh will work with the printer on the Preflight quality assurance step. The issue is then finally printed and mailed.

Bonnie Lawlor asked how long the process takes for a given issue; e.g., how much time is allotted to an issue and does it usually take that much time. He said that it is difficult to gauge at present. We recently did a double issue (the final issue of 2015). While the issue was not actually twice the size of a normal issue, it did throw the normal routine off a bit. Also, the most recent issue was a special case as we needed to get copies printed and shipped in time for the American Chemical Society (ACS) meeting in San Diego, CA (March 13-18, 2016) in order to take advantage of the article on the discovery of four new elements. He said that in general the schedule is not a problem. In 2015 the issue right before the World Chemistry Congress may have had some problems due to the additional work load required in preparation for the meeting. Josh checked the schedule for 2016 and said that for the September/October issue manuscripts are due July 12<sup>th</sup> and for the November/December issue manuscripts are due September 9<sup>th</sup> – so just under two months are allotted to each regular issue. Bonnie asked that Josh send her a copy of the schedule so that she can share it with the *CI* Editorial Advisory Board.

**ACTION:** *Joshua Gannon* will send the 2016 *CI* production schedule to Bonnie Lawlor for distribution to the *CI* Editorial Advisory Board.

### **Discussion**

Bonnie asked Josh and Spencer if there are any particular pain points in the process that the *CI* EAB should try to address so that the overall process is more effective and goes more smoothly. They said that they believe that the work flow is a good one and that it makes sense. From their perspective, problems arise when we go outside the work flow; e.g., a step gets skipped or the schedule gets crunched. An example was for the recent issue that required an expedited schedule to meet delivery for the March ACS meeting. In this instance the rough PDF step was skipped and they could not see in advance what potential problems could arise if the text was changed.

Spencer noted that problems arise when content changes are made after the article has been copy-edited, author approved, and put into the layout work flow. Major changes at this point require that the article be re-done and re-flowed and that takes major time and resources. The current flow is set so that the article and its content are firmed-up as much as possible before they are entered into the work flow for the issue layout. There will be changes at this point, but hopefully they will be minor, not major and they are kept to a minimum. The mantra at this point is “corrections” not “changes.” The introduction of new content requires that an article has to go through the process again. It may not be

difficult work, but it is time-consuming because it requires that the copy editor fiddle with the software to ensure that the change is correctly made. Bonnie asked if this happens often. The response was that it happens to varying degrees in some form for every issue. In some cases it is not significant; in others it may take a lot of re-work.

Spencer asked Josh if it would help him to have an Excel worksheet that showed what content is in the pipeline for each issue (authors, topics, etc.) since that information is not currently shared. Josh said that he does not need information at that level, but it would be valuable to know what the “backlog” is; e.g., how much overall content is in the pipeline. He looks at each issue as averaging 40 pages (De Gruyter has a maximum of 240 pages budgeted for the year) and if Fabienne is having problems with content for a future issue, some articles in a current issue may need to be held back. He said that having two issues at thirty five pages each is better than having one issue at forty pages and another at thirty pages. A thirty-two page issue is the smallest that they like to work with. It actually costs to produce an issue of less than thirty-two pages due to how paper works and how the folios work. The smaller size requires more touches to make the size work. Spencer said that if it is possible in the future it would be good if they could get a feel for the overall content pipeline. (*Note:* After I circulated these minutes Fabienne sent me an email to refine the page counts as follows: Because of the printing process, any single issue can only be a multiple of 4 pages. So if it first assembled in more than 32 pages, the content needs to be adjusted up to 36 or 40. If for example reviewing the rough draft and she hits 38 pages it is her decision to review it up to 40 (and find the content for it) or downsize to 36 (and cut things out). These are inevitable changes, not corrections).

Bonnie noted that one of the goals of the *CI* Editorial Advisory Board is to assist Fabienne with author recruitment and to ensure an adequate pipeline for 2016/2017. She also said that Fabienne and the EAB is working under the assumption of a thirty-two page (on average) issue and that it was very helpful to learn about the folio restrictions.

**ACTION:** *Bonnie Lawlor* will take Spencer’s request for advance notice of the *CI* content pipeline to the *CI* Editorial Advisory Board when it meets on March 9, 2016.

James Liu had two questions: 1) How are multi-media files being handled in the workflow and 2) is the website mobile-friendly?

Spencer answered the second question first. He said that *CI* online via De Gruyter is not mobile-optimized at present. The current usage data shows that everyone is downloading the full issue in PDF format and reading it offline. However, De Gruyter is improving their platform to make all articles mobile-optimized this year. Individual *CI* articles in HTML on the web will be much easier to read on mobile devices before the end of 2016. He also said that there are no plans with IUPAC to develop a mobile app for *CI* nor are there any plans to create a dedicated site for *CI*.

**ACTION:** *Spencer McGrath* will send Bonnie Lawlor the timeline for the De Gruyter 2016 platform enhancements.

Josh noted that the only non-text files processed for *CI* to date have been images and tables. Images have either been imbedded in the Word document or have been provided in Tiff, EPS, PDF, or JPEG formats. To date there have been no resolution or processing problems. Spencer asked that if the *CI* content strategy moving forward will include the use of other types of multi-media files, that IUPAC inform De Gruyter as much in advance as possible so that their platform people are aware of the change.



## (CPCDS) Committee on Publications and Cheminformatics Data Standards

**ACTION:** *IUPAC* will keep De Gruyter informed of all content strategy plans as they impact file formats.

A suggestion was raised that we reach out to *IUPAC* member organizations to see what “Best Practices” they might have in place for the production of their *CI*-like news journals.

**ACTION:** *Bonnie Lawlor* will raise the issue of a member survey regarding best practices for news journal production with the *CI* Editorial Advisory Board.

Bonnie thanked Spencer and Josh for taking the time today to give the production overview and that it was very helpful. She also thanked everyone who participated for joining in and noted that she will provide minutes as soon as possible.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 10:23am EST.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Lawlor, Chair  
IUPAC Committee on Publications and Cheminformatics Data Standards (CPCDS)  
February 20, 2016

\*\*\*\*\*