JFP Management Committee

Members Present: Erin Crowley, Cathy Cutter, Michelle Danyluk, Armitra Jackson-Davis, Doris D'Souza, Laurel Dunn, Martin Duplessis, Lisa Gorski, Joshua Gurtler, Lauren Jackson, Pragathi Kamarasu, Kali Kniel, Jovana Kovacevic, Alvin Lee, Judy Luther, Minto Michael, Matthew Moore, Ruth Petran, Ana Allende Prieto, Sarita Raengpradub, Birendra Rajapreyar, Patricia Rule, Panos Skandamis, Laura Strawn, Mark Turner, Pranaya Udash, Daniel Weller, Anett Winkler, Ian Young.

Board/Staff Present: Michelle Danyluk, Ruth Petran, Lisa Hovey, Dina Siedenburg.

Number of Attendees: 29.

Meeting Called to Order: Sunday, 10:00 a.m. Eastern Time, July 31, 2023.

Minutes Recording Secretary: Jovana Kovacevic.

Old Business: The meeting started at 10 AM. Matthew Moore distributed the meeting agenda and gave a brief introduction followed by the committee members introducing themselves.

Following the introduction, the chairman appointed Jovana Kovacevic as the recording secretary. A welcome to new committee members (Alvin Lee, Erin Crowley, Sarita Raengradub, Dan Weller, Kerry Bridges) was provided, and a thank you to exiting committee members (Narjol Gonzalez-Escalona, Jovana Kovacevic, Patricia Rule, Edith Wilkin, Pardeepeninder Brar) and reappointed members (Marion Castle and Valentina Trinetta) was also given. Then, there was a solicitation of any changes or modifications of the agenda, for which it was noted that the addition of an executive board update was needed. Next, the chairman sought the approval of the minutes of the meeting of 2022 from the committee members. A motion was passed to approve the minutes of the meeting from 2022 and was seconded by the committee members.

Michelle Danyluk provided the Executive Board update to the committee, where she noted that the attendance of the meeting has exceeded the previous year and expectations. She thanked the Ontario affiliate for all of their help with the meeting. Next, she noted the success of the June free webinar initiative, which resulted in over 9,000 views; more than what would normally be observed in a year. Michelle then noted that there is a new way to volunteer with IAFP for committees and other service roles through the website, where you can also sign up to get *JFP* updates. Finally, she provided a warning that an update to Google may have caused some to have all of their IAFP emails sent to email spam folders. If you notice this happening, please reach out to IAFP staff to get this fixed.

Jenn Woods from Elsevier provided an Administrative Report for the journal via Zoom. The transition to Elsevier has gone well, and we are starting to see the benefits of the new platform in the form of leveraging the

other related journals ("Recommended Articles and search results") that could draw readers to *JFP*. She noted several marketing videos and a marketing campaign for the journal are planned for further in 2023/2024. This includes videos in English and Mandarin, as well as interviews with Panos, and author testimonials. Additionally, she noted the entire back catalog of *JFP* articles should now be available on the platform.

In 2022 *JFP* had 361 submissions with 197 accepted and published with a 41% rejection rate. So far in 2023, there have been 104 submissions with 85 accepted. As projected in 2023, there are slightly fewer submissions (-2%) but more than the dip expected with the transition, as well as a 5% increase in accepted articles, with the majority of submissions from Asia and North/Central America. It was then noted that the excellent work of the editors and reviewers has allowed *JFP* to achieve a good speed, with an average of 5.2 weeks to first decision; competitive with or better than similar journals. *JFP* saw a dip in impact factor from 2.745 (2021) to 2.0 (2022); however, this dip occurred for the vast majority of journals (~80%) based on changes in calculation methodology by Clarivate. However, the CiteScore (based on 4 years of data instead of 2) increased from 3.80 (2021) to 4.20 (2022). Of note, some of the highest cited articles were invited reviews commissioned by the Scientific Editors, so this practice will continue. It should be noted that industry and government use *JFP* articles but their impact in these fields is not encompassed in citations. It was also noted that more has been done on social media interactions. When people bookmark articles in their reference library this can be seen as well. Authors can see in granular detail where the article has been mentioned.

Next, Jenn presented a summary of the current generative AI policies, Elsevier generative AI policies – were shared with the attendees. AI can be used but only to improve language and readability and not the substance of the article or data/figures. Has to be overseen by the author. Authors need to disclose when they use it. Judy Luther then added that this is the first that citable years will be usable (2023). Next, there was a question raised as to some past year's articles missing from the back catalog in the new system. It was noted that if anyone notices this, they should contact Elsevier, the Editors, or the management committee leadership to get the issue resolved. Joshua Gurtler then noted the articles that received the highest level of engagement via downloads, citations, and social media consisted of a lot of invited reviews solicited by the Editors, indicating the success of this practice and need to continue it. Alvin Lee then noted that there are other metrics that indicate the quality and success of *JFP* different from impact factor that we could utilize; specifically, the h index. A number of competitive journals have a higher IF but much lower than h index than *JFP*, which is quite high in the field at 148. Alvin then noted there can sometimes also be significant discrepancies between the citations attributed to an article between Google Scholar and Science Direct. Jenn noted this is quite true even though in theory all databases should be the same. Elsevier uses Scopus while Clarivate uses Web of Science. Google Scholar is quite different, and she noted it can be less reliable than the former two systems.

Next, Panos Skandamis provided the Scientific Editors report. He noted historically one of the challenges in increasing the recognition of *JFP* was that it historically did not have the sheer number of competitive journals a few decades ago that it does today, which has contributed to the loss in IF. Thus, it is not that *JFP* is not publishing good science, it is that there are now many other journals also publishing similar science. He noted the dilemma that in order to increase the number of high quality submissions to increase IF, it helps for the journal itself to have a competitive IF. He noted Open Access and the Elsevier platform will provide a number of advantages in increasing the exposure and citations of *JFP*. He underscored the importance of continuing to

attract and encourage others to submit high quality papers to *JFP*, as well as the importance of maintaining a competitive speed to first decision and maintaining the admirable level *JFP* has achieved. He noted there have been two successful webinars reaching out to potential authors in North America and Asia.

Panos also noted that there are plans to start producing special issues for the journal, including a special issue associated with the Annual Meeting, to publish works based on content and topics from the meeting. There were additional comments from others regarding the idea of reaching out to those who present or organize sessions on high impact topics to potentially contribute to *JFP* on those topics, after reviewing proposals/the program of the meeting. Panos then noted some other general trends and observations since the switch to open access. He noted that there has been a noticeable decrease in out of scope submissions, as well as generally better quality manuscripts being submitted lately. This was noted to be a good sign that *JFP* is receiving more and more high quality manuscripts.

Annette then also made the point that *JFP* likely has a substantially higher impact than a lot of the metrics discussed cover. Specifically, in industry papers are used and shared but this is not encompassed in a lot of the metrics used. Catherine Cutter then added that this is also true in policy settings, as referenced to *JFP* and *FPT* papers in policy and guidance documents do not usually count towards these metrics.Patricia Rule seconded the point about impact to industry, and mentioned that maybe folks in industry could be encouraged to share especially valuable work on their social media like Twitter. Finally, Joshua Gurtler then noted that in addition to time to decision and better exposure via Open Access, authors get the benefit of *JFP* having a very competitive article processing charge, which is $2,000 for non-members and $1,600 for members. This is notably less than other similar journals, whose open access charge can range from $2,080 to over $4,000.

New Business: New business was then addressed, starting with discussion by Matthew Moore about the use of generative AI in scientific publications and the policy *JFP* wants to adopt. The current policy of *JFP* defaulted to that of Elsevier, which could be modified or altered by *JFP* if preferred. Briefly, this policy states that authors can only use AI and AI-assisted technologies to improve readability and/or language of the work and nothing substantive; authors must also carefully ensure that in using this technology for language that it does not change the meaning or substance of the work; the use of such technology must be disclosed by the authors in a statement in the work; and that ChatGPT or similar AI technologies cannot be listed as authors on the work because they should not be used to the degree that they would rise to the level of authorship.

Joshua Gurtler then noted that there should be caution, especially during revisions, as changing the language in many cases can change the implication or connotation of the work's substance, especially when scientific terms or names are modified. Jovana Kovacevic then asked what would happen if it is used and not disclosed. Jenn noted that this can be tricky, as there is not software currently that can definitively detect if generative AI was used, even if one suspects that it has. However, Elsevier is currently working on technology to check this. Panos reaffirmed the concern and importance of being aware of this technology, and that the policy and proper uses of AI must be repeatedly communicated. In general, the importance of disclosing the use of this technology was determined by the committee to be important. The committee then agreed with the current Elsevier policy on generative AI, and voted favorably to adopt this policy for the time being.

Next, discussion of the committee to work with theFoundation Committee on developing a mechanism to help authors from underrepresented countries and/or situations pay for *JFP* article charges if they cannot afford them.

Matthew recommended forming a task force within the committee to work with the Foundation Committee. Alvin then noted that a proposal was already drafted and will be presented and discussed at the Foundation Committee Meeting on Wednesday, July 19, 2023; but that feedback from the Management Committee would be welcome. It was decided to table this topic until after the Foundation Committee meeting on July 19.

Next, Matthew initiated discussion of the use of colloquialisms and/or slang in *JFP* articles based on the concerns of a member who reached out to the committee. It was noted that *JFP* does not have a specific policy stated regarding the use of colloquialisms or slang in *JFP* or *FPT*. The Annual Meeting Program Committee does have instructions and a policy discouraging the use of colloquialisms and/or slang in its programming, given the international nature of IAFP. This is because others who are not familiar with the colloquialism or slang used may not understand or interpret it. The committee then agreed that this should be discouraged, and voted to recommend the addition of a policy discouraging the use of colloquialisms and slang in *JFP* to the Board.

Other new business was then discussed, with Joshua bringing up the idea that there are a lot of very good peer reviewers for *JFP*, and proposed creating some form of award or recognition of these peer reviewers from the journal in addition to the paper awards. There was general agreement of the committee that this would be a great idea and that other journals do this. The committee voted to propose the creation of an award for peer reviewers of *JFP* to the Board.

Next, Martin raised a question to continue discussion of the special issue related to the meeting. Other societies have this, where editors reach out to those who lead sessions of special interest. It was noted that the editors will identify this and reach out to potential authors, with a relatively high success rate so far. It was noted that reaching out personally to each potential author is likely to ensure a higher success rate in getting authors to contribute. The idea was also raised to tie the acceptance of abstracts of special interest for the meeting to invitations to write an article for the *JFP* special issue related to the conference. It was also noted that waivers are often provided for invited reviews, which especially can benefit certain early career authors in addition to the other benefits of publication in *JFP*. An idea was also raised to leverage the mentor/mentee network to identify potential authors, as well as target early career scientists like Assistant Professors.

Nominations for candidates interested in becoming Vice-Chair of the *JFP* Management Committee was sought with the direction to reach out to Matthew or Ian during the rest of the meeting or via email. Recommendations for the board were then reviewed and approved. No new additional business from the committee was mentioned, and the meeting was adjourned.

Recommendations to the Executive Board:

    1. To reappoint Marion Castle and Valentina Trinetta to another term on the *JFP* Management Committee.

2. To appoint Alvin Lee, Erin Crowley, Sarita Raengradub, Dan Weller, and Kerry Bridges to the *JFP* Management Committee.

3. To create a yearly award or recognition for outstanding peer reviewer(s) for the journal, whom which the scientific editors will develop criteria and select.

4. To create a statement or policy restricting and/or discouraging the use of colloquialisms or slang in *JFP*, which will be based upon the practice of the Annual Meeting Program Committee and enforced by thescientific editors.

Next Meeting Date: July 14, 2024, Long Beach, California.

Meeting Adjourned: 11:57 a.m. Eastern Time.

Chairperson: Matthew Moore.