APPENDIX C

Notes on individual journal meetings

Acta Cryst. Section C - Structural Chemistry Editorial Board Meeting 13 February 2024

Attending: Alan Kennedy (Chair, Section Editor), Amy Sarjeant (Section Editor), Allen Oliver, Maria Rosales-Hoz, Muhammed Yousufuddin, Glenn Yap, Iain Oswald, Xiaoping Wang (Co-editors), Peter Strickland (Executive Managing Editor), Sean Conway (Managing Editor)

Apologies for absence: Andrew Allen, Jonathan White, Andreas Lemmerer, Eric Reinheimer, Carol Hua, William Lewis, David Turner, Renata Diniz

The main aims of the meeting were a general discussion on the state of the journal in terms of reduced submissions and impact factor, the experiences of the Co-editors working on the journal and how we might attract more content to the journal.

Some statistics for 2023

Impact factor: 0.6 (predicted) for 2023, 0.8 (predicted 0.7) for 2022

Papers submitted: 132 in 2023, 171 in 2022

Papers published: 62 in 2023, 96 in 2022

Rejection rate: 51% in 2023, 43% in 2022

Summary

The downturn in submissions is not restricted to Acta C. The other IUCr chemistry journals are also seeing a reduction in submissions. Acta C will aim to attract more submissions via a number of initiatives.

The editorial boards of Acta B and Acta E could be made aware that transfer to Acta C can be considered for suitable submissions.

Acta C Co-editors should consider not immediately discarding papers they think more suitable for Acta E. If the science is good then consider for Acta C. The Section Editors can be asked for advice.

Notes for Authors will be looked at to see if the advantages of Acta C can be made clear upfront. This will be in conjunction with a major overhaul of the Notes by the Chester Office to bring them in line with the other IUCr journals.

Keeping review time low is important.

General discussion

Identity

The identity of the journal is unclear. It occupies the middle ground between Acta B and Acta E. And while it has been trying to raise its profile and scope to move beyond its original role as a single-structure communication journal, it has not fully achieved this and a lot of the content looks similar. Acta E took over as the single-structure communication journal, publishing articles that would have been published in Acta C. But Acta E has progressed to include papers with more content and more science. Acta C could be suggested

for some of these papers if the Acta E Co-editors were aware that this transfer route was possible.

One of the dilemmas of a Co-editor is what should they tell authors when asked whether an article should be submitted to Acta C or Acta E? The main distinction is that Acta E is the open-access chemistry journal. When Acta E lost its impact factor in 2012, the advice to regain the impact factor was to increase the quality of the content. Having an impact factor is important, so this course of action was followed, which inevitably brought the nature of the content of Acta E closer to that of Acta C. Now, the publishing models are different, but there is a lot more overlap between Acta C and Acta E than when Acta E began.

Transfers between the IUCr chemistry journals

A relatively common decision/recommendation when reviewing for Acta C is to suggest transfer to Acta E. But there does not seem to be any transfer in the other direction. Also there is effectively no transfer from Acta B to Acta C, so although Acta C occupies the middle ground, no papers are being pushed its way from either of the other two chemistry journals.

However, at the moment, all of the chemical journals (B/C/E) are experiencing a downturn in submissions, so it is not a simple case of moving papers to Acta C when suitable. Also the open-access nature of Acta E provides guaranteed revenue for the IUCr.

ACTION: The editorial boards of Acta B and Acta E could be made aware that transfer to Acta C can be considered for suitable submissions.

Submissions

The reason for the downturn in submissions is not clear. It may be to do with competition from similar journals, for example, *Crystals*, which are less stringent and publish speedily.

The scope of Acta C changed a few years ago to say that a paper published in the journal should include more than just the description of a structure, it should tell a chemical story. We have been firm in applying that idea in the past. Should we start accepting good crystal structure papers into Acta C again? It will not help the impact factor, but it will populate the contents pages and not give the impression that the journal is in trouble. This lessening of standards does not apply to papers that are incorrect, but to papers that have good-quality data that up to now we might consider recommending for transfer to Acta E.

One advantage of this is that authors will then have more of a choice, in that they will be able to publish for free in Acta C, rather than paying the open-access fee to publish in Acta E. Also, some of those authors might be covered by transformative deals with Wiley and be able to publish as open access, thus increasing visibility and matching the advantages of Acta E at no direct cost.

The Co-editors did not express any problem with this approach in the short term.

Notes for Authors

We will revisit the Acta C Notes for Authors and revise them to state more clearly what the journal actually is and does. The Notes could be treated like a promotional tool stating upfront important aspects about the journal so that the Notes are useful to non-crystallographers and chemists. An example being that we could make clear that you can submit in formats other than CIF. An editorial might accompany the revised Notes.

ACTION: Alan Kennedy, with the help of the Section Editors, will look at Notes for Authors and see how they can be altered to be more attractive and more informative to potential authors looking to publish in the journal. This could also include emphasis of the advantages and differences with respect to Acta B and Acta E.

Impact factor

The impact factor is affected greatly by highly cited software papers, e.g. a Sheldrick or a Spek paper. What about a paper on APEX5 or CrysAlis PRO? A paper on CrysAlis PRO has been asked for and promised over the years under different Section Editors. These papers are not easy to get, though it is not for the lack of effort, which is still ongoing. We could think about being more systematic about investigating what programs are being used and seeking articles about these.

Collections

The ongoing collections and series look good and the Electron Diffraction collection will be popular. The Best Practices series could involve teaching aspects. We could ask eminent crystallographers (old and new) to contribute and the collection could become a primer for young crystallographers. Acta E has published a substantial number of articles in a teaching issue (https://journals.iucr.org/special_issues/2023/teaching/), so we would need to avoid too much overlap.

It is difficult to get authors to write to a deadline. It may be easier if the collection is tied to a special event (birthday, meeting) or a conference.

The ACA and BCA could be looked at for sessions on best practices. Also, the chair of any appropriate session could be asked for an article giving an overview of the session. The Electron Diffraction collection has been promised an article giving an overview of a panel discussion; something similar might be possible for microsymposia.

Review articles are ideal and Acta C can publish these but they are notoriously difficult to get.

Early-career crystallographers

It would be good to start an initiative to bring in early-career scientists and crystallographers as a long-term plan. We could look at the The Early Stage Crystallographers Group of the BCA and the Young Scientist Special Interest Group (YSSIG) of the American Crystallographic Association and ask for papers reporting the results of their early work. We could also make the Editorial Board available to help with any difficult aspects of the work, working in an educational capacity. Such work could be grouped under a collective title.

Co-editor experience

The reminder messages, the upgraded submission system and PROPHY were found to be useful and liked.

In general terms, a major revision means that more work is required in terms of experiment and a minor revision means that no new work has to be carried out. There may be a problem with what can be uploaded to the submission system depending on whether a mayor or minor revision has been requested. It was reported that if a minor revision is requested then there is no connection to the upload website. Chester will investigate [*ACTION*].

Boilerplate messages are not very friendly so they are rewritten by Co-editors as needed. Co-editors should be aware that their boilerplate messages can be personalised in Chester if they are regularly using their own form messages.

The comments of the Section Editors about proofs are written for the Chester Office and are forwarded to Co-editors for information. No action is needed by Co-editors and no criticism is intended.

We need to pay attention to the speed of the reviewing process. In the rapidly changing world of publishing, it is a very important aspect. We may attract more submissions if we have speedier review. We do operate in a very professional manner so that invariably leads to longer review times, but there is always room for improvement. Getting referees is still the most time-consuming part of review. Articles should be judged on their own merit and the quality of a structure, in terms of checkCIF, does not need to be as high as previously if the structural investigation is only a small part of a wider chemical story. Structural scientists may still be under the impression that Acta C demands that certain strict guidelines be met, but that is not the case and we

need to make this clear.

Review panel

The review panel has been revisited and updated recently. Co-editors have been asked to let the Chester Office know of anyone who consistently declines to review and these reviewers will be contacted about their willingness to continue on the panel.

Marketing and promotion

The Chester office would like to know if you are attending or speaking at a conference and we can link this to some promotional endeavours. We can also provide promotional slides for inclusion in any talk.

Rejected and withdrawn articles

When a paper is withdrawn or rejected there is a chance that it will not come back to Acta C. A suggestion was made that, 4-6 weeks after an article has been withdrawn or rejected, the author should be contacted to suggest that we would be happy to look at any updated version of the article. Chester will do this as a monthly process for articles that we would like to see resubmitted to the journal. [*ACTION*]

Editorial Board

Recent changes to the Editorial Board are outlined in the meeting agenda. Suggestions for new members of the Editorial Board or review panel can be made at any time to the Chester office.

General matters

It was suggested that Acta C could have a different section that would report short form structure reports or letters. IUCrJ has a section entitled Research Letters. Bimonthly publication was suggested but this is not possible due to current agreements with Wiley. Merging of Acta C and Acta E was also suggested. This is part of a long-term plan for discussion and will be addressed in the future, but not at the present time, the main reason being the fact that some of the journals are hybrid and some are open access.

Ideas for future collections

- A collection on software, and perhaps a review article on advances in crystallographic software
- A collection on in-situ measurements; this would loosen the R-factor perception
- Crystallographic problem data sets on the website https://xray.chem.wisc.edu/crystallographic-problems/. The original crystallographers could be encouraged to submit articles describing their problem structures. *ACTION **[DONE]***: contact Ilia Guzei to see if this is a possibility.

Current collections and series

Advances in Electron Diffraction for Structural Characterization (to be published in 2024)
Guest editors: Glenn Yap (University of Delaware, USA; e-mail: gpyap@udel.edu), Eric Reinheimer (Rigaku Americas, USA; e-mail: eric.reinheimer@gmail.com), Joe Ferrara (Rigaku Americas, USA; e-mail: joseph.ferrara@rigaku.com), Laura Samperisi (Eldico Scientific AG, Switzerland; e-mail: samperisi@eldico.ch) and Gunther Steinfeld (Eldico Scientific AG, Switzerland; e-mail: steinfeld@eldico.ch)

Crystallography in Latin America: a vibrant community (to be published in 2024)
Guest editors: Maria Rosales-Hoz (Cinvestav, Mexico; e-mail: mrosales@cinvestav.mx) and Renata Diniz (Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil; e-mail: dinizr@qui.ufmg.br)

Best practice in crystallography (an occasional series for 2024)

Guest editor: Alan Kennedy (University of Strathclyde, Scotland; e-mail: a.r.kennedy@strath.ac.uk)

Exploring intermolecular forces and interactions (2024)
Guest editors: Joseph Reibenspies (Texas A&M University, USA; e-mail: j-reibenspies@tamu.edu) and Peter Corfield (Fordham University, USA; e-mail: pcorfield@fordham.edu)

Initiatives in the Chester Office

- Contact Commission for Structural Chemistry
- Contact authors who published in the journal previously
- Offer free open access to selected authors in competitor journals
- Send open-access articles to authors referenced therein to increase awareness of Acta C

Acta Cryst. Section D - Structural Biology Editorial Board Meeting 12 February 2024

Present: Svetlana Antonyuk, Charlie Bond, Evangelia Chrysina, Gino Cingolani, Mirjam Czjzek, Kristina Djinovic-Carugo, Elspeth Garman, Louise Jones, Randy Read, Markus Rudolph, Peter Strickland, Jiawei Wang, Hongyi Xu

Our new Co-editors were welcomed to *Acta D*.

State of the journal
Acta D is currently getting fewer submissions and this could be a result of a number of factors including a relatively low impact factor.
The publication of a paper about the *CCP4 Suite* should raise the impact factor in a couple of years, showing how one paper can affect this statistic. However, it would be good to take action to increase the number of submissions.

Expanding the scope
Charlie said he had spoken to Rhys Grinter and Gavin Knott who suggested *Acta D* could publish articles about how *AlphaFold* is used in structural biology and how it can be used as a tool in hypothesis testing. Both Rhys and Gavin consider themselves to be 21st century structural biologists and use *AlphaFold* as a tool. Lots of people are now using *AlphaFold* structures instead of crystallographic structures. Randy thought that allowing *AlphaFold* papers was a good idea provided it was emphasised that experiments were still needed. An issue devoted to *AlphaFold* was suggested (*Acta AlphaFoldica*!). Guidelines are needed on what data are required to support *AlphaFold* so an article on these could also be written.

It was thought that the journal needs to develop to cover more structural biology not just crystallography, but it needs to be done in such a way that current or past authors are not alienated. The scope of the journal needs to broaden and Charlie suggested that our journals should be a home for papers published on the arrangement of atoms no matter what technique was used to determine the arrangement.

Gino suggested that the name *Acta Crystallographica* is a hindrance and asked if we could change the name. Peter responded to this stating that in the long term we may review the names of the journals if we move to full open access. While keeping one journal named *Acta Crystallographica*, others may be changed. However, changing the names of journals needs to be done very carefully as it could affect the indexing of journals. There could be a break in the citation record if the new journal name is not seen as a continuation of the old one.

Gino also suggested that *Acta D* should invite authors to contribute to special issues on specific topics. *Acta D* could publish more review articles on topics such as cryoEM, and these could be well cited. Our editors are specialists in a number of areas and could also be asked to write papers.

Hongyi thought that electron diffraction especially microED and 3D-ED were at an exciting development stage. Although lysozyme was the enzyme being studied most, methods were developing. A number of problems were being overcome such as sample thickness, beam damage and the need for a data pipeline.

Promoting the journal
Evangelia thought that we should market the journal to younger people. She thought that they would be interested in the history of how crystallography has developed. Again review articles could be commissioned.

Charlie thought it was good to promote the fact that it does not have to cost anything to publish in *Acta D*. With open-access agreements in place for many institutions, authors won't need to pay open-access fees directly. *Acta D* should be promoted as an authoritative journal which is trustworthy and publishes work that has undergone rigorous review. Like many society journals it has academic strength and rigour. Mirjam said that in France, research institutes are encouraging researchers to publish in society journals rather than in predatory journals.

As the impact factor was likely to rise because of the *CCP4 Suite* paper, Markus wondered if we could commission papers on other highly used programs. He has been trying to get Gerard Bricogne to write a paper on *GRADE* as this does not have a standard journal reference.

Mirjam thought that we should not send out email requests to try to attract authors and everyone agreed that they get too much spam already. She suggested that publicity at conferences was a better way to attract people. Perhaps organising a workshop on publishing, for example at schools for students, could be one way to introduce authors to *Acta D*. The workshop could cover quality, open science, how to spot predatory journals for instance. Randy thought this could work and said that we had a refereeing workshop at the IUCr Congress that was well attended. Elspeth teaches at lots of workshops and said that perhaps she could spend 10 minutes speaking about publishing.

Kristina thought that to broaden the scope we needed to promote *Acta D* at meetings outside of hardcore crystallography such as Protein Science or FEBS meetings.

Evangelia mentioned other places where we could let people know about the benefits of publishing in *Acta D*, for example Instruct and the European Open Science Cloud.

Hongyi wondered if we could reach out to the Chinese community and it was thought that an impact factor above 5 was important to attract Chinese authors.

Hybrid methods could be another area that is promoted. Articles on how the information from different methods is collated, how people decide what experiments to perform, what people actually do and how validation is performed. This would be helpful for young scientists. Promoting an integrative approach could also attract people using cryoEM and *AlphaFold*. Kristina thought that most people now have an integrative approach and a review on the subject would be good.

Virtual collections of papers that we have already published are another way to promote the content of the journal. For example collecting together all the papers from a particular synchrotron or facility - all the beamline papers, equipment and structures (this could be in collaboration with JSR).

Day-to-day editing

Data requirements are now in place for structural articles. There have been some problems with large data files and it is suggested that if an author has problems uploading files they could place them in a drop box or similar. If you let Louise know, they can then be downloaded and placed on the website. Markus had a tip for downloading the data using wget if you are using Linux.

Elspeth reminded people that authors can suggest cover pictures and asked if this could be publicised more. She also noted that any ideas for additions to Notes for Authors are welcomed. She now checks that crystal pictures have scale bars and that the temperature of data collection is included. She has recently had a paper where all the authors did not agree with the revised version so the paper could not be published - so watch

out for problems like this. Randy reminded everyone that the Co-editor handbook is a good source of information if faced with a problem.

Randy, Elspeth and Mirjam said that they had tried Prophy and thought it was good at suggesting reviewers. Markus also thought that it was good for finding a balanced selection *e.g*. people of different ages.

Markus had a problem with mtz files not containing the correct data and suggested that perhaps a pre-submission checklist could be implemented. Louise thought that we should try to keep things simple so that we do not deter authors.

It was thought that some authors believe some of the information asked for is trivial and do not want to include it, even though editors think it is important. It was suggested that we publish instructions on how to obtain the data to include in a paper, *e.g*. for Table 1. Randy explained that some programs are trying to automate this table, *e.g*. *Phenix* and *CCP4*. Perhaps a paper could also explain why the data are needed.

Louise mentioned that the Journals Management Board meeting will be held soon and if anyone has anything to raise at the meeting please let her know.

Acta Cryst. Section F - Structural Biology Communications Editorial Board Meeting 7 February 2024

Present: Jon Agirre, Yang Chen, Louise Jones, Gordon Joyce, Atsushi Nakagawa, Cristy Nonato, Maria Romao, Steven Sheriff, Linda Shimon, Norbert Strater, Peter Strickland, Francis Tsai, Mark van Raaij

It was suggested that we hold meetings 3-4 times per year and for future meetings we will try to change the time of day so as to accommodate editors in different parts of the world.

We have two new *Acta F* Section Editors - Jon Agirre and Cristy Nonato. Together with Mark van Raaij they are formulating a number of new ideas for the journal.

Acta F is currently receiving a low number of submissions so we need to increase the number of articles but without lowering the quality.

Jon explained how we hope to add value to papers and differentiate the journal from others. Ideas include publishing supporting videos with papers or having interviews with the authors.

Short methods communications are encouraged including those on programs and apps. Wet-lab notes on protein purification, expression and crystallization are still welcomed.

The journal also hopes to target younger authors, especially PhD students who are writing up their theses and may want to publish their introduction as a review in *Acta F*. If you know of any students who may be interested please let us know.

Jon would like the journal to be more inclusive and increase the representation of women and minorities, and highlighting such authors in interviews is one way to do this. Francis asked how we would identify women or minorities as it is not always clear who would fall into these groups. Should they identify themselves? Jon suggested we merely ask authors if they agree to participate in an interview. So as not to bias the review process this could be done after acceptance. Jon argues that, due to the leaky pipeline in STEM, women and minorities are much better represented at early stages; by targeting ECR scientists (usually first authors on papers) with the interviews, we aim to showcase this diversity without having to ask for self-identification. Linda suggested that we could go further and include a short CV and photograph with papers. Jon thought that this could be considered for papers of a particular type, *e.g*. those by students.

Norbert wondered if interviews could affect citations if they were part of the paper. It was thought that the interviews would not actually be in the main part of the paper. They could be supporting information or more likely they will be promotional material that appears on the *Acta F* website and social media channels, and has a link to the paper. The idea is that they add value and generate a discussion rather than gain citations in their own right. Francis asked if there would be new sections in the journal to accommodate the papers and it was thought that this would be the case.

Unfortunately, authors still need to publish in journals with high impact factors. We therefore will need to attract manuscripts that are likely to get cited. Extra editorials and commentaries will hopefully attract more high-quality manuscripts. Note that for impact factor calculations, citations of commentaries and editorials do get counted, but they are not included in the total number of papers published.

Problems with reviewing papers written in poor English were discussed. Poor papers should be returned to

the authors and they should be asked to get a colleague who is a native English speaker to help. Good referees may be reluctant to review such papers so it is important that we do not ask them to review papers that are obviously poor quality. Authors can also be encouraged to seek professional help with writing their papers. Details of language-editing services can be found at https://journals.iucr.org/services/languageservices.html.

It was suggested that maybe chatGPT could also be used but we were reminded that although this may use the English language correctly, the content it produces may not be correct. Note that we allow the use of chatGPT in IUCr Journals but expect its use to be documented fully in the paper, and chatGPT is not acceptable as an author on a paper.

Sometimes a supervisor may not have read a student's paper and this may cause problems. It was suggested that we may want early career authors to confirm that their supervisors have read the paper and/or state if they have used chatGPT to write their paper.

Gordon suggested that we may want to improve the text on the *Acta F* home page to list the different types of papers that we will publish. This was thought to be a good idea and it will be updated in due course.
Jon also suggested that we need to post messages on social media about papers *e.g.* "Did you know that *Acta F* publishes..."

The *Acta F* review panel has been in existence for some time and needs refreshing. Note that these are people who have agreed to undertake a certain number of reviews per year. Some people on the board may no longer be able to commit to this. Please let us know if there are any people on the panel that do not respond quickly and could be replaced. Also if there are any people you think are enthusiastic and could join the panel please let us know. The panel is listed on the website at https://journals.iucr.org/f/services/editors.html but if you need more information on the panel please contact Louise.

Separate to the review panel, Mark also keeps a list of people who have asked to be reviewers. These are often unknown to us but may be suitable as a second reviewer if they fit the topic of the paper.

Also mentioned was the Prophy system which can be useful for finding reviewers. This is accessible via the submission system and is worth looking at.

We are also looking for new Co-editors to cover the areas we would like to expand into and to replace Co-editors who have retired. We are particularly short for cryo-EM and other complementary techniques. If you have any suggestions they are most welcome.

Although we are happy to have groups of articles on specific topics, the term special issue has come to be associated with so-called predatory journals and is something to be avoided. We may be better using terms such as focused issue or collection. Suggestions for topical reviews or focused issues where there is a gap in the market are welcomed. Also, if you have seen any innovations or ideas in other journals that you would like to see in *Acta F* please let us know.

Francis asked how could someone tell if a paper should go in *IUCrJ*, *Acta D* or *Acta F*. Louise explained how originally *Acta F* contained crystallization papers and the length of paper was thought to be one criterion but this may not be the case now. We need the Co-editors' help to define what the differences should be and it is a question that we hope to answer as the journal is developed further. Note that transfers do occur between IUCr journals so all is not lost if a paper goes to the "wrong" journal. There is a specific procedure

for transfers and Louise can provide details if you are interested.

Francis thought that having defined subsections, *e.g.* for students, would help. Also one possibility could be to have all biological papers submitted centrally and have a group of people decide where they should go. This was thought to be a large change to our current workflow but could be a possibility in the future.

Mark said that the Journals Management Board meeting will take place in Chester in March 2024 and he and Jon will be attending. If there is anything that the Co-editors want to raise at the meeting then please let us know.

IUCrJ Main Editor meeting 20 February 2024

Annual report

An annual report for *IUCrJ* is being prepared for the JMB meeting on 7-8 March. Peter will prepare some summary paragraphs for the start and end of the report , but would be grateful if each Main Editor could review the paragraph for their section by 1 March. He will write to Main Editors about this.

Attracting high-quality submissions

It is important that the journal continues to attract high-quality submissions. Ideas on how to do this are welcome from all Editorial Board members. Andrew noted that it was important for authors that articles are well reviewed in a reasonably fast time, but occasionally there are some problems. Peter noted that home pages for Editors, Main Editors and Managing Editors are to be updated, and will highlight articles that appear to be stuck in the system, and provide a new mechanism for chasing these.

Voting and quality of submissions

It was felt that the voting system is generally working satisfactorily. It was noted that Richard thinks that some very technical papers are being sent for review. Ted thought that papers needed at least an accessible abstract and introduction. It was also noted that some really good research can be difficult reading, but there clearly needs to be an advance reported for an article to progress. Andrew noted that if there is a tied vote, he looks at the comments but often goes with the opinion of the Main Editor most closely associated with the subject area of the article. For a positive vote where there may nevertheless be some concern that the Abstract or Introduction should be made more accessible to the broader IUCrJ readership, it would be appreciated if this concern is noted as a comment, so as to alert the Co-editor that this issue should be addressed with the authors during the review process.

Peter noted that it is very helpful in case of a no vote to either suggest alternative IUCr journals or even to say that the article is out of scope of IUCr journals.

Points for the Journals Management Board meeting

Richard will attend this meeting on behalf of *IUCrJ*. Please let Peter or Richard know if you have any points that you would like to have discussed at this meeting. One of the chief points of discussion will be to look at ways to boost the number of high-quality submissions to the journals.

Editorial advisory board

IUCrJ has an Editorial Advisory Board with a number of high-profile members. It was agreed that we should write to the Advisory Board to ask if they would like to nominate Co-editor candidates or have specific ideas for developing the journal. Peter will draft a message to go to the Advisory Board. It was also noted that additional members could be added to the Advisory Board to provide help to the journal when needed.

Meetings with Co-editors

Most of the journals are having meetings with their full board before or after the Journals Management Board meeting. It was thought that for *IUCrJ*, virtual meetings of individual sections might work best, with say 1-2 meetings for each section per year. This might be especially useful when there are new Co-editors or a Co-editor is not doing well. Sriram noted that it might also be useful to have an alignment meeting when

the Main Editor of the section rotates out. The IUCr Office can set up such virtual meetings.

Editorials

We are currently publishing around six Editorials each year and running this flexibly seems to work well. Ted will be writing the next (March) Editorial.

Commentaries

The journal is publishing one or two Commentaries each issue. Reviewers of the original article are usually asked to write a Commentary, and generally agree to do so. It was thought that Commentaries are a good feature of the journal.

IUCr 75th collection

Articles will continue to be submitted for this collection for the next 2-3 months. They will generally be labelled 'IUCr 2023 collection' during voting. Around 100 articles have been promised.

Special collection on Structure Prediction

This is a first for *IUCrJ*. It will be a set of around 8-10 articles, all commissioned, on structure prediction in inorganic and organic materials, nano-structures and biomolecular systems. Richard and Ted are putting the issue together. Ted mentioned that one of the topics might be the value of AI in drug design. Sriram mentioned that he had recently contributed a News and Views article on 'Structural biology in the age of AI' (https://www.nature.com/articles/s41592-023-02123-3) that looked at the balance between prediction and experiment.

New subject areas

There were no suggestions for new subject areas to add to *IUCrJ* at this stage.

Status of the Editorial Board

A number of appointments is needed to cover for retirements of Co-editors. Peter agreed to provide a summary of the requirements in these notes.

Five of the sections need to consider additional Co-editor appointments:

Biology and Medicine - up to 4 appointments

Chemistry and Crystal Engineering - 2-3 appointments

CryoEM - OK

Electron Crystallography - OK

Materials and Computation- 2-3 appointments

Neutron and Synchrotron Science and Technology- 2-3 appointments

Physics and Free Electron Laser Science and Technology- 1-2 appointments

Promoting the journal

The use of leaflets and posters at meetings was mentioned. The IUCr Office can also provide slides *e.g.* for the inclusion at the end of lectures or for showing between lectures. In 2024, it will be the 10th anniversary of *IUCrJ*. One idea was to have an Editorial on the 10 most cited papers in the journal. Sriram noted that we need to decide which areas we want to grow, who we want to publish and also consider what we can say that we are better at than our competitors.

Journal of Synchrotron Radiation Editorial Board meeting 21 February 2024

Chair: Kristina Kvashnina. Attendees: Andrew Allen, Yoshiyuki Amemiya, Miguel Aranda, Anna Bergamaschi, Dibyendu Bhattacharyya, Manuel Guizar-Sicairos, Rebecca Ingle, Shelly Kelly, Thomas Proffen, Andrew Stevenson, Richard Strange, Peter Strickland, Tony Weight, Makina Yabashi, Masaki Yamamoto, Diling Zhu.

Introduction

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and the attendees introduced themselves in turn. The new Co-editors were welcomed. It was emphasized that the Main Editors and Editorial Office are always there to help if anyone has any problems with anything.

Editorial board

Details of the JSR Editorial Board were provided - two Co-editors retired in 2023 [Svante Svensson (Uppsala University, Sweden), Vincent Favre-Nicolin (ESRF, France)] and five new Co-editors were appointed [Nong Artrith (Utrecht University, The Netherlands), Manuel Guizar-Sicairos (Paul Scherrer Institut, Switzerland), Rebecca Ingle (University College London, UK), Gihan Kamel (SESAME, Jordan), Diling Zhu (Linac Coherent Light Source, USA)].

Review

It was stressed that the Co-editor is in charge of making the final decision on a paper. Reviewers send in their reports and can advise, but the final decision is with the Co-editor.

Prophy - a tool incorporated into the reviewing system to help Co-editors choose referees - was discussed and was looked on positively in general and provided good suggestions on the whole. However, it should not be used blindly and is best to check the suggestions using, for example, Google Scholar before inviting suggested reviewers. Also check that names suggested by Prophy are not already co-authors of the paper or credited in the Acknowledgments section.

Automatic email chasing was explained for those who have not already experienced it. It was generally found to be helpful, though sometimes authors are given extra time to carry out revisions which the chase emails do not take into account. Chase emails can be disabled for a particular paper if necessary by contacting the Editorial Office. Reviewers also receive email reminders a few days before their deadline is due. It might be useful if Co-editors check their homepage at least once a month in case such emails are not getting through.

A checklist for Co-editors was mentioned, which was something sent out in the past. The Editorial Office will look into providing this to all Co-editors.

Review and revision timescales were discussed. By default, authors are given four weeks to revise their paper. For reviewers, the invite email asks the reviewer to carry out the review in one to two weeks.

It was found that sometimes not all referee reports have been attached to the email that is sent out to the author asking for revision. It is always best to check that all reports are attached at this stage. It was mentioned that it would be easier if the referee reports were made available on the paper homepage along with all other parts of the paper once the

Co-editor had sent the author the revision email. Some other journals do this. The Editorial Office will look into this.

Caution was advised should a reviewer upload their report as an annotated PDF. In one such case the reviewer could be identified from the annotated PDF. Whether a reviewer should be identified was discussed and whether it should be journal policy or left to the reviewer to decide. The current default is that reviewers are kept anonymous. However, some reviewers insist of being named. It was agreed that the reviewer should be the one to decide if they wish to be named.

The Co-editor can be a second reviewer if it is proving difficult to find reviewers.

It is important to communicate personally with reviewers especially if the final decision does not follow their advice. Reviewers are important and spend a lot of their valuable time working on papers for us so it is important to thank them and to inform them of the final decision on a paper. It also helps to build up a relationship with a referee. The Editorial Office will look into whether reviewers could be thanked automatically by email once a decision has been made on a paper.

It was clarified that it is preferable that the Co-editor is not from the same institution as the authors, but reviewers are allowed to be at the same institution as the Co-editor.

Beamline articles

The question arose as to whether beamline articles that describe the *design* of a beamline should be published. The beamlines category of papers was set up so facilities could describe new beamlines, give credit to the beamline scientists and a provide dedicated reference for that beamline. Beamline articles do not necessarily have to show any novel features - a paper on a new beamline at a facility where the beamline scientist is going to ask reviewers to refer to the paper is reasonable. Ideally the beamline should be up and running and results of experiments provided. If it is a beamline *design* paper we should be much more insistent on what is the new concept distinguishing it from other beamlines.

Submissions

Co-editors were asked about ways to attract new submissions to the journal. Suggestions included a personal invitation, for example if a Co-editor were to see a particularly good talk at a conference or meeting.

Promoting JSR

For Co-editors giving talks at meetings, the Editorial Office can provide slides, poster, leaflets etc. for inclusion at the end of lectures to promote JSR, or IUCr journals in general.

Other ideas to promote JSR included:

- Marketing the journal at conferences, JSR anniversary memorabilia, e.g. logos on mugs, coffee cups etc.

- Providing online training days on for example synchrotron radiation methods or something more specialized that we might be in the position to provide with the expertise on the Editorial Board.

Ways to mark the 30th anniversary of JSR were discussed - the first issue was published in October 1994 - and included publishing an editorial on the history of the journal, how it was started and how it has changed over the years, include statistics; asking previous Editors to write a summary of their experiences; inviting papers from facilities, e.g. upgrades to facilities, thought is difficult to know who to ask to write such papers and we should be careful not to omit facilities; inviting papers from new facilities, including an overview of all their beamlines; taking more of a human perspective and asking for example 12 random scientists working at beamlines to write about their own experiences.

Special issues

Forthcoming special issues were listed. Co-editors were encouraged to put forward topics for special issues. One suggestion was new scientific applications at fourth-generation synchrotrons (MAX IV, ESRF-EBS, APS-U) for 2025/2026.

Scientific commentaries

Publishing commentaries on papers is a good way to publicize articles. They are often written by one of the referees. Co-editors were encouraged to contact the Editorial Office if they accept a good paper that would make a good commentary article.