

MINUTES OF MEETING OF JAV TECHNICAL WG, 2 February 2006

Present: Andrew Wray, Bernie Rous, Bev Acreman, Claire Saxby, Cliff Morgan (chair), Evan Owens, John Ober, Peter McCracken

Apologies for absence: Catherine Jones, Scott Plutchak

The WG focused on discussing the terms and definitions that had been agreed at the previous meeting of 19 January.

1. "Author's Original"

This term was preferred to "Preprint" because "Preprint" implied that the article would eventually go through some form of publishing process, whereas the term "Author's Original" does not imply any further processing, and makes it clear that the author takes full responsibility for the article.

"Original" is preferred to "Draft" since "Draft" implies a level of incompleteness that may not be true of an article at this stage.

The Author's Original may go through any number of iterative stages. The term does not imply that any peer review process has taken place between one Author's Original and a later version of an Author's Original - the two versions may differ as a result of peer review, or they may not; and the form of peer review itself may vary considerably - it may be blind or open, it may be thorough or cursory. We will not attempt to define the various flavours of review. "Caveat lector".

TERM AND DEFINITION AGREED as in minutes of 19 January

2. "Accepted Manuscript"

Noted that this was the equivalent to "Postprint" in SHERPA/RoMEO terminology, but we will not try to do a cross-mapping of our terms and other terms since if they are not one-to-one mappings they may confuse.

CM proposed a change in the definition so that it said "prior to copy-editing" rather than "prior to final typesetting". That is, stages that occur between "Accepted Manuscript" and "final typesetting" should belong in the next category ("Proof"), which we are proposing should be used for any version of the article that is essentially an internal publisher (used in its broadest sense) version.

TERM AND CHANGE TO DEFINITION AGREED

3. "2nd Party Proof"

JO noted that the term "2nd party" was introduced at this stage to emphasise that a party other than the author had now become involved. However, since second parties are also involved in any review process that may occur with an "Author's Original", this was not strictly true, so it was proposed to drop the "2nd Party" and just use "Proof".

A proof would not be the same as the Accepted Manuscript - it would have to represent some later stage, even if that was for example a normalization of the author's Word document into a standard style. In this case, the un-normalized Word version would be the Author's Original and the normalized version a Proof.

CM queried the 19 January definition, which states that "This [version] would include the early release version to the publisher's websites". Some publishers may regard the early release version as a proof version (especially if it's very early, such as Elsevier's Articles in Press), but others would regard the early release version as the Version of Record. Proposed to delete reference to early version from the 19 January definition.

TERM "PROOF" AND CHANGE TO DEFINITION AGREED

4. "2nd Party Version of Record"

Agreed to delete "2nd Party" and to revise definition so that it uses the phrase "declares fit for, or approves for, publication" rather than makes any reference to legal responsibility.

TERM "VERSION OF RECORD" AND DEFINITION (broadly) AGREED

5. "Corrected Version of Record"

This refers to Versions of Record that have been formally corrected by the party responsible for declaring the article fit for publication.

If the author updates the article, and such an update is not formally published as a Corrected Version of Record, it will constitute a new Author's Original. [Not sure I've quite got this right! Maybe only a new Author's Original if updating makes article sufficiently different? May need to bite the bullet and distinguish between Corrected Version of Record and Author's Update of Version of Record ...].

TERM "CORRECTED VERSION OF RECORD" AGREED. DEFINITION TO BE AGREED

Some general points:

- i) Each version has value added compared with the previous version.
- ii) Two versions are essentially fixed stages - the Accepted Manuscript and the Version of Record. All of the other versions may have any number of iterative stages, each of which should be identified by a date stamp.
- iii) Accepted Manuscripts should have a link to a site that describes any (peer) review process that the article undertook in order to achieve Accepted Manuscript status.
- iv) Versions that are supposed to be "internal process" stages (any of the Proof stages) may "leak out" and be made publicly available