

MINUTES OF JAV TECHNICAL WG, 19 January 2006

ATTENDEES: Scott Plutchak, John Ober, Catherine Jones, Claire Saxby, Bev Acreman, Bernie Rous

APOLOGIES: Pete McCracken, Cliff Morgan, Andrew Wray, Evan Owens

1. BR had circulated the CrossRef document which was agreed to be close conceptually with the work we are doing, and also seemed to be struggling with concepts and terms.

2. Working from Catherine's proposal and questions, and referring to John's depiction/description of relationships, we concentrated on terminology and definitions including:

Author's Original Term Agreed

Definition: The starting point for a work that is at an appropriate quality level for the author(s) to submit it to the external approval/publication process. Tells the user that no-one other than the author(s) has accepted responsibility for the article. May also have a version number or date. Content and layout as the author(s) style.

Accepted Manuscript Term Agreed

Much discussion surrounded this item. It was noted that not all Accepted Manuscripts are peer-reviewed (some accepted by the editor without change), also theoretically the article may not have changed at all, but conceptually it now had a quality stamp having been accepted by a journal. There was some discussion about substituting "quality review" for peer-review, as a term that could more usefully cover various forms of quality control (e.g. editorial reviews of an invited piece from a known scholar). It was assumed that readers could follow links to descriptions of quality review processes rather than attempt to capture the variants in quality review via version metadata. It was decided that this was an important difference between the author's original and the accepted manuscript and that the iterations in between were less important to document.

We decided to use the CrossRef glossary terms with some key differences:

Definition: Represents the author's version of the manuscript that follows significant value-adding activities by the 2nd party, e.g. processing, quality review, communicating revisions, and editing, but prior to final typesetting for publication. This version of the work may have a DOI assigned.

2nd Party Proof Term Agreed

This is a conceptual stage and need not be different from the Accepted Manuscript.

Definition: Version(s) of the article created as part of the publication process; including: copy-edited version, typeset version or proof, revised proof. This would include the early release version to the publisher's websites. Content: peer-reviewed and layout: 2nd party's style.

2nd Party Version of Record

Discussion parked until next meeting. Dislikes in current definition include the implied legal responsibility all publishers have disclaimers when it simply means a license to publish or copyright has been assigned. We discussed taking out the notion of responsibility in favour