Cloud publishing — One year on
# SAGE STM journals

Grown to 4th biggest medical publisher in 2013

## Number of journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th># Medical Journals With RSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWW</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley-Blackwell</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informa/ T&amp;F</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary-Ann Liebert</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Turnaround times and quality

- Time to publication: Driving down average turnaround times (average down to 25 days)
- Fast-track 9 days (we don’t do published author version)
- Quality: author and editor surveys confirm quality is going up
- Investing in good copy-editing and automation
The STM factor

• Acceleration:
  STM drives workflow changes and innovation

• Automation:
  part of what STM is all about, plus controlling cost
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![Graph showing ratio of number of journals to number of resources](image)
2013● Reduced turnaround times, good quality, no increase in costs
● Per page rate vs flat rate (ie for web pdfs); standardizing costs 2014 and beyond

2014● Automation: typesetting costs going down, quality checks and enhancement
● Templates: costs going down

2007
Management/Development
Manual tasks

2015
Management/Development
Manual tasks

Automation
Cloud publishing — One year on

Rethinking the liaisons between Intellectual Capital Management and Knowledge Management

Paul H.J. Hendriks
Radboud University Nijmegen, Institute for Management Research

Célio A.A. Sousa
State University of Campinas, Research Unit UNICAMP

Abstract
Intellectual Capital Management (ICM) and Knowledge Management (KM), two highly popular topics in current management discussions, are often used interchangeably. The venous understanding of ICM is that amounts of measurement, reporting and evaluation most directly define this perspective, whereas KM connects diversity of organizational knowledge with possibilities and limitations of management. That raises the question of how the management focus on knowledge in KM discussions is connected to the evaluation and measurement approaches of ICM. An extensive review of the literature shows that knowledge plays a background role in ICM literature [1]. It could be argued that the concept of ICM is in the way of KM literature in the ability to explain and understand the notion of knowledge as an organizational resource or capability is not. More specifically, the perspective of ICM in KM measurement discussion, a use of knowledge, perspective approach, own firm elements of knowledge are used to supplement stock elements. Critical understanding of knowledge, for instance, as intangible-based assets, are actually absent from ICM discussions. What this makes perhaps is that ICM and KM discussions, which are presently mostly developed in isolation, should set up more meaningful and systematic studies than are currently established. Two important areas for building such studies include (i) the period of the contextual, temporally derived and socially built nature of knowledge in relation to measurement and (ii) developing a systematic approach to understanding what measuring or not measuring does to organizational knowledge.
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1. Introduction

Intelligent Capital Management (ICM) and Knowledge Management (KM) are often used interchangeably [1, 2]. At first sight this appears plausible. Many authors use the term “knowledge” in the definition of both concepts. For instance, IC is defined as “the state of knowledge of the executive and the practical resolution of that knowledge” [1], or more concisely as “knowledge that produces value” [2]. The management of IC (or KM) then almost inevitably becomes “knowledge management.”

On closer examination, however, the relationship between ICM and KM appears more problematic than suggested by the many definitions of the term “intellectual capital” and “knowledge management.” The common ground for both deems often concerns the organizational perspectives on knowledge. As several authors argue [e.g. 1, 6, 7], a perspective on organizations as knowledge systems holds the reality that intangible competitive advantage depends on the effective and efficient integration of distributed knowledge, i.e. relevant knowledge concerning different subjects is available in different persons across different locations. Knowledge becomes organizational because of its distributed nature. An interpretation of organizational knowledge as distributed capacity (the ICM perspective)...
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Word proof workflow
Benefits

- Cleaner xml
- Turnaround times reduced (up to 20%)
- Widening gap between display and content: Authors/editors more willing to work just on content, and leave the display for later
- Time to publication down, less correction rounds, both at revises and xml stages
- 95% of authors/editors submit in Word, so are more comfortable editing Word than marking up a PDF.
- Quality not affected in key areas
- There will be no manual intervention of incorporating the corrections at the typesetter’s end, which minimizes the chance of corrections missed out.
- Workflow as stepping stone to cloud publishing: Authors/editors and Production Editors directly involved with source files

Challenges

- Managing author/editor expectations (some layout/special character problems; guidelines)
- Some layout-, math-, and font-heavy journals for now excluded
- Managing in-house expectations (quality/technical issues/effort to process files)
C&M’s emBOX

Cenveo’s
Online Editing System (OES)

Hurix’ Dictera
ONLINE EDITING SYSTEM
Proof Corrections made Online

BENEFITS TO PUBLISHER

- Online editing using HTML5
- Insertion and removal of images, text and Unicode characters
- Integration with file management system
- Authors/Editors are allowed to modify the allocated files with login credentials
- Multiple file attachments (any media files)
- Changes made can be viewed as standard PDF Proof
From innovation into production

- Keep it simple
- Chose small number of partners
- Have clear team structure
- Deliver often and early
- Know how much control over development is needed
- Work with authors/editors
Current workflow

Word proof workflow
Workflow variables

Complex text books

- Word
- NLM xml
- Cloud/html
- InDesign
- NLM xml
- Print pdf/ePub/Web pdf/Full text

Templated journals

- Word
- NLM xml
- Cloud/html
- In-house .css
- Princexml
- NLM xml
- Print pdf/ePub/Web pdf/Full text

Encyclopaedias

- Word
- NLM xml
- InDesign
- In-house .css
- NLM xml
- Print pdf/ePub/Web pdf/Full text

- Cloud/html
- In-house .css
- NLM xml
- Print pdf/ePub/Web pdf/Full text
Next steps

- Assess how we deal with very complex titles (i.e., TeX)
- Analyze relation between technical challenges and workflow/organizational parameters, and most importantly, expectations from different stakeholders
Work with authors/editors

What exactly do they work on? (articles/multimedia content/course work)
  → Define framework; define internal and external stakeholders

How do they work? (technical knowledge)
  → Define tool infrastructure (ie for references and version control)
  → Define level of author/editor tasks
Further reading

- Bill Kasdorf: Deconstructing the Editorial and Production Workflow

All other further reading from last year:

“Publishing is about content, not format”

Don’t bind content to display

DS Willis

Boil, Reduce, Simmer”

Brendan Dawes