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A Note from the New JLSC Editors

Mark Newton & Melanie Schlosser
Editors-in-Chief

We would like to take just a few words to say how honored we are to have the privilege of working on this inspiring project: editing the Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication (JLSC) has been deeply satisfying and engaging work, primarily because of the insightful contributions of so many across our community. And with this—we’re off and running. Our first new issue begins with two articles, and we’ll be adding to it in the weeks to come.

Our shared vision for this next chapter of the journal includes a conscious push forward to advance JLSC beyond print-publishing traditions that no longer make sense for us. With this first issue, we’re moving the journal fully into a mode of continuous (incremental) publication. Rather than produce a number of discrete issues each year, we’ll publish a single general issue for the year, and add new articles as they’re ready. We will continue to have discrete special issues as needed. As JLSC has already been publishing incrementally within the individual issues, this is a fairly small change, but we feel it will be beneficial to our authors and readers in getting content to press as quickly as possible, and will simplify our editorial and production processes. We will be working with our editorial board to introduce more procedural advancements to the journal in the months to come, and we are excited to have the opportunity to innovate within the best practices for digital publishing.

We also want to take this opportunity to express our gratitude towards our excellent pool of new and continuing peer reviewers. When we sent out a call for applications for new reviewers in January, our expectations were modest. Imagine our excitement when we very quickly received an almost overwhelming number of applications, which continue to trickle in six months later. We attribute the interest in reviewing to the excellent work done by the
inaugural editors (Isaac Gilman and Marisa Ramirez) and the dedication and generosity of the community of librarians working in scholarly communication, and are immensely grateful for it. Since January, we have added 57 new reviewers to our pool, and documented review interests for 27 existing reviewers. We continue to reach outside of our pool when we need additional expertise, but we now have a wealth of talented people at our fingertips, and it has made all the difference in our work.

In this issue: Jeremy Kenyon, Nancy Sprague, and Edward Flathers of the University of Idaho work to better understand the journal article as a vehicle for enabling the distribution of data in supplementary files. In comparing disciplinary practices, the authors identify a number of similarities that suggest some common limitations to the approach. Examining both access to and utility of shared data, the authors highlight the necessity of manual processing of supplementary content to enable reuse. In our other article, editor Melanie Schlosser reports on a study she conducted to understand the presentation of copyright information on journals published by libraries. While her findings suggest that the community has room to improve practice in this area, the study itself represents a tendency toward introspection, community building, and challenge of assumptions that has characterized library publishing or #libpublishing in recent years.

That one of our earliest articles is written by a member of the editorial team requires some contextualization. The research project reported on was well underway before the call for new editors, and was always intended for publication in JLSC. We were assured by the outgoing editor that it was appropriate for an editor to submit to her own journal, but it still posed challenges to our editorial workflow. The solution we settled on involved an entirely ‘offline’ process managed by Mark. In all other respects, this article was handled like any other: with anonymous peer review, an editorial decision, and revisions addressing reviewer and editorial comments. We feel that the resulting article was strengthened by the journal’s review process, and meets JLSC’s high standards for quality.

We hope you enjoy these articles, and we encourage you to sign up to be notified when new content is added to the issue. An RSS feed and an announcements email list are both available via the journal’s homepage. We look forward to this next era in the life of our journal and we welcome your feedback and your submissions.