described the factors that influence a person’s decision to agree to review manuscripts and how to conduct an experiment to find a better outcome, the meeting offered something for everyone.

Another well-attended session was the “Report from an Authorship Retreat”. The session summarized the discussion at a retreat held on the previous night on authorship; the goal of the retreat was to make progress in defining authorship among the sciences. Items of consensus included these: editors should require authors to identify their contributions to a work, contributors not listed as authors should be identified (in the acknowledgments), and accountability is key. Less clear were how to indicate individual contributions to a work and whether it is acceptable for authors to be accountable for only the parts of the work that they themselves did. CSE will grapple with the thorny issues raised in the session for further white-paper revisions.

The five international scholars (recipients of CSE scholarships), four from Nigeria and one from Nepal, added depth and breadth to the meeting by asking questions, networking, and explaining the issues that they face in their daily work.

The second annual CSE poster session featured seven fascinating presentations on journal readability, trends in authorship, incorrect journal references, improving submission-to-publication timing statistics, evaluating a reviewer-grading system, visibility of journals after inclusion in the Web of Science, and tracking the growth and use of journals. [Editor’s note: For abstracts of the posters, please see pages 111–114 of the July–August 2009 issue of Science Editor.] The poster presenters were willing to discuss their research in detail and inspired others to begin their research projects to present at CSE next year.

And, finally, if you missed an important session or missed the meeting entirely, thanks to the efforts of Web Editor Seth Beckerman, we can “Show You the Data”: the presentations are available online at www.councilscienceeditors.org/events/2009_presentations.cfm.

Read More about the Annual Meeting Sessions

For reports on sessions of the 2009 CSE annual meeting, please see the Annual Meeting Reports sections of this issue and the next two issues of Science Editor. Special thanks to Jamie Holaday and Bernard Appiah for recruiting the reporters and compiling the reports.

♦ Poster on Readability Wins at Annual Meeting

Attendees at the 2009 CSE annual meeting chose as best poster “Readability in Natural History Journals” by Elizabeth Hassell, Amy Ostvig, Matt Terry, Janene Auger, and E Shannon Neeley, of Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Each annual-meeting attendee received a ballot. The prize for the winning poster was a copy of Scientific Style and Format: The CSE Manual for Authors, Editors, and Publishers, 7th edition, and free registration for the 2010 CSE annual meeting.

Abstracts of all posters presented at the 2009 annual meeting appeared in the July–August 2009 issue of Science Editor. Abstracts of posters for potential presentation at the 2010 annual meeting will be due in February; please watch the CSE Web site for the call for submissions.

Poster presenter Elizabeth Hassell and fellow attendee Susan M Shirley