The Challenges of Bibliographic Control and Scholarly Integrity in an Online World of Multiple Versions of Journal Articles

by **Todd Carpenter** (Managing Director, NISO, One North Charles Street, Suite 1905, Baltimore, MD 21201; Phone: 301-654-2512; Fax: 410-685-5278) <tcarpenter@niso.org> *www.niso.org*

by **Sanford G. Thatcher** (Director Emeritus, Penn State Press, 8201 Edgewater Drive, Frisco, TX 75034-5514; Phone: 214-705-1939) <sandy.thatcher@alumni.princeton.edu>

What began as two separate efforts — to describe recent efforts at bringing the problem of multiple versions of articles under stronger bibliographic control and to confront the problems of multiple versions for the integrity of scholarly practices raised by the widespread adoption of Green OA mandates — had the happy outcome of being combined when **Katina Strauch** suggested to us that our topics were closely enough related to be usefully joined in a co-edited special issue. We think the articles we commissioned bear out her faith in this complementary relationship between the two subjects examined here.

In a way, the second problem may be viewed as one special case of the more general challenges identified under the heading of the first problem. The background for the latter is laid out broadly by **Todd Carpenter** in his survey of three major efforts at enhanced bibliographic control — Journal Article Versions (**NISO/ALPSP**), Versions of Eprints (**JISC**), and the Version Identification Framework (**JISC**) — with JAV focusing on journal articles alone while the **JISC** projects expanded the scope to include "a broader range of content forms." **Carol Anne Meyer** describes how **CrossMark**, an extension of the **CrossRef** system, is being developed to build on the JAV initiative and extend it even further by using it

for books as well as journals. **Lettie Conrad** discusses the challenges that **SAGE Publications** is facing in incorporating the JAV recommendations into its **SAGE Journals Online** system hosted by **HighWire Press**.

Stevan Harnad begins the second section by outlining the rationale for, and progress of, Green OA as his preferred strategy for moving STM publishing, and eventually all scholarly publishing, in the direction of open access. With this framework he discusses how peer review, and to a lesser extent copyediting, will remain the only valuable functions that publishers will have reason to charge for in an OA environment. Reflecting on his long experience as an STM journal copyeditor, **Joe Fineman** follows with an honest assessment of what kinds of service copyeditors can usefully continue to provide in an online publishing environment and what kinds may no longer justify the expense of providing. Building on these contributions, but focusing more on journal publishing in the humanities and social sciences, **Sanford Thatcher** reports the results of a collaborative effort by several university press copyeditors to assess the adequacy of Green OA versions (what in JAV's terminology would be called "Accepted Manuscripts") posted on **Harvard's** DASH repository, comparing these as feasible with the final versions as published (JAV's Versions of

Record"). One perhaps surprising result of this exercise is that much editing traditionally done for print-based journals, especially formatting to conform with house style, is unnecessary in an online environment, whereas types of editing not typically now done for reasons of cost, such as checking of citations and quotations for accuracy, will become cheaper to perform and more important as contributions to scholarly integrity.