(264–271) Proposals to refine Articles 29–31 with regard to effective publication of electronic material

Nicholas J. Turland[1] & Sandra Knapp[2]

1 *Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin, Freie Universität Berlin, Königin-Luise-Str. 6–8, 14195 Berlin, Germany*
2 *Department of Life Sciences, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*
Author for correspondence: *Nicholas J. Turland, n.turland@bgbm.org*

DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/653.35

The following proposals aim to address the happily few "teething problems" that have occurred since the effective publication of electronic material became possible on 1 January 2012, following the decisions of the Melbourne Congress in 2011.

(264) Delete clause (c) of Rec. 29A.2:

"*29A.2.* Authors of electronic material should give preference to publications that are archived and curated, satisfying the following criteria as far as is practical (see also Rec. 29A.1):

(a) The material should be placed in multiple trusted online digital repositories, e.g. an ISO-certified repository.

(b) Digital repositories should be in more than one area of the world and preferably on different continents.

~~*(c)* Deposition of printed copies in libraries in more than one area of the world and preferably on different continents is also advisable (but see Rec. 30A.2).~~"

Recommendations in the *Code* should be realistic. It is not realistic to expect libraries to deal with potentially huge numbers of what are essentially reprints. If authors wish to print copies of electronic publications and deposit them in libraries, they are free to do so, and the libraries can decide whether or not to accept or curate them.

(265) Amend Art. 30.2 as follows (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough):

"*30.2.* An electronic publication is not effectively published if there is evidence within or associated with the publication that it**s content** is merely ~~a~~ preliminary ~~version that~~ **and** was, or is to be, replaced by ~~a version~~ **content** that the publisher considers final, in which case only **the version with** that final ~~version~~ **content** is effectively published."

The aim here is to more clearly establish that it is the *content* of an electronic publication that must not be preliminary in order for

publication to be effective. For the definition of content, see prop. 268 below.

(266) Add a new Note after Art. 30.2:

"*Note n*. An electronic publication may be a final version even if details, e.g. volume, issue, or page numbers, are to be added or changed, provided that those details are not part of the content (see Art. 30.2bis)."

This Note is to clarify that page numbers are not part of the content of a publication and are therefore to be excluded from the question of what is a preliminary or final version. For Art. 30.2bis, see prop. 268 below. This makes explicit the rejection of the amendment to Art. 29 Prop. B at the Nomenclature Section of the Melbourne Congress (see Flann & al. in PhytoKeys 41: 118–119. 2014). From the floor it was proposed that the word "paginated" be inserted in what are now the last words of Art. 29.1 (i.e. "…in an online [paginated] publication with an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) or an International Standard Book Number (ISBN).") – the amendment was defeated by a show of hands.

(267) Move Art. 30 Note 1 and Ex. 5 to Art. 29.

This is editorial. Article 30 Note 1 and Ex. 5 belong in Art. 29, not in Art. 30. Moreover, Ex. 5 does not even illustrate Note 1. The PDF publication mentioned in the Example does not contain an ISSN or ISBN, so there is no "citation … of an inappropriate ISSN or ISBN". The Editorial Committee should consider replacing or repositioning this Example.

(268) Convert Art. 30 Note 2 to an Article, as follows (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough):

"~~*Note 2*~~ ***30.2bis***. Content ~~in~~ **of an electronic publication includes that which is visible on the page, e.g. text, tables, illustrations, etc., but it excludes volume, issue, and page numbers; it also excludes** external sources accessed via a hyperlink or URL (Uniform Resource Locator) ~~embedded in text is not part of the publication; nor is associated information that does not form part of the text itself, such as page numbers (if preliminary or lacking) or watermarks. Content is that which stands alone as the version that the publisher considers final (see Art. 30.2)~~."

Art. 30 Note 2 is promoted to an Article and amended so as to define what content is and especially what it is not. See prop. 271 below for a Recommendation on the positioning of the date of publication as part of the content.

Art. 30.3 could be editorially moved to immediately precede Art. 30.4. It would be welcome if someone could find a good Example to illustrate Art. 30.3.

(269) Add to Rec. 30A.1 (new text in bold):

"*30A.1.* Preliminary and final versions of the same electronic publication should be clearly indicated as such when they are first issued. **The phrase "Version of Record" should only be used to indicate a final version in which the content will not change.**"

The phrase "Version of Record" is commonly used by publishers to indicate the final version of an electronic publication. This addition is to encourage its use and to discourage its misuse for what is in fact a preliminary version.

(270) Add a new paragraph after Rec. 30A.1:

"*30A.1bis*. To facilitate citation, final versions of electronic publications should contain final pagination."

Many journals publish final versions of articles individually in advance of completion of an issue (e.g. "online first" or "issue in progress" articles). In some cases, the pagination of such articles is preliminary, later to be repaginated when the articles are arranged in an issue in a sequence other than that in which they were published. Preliminary pagination can cause difficulty in accurately citing the publication, especially after both preliminarily and definitively paginated PDFs of the same publication have been published. "Citation-ready" publications, in which the final version is published only with final pagination, avoid such problems. We realize that some journals have good reasons for arranging articles in a particular, non-chronological sequence. Nevertheless, we hope this Recommendation will help move citation-ready publications toward standard practice.

When it is necessary to cite an article that only has preliminary pagination, e.g. when it is not possible to wait until the final pagination becomes available, it could be helpful to indicate in the citation that the pagination is preliminary. We suggest the Editorial Committee seek examples of good practice in citation for inclusion as Examples in the *Code*.

(271) Reword Rec. 31B.1 as follows:

"*31B.1.* The date of effective publication should be clearly indicated as precisely as possible within a publication as part of the content. When a publication is issued in parts, this date should be indicated in each part."

This is a simplification and modernization of the present Recommendation, which contains wording left over from the days when only printed matter could be effectively published. It also specifies that the date should be indicated in the *content* of the publication, which is especially important in electronic material where the date might otherwise appear far less usefully, e.g., on an associated web page.