

## **Minutes of the 2014 DCPB Divisional Business Meeting (Austin, TX)**

The business meeting of the Division of Comparative Physiology and Biochemistry (DCPB) was held on 4 January 2014 at the Hilton Austin in Austin, Texas. Division Chair Don Mykles called the meeting to order at 5:45 PM. Don introduced incoming Chair Stephen Secor, Program Officer Jonathon Stillman, incoming Secretary Deborah Lutterschmidt, and incoming Student/Postdoc Representative Natalie Pitts. The meeting was then turned over to Bill Zamer, NSF Program Officer for the Physiological and Structural Systems Cluster, who provided the following update on the Division of Integrative Organismal Systems (IOS).

The NSF budget for the coming year is not yet finalized, and Bill reported that IOS is operating at approximately 90% of the 2013 fiscal year budget. NSF support for SICB symposia will be very competitive, and Bill indicated that program officers are particularly interested in funding the following types of endeavors: symposia that look to the future of a particular field of science (versus symposia that are primarily retrospective in nature), and workshops that address specific questions to discuss what direction(s) and or goal(s) a particular field should follow. Bill also reminded DCPB members that only the Animal Behavior Cluster supports Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant (DDIG) submissions, and members should contact their respective program officers if they have questions about why other clusters within IOS do or do not accept DDIG proposals.

Next, Bill reminded DCPB members about the recent change in the policy to Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) Program: requests for REU support should be built into full proposals and requested at the time of submission, as REU supplement requests will no longer be considered. This policy change reflects the assumption/expectation that undergraduates should be involved in all NSF-funded research, so the costs of supporting undergraduate research should be built into the proposal itself. The Division of IOS is still interested in supporting Mid-Career Investigator Awards; these awards are designed to provide opportunities for well-established, post-tenured but non-retired researchers to retool their research programs, particularly in the areas of genomics and bioinformatics. A Mid-Career Investigator Award is issued as a supplement to an existing award, either the researcher's own award or that of a collaborator. Bill urged interested and qualified members to contact their program officers to discuss the opportunity further. Bill highlighted NSF's support of SICB with the Broadening Participation Social on the evening of Monday, 6 January 2014. The social will be followed by an update of the new preproposal system from NSF program officers.

The NSF Divisions of IOS and Environmental Biology (DEB) initiated a 3-year preproposal pilot program in Jan 2012. Bill reminded DCPB members that the DEB core solicitation differs from that of IOS. In particular, the submission deadlines between DEB and IOS differ, and the Conflicts of Interest templates for the two divisions are also different and cannot be interchanged. DEB will be testing an additional new policy: invited full proposals that receive a high quality ranking but are unfunded can bypass the preproposal process in the next round and be submitted directly as a full proposal. This policy is specific to DEB and has not been instituted in IOS. Bill urged all eligible junior faculty planning to submit a CAREER proposal for the July 2014 deadline to submit the relevant project as a preproposal in Jan 2014. Bill emphasized that the opportunity to receive feedback from NSF reviewers would be invaluable in making the CAREER proposal more competitive.

Finally, Bill discussed that a current focus of the Grand Challenges in Organismal Biology is "Genomes to Phenomes" and encouraged members to consider opportunities for planning grants. A Wiki will be available soon to solicit feedback. Don Mykles, DCPB Chair, further

echoed that the Wiki will be critical for voicing opinions about policy as well as where investments can be made strategically. The meeting was then turned back over to the DCPB.

Don announced that Ted Garland, Jr. has agreed to be the DCPB representative for The 9<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Comparative Physiology and Biochemistry (ICCPB), to be held 23-28 August 2015 in Kraków, Poland. In January 2014, Stephen Secor will take over as DCPB Chair, Deborah Lutterschmidt as Secretary, and Natalie Pitts as Student/Postdoc Representative. Elections will be held in spring 2014 to elect a new Program Officer and Chair-elect. Stephen Secor has organized a Nominating Committee for these elections, and Stephen encouraged anyone interested in being involved in the elections to contact him.

Regarding the Division's budget, DCPB supported four different symposia at the 2014 SICB annual meeting with a total of \$2000: \$1000 for Epigenetics: Molecular Mechanisms through Organismal Influences, \$1000 for Stress, Condition and Ornamentation, \$500 for The Micro and Macro of Nutrient Effects in Animal Physiology and Ecology, and \$250 for Methods and Mechanisms in Ecoimmunology. These funds were made available, in part, through the \$5 per member surcharge for the DCPB and an increase in the allocation of member dues to the DCPB to support symposia. The DCPB has also agreed to provide \$9000 to the American Physiological Society (APS) to support two symposia at the APS Intersociety Meeting: Comparative Approaches to Grand Challenges in Physiology, to be held 5-8 Oct 2014 in San Diego, CA.

The SICB executive committee joined the divisional business meeting at approximately 6:10 PM; committee members Jon Harrison, Billie Swalla, Peter Wainwright, Lou Burnett, Karen Martin, and Brett Burk were present. Program Officer Jon Harrison provided a SICB membership update, stating that SICB has 3400 members, and that the Austin 2014 meeting is the second largest meeting in SICB history with more than 1500 abstracts submitted. The Society's Journal, Integrative and Comparative Biology (ICB), is in the top 10 of 150 journals in this category and has an impact factor of 3.0. The journal is currently looking for an editor.

The Executive Committee then discussed with the DCPB an option for the 2018 annual meeting location. Sheraton, Inc. has offered SICB a 4% rebate on hotel reservations (a potential savings of \$40,000 for the Society) if SICB commits to the Swan and Dolphin Resort (a Disney property) in Orlando, Florida for the 2018 annual meeting. Despite the potential savings that could be used to support students and/or lower registration fees, there were substantial and significant concerns raised by the members of the DCPB. Many members cited the relatively poor experience they had at the 2006 annual meeting in Orlando, held at the Buena Vista Palace Resort and Spa in the Walt Disney World Resort. Most of the cited concerns were related to the very high costs of food and drink, and the distance of the hotel property from restaurants, bars, and other attractions. An excellent point was made that city centers are a real draw for people when considering whether they will attend the SICB annual meeting, and other members pointed out that if fewer people attend the annual meeting the promised 4% rebate from Sheraton won't actually benefit the Society as much. Brett Burk, SICB's Executive Director, together with the Executive Committee, said the discussion about the 2018 annual meeting venue would continue, and returned the meeting floor to the DCPB at approximately 6:15 PM.

An update was provided about the Bartholomew Award by Art Woods and Shiela Patek, Chair and incoming Chair, respectively, of the Bartholomew Award Selection Committee. There was a brief discussion about ways to elevate the prestige of the award outside of the society. The Bartholomew Award has been one of the most successful awards of SICB and the DCPB, who sponsors the award, but its prestige typically doesn't translate beyond SICB.

Some suggestions for accomplishing this task included: 1) advertising the Bartholomew Award more broadly to obtain a larger applicant pool (there were 10-12 applications per year on average for the last 5 years); and 2) raising the profile of the award by providing a bigger platform for the winner (e.g., contacting Nature or Science and negotiating space for a 2-page essay to be written by the Awardee, contacting the NY Times to negotiate spots in their blog for the Awardee, asking the Journal of Experimental Biology to publish a press release, or requiring the winner to contribute a research article in Integrative and Comparative Biology). It was suggested that accomplishing these goals would not only benefit the Bartholomew Award recipient but also the Society as a whole.

Stephen Secor, incoming Division Chair, delivered the journal report from Physiological and Biochemical Zoology on behalf of Katie Gilmour and Trish Schulte, Co-editors in chief, who could not attend the annual meeting. Don Mykles delivered the Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology journal report. Both reports are appended to the end of these meeting minutes.

The last item discussed was the upcoming deadline for Symposium Proposals for the 2016 meeting in Portland, Oregon. There were relatively few proposals submitted for the 2015 Palm Beach Meeting, where there will be a total of 12 symposia. The DCPB would like to have a strong presence at the 2016 Portland meeting, and Don encouraged members to start thinking about/planning potential symposia topics now, well in advance of the August 2014 deadline. In particular, pairing up with other divisions would be a great way to generate broad interest in DCPB-sponsored symposia.

Members with comments or suggestions regarding the online app or the meeting program were encouraged to contact Jonathon Stillman or the Executive Committee. Members were also reminded to attend the Bartholomew Award Lecture later the same evening, given by Daniel Warner of the University of Alabama at Birmingham. Chair Don Mykles adjourned the meeting at 6:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted by  
Deborah Lutterschmidt, DCPB Secretary.

### **Report from the Editors of Physiological and Biochemical Zoology (PBZ) for 2013**

This year marks our last report as Editors of PBZ, as we (Katie Gilmour and Trish Schulte) will be stepping down as of June 30, 2014, at the end of our five-year term. The search for new editor(s) is actively underway, and we invite anyone who is interested in the opportunity to consider submitting a proposal to the University of Chicago Press. Proposals from prospective editors are due by February 14, 2014 (see the PBZ website for details). If you are interested in the editorship and have questions about the administrative processes of PBZ, feel free to contact the Managing Editor, Andrea Canfield, at [pbz@uci.edu](mailto:pbz@uci.edu).

We have greatly enjoyed our time at PBZ and are pleased that the journal is flourishing and is in an excellent state to welcome the incoming editor(s).

This year (2013) we received a total of 163 submissions (down from 196 in 2012, due in part to the later deadline for this year's Focused Issue) and 139 revisions from countries around the world: 43% from North America, 21% from Europe, and remaining submissions from 16 other nations, headed up by China, Australia, South Africa, and Argentina.

The quality of our published papers remains high, and our rejection rate has increased slightly to 55% (up from 50% in 2012). Of rejected papers, 58% were rejected without review.

One of our major priorities when we first assumed the editorship of PBZ was to try to reduce the time to initial decision on manuscripts, which was 55 days in 2008, the year before we took over the journal. The average time to provide a first decision is now 37.5 days (the same as in 2012). Average time with reviewers is unchanged from last year, at 18 days. The average time to final decision is 63 days, substantially reduced from the average of 116 days to final decision in 2008. Although the time to final decision is largely dependent on how long it takes authors to revise their manuscripts, we have worked hard to minimize processing time in the journal office, which has contributed to the reduced time to reach a final decision.

We continue to struggle to get the University of Chicago Press to reduce the time between acceptance and online publication, which was 67 days in 2013 (up from 50 days in 2012). However, this is still down substantially from the 172 days between acceptance and publication that was the average in 2008, the year before we assumed the editorship.

Our impact factor for 2012 increased to 2.456, up from 2.190 in 2009. Our impact factor continues to fare well compared to competitor journals (e.g. JEB 3.236, CBP-A 2.167, JCP-B 2.024). Readership remains high, with monthly online downloads averaging over 12,000 per month, and peaking at over 17,000 per month in fall, which is the busiest time of year.

We have moved publication of our Focused Issue to January/February (to maximize the impact of the Focused Issue on publication metrics), so our Focused Issue for 2013 (Conservation Physiology) is now available online. Our next Focused Issue will be on Developmental Physiology. Papers are due March 1, 2014.

Publishing PBZ would not be possible without the hard work of a large number of people, and we would like to extend our particular thanks to the PBZ managing editor, Andrea Canfield; the PBZ Associate editors, Ted Garland, Jon Harrison, Irene Tieleman and Stephen Secor; the entire editorial board; and the 364 dedicated individuals who provided reviews for PBZ in 2013, of the 727 invited. (Special thanks to the 227 referees who returned reports on time!).

**Respectfully submitted: Dr. Kathleen Gilmour; Dr. Patricia Schulte. Co-editors in Chief, PBZ**

**Report from the Editors of Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology (CBP) for 2013**

Prepared from information provided by Patrick Walsh, Co-Editor in Chief

In general, manuscript flow and rejection rates have not changed very much since 2012, but Impact Factors have again increased, with all parts of the journal now above 2.0. As detailed in the appended letter to the Editorial Board and Associate Editors, there are some major structural changes on the horizon for the journal. The journal very much appreciates the association with DCPB and SICB as sponsoring societies. The DCPB is currently represented on the journal's Editorial Board and Associate Editor roster as per the bylaw requirements, but if members feel that DCPB could be better represented please contact Patrick Walsh, Co-Editor in Chief. The journal is also searching for a replacement for Patrick as the Editor in Chief of Part D: Genomics and Proteomics. If members know of potential candidates (especially qualified women) please bring them to the attention of the journal's Co-editors.

November 25, 2013

Dear Associate Editors and Editorial Board Members of CBP,

We are writing to let you know of some changes happening at CBP. After many years at the helm, Tom, Pat and Leslie have decided to step down from the Editorial Team at CBP. At the end of 2013 Tom will conclude a 20-year run as a Co-Editor-in-Chief (until 2003 with Peter Hochachka and then with Pat), and Leslie has been holding the CBP office together forever. Pat will continue on for one more year as Co-Editor-in-Chief in charge of Part D: Genomics and Proteomics.

For many years now, 'CBP' has technically been four separate journals (each Part actually has a separate ISSN number), but all under two Editors-in-Chief and all with one common editorial management and submission system. In part because of the continuing increase in submissions (we are in the neighborhood of 1500 MS's/year!), Elsevier has chosen to distribute the editorial workload a bit more, and assign a separate Editor-in-Chief to each of the four Parts. The four Parts will remain closely linked 'sister journals' and continue to share a single submission system and common referee database. The new Co-Editors-in-Chief will be Mike Hedrick (U North Texas, Part A), Chris Moyes (Queens U, Part B) and Martin Grosell (U Miami, Part C) with Pat continuing on *pro tem* for Part D until the transition has been smoothly made and we can identify a suitable replacement. The editorial 'office' will move to Queens U under the new Managing Editor Marlene Kraml. Chris will have the role of cat herder (officially: 'coordinating editor') to insure the smooth coordination of all four parts.

The increased manuscript flow (which we all believe is a 'good thing') necessitated some adjustments in the editorial board and associate editorships. We have attached a listing of the new board, noting that in close collaboration with the new editors-in-chief, parts of the board have been turned over to reflect changing topic areas. Unfortunately, in the shuffle towards the new model, the position of a separate Reviews Editor has been eliminated. We wish to take this opportunity to thank Göran Nilsson for the many years as CBP Reviews Editor. Göran has been wearing multiple editorial hats for journals and projects, so he will now be able to devote more time to those projects. Additionally, we thank outgoing associate editors Mark Sheridan and Nancy Denslow for their long, productive association with CBP. We'd like to welcome Holly Shiels, Jordi Altimiras, Peter Fields, Nick Bernier, David Buchwalter and Don Mykles as new associate editors. With the continuing Associate Editors, CBP will now have a team of 11 AEs, each mostly identified with a particular CBP Part. The AEs will increase their workload to review more manuscripts, as well as assume some of the functions of the Reviews Editor by playing active roles in soliciting review articles and special issues (including, we hope, some articles by themselves!).

We will also need to ask our Editorial Board members for increased and more active involvement in the journal. In the current model where EB members have been asked to determine a manuscript's suitability and suggest referees, we realized we

were leaving relatively untapped a great pool of actual referees. So, we are hoping that EB members will contribute up to four referee assignments per year (of course this all depends on manuscript flow in topic areas). We hope you will agree that this will not be too onerous a task - especially considering how much effort and depth many of you have put into your initial assessments of manuscripts in the past.

One of the many achievements of Peter and Tom in the early years of the 'rebirth' of CBP was to recognize the importance of, and the need to build or rebuild, connections with our sponsoring societies. We think that the slate of Editors, Associate Editors and Editorial Board members continues to reflect this constituency with members from all the societies and geographical regions they represent. However, if you think we have underrepresented any of our supporting groups, please let us know.

Over the last several weeks, Tom has been working hard to implement some important changes in the Editorial Express submission and management system. While most of these will be largely transparent to you, they should make MS flow even smoother. One notable change has been that we now request direct submission of a single complete pdf for the review stages (source files are required at final acceptance only). There are also lots of new tweaks to help the Editors identify referees.

Even though we are just a tiny bit biased, we think that CBP is in great shape and ready to serve the next generation of comparative biologists. All the 1-year and 5-year Impact Factors are well over 2.0, manuscript submission remains high (we are on track in 2013 to hit overall MS number 23000 since Aug. 1993! Less than 42 to go), review standards are decent to excellent and turnaround times are rapid. We hope that you will join us in welcoming the new team, and give them the best support you can in terms of your editorial duties and submitting to CBP your best papers - well at least the ones that didn't make your internal cut for Science, Nature and PNAS.

With apologies to Douglas Adams: So long, and thanks for all the fish!

Tom, Pat and Leslie

*"There was a point to this story, but it has temporarily escaped the chronicler's mind."*

*— Douglas Adams, So Long, and Thanks for All the Fish*

(to Dec. 30, 2013)

	2013		2012		2011		2010	
submitted	1311	100.0	1275	100.0	1337	100.0	1247	100.0
currently pending	87	6.6	79	6.2	69	5.2	104	8.3
accepted	274	20.9	349	27.4	356	26.6	395	31.7
rejected	168	12.8	97	7.6	96	7.2	138	11.1
desk rejected	669	51.0	662	51.9	725	54.2	497	39.9
withdrawn	9	0.7	3	0.2	4	0.3	4	0.3
currently returned for revision	186	14.2	85	6.7	87	6.5	109	8.7
			1275		1337			
all rejections	837		759		821		639	
rejection rate (%)	63.8		59.5 %		61.4 %		51.20%	
					assuming that 25% of pending mss (40 of 160) will not make it all rejections			
final rejection rate (estimate)	76%		73.0 %		64.4 %		55.50%	
current acceptance rate (%)	20.9		27.4 %		26.6 %		31.70%	
accepted without requiring revision	0		0		0	0	0	
reviewers who supplied reports see attached pdf	1198		1144		1291		1482	
submissions by section								
A	407							
B	444							
C	353							
D	107							