

Additional Comments on JBT (All comments welcome!)

- [1.](#) Gives good quality of description of experimental details. This is what you need, if you work in a resource facility (mass spec in my case).
- [2.](#) I think a problem for the JBT is that many members do not have to publish to survive. That's two strikes against us.
- [3.](#) I think we should keep the Journal!
- [4.](#) Please continue with the journal.
- [5.](#) JBT should try to improve its visibility to the scientific community and therefore its rating among other journals so that when authors are considering publishing a methods based article in RCMS, AnalChem, AnalBiochem, etc. JBT is also considered. How to best accomplish this I do not know. I know from personal experience that at least one ABRF research group discussed publishing their yearly study results in a "more highly visible" journal.
- [6.](#) Critical comment by editors/reviewers/readers would be nice, also consistent with the consensus intent when the idea of the journal was originally discussed.
- [7.](#) Keep it alive!
- [8.](#) Articles addressing the business/management side of core laboratories and more review articles about cutting edge technologies/data management software that are poised for implementation in a core setting would be welcome. The current content seems heavily biased toward proteomics.
- [9.](#) JBT is the most useful publication for my laboratory. It is method oriented, Authors are usually critical scientists, it has the most relevance for operating a core facility. Please keep the journal and continue to deliver hardcopies.
- [10.](#) Some articles are too long.
- [11.](#) Getting better, but clearly a long, long way to go to catch the competition
- [12.](#) The publicity of JBT is very low and also reflects the impact factor. Greater publicity as well as stronger editorial board with international representation is needed
- [13.](#) I think it should continue to be free of charge when we pay our annual fee to the ABRF.
- [14.](#) I have published one paper in JBT. It was about work carried out in one of the study section exercises, so I thought publication in JBT was particularly appropriate.
- [15.](#) Nature Protocols is yet another competitor.
- [16.](#) JBT suffers primarily from general lack of rigor, but then many journals are

	struggling with the same thing. The literature watch parts are very helpful. I would like to see more comparison of methods and instruments, as well as critical discussion comparing papers that are getting different results. An active recruitment of manuscripts in the area of comparisons would be useful. Also, I'd like to see work encouraged, where major proteomics datasets are evaluated by an independent assessment, or that track the protein expression in the public MSMS datasets. Wouldn't it be interesting to see a quarterly review of the public MSMS datasets, including protein coverage, etc.
<a href="#">17.</a>	I enjoy the research group updates at the end of each JBT. I would like to be able to read more about what each group is up to more often.
<a href="#">18.</a>	no comments
<a href="#">19.</a>	You have to change editorial board from old time friends to real ABRF/acdemics / Scientists
<a href="#">20.</a>	I think JBT has a niche and is doing the job. I do not see any "negative" aspects of publishing in JBT relative to other Journals, esp Analytical Biochem or Biotechniques. I would encourage ABRF members to publish their useful methods in JBT. On a personal note, the few techniques I have tried from JBT articles work well and many techniques I have treid from Analytical Biochem or Biotechniques are difficult to reproduce - might be just my bad hands!
<a href="#">21.</a>	JBT seems to be spit into 2 main themes: protein chemistry and nucleic acid chemistry. Therefore, if you are going to email table of contents to people, you may want to tailor it to their interests (i.e. don't send DNA sequencing methods to a proteomics lab).
<a href="#">22.</a>	The journal is one of the important points to join the ABRF society.
<a href="#">23.</a>	Do not skip any edition.
<a href="#">24.</a>	I think JBT plays a critical role for ABRF. Lets continue it!
<a href="#">25.</a>	JBT has sunk to the bottom of my reading list, along with JAMS. At the present time, more focused reseach work along with scanning the MCP, Proteomics and Journal of Proteomis seems to be a better use of my time.
<a href="#">26.</a>	If possible, the journal should be published bimonthly rather than quarterly.
<a href="#">27.</a>	JBT is one of the few journals with detailed experiments and techniques. Few journals contain these details anymore.
<a href="#">28.</a>	I would prefer online exclusively with back issues made available as well. I simply can not handle the amount of paper journals anymore.
<a href="#">29.</a>	I enjoy JBT. It has been useful in my work and research. I think that the frequency of the journal should be increased to at least 6 times a year.
<a href="#">30.</a>	I think that JBT has published good work, but doesn't have the critical volume to make it a competitive alternative to other more established journals. Personally, I

	would choose to publish in a journal with a higher impact factor. I don't think the main role of the ABRF is to be a publisher. I'd like to see a more informal newsletter-like publication used to keep our members in touch with each other.
<a href="#"><u>31.</u></a>	I am long retired-1999 and am the white hair of the ABRF and, as such, want it to succeed. Thanks for letting me participate, Audree Fowler
<a href="#"><u>32.</u></a>	Was annoyed to see an article that I rejected for one journal show up in J. Biomol. Tech. I think the standards of reviewing are inconsistent. Does anyone proofread the figures? Last issue, 1st article had a messed up figure. I'm not sure anyone noticed.
<a href="#"><u>33.</u></a>	As a member of ABRF, I first thought that there would be a role for JBT in publications. Now, I feel that our money could be spent on other things besides the typesetting/hardcopy. I feel that it would be adequate to have many of the methods on the ABRF website, electronically, saving the JBT citation (is this possible) and with review, still, but that the hard copy is perhaps an expense that we can skip. (perhaps it pays for itself? though I doubt it. I do think that if an article can be submitted to a more prestigious journal, that is what most researchers will do -- otherwise it appears that we are patting ourselves on our own back.s The newsletter formally played a great role in disseminating methods for education. Thanks
<a href="#"><u>34.</u></a>	Not being a member of ABRF, i have only heard of JBT, but never seen it. I am, however, a regular reader of the ABRF group emails & website
<a href="#"><u>35.</u></a>	I sort of like it and think it is a good face for ABRF. I think the ABRF studies are particularly useful and informative (you know, the blind tests of various technologies on unknowns)
<a href="#"><u>36.</u></a>	I think the JBT is a valuble resource for the Association but like all things whether it should continue should be determined based on a cost/benefit calculation. Thus any thing that can be done to reduce the cost of production should be considered. Ending the automatic mailing of hard copies to members would be a good start. Electronic access only would probably save much money and make the operation more viable. It takes time start up a journal. Reducing the cost of production will allow more time for it to develop. The Web Com has adopted promoting the JBT as a goal in the web site face lift. The Pub. Com. should be made aware of the planned changes.
<a href="#"><u>37.</u></a>	Just keep the quality high and be patient. It will grow
<a href="#"><u>38.</u></a>	The content of JBT has improved dramatically over the last year. I think it is important to have a balance between DNA and protein technologies.
<a href="#"><u>39.</u></a>	This is a great resource. It would be nice to eventually have this published monthly. I always look forward to receiving my copy.
<a href="#"><u>40.</u></a>	This journal is really the closest to what I need for my work!

<a href="#"><u>41.</u></a>	I would have compared JBT to Molecular and Cellular Proteomics. This journal is newer than the JBT but has surpassed the JBT in quality and quantity of articles published. I believe it is one of the models against which we should measure the JBT. If the JBT is to succeed and contribute to the activities of the ABRF, it must increase the quality and depth of its content. It is currently little more than a parochial newsletter with reports that are sometimes scientifically marginal. But it has improved and Gregg Fields has built up the journal. The pace of improvement needs to be increased.
<a href="#"><u>42.</u></a>	Regrettably, I admit to seeing JBT as a low rung on the ladder, and probably not worth the valuable time of the very talented people who assemble it. ABRF covers quite a wide range of technical specialties, so any one issue may contain one or no articles of interest to a single reader. It does not have the appearance of a successful venture in its present form. Perhaps it could do better as a fully electronic journal?
<a href="#"><u>43.</u></a>	I just rejoined recently, so I haven't seen much of JBT. So far, very little has been of interest to me.
<a href="#"><u>44.</u></a>	If the Journal is paying for itself through advertising, then it should continue in its present format - if it is not paying for itself, then we should go to an electronic format. It might be useful to solicit one or more unique articles each publication - there is a definite skewing toward 'what I did with my mass spec today' articles which makes the journal just another journal. What are members trying? What's novel? What's the future? We should be able to get members to write up some of what's being tried in laboratories - not soup-to-nuts completed projects.
<a href="#"><u>45.</u></a>	earlier questions regarding 'negative effect' did not explain what the negative effect was upon. unclear how to answer
<a href="#"><u>46.</u></a>	The journal was professionally done. Continue it!
<a href="#"><u>47.</u></a>	Reading a journal regularly is a habit. Habits are made by frequent repeated events and actions. JBT needs to be published regularly for regular reading habits can be made.
<a href="#"><u>48.</u></a>	I don't read JBT, I just lurk on the discussion list.
<a href="#"><u>49.</u></a>	I feel JBT is a distraction for the ABRF leadership. We best focus on what we do best, not what other societies do best.
<a href="#"><u>50.</u></a>	I find I have insufficient time for ALL journals!! There are simply too many, which is not to be construed as a comment against JBT.
<a href="#"><u>51.</u></a>	fully electronic version would be OK if single articles could be easily downloaded
<a href="#"><u>52.</u></a>	KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK!
<a href="#"><u>53.</u></a>	It is too heavily proteomics oriented to be of great use to me.
<a href="#"><u>54.</u></a>	It is a very useful society journal in my opinion. It would be difficult to publish eg

research groups results in journals such as *Analytical Biochemistry*. I suggest keeping it.