

**From:** Mark Patterson [mailto:[m.patterson@elifesciences.org](mailto:m.patterson@elifesciences.org)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 25, 2012 4:52 PM  
**To:** Sequeira, Ed (NIH/NLM/NCBI) [E]  
**Subject:** Re: PMC editorial

Thanks Ed

I'm working on this, and trying to figure out how best to position the release of this initial content. We also have to have a much shorter standfirst (the one I sent to you was too long). With the proposed title, I'm trying to indicate that this event is the first part of the launch of the journal, the second part being the launch of the Highwire site. I'm not sure how this will go down with the folks here, but wanted to see what you felt as well.

So would something like this be OK from your standpoint

SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING: Launching *eLife*, Part 1.

#### **Standfirst**

The new open-access journal *eLife* launches today by making its first content available in PubMed Central.

Cheers

Mark

On Tue, Sep 25, 2012 at 6:43 PM, Sequeira, Ed (NIH/NLM/NCBI) [E] <[sequeira@ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](mailto:sequeira@ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)> wrote:

Hi Mark

Thanks for letting me have a look at this. I'd intended to check in with you sometime this week anyway about what sort of launch announcements you're planning. My reaction to the editorial: Now that we know for sure that you love us, we'd like you to pretend that we're complete strangers in public.

Seriously, we'd like to play down the idea that there's anything special about what you're doing in PMC. Chris Kelly, who manages PMC production, is constantly fending off publishers – generally new, small journals – who push to get into PMC as early as possible because it raises their credibility and, often, their chances of survival. We're being deluged by these startups and are spending a fair amount of time trying to define a higher bar that can be applied objectively. And it's not just the little guys. We'd had people like Peter Ashman at BMJ complain about inequitable treatment in a slightly different context.

I'm comfortable justifying what we're doing with eLife, but anything you publish that presents this as a special deal could complicate our life greatly. I hope you understand the situation. I've made some comments and edits to your paper to address this concern. Not expecting you to use them verbatim. Just suggesting a change in tone. You'll notice that I also allude to a list of published articles on your site to reinforce the idea that the journal is officially off the ground and this is not some kind of pre-release in PMC.

Jen, I'm assuming that Neil passed back my response to your question about whether we'd like to collaborate on a press release with you. The reasons there are similar to my reaction to the editorial.

Let's talk if you have a problem with anything I've suggested.

Thanks

Ed

**From:** Mark Patterson [<mailto:m.patterson@elifesciences.org>]  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 22, 2012 1:11 PM  
**To:** Sequeira, Ed (NIH/NLM/NCBI) [E]  
**Cc:** Jennifer McLennan  
**Subject:** PMC editorial

Hi Ed

We're planning to publish a short editorial to accompany the first articles that we publish on PMC (date still TBD). We think it's important to provide a bit of background and context to this landmark in the project. Please could you take a look and let us know if there's anything that doesn't sound quite right to you?

And I would like to say a big thank you for the help that you and your colleagues have provided.

Cheers

Mark