or-negative-ones-for-that-matter/; Shankar Vedantam, "Five Ways to Spot a Fake Online Review, Restaurant or Otherwise," *The Salt: NPR's Food Blog*, September 12, 2012, accessed October 5, 2012, http://www.npr.org/blogs/thesalt/2012/09/12/160755775/five-ways-to-spot-a-fake-online-review-restaurant-or-otherwise.

5. Lawrence Souder, "The Ethics of Scholarly Peer Review: A Review of the Literature," *Learned Publishing* 24 (2011): 55–72, accessed October 5, 2012, doi: 10.1087/20110109.

6. Richard Horton (2000), as quoted in Souder, "The Ethics of Scholarly Peer Review," 55; Scott Jaschik, "Journal Editors Promote Pledge of Ethics," *Inside Higher Education*, June 12, 2012, accessed October 5, 2012, http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/06/12/journal-editors-promote-pledge-ethics.

7. Joseph Branin, and others, "Best Practices: A Guide to Best Practices for Editors of Library and Information Science Journals," September 2010, accessed October 5, 2012, http://www.lis-editors.org/best-practices/index.shtml; Joseph Branin, and others, "A Statement of Ethics for Editors of Library and Information Science Journals," September 2010, accessed October 5, 2012, http://www.lis-editors.org/ethics/index.shtml.

8. Gary Marchionini, "Reviewer Merits and Review Control in an Age of Electronic Manuscript Management Systems," *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 26, doi: 1402256.1402264.

9. "Open Peer Review," *Wikipedia*, accessed October 5, 2012, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_peer_review.

10. "Overview: *Nature*'s Peer Review Trial," December 2006, accessed October 5, 2012, http://www.nature.com/nature/peerreview/debate/nature05535.html; "What is Open Peer Review, as Operated by the Medical Journals in the BMC Series?," accessed October 5, 2012, http://www.biomedcentral.com/authors/authorfaq/medical.

11. Patricia Cohen, "Scholars Test Web Alternative to Peer Review," *The New York Times*, August 23, 2010, accessed October 5, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/24/arts/24peer.html; Beth Mole, "The Future of Peer Review in the Humanities is Wide Open," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 13, 2012, accessed October 5, 2012, http://chronicle.com/article/The-Future-of-Peer-Review-in/133563/.

Errata

In the September 2012 article "Give 'Em What They Want: A One-Year Study of Unmediated Patron-Driven Acquisition of e-Books" by Fischer, Wright, Clatanoff, Barton, and Shreeves, the "Total Ebrary Usage (%)" column of the "50–100+" row was transposed. The correct figure is 0.8 as noted below:

We regret the error.

TABLE 9 Total Ebrary Usage for 11 Months		
User Sessions	Titles Used	Total Ebrary Usage (%)
1	3,049	32.5
2	2,580	27.5
3–5	1,982	21.1
6–10	1,042	11.1
11–49	661	7.0
50–100+	73	**0.8**
Total	9,387	