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Why are you here?
Workshop Outline

• How to get Published
  ▪ Scholarly publishing overview
  ▪ What to publish
  ▪ Select your journal/readers/audience carefully
  ▪ Typical article structure
• Surviving Peer Review/Social Media/OA/Ethics
  ▪ The review and editorial process and your response
  ▪ Promoting your research using social media
  ▪ Open Access or Not?
  ▪ Publishing ethics

Questions and Answers
Scholarly Publishing Overview
Peer-reviewed journal growth 1990-2013

# Total Journals per Decade (Active, Academic / Scholarly, Refereed / Peer-reviewed)

# Total Journals per year (since 2001)

Annual Growth: 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% 4% 4% 4% 4% 4% 2%

2001: 20,063
2002: 20,608
2003: 21,145
2004: 21,769
2005: 22,460
2006: 23,241
2007: 24,166
2008: 25,243
2009: 26,251
2010: 27,410
2011: 28,611
2012: 29,316
2013: 29,463

$y = 484.5e^{0.33x}$

$R^2 = 0.9947$
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Scholarly publishing today
Scientific, technical and medical (STM) publishing

2,000 STM publishers

1.4 million peer-reviewed articles

20,000 peer-reviewed journals
Academic publishing
The publishing cycle

Solicit & manage submissions
> 13,000 editors

>700 million downloads by reviewers
>11 million reviewers
>120 countries!

>12.6 million Production articles available

557,000+ Manage Peer Review reviewers

30-60% rejected by editors

365,000 Edit & prepare accepted articles

Publish & Disseminate

>700 million downloads by researchers
>11 million reviewers
>120 countries!
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Trends in publishing

- Rapid conversion from “print” to “electronic”
  - 1997: print only
  - 2009: 55% e-only (mostly e-collections)
  - 2019: 55% e-only (mostly e-collections)
  - 2014: 95+% e-only (in life sciences field over 99%)
  - 2018: ???

- Changing role of “journals” due to e-access
- Increased usage of articles (more downloads), but less in-depth use
  - at lower cost per article

- Electronic submission
  - Increased manuscript inflow

- Experimentation with new publishing models
  - E.g. “author pays” models, “delayed open access”, etc.
Why to publish and What to publish
**Your personal reason for publishing**

However, editors, reviewers, and the research community don’t consider these reasons when assessing your work – the content counts!
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Why publish?

Publishing is one of the necessary steps embedded in the scientific research process. It is also necessary for graduation and career progression.

What to publish:

✓ New and original results or methods
✓ Reviews or summaries of particular subject
✓ Manuscripts that advance the knowledge and understanding in a certain scientific field

What NOT to publish:

✗ Reports of no scientific interest
✗ Out of date work
✗ Duplications of previously published work
✗ Incorrect/unacceptable conclusions

You need a STRONG, EFFECTIVE manuscript to present your contributions to the scientific community.
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A good manuscript has ......

- good **CONTENT**
  - ✔ useful and exciting

*and has*

- a good **PRESENTATION** of the data
  - ✔ clear and logically constructed
What is a strong manuscript?

✓ Has a novel, clear, useful, and exciting message

✓ Presented and constructed in a logical manner

✓ Reviewers and editors can grasp the scientific significance easily

Editors and reviewers are all busy scientists. Make things easy to save their time.
How to get your article published
Before you start writing
Refine your searching – be strategic!

Too many researchers have abandoned all the value of libraries when they stopped going there physically!

There is more than Google.

Learn what online resources are available at your institute, and learn to search in a clever way.

*Ask your library experts for help.*

Haglund and Olson, 2008:

“... researchers have difficulties in identifying correct search terms. Searches are often unsuccessful.”
Use the advanced search options

- Within Google and Google Scholar use the advanced searches and check out the Search Tips.

- In ScienceDirect, Scopus, WoS, PubMed and other databases use proximity operators:
  - w/n  Within - (non order specific)
  - pre/n  Precedes - (order specific)

E.g. wind w/3 energy
Find out what is being cited and from where
Find out who is being cited
Strategic Information gathering

• Make sure your idea/concept is original at the beginning of your research, not at the time of writing!
• There are many tools available such as SCOPUS, WoS, Google Scholar, PubMed.
• Use what you have available. Become skilled in using these effectively…..
• Referees of papers in Elsevier journals get 1 month personal free access to Scopus.
Questions to answer before you write

Think about WHY you want to publish your work.

- Is it **new and interesting**?
- Is it a current **hot topic**?
- Have you **provided solutions** to some difficult problems?
- Are you **ready** to publish at this point?

If all answers are “yes”, then start preparations for your manuscript.
What type of manuscript?

- Full articles/Original articles;
- Letters/Rapid Communications/Short communications/Case reports;
- Review papers/perspectives

Self-evaluate your work: Is it sufficient for a full article? Or are your results so thrilling that they need to be shown as soon as possible?

Ask your supervisor and colleagues for advice on manuscript type. Sometimes outsiders see things more clearly than you.
Identifying the right journal
And writing for it
Select the best journal for submission

- Look at your references – these should help you narrow your choices.

- Review recent publications in each “candidate journal”. Find out the hot topics, the accepted types of articles, etc.

- Ask yourself the following questions:
  ✓ Is the journal peer-reviewed to the right level?
  ✓ Who is this journal’s audience?
  ✓ How fast does it make a decision or publish your paper?
  ✓ What are the various Impact metrics for the journal?
  ✓ Do you want/need to publish Open Access?
  ✓ Does it really exist or is dubious? (check for example Beall’s List of Predatory Open Access Publishers)

http://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/
Choose the right journal

Investigate all candidate journals to find out

- Aims and scope
- Accepted types of articles
- Readership
- Current hot topics
  - go through the abstracts of recent publications
Bibliometric indicators

Impact Factor
Eigenfactor
SJR
SNIP
H-Index
What is the Impact Factor (IF)?

Impact Factor

[the average annual number of citations per article published]

For example, the 2014 impact factor for a journal is calculated as follows:

- $A =$ the number of times articles published in 2012 and 2013 were cited in indexed journals during 2014
- $B =$ the number of "citable items" (usually articles, reviews, proceedings or notes; not editorials and letters-to-the-Editor) published in 2012 and 2013
- 2014 impact factor = $\frac{A}{B}$

- e.g. 600 citations = 2.000

150 + 150 articles
Impact Factor and other bibliometric parameters
Influences on Impact Factors: Subject Area

- Fundamental Life Sciences
- Neuroscience
- Clinical Medicine
- Pharmacology & Toxicology
- Physics
- Chemistry & Chemical Engineering
- Earth Sciences
- Environmental Sciences
- Biological Sciences
- Materials Science & Engineering
- Social Sciences
- Mathematics & Computer Sciences

Mean Impact Factor
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Compare journals

Search for and choose up to 10 journals to analyze and compare.

Scimago journal rank by year

SJR | IPP | SNIP | Citations | Documents | % Not cited | % Reviews
---|-----|------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------
0.157 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.410 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.606 |     |      |           |           |             |             
1.225 |     |      |           |           |             |             
10.107 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.904 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.421 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.266 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.301 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.759 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.444 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.212 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.201 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.325 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.760 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.179 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.230 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.592 |     |      |           |           |             |             
1.709 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.323 |     |      |           |           |             |             
0.398 |     |      |           |           |             |             

Chart Options: Chart, Table
Identify the right audience for your paper

- Identify the sector of readership/community for which a paper is meant
- Identify the interest of your audience
- Get advice from your university library team on where to publish
- Ask your supervisor or colleagues for recommendations
Your Journals list for this manuscript

So you now have a list of candidate journals for your manuscript……

✓ All authors of the submission agree to this list and the sequence of journals

✓ Write your draft as if you are going to submit to the first journal on your list. Use its Guide for Authors - these differ per journal

✗ DO NOT gamble by submitting your manuscript to more than one journal at a time.
   International ethics standards prohibit multiple/simultaneous submissions, and editors DO find out! (Trust us, they DO!)
Read the ‘Guide to Authors’- Again and again!

- Stick to the Guide for Authors in your manuscript, even in the first draft (text layout, nomenclature, figures & tables, references etc.). In the end it will save you time, and also the editor’s.

- Editors (and reviewers) do not like wasting time on poorly prepared manuscripts. It is a sign of disrespect.
Read the ‘Guide to Authors’ - Again and again!

Guide for Authors

- Introduction
  - Scientific Checklist
  - Types of papers
- Before you begin
  - Ethics in publishing
  - Policy and ethics
  - Conflict of interest
  - Submission declaration and verification
- Changes to authorship
- Institutional e-mail address
- Copyright
- Role of the funding source
- Funding body agreements and policies
- Open access
- Green open access
- Language (usage and editing criteria)

- Submission
  - Classification
  - PREPARE
  - Language
  - Use of Word processing software
  - Article structure
  - Materials and methods
  - Results
  - Discussion
  - Essential Title Page Information
- Keywords
- Abstract
- Graphical Abstract
- Chemical compounds
- Acknowledgements
- Nomenclature and abbreviations
- Genbank
- Math formulae
- Footnotes
- Artwork
- Tables
- References
- Video data
- Database linking
- AudioSlides
- Submission checklist

AFTER ACCEPTANCE

- Use of the Digital Object Identifier
- Online proof correction
- Offprints
- Author Inquiries
Common problems with submissions:

An international editor says...

“The following problems appear much too frequently”

- Submission of papers which are clearly out of scope
- Failure to format the paper according to the Guide for Authors
- Inappropriate (or no) suggested reviewers
- Inadequate response to reviewers
- Inadequate standard of English
- Resubmission of rejected manuscripts without revision

– Paul Haddad, Editor, *Journal of Chromatography A*
Why is language important?

Save your editor and reviewers the trouble of guessing what you mean

Complaint from an editor:

“This paper fell well below my threshold. I refuse to spend time trying to understand what the author is trying to say. Besides, I really want to send a message that they can't submit garbage to us and expect us to fix it.

My rule of thumb is that if there are more than 6 grammatical errors in the abstract, then I don't waste my time carefully reading the rest.”
Key to successful scientific writing is to be alert for common errors:

- Sentence construction
- Incorrect tenses
- Inaccurate grammar
- Not using English

Check the Guide for Authors of the target journal for language specifications.
Scientific Language – Sentences

✔ Write direct and short sentences – more professional looking.

✔ One idea or piece of information per sentence is sufficient.

✖ Avoid multiple statements in one sentence – they are confusing to the reader.
Authorship: Who is allowed to be an Author?

- Policies regarding authorship can vary
- Most common example: the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (“Vancouver Group”) declared that an author must:
  1. **substantially contribute** to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data;
  2. **draft** the article or **revise** it critically for important intellectual content; and
  3. **give their approval** of the final full version to be published.
  4. agreement to be **accountable for all aspects of the work** in ensuring that questions related to accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

**ALL four** conditions must be fulfilled to be an author!

All others would qualify as “Acknowledged Individuals”
Authorship - Sequence & Abuses

• General principles for who is listed first:
  - **First Author**
    - Conducts and/or supervises the data generation and analysis and the proper presentation and interpretation of the results
    - Puts paper together and submits the paper to journal
  - **Corresponding author**
    - The first author or a senior author from the institution
      - Particularly when the first author is a PhD student or postdoc, and may move to another institution soon.

• Abuses to be avoided:
  - **Ghost Authorship**: leaving out authors who should be included
  - **Gift Authorship**: including authors who did not contribute significantly
Typical article structure
Typical Structure of a Research Article

• Title
• Abstract
• Keywords

• Main text (IMRAD)
  - Introduction
  - Methods
  - Results
  - And
  - Discussions

• Conclusion
• Acknowledgement
• References
• Supplementary Data

Journal space is not unlimited.
Your reader’s time is scarce.
Make your article as concise as possible - more difficult than you imagine!

Make them easy for indexing and searching! (informative, attractive, effective)
The process of writing – building the article

Title & Abstract

Conclusion

Introduction

Methods

Results

Discussion

Figures/tables (your data)
Title

A good title should contain the fewest possible words that adequately describe the contents of a paper.

Effective titles

✓ Identify the main issue of the paper
✓ Begin with the subject of the paper
✓ Are accurate, unambiguous, specific, and complete
✓ Are as short as possible
   ✓ Articles with short, catchy titles are often better cited
✗ Do not contain rarely-used abbreviations
✓ Attract readers - Remember: readers are the potential authors who will cite your article
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Keywords

In an “electronic world”, keywords determine whether your article is found or not!

Avoid making them

✗ too general (“drug delivery”, “mouse”, “disease”, etc.)
✗ too narrow (so that nobody will ever search for it)

Effective approach:
Look at the keywords of articles relevant to your manuscript
Play with these keywords, and see whether they return relevant papers, neither too many nor too few – a good guideline.
Abstract

Tell readers what you did and the important findings

• One paragraph (between 50-250 words) often, plus Highlight bullet points
• Advertisement for your article, and should encourage reading the entire paper
• A clear abstract will strongly influence if your work is considered further

Graphite intercalation compounds (GICs) of composition $C_xN(SO_2CF_3)_2 \cdot \delta F$ are prepared under ambient conditions in 48% hydrofluoric acid, using K$_2$MnF$_6$ as an oxidizing reagent. The stage 2 GIC product structures are determined using powder XRD and modeled by fitting one dimensional electron density profiles.

A new digestion method followed by selective fluoride electrode elemental analyses allows the determination of free fluoride within products, and the compositional $x$ and $\delta$ parameters are determined for reaction times from 0.25 to 500 h.
Introduction

The place to convince readers that you know why your work is relevant, also for them.

Answer a series of questions:

- What is the problem?
- Are there any existing solutions?
- Which one is the best?
- What is its main limitation?
- What do you hope to achieve?
Pay attention to the following

✓ Before you present your new data, put them into perspective first

✓ Be brief, it is not a history lesson

✗ Do not mix introduction, results, discussion and conclusions. Keep them separate

✗ Do not overuse expressions such as “novel”, “first time”, “first ever”, “paradigm shift”, etc.

✓ Cite only relevant references
  • Otherwise the editor and the reviewer may think you don’t have a clue what you are writing about!
Methods / Experimental

- Include all important details so that the reader can repeat the work.
  - Details that were previously published can be omitted but a general summary of those experiments should be included
- Give vendor names (and addresses) of equipment etc. used
- All chemicals must be identified
- Do not use proprietary, unidentifiable compounds without description. State purity and/or supplier if it is important.
- Present proper control experiments
- Avoid adding comments and discussion
- Write in the past tense
  - Most journals prefer the passive voice, some the active.
- Consider use of Supplementary Materials
  - Documents, spreadsheets, audio, video, ...

Reviewers will criticise incomplete or incorrect method descriptions, and may even recommend rejection
Results – what have you found?

The following should be included

✓ the main findings
  - Thus not all findings. Decide what to share.
  - Findings from experiments described in the Methods section

✓ Highlight findings that differ from findings in previous publications, and unexpected findings

✓ Results of the statistical analysis
Results – Figures and tables

Illustrations are critical, because:

• Figures and tables are the most efficient way to present results
• Results are the driving force of the publication
• Captions and legends must be detailed enough to make figures and tables self-explanatory
• Figures and tables should not need further explanation or description in text. Less writing and less reading. Let your figures do the work instead of words.

"One Picture is Worth a Thousand Words"
Sue Hanauer (1968)
Results – appearance counts!

✓ Un-crowded plots
  ✓ 3 or 4 data sets per figure; well-selected scales; appropriate axis label size; symbols clear to read; data sets easily distinguishable.
✓ Each photograph must have a scale marker of professional quality in a corner.
✓ Text in photos / figures in English
  ❌ Not in French, German, Chinese, Korean, ...
✓ Use colour ONLY when necessary.
  ❌ If different line styles can clarify the meaning, then do not use colours or other thrilling effects.
✓ If used, colour must be visible/distinguishable when printed in black & white.
❌ Do not include long boring tables!
Discussion – what do your results mean?

• It is the most important section of your article. Here you get the chance to SELL your data! Many manuscripts are rejected because the Discussion is weak.

• Check for the following:
  ✓ Do your results relate to the original question or objectives outlined in the Introduction section?
  ✓ Do you provide interpretation for each of your results presented?
  ✓ Are your results consistent with what other investigators have reported? Or are there any differences? Why?
  ✓ Are there any limitations?
  ✓ Does the discussion logically lead to your conclusion?

• Do not:
  ✗ Make statements that go beyond what the results can support
  ✗ Suddenly introduce new terms or ideas
Conclusions

✓ Present global and specific conclusions
✓ Indicate uses and extensions if appropriate
✓ Suggest future experiments and indicate whether they are underway

✗ Do not summarise the paper
  • The abstract is for that purpose

✗ Avoid judgments about impact
  • Others can comment, you should not.
References: get them right!

✓ Please **adhere to the Guide for Authors** of the journal

✓ It is **your** responsibility, not of the Editor’s, to format references correctly!

✓ Get help, save time - use Reference management software

✓ Check

  - Referencing style of the journal
  - The spelling of author names, the year of publication
  - Punctuation use

✗ Avoid citing the following if possible:

  - Personal communications, unpublished observations, manuscripts not yet accepted for publication
  - Articles published only in the local language, which are difficult for international readers to find
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Some Publishers are helpful!

"Imagine if contributors could submit their papers to a journal without worrying about formatting the manuscript, including those pesky references, to exacting specifications?“ Kelvin J.A. Davies, 2012

Called Your Paper Your Way, introduced to the journal Free Radical Biology & Medicine and now offered in more than 730 Elsevier journals.

More than half of authors find it easier and more helpful. Reviewers are equally happy as figures and tables can be put in the right place by authors to allow easier review.

[Link to Elsevier website for more information]

www.elsevier.com/authors/journal-authors/your-paper-your-way
Reference Management Software helps

• Many journals are helpful in formatting the journal reference style for you (e.g. Elsevier’s Your Paper Your Way service).

• If the publisher is not offering this service it is your responsibility to format references correctly!

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_reference_management_software
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Supplementary Material

• Data of secondary importance for the main scientific thrust of the article
  ▪ e.g. individual curves, when a representative curve or a mean curve is given in the article itself

• Or data that do not fit into the main body of the article
  ▪ e.g. audio, video, ....

• Original figure before color correction or trimming for clarity

• Not part of the printed article
  ▪ Will be available online with the published paper

• Must relate to, and support, the article
Cover Letter

January 1, 2008

Dear Professor Schmidt,

Enclosed with this letter you will find an electronic submission of a manuscript entitled “Mechano-sorptive creep under compressive loading – a micromechanical model” by John Smith and myself. This is an original paper which has neither previously nor simultaneously in whole or in part been submitted anywhere else. Both authors have read and approved the final version submitted.

Mechano-sorptive is sometimes denoted as accelerated creep. It has been experimentally observed that the creep of paper accelerates if it is subjected to a cyclic moisture content. This is of large practical importance for the paper industry. The present manuscript describes a micromechanical model on the fibre network level that is able to capture the experimentally observed behaviour. In particular, the difference between mechanosorptive creep in tension and compression is analysed. John Smith is a PhD-student who within a year will present his doctoral thesis. The present paper will be a part of that thesis.

Three potential independent reviewers who have excellent expertise in the field of this paper are:

Dr. Fernandez, Tennessee Tech, email1@university.com
Dr. Chen, University of Maine, email2@university.com
Dr. Singh, Colorado School of Mines, email3@university.com

I would very much appreciate it if you would consider the manuscript for publication in the International Journal of Science.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Schmidt
School of Science and Engineering
Northeast State University
College Park, MI 10000
USA

Final approval from all authors

Explanation of importance of research

Suggested reviewers
Suggest potential reviewers

• Your suggestions will help the Editor to move your manuscript to the review stage more efficiently.

• You can easily find potential reviewers and their contact details from articles in your specific subject area (e.g., your references).

• The reviewers should represent at least two regions of the world. And they should not be your supervisor or close friends.

• Be prepared to suggest 3-6 potential reviewers, based on the Guide to Authors.
Do everything to make your submission a success

• No one gets it right the first time!
  ✓ Write, and re-write ….

• Suggestions
  ✓ After writing a first version, take several days of rest. Come back with a critical, fresh view.
  ✓ Ask colleagues and supervisor to review your manuscript. Ask them to be highly critical, and be open to their suggestions.
  ✓ Make changes to incorporate comments and suggestions. Get all co-authors to approve version to submit.

Then it is the point in time to submit your article!
The peer review process
The Peer Review Process is not a black hole!

Initial Editorial Review or Desk Reject

Many journals use a system of initial editorial review. Editors may reject a manuscript without sending it out for review.

Why?

• The peer-review system is **grossly overloaded** and editors wish to use reviewers only for those papers with a good probability of acceptance.

• It is a **disservice** to ask reviewers to spend time on work that has clear and evident deficiencies.
First Decision: “Accepted” or “Rejected”

Accepted
• Very rare, but it happens

Congratulations!
  ▪ Cake for the department
  ▪ Now wait for page proofs and then for your article to be online and in print

Rejected
• Probability 40-90% ...
• Do not despair
  ▪ It happens to everybody
• Try to understand WHY
  ▪ Consider reviewers’ advice
  ▪ Be self-critical
• If you submit to another journal, begin as if it were a new manuscript
  ▪ Take advantage of the reviewers’ comments and revise accordingly
  ▪ They may review your manuscript for the next journal too!
  ▪ Read the Guide for Authors of the new journal, again and again.
The Peer Review Process – revisions

Author

START

Submit a paper

Reviewer

Review and give recommendation

ACCEPT

Reject

Revision required

Make a decision

Yes

No

REVISE

Revise the paper

Basic requirements met?

Yes

[Yes]

Assign reviewers

Collect reviewers' recommendations

[Reject]

[Revision required]

[Accept]

[Reject]

ACCEPT

[Yes]

[No]

Revise the paper

First Decision: “Major” or “Minor” Revision

• Major revision
  ▪ The manuscript may finally be published in the journal
  ▪ Significant deficiencies must be corrected before acceptance
  ▪ Usually involves (significant) textual modifications and/or additional experiments

• Minor revision
  ▪ Basically, the manuscript is worth being published
  ▪ Some elements in the manuscript must be clarified, restructured, shortened (often) or expanded (rarely)
  ▪ Textual adaptations
  ▪ “Minor revision” does NOT guarantee acceptance after revision, but often it is accepted if all points are addressed!
Manuscript Revision

• Prepare a detailed Response Letter
  ✓ Copy-paste each reviewer comment, and type your response below it
  ✓ State specifically which changes you have made to the manuscript
    ✓ Include page/line numbers
    ✗ No general statements like “Comment accepted, and Discussion changed accordingly.”
  ✓ Provide a scientific response to comments to accept, ..... 
  ✓ ..... or a convincing, solid and polite rebuttal when you feel the reviewer was wrong.
  ✓ Write in such a manner, that your response can be forwarded to the reviewer without prior editing

• Do not do yourself a disfavour, but cherish your work
  ▪ You spent weeks and months in the lab or the library to do the research

.....Why then run the risk of avoidable rejection by not taking manuscript revision seriously?
Increasing the likelihood of acceptance

All these various steps are not difficult.

- You have to be consistent.
- You have to check and recheck before submitting.
- Make sure you tell a logical, clear, story about your findings.
- Especially, take note of referees’ comments. They improve your paper.

This should increase the likelihood of your paper being accepted, and being in the 30% (accepted) not the 70% (rejected) group!
What leads to acceptance?

- Attention to details
- Check and double check your work
- Consider the reviewers’ comments
- English must be as good as possible
- Presentation is important
- Take your time with revision
- Acknowledge those who have helped you
- New, original and previously unpublished
- Critically evaluate your own manuscript
- Ethical rules must be obeyed

– Nigel John Cook
Editor-in-Chief, Ore Geology Reviews
Promoting your article
Your Paper is Published – What now?

• Your paper becomes visible online in the journal website, such as ScienceDirect, Springer Link etc. and in databases as SCOPUS, PubMed, etc.

• There are many things you can do to draw attention to your great research just online…

• Think Social Media! Check out the Publishing Campus for suggestions.
More information

- [www elsevier com promote your work](www elsevier com promote your work)
  - Animation video (YouTube) [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zRXnbKtHkHM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zRXnbKtHkHM)

- [www publishingcampus com](www publishingcampus com): College of Networking / Getting Noticed

Brochure  Factsheet  Online lectures and interactive courses
Open access publishing
# What is the difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gold Open Access</th>
<th>Green Open Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Free public access to the final published article</td>
<td>▪ Free public access to a version of your article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Access is immediate and permanent</td>
<td>▪ Time delay may apply (embargo period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Open access fee is paid by the author, or on their</td>
<td>▪ No fee is payable by the author, as costs are covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behalf (for example by a funding body)</td>
<td>by library subscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Determined by your user licence</td>
<td>▪ Authors retain the right to use their articles for a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Open versions of your article should have a user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>license attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Publish in an open access journal</td>
<td>▪ Link to your article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Publish in a journal that supports open access</td>
<td>▪ Selected journals feature open archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also known as a hybrid journal)</td>
<td>▪ Self-archive a version of your article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elsevier Publishing Campus**
Why publish in an open access journal?

- Want community to access my research without restriction: 67%
- Want to increase readership of article: 66%
- Less time between submission and publication than for subscription journals: 37%
- Have published in open access journals before and had a good experience: 36%
- Other researchers in my specialty publish in open access journals: 25%
- Funding body mandate: 10%
- Institutional mandate: 5%
- Other reason (please specify): 5%
- No reason/ prefer not to say: 3%

14% have been asked by their departmental head or funding organization to publish open access.
Tips for publishing gold open access

Find the right journal: Look for reputable journals

Collect key info: Check your funding body and institution’s policies

Make your article OA: Select a license and pay an OA fee

Publish OA: Share the final version of your article!

Much more information may be found online at Elsevier Publishing Campus
Publication Ethics
Author Responsibilities

As authors we have lots of rights and privileges, but also we have the responsibility to be ethical.
Ethics Issues in Publishing

Scientific misconduct

- Falsification of results or images

Publication misconduct

- Plagiarism
  - Different forms / severities
  - The paper must be original to the authors
- Duplicate publication
- Duplicate submission
- Appropriate acknowledgement of prior research and researchers
- Appropriate identification of all co-authors
- Conflict of interest
Plagiarism

• A short-cut to long-term consequences!

• Plagiarism is considered a serious offense by your institute, by journal editors, and by the scientific community as a whole.

• Plagiarism may result in academic charges, but will certainly cause rejection of your paper.

• Plagiarism will hurt your reputation in the scientific community.
Duplicate Publication

• Duplicate Publication is also called Redundant Publication, or Self Plagiarism
• Definition: Two or more papers, without full cross reference, share the same hypotheses, data, discussion points, or conclusions

❌ An author should not submit for consideration to another journal a previously published paper.
   ✓ Published studies do not need to be repeated unless further confirmation is required.
   ✓ Previous publication of an abstract during the proceedings of conferences does not preclude subsequent submission for publication, but full disclosure should be made at the time of submission.
   ✓ Re-publication of a paper in another language is acceptable, provided that there is full and prominent disclosure of its original source at the time of submission.
   ✓ At the time of submission, authors should disclose details of related papers, even if in a different language, and similar papers in press.
   ✓ This includes translations
Plagiarism Detection Tools

Elsevier is participating in 2 plagiarism detection schemes:
- TurnItIn (aimed at universities)
- iThenticate (aimed at publishers and corporations)

Manuscripts are automatically checked against a database of 30+ million peer reviewed articles which have been donated by 200+ publishers, including Elsevier.

More traditional approach also happens:
- Editors and reviewers
- Your colleagues
- Readers
- "Other" whistleblowers
  - "The walls have ears", it seems ...
Publication ethics – Self-plagiarism

2003

Same colour left and right = Same text

2004
An article in which the authors committed plagiarism: it will not be removed from ScienceDirect ever. Everybody who downloads it will see the reason for the retraction...
Figure Manipulation – some things are allowed

As long as they don’t obscure or eliminate info present in the original image

- Brightness
- Contrast
- Colour Balance
- Nonlinear adjustments

Must be disclosed in the figure legend

- Enhanced
- Obscured
- Moved
- Removed
- Introduced
Figure Manipulation: Example - Different authors and reported experiments

Am J Pathol, 2001

Images worked on, added to, rotated 180°, to become:

Life Sci, 2004

Rotated 180°
Zoomed out ?!
Elsevier Publishing Campus

Packed with free online lectures and interactive courses, together with expert advice and resources to help on your way to publishing a world-class book or journal article.

- **College of Skills Training**
  - Boost your publishing skills in journals and books

- **College of Big Ideas**
  - Discuss trending topics in publishing and academia

- **College of Networking**
  - Make the most of every opportunity

- **College of Research Solutions**
  - Training for effective and efficient research skills

- **College of Career Planning**
  - Get ahead in your academic career

- **College of Recommended Organizations**
  - Reach your potential with support from global resources

[publishingcampus.com](http://publishingcampus.com)
Download your personalized Certificate of Completion for this workshop now!

• Go to www.publishingcampus.com and sign up to the Publishing Campus (enter your first and last name carefully as your certificate will be created using those details) or log in if you already have profile.

• Go to www.publishingcampus.elsevier.com/workshops
• Enter the claim code: SGMREV
• Fill in the survey

• You will be redirected to a page where you will be able to download your certificate.

Need help?
Send email to publishingcampus@elsevier.com
Questions?

Or for questions later, please contact a.newman@elsevier.com

This set of slides as a PDF will be available through the university. There is full permission granted to distribute them as long as they are not edited.