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What will we cover in this workshop?

• Understanding scholarly publishing

• How to get published:
  • Preparing
  • Structuring & writing
  • Using Proper Scientific Language

• Publishing ethics
Understanding Scholarly Publishing
Let’s Start at the Beginning

Journal publishing has thrived for over 340 years but the fundamental role of Publishers remains unchanged.
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The Publishing Cycle

- Solicit & manage submissions
- Manage peer review
- Production: Edit & prepare
- Publish & disseminate
- Archive & promote use

- 30-60% rejected by > 7,000 editors
- 10 million articles in archive
- >480 million downloads by >30 million researchers in >180 countries!
- 500,000+ reviewers
- Nearly ½ million articles accepted
- 9.8 million articles available
- >480 million downloads by >30 million researchers in >180 countries!
Peer Review

Helps to determine the quality, validity, significance and originality of research.

Helps to improve the quality of papers.

Publishers stand outside the academic process and are not prone to prejudice or favour.

Publishers facilitate the review process by investing in online review systems and providing tools to help Editors and Reviewers.
A well understood concept

Without it there is no control in scientific communication

Journal Editors evaluate and reject certain articles prior to external peer review
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Global Expansion of Research
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Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering

Volumes 246–248, 16 October 2012, Pages 76–88

Fluid layout design of multi-component systems using 3D analytical sensitivity analysis

Zhang H., J.H. Zhu, L. Xia

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi’an, China

Abstract

This study presents the integrated layout optimization formulation is established, which is based on the three-dimensional analytical sensitivity analysis method (3D ASA) combined with the XFEM to describe material behavior with respect to geometric variables. The effect of geometric factors on material behavior is analyzed, and the results are used to optimize the layout of the multi-component system.
Get social!

• New ways to communicate
  – Make sure the world knows you and your work

• New communities
  – Connect and collaborate
‘How To Get Published’
Preparing Your Manuscript
Are You Ready To Publish?

- Not ready – outdated work
- New + original results
- Ready + considered
Are you ready to publish? Guiding questions

- Have you done something **new** and interesting?
- Have you provided solutions to any difficult problems?
- Have you checked the latest results in the field?
- Have you verified the findings?
- Did you perform the appropriate controls?
- Do your results fit - is the story complete?
Choosing the right journal

Find the journal that best suits your work:  
*Look at the Aims & Scope of a journal*

**Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology**

*Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology* provides an International forum for original research papers, reviews, and commentaries on all aspects of the molecular biology, biochemistry, physiology, ultrastructure, genetics and evolution of plant-microbe interactions. Papers on all kinds of infective pathogen, including viruses, prokaryotes, fungi, and nematodes, as well as mutualistic organisms such as *Rhizobium* and mycorrhizal fungi, are acceptable as long as they have a bearing on the interaction between microbe and plant.

…
Read The ‘Guide for Authors’

• Find it on the journal homepage of the publisher, e.g. Elsevier.com
• Keep to the Guide for Authors in your manuscript
• Editors do not like wasting time on poorly prepared manuscripts
‘How To Get Published’
structuring & writing and your article
General structure of a research article

Title Abstract

Keywords

Introduction

Methods Results AND Discussion

Conclusion

Acknowledgements

References

Supporting Materials
Titles

- Fewest possible words
- Adequately describes content
- Identifies main issue
- Does not use rarely-used abbreviations

Effective manuscript titles
This is the advertisement of your article. Make it interesting and understandable

Make it accurate and specific

A clear abstract will strongly influence whether or not your work is considered

Keep it as brief as possible
Keywords

- Used by indexing and abstracting services
- Are the labels of the manuscript
- Use only established abbreviations e.g. DNA
- Do not repeat words in the title

Highlights

- Advertise your work
- 3-5 bullet points
- Key conclusions
- Use full sentences
Introduction

Provide a brief context to the readers

Address the problem

Identify the solutions & limitations

What is hoped to be achieved

Consistent with the nature of the journal
Methods

Describe how the problem was studied

Include detailed information

Do not describe previously published procedures

Identify the equipment and describe materials used

Other researchers should be able to reproduce your work using the method description
Results

Be clear & easy to understand

Highlight the main findings

Feature unexpected findings

Provide proper statistical analysis

Include clear illustrations & figures
Discussion

Most important section!

What do the results mean?

Make the discussion correspond to the results

Compare your own results with published work

What is the ‘bigger picture’?
Go beyond your results
The Conclusion

- Should be clear & concise
- Provide justification for the work
- Advance the present state of knowledge
- Provide suggested future experiments

Take Home Message!
Acknowledgements

Advisors
Financial Supporters & Funders
Proofreaders & Typists
Suppliers who may have donated materials
# References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do not use too many references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always ensure you have fully absorbed material you are referencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use published work – not grey literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid excessive self-citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid excessive citations of publications from the same region/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform strictly to the style in the guide for authors or ‘Your Paper Your Way’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Process of Writing
Building the Article

Title & Abstract

Conclusion

Introduction

Methods

Results

Discussion

Figures/Tables (your data)
Cover Letter

Your chance to address the Editor directly

– “selling” your work

– WHY did you submit the manuscript to THIS journal?
  - Do not summarize your manuscript, or repeat the abstract

– Mention special requirements, e.g. *if you do not wish your manuscript to be reviewed by certain reviewers*

– Declare whether the current manuscript is based on previously-published (conference) paper(s) and how it has been (significantly) extended/altered

– Although most editors will not reject a manuscript only because the cover letter is bad, a good cover letter may accelerate the editorial process of your paper
Suggest potential reviewers

• Your suggestions may help the Editor to pass your manuscript to the review stage more efficiently.

• The reviewers should represent at least two regions of the world. They should not be your supervisor, direct colleagues at the same institute or close friends.

• Generally you are requested to provide 3-6 potential reviewers. Check the Guide for Authors!
Post-review revision

Carefully study the reviewers’ comments and prepare a detailed letter of response

• Respond to all points - even if you disagree
• Write a polite, scientifically solid rebuttal
• State specifically what changes you have made to address the reviewers’ comments, mentioning the page and line numbers where changes have been made
• Perform additional calculations, computations, or experiments if required; these usually serve to make the final paper stronger
• Avoid repeating the same response over and over
Editor Decisions

Reality: editorial decision making is NOT a democracy

Example:

• 4 reviews received, 3 minor revision, 1 reject
• The editor may reject the paper if the fourth reviewer found a fundamental flaw that the other reviewers failed to notice

OR

• The editor may make a revise decision

*The interpretation of what constitutes minor and major revision can vary considerably among reviewers and editors*
Publishing Ethics
Authorship, Plagiarism, multi submissions
What does it mean to be an Author?

An “author” is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study.

Being an author comes with credit but also with responsibility: they are two sides of the same coin.

Decisions about who will be an author and the order of authors should be made before starting to write up the project.
Authorship

Example, the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (aka Vancouver Group) declared that an author must:

1. substantially contribute to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data **AND**

2. draft the article or revise it critically for important intellectual content **AND**

3. give their approval of the final version to be published

→ all 3 conditions must be fulfilled to be an author
Authorship

- Corresponding Author
- First Author
- Good Listing Principle
- Ghost Authorship
- Gift Authorship
- Poor Listing Principle
What is Plagiarism?

“Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit, including those obtained through confidential review of others’ research proposals and manuscripts.”

source: Federal Office of Science and Technology Policy, 1999

“Presenting the data or interpretations of others without crediting them, and thereby gaining for yourself the rewards earned by others, is theft, and it eliminates the motivation of working scientists to generate new data and interpretations.”

Professor Bruce Railsback  
Department of Geology, University of Georgia

M. Errami & H. Garner, A tale of two citations  
Forms of Plagiarism

Work that can be plagiarised includes…

- Words (Language)
- Ideas
- Findings
- Writings
- Graphic Representations
- Computer Programs
- Diagrams

- Graphs
- Illustrations
- Information
- Lectures
- Printed Material
- Electronic Material
- Any Other Original Work

Higher Education Academy, UK
A researcher notices a paragraph in a previously published article that would be suitable as the Materials & Methods in his article.

The researcher decides to copy that paragraph into his paper without quotes or attribution.

• Has the Researcher violated any ethical boundaries?
• How about if you copy your own work?
A researcher is ready to submit her paper and decides to submit to *Science*, *Nature* and *Cell* at the same time.

A researcher has had his paper rejected by *Science* and decides to submit it to *Nature*. Failing that, he plans to submit it to *Cell*. Failing that, he plans to submit to each journal in his discipline until it is accepted.

The first scenario is **not acceptable** to most research communities and journals.

The second scenario is **acceptable** but authors should heed the advice of referees and editors concerning improvements.
Submissions (A)

Multiple, redundant, or concurrent publication issues

- Should be avoided where manuscripts that describe essentially the same research are published in more than one journal or primary publication.
- An author should avoid submitting a previously published paper for consideration in another journal.
- Duplication of the same paper in multiple journals of different languages should be avoided.
- “Salami Slicing”, or creating several publications from the same research, is manipulative and discouraged.
Plagiarism Detection

Cross Check Initiative (2009)

Huge database of 30+ million articles, from 50,000+ journals, from 400+ publishers

Software alerts Editors to any similarities between the article and this huge database of published articles

Many Elsevier journals now check every submitted article using CrossCheck
What are the potential consequences?

Potential consequences can vary according to the severity of the misconduct and the standards set by the journal editors, institutions and funding bodies.

Possible actions include:
- **Written letters of concern and reprimand**
- **Article retractions**
- **Some form of disciplinary action on the part of the researcher’s institute or funding body**
All Elsevier journals are members of COPE.

Who is really responsible for Ethics?

All Stakeholders
Authors
Institutions
Companies
Agencies
Funding Bodies
Publishers/
Journal Editors

All Elsevier journals are members of:

COPE
COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION ETHICS
Thank You & questions

Contact for further questions:

- e.vanommenkloeke@elsevier.com
Further reading and info:

Authors: www.elsevier.com/authors
Reviewers: www.elsevier.com/reviewers
Ethics: www.ethics.elsevier.com

Free webcast tutorials on getting published:
www.elsevier.com/trainingwebcasts