How to write great papers and get published
Understanding and benefiting from the publishing process

Presented by: Anthony Newman, Senior Publisher
Max Bearzot, Customer Consultant

Location/Date: Israel, December 2019
Why are you here?
Workshop Outline

• How to get Published
  ▪ Scholarly publishing overview
  ▪ What to publish
  ▪ Select your journal/readers/audience carefully
  ▪ Articles types and options
  ▪ Typical article structure
• Surviving Peer Review/Social Media/OA/Ethics
  ▪ The review and editorial process and your response
  ▪ Open Access options
  ▪ Promoting your research using social media
  ▪ Publishing ethics
• Questions and Answers
Peer-reviewed journal growth 1990-2013
Scholarly publishing today
Scientific, technical and medical (STM) publishing

2,000+ STM publishers

1.8 million peer-reviewed articles

28,000 peer-reviewed journals
Academic publishing
The publishing cycle

30-60% rejected by >13,000 editors

Solicit & manage submissions

>700 million downloads by >11 million researchers in >120 countries!

Peer Review

557,000+ reviewers

12.6 million Production articles available

Publish & Disseminate

365,000 articles accepted
Trends in publishing

- Rapid conversion from “print” to “electronic”
  - 1997: print only
  - 2009: 55% e-only (mostly e-collections)
    25% print only
    20% print-plus-electronic
  - 2014: 95+% e-only (in life sciences field over 99%)
  - 2025: ???
- 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
  - “author pays” models – Open Access, “delayed open access” – Open Archiving.
- Experimentation with new publication types and innovations
  - More exposure, more data reuse, more flexibility
Researcher Academy

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.
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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

Author details

Bax, Jeroen J.J.

Author ID: 55420749700

Affiliation:
Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Documents by author:
1771

Total citations:
141956 by 95291 documents

h-index:
145

Document and citation trends:

1771 Documents  Cited by 95291 documents  4005 co-authors  Topics
Strategic Information gathering

• Make sure your idea/concept is original at the beginning of your research, not at the time of writing! (Checklist!)
• 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
- New manuscript types (research elements): e.g. Micro Articles, Data in Brief, MethodsX, Software, Graphical Reviews……..

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?

Do you want to experiment with the new articles types?

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 archived version of Beall’s List of Predatory Open Access Publishers)
Choose the right journal

Investigate all candidate journals to find out

- Aims and scope
- Accepted types of articles
- Readership
- New paper types
  - go through the abstracts of recent publications)
Bibliometric indicators

Impact Factor  CiteScore  SJR  SNIP  H-Index
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

Just launched in August 2019:
Now there is another option for finding your ideal journal using AI technology and your abstract:
The Elsevier Journal Finder
https://journalfinder.elsevier.com/about
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!
Common problems with submissions:

An international editor says…

“\textit{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, \textit{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.”
Scientific Language – Overview

Write with clarity, objectivity, accuracy, and brevity.

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 or Senior 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
Analyzing trends & Journal quality indicators
### Overview of publications at Ben-Gurion University 2016-2018

**Ben-Gurion University of the Negev**

Overview of publications at Ben-Gurion University 2016-2018

#### Overall research performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Output</td>
<td>8,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>5,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field-Weighted Citation Impact</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Count</td>
<td>51,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations per Publication</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h5-Index</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Publications by Discipline

- **Computer Science (8.8%)**
- **Mathematics (6.4%)**
- **Physics and Astronomy (7.8%)**
- **Chemistry (4.5%)**
- **Chemical Engineering (2.2%)**
- **Materials Science (6.0%)**
- **Engineering (3.3%)**
- **Environmental Science (3.3%)**
- **Earth and Planetary Sciences (2.7%)**
- **Agricultural and Biological Sciences (4.6%)**
- **Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology (6.4%)**
- **Neuroscience (2.4%)**
- **Arts and Humanities (2.3%)**
- **Social Sciences (6.2%)**
- **Psychology (2.0%)**
- **Other (10.5%)**
Performance indicators – Ben-Gurion University 2016-2018

Performance indicators

Outputs in Top Citation Percentiles

Publications in top 10% most cited worldwide

- Ben-Gurion University of the Negev: 12.6%
- Israel: 15.2%

International Collaboration

Publications co-authored with Institutions in other countries

- Ben-Gurion University of the Negev: 44.7%
- Israel: 47.9%

Publications in Top Journal Percentiles

Publications in top 10% journals by CiteScore Percentile

- Ben-Gurion University of the Negev: 36.4%
- Israel: 36.5%

Academic-Corporate Collaboration

Publications with both academic and corporate affiliations

- Ben-Gurion University of the Negev: 2.5%
- Israel: 3.9%
### Collaboration

**Scholarly Output at the Ben-Gurion University of the Negev by amount of international, national and institutional collaboration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Scholarly Output</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Citations per Publication</th>
<th>Field-Weighted Citation Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International collaboration</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>3,845</td>
<td>32,419</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only national collaboration</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>8,263</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only institutional collaboration</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>8,539</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single authorship (no collaboration)</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic-Corporate Collaboration

**Scholarly Output at the Ben-Gurion University of the Negev with both academic and corporate author affiliations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Scholarly Output</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Citations per Publication</th>
<th>Field-Weighted Citation Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic-corporate collaboration</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No academic-corporate collaboration</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>8,389</td>
<td>46,327</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scopus is one of the largest abstract and citation databases of peer-reviewed literature, and features smart tools that allow you to track, analyze, and visualize scholarly research.

Scopus delivers a comprehensive view on the world of research. No packages, no add-ons. One all-inclusive subscription.
**What content does Scopus include?**

- Updated daily
- “Articles in Press” from > 3,750 titles
- 40 different languages covered

### JOURNALS
- **22,800** peer-reviewed journals
- **>280** trade journals
- Full metadata, abstracts and cited references back to 1970
- Funding data from acknowledgements
- 3,759 fully Open Access titles
- Going back to 1788

### CONFERENCES
- **100K** events
- **8.1M** records >10%
- Special issue of regular journal & conference proceedings.
- Mainly Engineering and Physical Sciences

### BOOKS
- **>562** book series
- **30K** Volumes
- **1.3M** items
- **210k stand alone books**
- Monographs, edited volumes, major reference works and graduate level textbooks
- Focus on Social Sciences and A&H

### PATENTS
- **38M** patents from 5 major patent offices:
  - UK
  - US
  - Japan
  - Europe
  - World

---

**Physical Sciences**
- 7,443

**Health Sciences**
- 6,795

**Social Sciences**
- 8,086

**Life Sciences**
- 4,492
Analyze searches: a graphic overview of macro-trends
Topic of prominence on Scopus: find out what topics are getting increasing attention

These are clusters of publications that cite each other. You can see it like a large network of publications.

Impact Factor and other bibliometric parameters
Impact Factor™

- The average annual number of citations per article published

\[
\text{Peer-reviewed documents} + \frac{\text{the number of times articles published in 2015 and 2016 were cited in indexed journals during 2017}}{150+150} = \text{IF}^{\text{TM}} = 600
\]

The number of "citable items" (usually articles, reviews, proceedings or notes; not editorials and letters-to-the-Editor) published in 2015 and 2016
Influences on Impact Factors: Subject Area Differences

- Citation/rate

Aggregate journal impact factors across 25 fields of research
Beyond the IF – What are the relevant indicators for journals?

CiteScore™
- Comprehensive, Transparent, Current and free metrics for helping to analyze where research outputs are published.
- Calculated using data from Scopus, CiteScore metrics help validate citations received by journals and proceedings.

Source-Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP)
- Developed by CWTS, University of Leiden, Netherlands.
- Measures contextual citation impact by weighting citations based on the total number of citations in a subject field.
- The impact of a single citation is given higher value in subject areas where citations are less likely, and vice versa.

SCImago Journal Rank (SJR)
- Developed by SCImago, Spain.
- A prestige metric that can be applied to journals, book series and conference proceedings.
- With SJR, the subject field, quality and reputation of the journal have a direct effect on the value of a citation.

Free Journal Metrics for +25 000 sources on Scopus

![Image of Scopus website showing journal metrics]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source title</th>
<th>CiteScore</th>
<th>Highest percentile</th>
<th>Citations 2017</th>
<th>Documents 2014-15</th>
<th>% Cited</th>
<th>SNIP</th>
<th>SJR</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress in Retinal and Eye Research</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>99% 1/108 Ophthalmology</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>5.751</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genome Research</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>98% 2/71 Genetics (clinical)</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>12.367</td>
<td>Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Resistance Updates</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>99% 3/92 Pharmacology</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.696</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Cancer</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>99% 1/58 Hepatology</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>Karger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Journal comparator on Scopus

Percentage documents not cited by year

CiteScore by year

SNIP by year

Citations by year

Documents by year

Percent not cited by year

Percentage review articles by year
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Research integrity and reproducibility when publishing
Research integrity and reproducibility

A manifesto for reproducible science

Marcus R. Munafò, Brian A. Nosek, Dorothy V. M. Bishop, Katherine S. Button, Christopher D. Chambers, Nathalie Percie du Sert, Uri Simonsohn, Eric-Jan Wagenmakers, Jennifer J. Ware & John P. A. Ioannidis

Nature Human Behaviour 1, Article number: 0021 (2017) | Download Citation
What is Mendeley

Reference Manager and a workflow tool supporting researcher needs…

Reference management
Collect, read, organize and cite all of your research from one library

Research network
Promote your work. Connect and collaborate with millions of researches worldwide

Datasets
Store, share and cite datasets with one secure online repository

Careers
Search for science and technology jobs in institutions worldwide

Funding
Find the best funding for your research, bookmark your favorites and stay up to date

www.Mendeley.com
Mendeley Data is a certified, free-to-use repository that hosts open data from all disciplines, whatever its format (e.g. raw and processed data, tables, codes and software).

Your data will receive a DOI, making it independently citable and it can be linked to any associated article on ScienceDirect, making it easy for readers to find and reuse.
Data sharing with Mendeley

https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/xz6gv65m6d/6
Reappraisal of *Hydatigera taeniaeformis* (Batsch, 1786) (Cestoda: Taeniidae) sensu lato with description of *Hydatigera kamiyai* n. sp. ✪

Antti Lavikanen *,†,‡, Takashi Iwaki ♀,†, Volto Haukosalmi ℹ, Sergey V. Komarova *, Maurizio Cassiraghi *, Nikolai E. Duchenov†, Andrea Galimberti *, Ali Halajan ‡, Heikki Henttonen ‡, Madoka Ichikawa-Seki ‡, Tadashi Itagaki ‡, Anton V. Krivopalov ‡, Seppo Meni ‡, Serge Morand ‡, Anu Näräaho ‡, Geri E. Olsson ‡, Alexia Ribas ‡,☆, Yutaka Terae *, Minoru Nakao ☆

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2016.01.003

**Highlights**

- *Hydatigera taeniaeformis* sensu lato is a complex of three cryptic entities (clades).
- Divergence is consistent across multiple genetic markers.
- Clades differ in geography and intermediate host associations.
- The Cosmopolitan clade in rats and mice is assigned to *H. taeniaeformis* sensu stricto.
- The North-European clade in voles and Apodemus is described as *Hydatigera kamiyai* n. sp.
3. Results

Original data of this study including nucleotide sequence alignments, numerical morphological data and a drawing (atypical proglottid from a lynx) are available at Mendeley Data (http://dx.doi.org/10.17632/f34pw8m4y1).

3.1. DNA barcoding and phylogenetic relationships

A total of 52 cox1 haplotypes (sequence types), of which 48 were new, were identified among the 150 specimens of *H. taeniaeformis* s.l. Taking into account previously published data, the complete cox1 data set included 80 haplotypes. Three main clades A, B and C, corresponding to the previously identified genetic entities of *H. taeniaeformis* s.l. (Okamoto et al., 1995a; Galimberti et al., 2012a), were detected (see the phenogram in Supplementary Fig. S1). Bootstrap supports for the clades were: A, 99%; B, 52%; and C, 99% (B + C, 97%). Clade A consisted of 36 haplotypes (designated as A1–A36), whereas clades B and C included 22 haplotypes each (B1–B22 and C1–C22, respectively).

Genetic divergence was estimated by comparing K2P distances of the partial cox1 sequences within and between the three clades (Table 3). Pairwise divergence values were low (<1.4%) within clade C, but higher within clades A and B, reaching up to 5.1% and 3.5%, respectively. Within a single definitive host individual, distances among the haplotypes of clade B reached 2.2%. In the phylogenetic analysis, clade A was divided into two subclades with bootstrap supports of 61% and 84% (ML tree in Supplementary Fig. S2A). Pairwise divergence values within these subclades (0.3–3.5%) overlapped with values between them (1.6–5.1%). Clade A diverged from the other clades with distance values comparable with the distances between *H. taeniaeformis* s.l. and *H. krapkowksi*, i.e. the distances ranged at the interspecific level as was also observed in previous studies (e.g. Lavikainen et al., 2008, Galimberti et al., 2012a; Nakao et al., 2013a). Between clades B and C, divergence values were lower, but equal to or slightly higher than values between the subclades of clade A. Phylogenetic relationships of the haplotypes within the clades remained mostly uncertain due to low bootstrap values (for most nodes <50%; Supplementary Fig. S2).
Research data for this article

Mendeley

Hydatigera
Revision of Hydatigera taeniaeformis species complex with a description of a new species (Lavikainen et al., IJP 2016):
1. Morphological data.
A drawing (atypical segment). Morphological matrix.
2. DNA data.
Nucleotide sequence alignments (18S rDNA; pold & pepck; mitochondrial protein-coding…

Dataset

- lynx_segment.jpg  467KB
- morphological matrix.xls  69KB
- Hyd_18S.phy  22KB

Show all 6 files on Mendeley Data
Why should I share my research data?

**How you benefit**
- You get credit for the work you've done
- Leads to more citations! *
- Can boost your number of publications
- Increases your exposure and may lead to new collaborations

**What it means for the research community**
- It's easy to reuse and reinterpret your data
- Duplication of experiments can be avoided
- New insights can be gained, sparking new lines of inquiry
- Empowers replication

**And society at large...**
- Greater transparency boosts public faith in research
- Can play a role in guiding government policy
- Improves access to research for those outside health and academia
- Benefits the public purse as funding of repeat work is reduced
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
  - Reviews, Micro Articles etc different layout.
  - Social sciences more discussion and less data.

Make them easy for indexing and searching! (informative, attractive, effective)

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

Tell readers what you did and the important findings

• One paragraph (between 50-250 words) often, plus Highlight bullet points (and Graphical Abstracts if allowed)
• 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 $\text{C}_x\text{N}(\text{SO}_2\text{CF}_3)_2 \cdot \delta\text{F}$ are prepared under ambient conditions in 48% hydrofluoric acid, using $\text{K}_2\text{MnF}_6$ 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.
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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

Researcher Academy
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 and understand
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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

• But also consider publishing your data in an easier to discover format – *Data In Brief* or *Mendeley Data* for example
Cover Letter

Your chance to speak to the editor directly

• Submitted along with your manuscript

• Mention what would make your manuscript special to the journal

• Note special requirements (suggest reviewers, conflicts of interest)
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 behavior. In particular, the difference between mechano-sorptive 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 research that this paper is:

- 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 if you would consider the manuscript for publication in the International Journal of Science.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

A. Professor
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 the 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!

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.
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The Peer Review Process – revisions

START

Submit a paper

Basic requirements met?

Yes

Assign reviewers

No

Collect reviewers’ recommendations

[Reject]

Make a decision

[Revision required]

[Yes]

[Accept]

Review and give recommendation

Revise the paper

REJECT

ACCEPT

Author

Editor

Reviewer

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 – consider colour coding
  ✓ 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
  ▪ It took you weeks to write the manuscript........

.....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!*
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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
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## 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><strong>Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Open access fee is paid by the author, or on their behalf (for example by a funding body)</td>
<td>▪ No fee is payable by the author, as costs are covered by library subscriptions</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 wide range of purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Open versions of your article should have a user license attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Publish in an open access journal</td>
<td>▪ Publish in a journal that supports open access (also known as a hybrid journal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Link to your article.</td>
<td>▪ Selected journals feature open archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Self-archive a version of your article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why publish in an open access journal?

- 67% want community to access their research without restriction
- 66% want to increase readership of their article
- 37% want less time between submission and publication than for subscription journals
- 36% have published in open access journals before and had a good experience
- 25% other researchers in their specialty publish in open access journals
- 10% funding body mandate
- 5% institutional mandate
- 5% other reason (please specify)
- 3% no reason/prefer not to say

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 ResearcherAcademy.com

OPEN ACCESS is here to stay – learn about the many options and possibilities!

Transformative agreements between Publishers including Elsevier, and the NL Funding bodies are taking place
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 also do yourself to draw attention to your great research that was just published online…

• Think Social Media! Check out the Researcher Academy for suggestions.
More information

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

- [www researcheracademy com](https://www.researcheracademy.com): College of Networking / Getting Noticed

[Brochure] [Factsheet] [Online lectures and interactive courses]
Publication Ethics
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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.
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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)
  - formerly called CrossCheck and how Crossref Similarity Checker

Manuscripts are automatically checked against a database of 50+ 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

Same colour left and right = Same text

2003

2004
An article in which the authors committed plagiarism: it will not be removed from ScienceDirect ever. Everybody who opens or 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
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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 21
Figure Manipulation – Example
Same manuscript, different experiments
Figure Manipulation – Example
Same manuscript, different experiments
Figure Manipulation – Example 2

Same image (preparation) and same data are manipulated and reused in these papers.

- Published in 2005
  Paper #13 Fig. 2A

- Published in 2003
  Paper #9 Fig. 2A

- Published in 2007
  Paper #6 Fig. 3A

`a~e: same tissue`

- Published in 2003
  Paper #8 Fig. 5A (top right)
  Paper #8 Fig. 5A (bottom left)

- Rotate
- Change aspect ratio
This figure is representing different treatments on different tissue types. However, some of the panels appear to show overlapping areas!
Online Resources

Discover a wealth of knowledge
Researcher Academy supports researchers throughout their research journey

RESEARCH PREPARATION
Funding, Data management

COMMUNICATING YOUR RESEARCH
Ensure visibility, Social impact

WRITING FOR RESEARCH
Manuscript preparation, Writing skills

NAVIGATING PEER REVIEW
Peer review for authors, Reviewer skills

PUBLICATION PROCESS
Journal selection, Ethics, Open access

60+
Modules created by research experts

>100
Videos, downloadable guides & tools

$ Earn certificates & exclusive discounts

https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/
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More resources are available from your university library! Use your campus tools and colleagues

• Information around journals such as impact factor, time to first decision, is a journal in SCOPUS or Web of Science?

• Some Graduate Schools help by giving writing courses.

• The policies on Open Access are changing rapidly and your library is the best place to go to find the current situation.

• Remember most universities have some journal editors or editorial board members on campus who, if approached in the right way, will give you help and advice.
Questions?

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

https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/workshop and then enter code CJGOLF which gets you to the link to download your certificate of attendance plus other resources including this presentation.

There is full permission granted to distribute this slide set as long as the presentation is not edited.