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Peer-Reviewed Journal Growth 1665-2001

No of titles launched and still extant 2001

Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society (London)

2009
1.4 million articles in 23,000 journals by 2,000 publishers

Source:
M A Mabe The number and growth of journals
Serials 16(2), 191-7, 2003
Elsevier Journal publishing volume

- 1,000 new editors per year
- 20 new journals per year

- Organise editorial boards
- Launch new specialist journals

- 600,000+ article submissions per year

- 200,000 reviewers
- 1 million reviewer reports per year

- 40%-90% of articles rejected

- 11 million articles now available

- 11 million researchers
- 5,000+ institutions
- 180+ countries
- 400 million+ downloads per year
- 3 million print pages per year

- 280,000 new articles produced per year
- 190 years of back issues scanned, processed and data-tagged

Publish and disseminate
Solicit and manage submissions
Manage peer review
Edit and prepare
Archive and promote
Production
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
  - 2013: 95+% e-only
- Changing role of “journals” due to e-access
- Increased usage of articles
  - at lower cost per article
- Electronic submission
  - Increased manuscript inflow
- Experimentation with new publishing models
  - E.g. “author pays” models, “delayed open access”, etc.
Open Access
Gold Open Access

- After acceptance, research is made immediately, permanently open access
- Readers can copy and reuse the content as defined by user licenses.
- Costs are covered by a open access publication fee
- Some funding bodies & institutions will reimburse authors for such fees.

Benefits of Gold

- Immediate open access
- You can choose your user license
- Authors retain copyright
- Share the final published article
Green Open Access

- After publication and acceptance in a subscription journal author publish in a journal
- The article is immediately available to subscribers
- After a delayed period of time (an embargo) authors can post their manuscript to an institutional repository for public use
- Applies to the accepted author manuscript and preprint versions
- Cost of publication are covered and dependent on the subscription model.
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
- Keep your AAM: See your journal’s posting policy
- Make your article OA: Select a license and pay an OA fee
- Publish OA: Share the final version of your article!
Complying with new policies

Three key funder developments:

- Research Councils UK
- European Commission - Horizon 2020
  - Every EU country to develop their own policy
- Office of Science and Technology Policy (US)
However, editors, reviewers, and the research community don’t consider these reasons when assessing your work.
Always keep in mind that ...

... your published papers, as a permanent record of your research, are your passport to your community!
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** manuscript to present your contributions to the scientific community.
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
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.*
Practical Advice - Strategic Information Gathering

- Find out what’s Hot
  - [http://info.scopus.com/topcited/](http://info.scopus.com/topcited/)
  - Almetrics Application

- Find the trends of the subject area
  - Search tips (including alerts)
  - Journals, authors, publications per year (Scopus)

- Evaluate which journal is right for your manuscript
  - Impact Factor
  - Journal Analyzer (Scopus)
  - SNIP & SJR ([www.journalmetrics.com](http://www.journalmetrics.com))
  - h-Index

- Find out more about the journals
  - Who are the editors?
  - Guide for authors
Use the advanced search options

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

- In ScienceDirect, Scopus, WoS/WoK 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’s Hot (downloads)
Find out what is being cited and from where
Find out who is being cited
Find out who is being cited
Find out **who** is being cited – in more depth
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;
- 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.
Select the best journal for submission

- Look at **your references** – these will 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 is the journal’s **Impact Factor**?
  - Does it really exist or is **dubious**? (check for example Beall’s List of Predatory Open Access Publishers)

- **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!)
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
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
What is the Impact Factor (IF)?

**Impact Factor**

*the average annual number of citations per article published*

- For example, the 2013 impact factor for a journal is calculated as follows:
  - \( A \) = the number of times articles published in 2011 and 2012 were cited in indexed journals during 2013
  - \( B \) = the number of "citable items" (usually articles, reviews, proceedings or notes; not editorials and letters-to-the-Editor) published in 2011 and 2012
  - 2013 impact factor = \( \frac{A}{B} \)
  - e.g. 600 citations \( = \frac{2000}{150 + 150} \) articles
Impact Factor and other bibliometric parameters

![Graph showing the relationship between time after publication and citations. Key features include:
- **Impact Factor Window**
- **Immediacy Index Window**
- **Cited half-life**
- Time after publication (Years)
- Citations
- 50% of citations
- Graph shows the increase in citations after publication, followed by a decline, with the cited half-life indicating the time it takes for citations to halve.](image-url)
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

Values range from 0.0 to 3.5.
So you now have a sequence list of candidate journals for your manuscript?

All authors of the submission agree to this list

Write your draft as if you are going to submit to the first on your list. Use its Guide to Authors
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!
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
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.”
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
- **One idea** or piece of information **per** sentence is sufficient
- **Avoid** multiple statements in one sentence

An example of what NOT to do:

“If it is the case, intravenous administration should result in that emulsion has higher intravenous administration retention concentration, but which is not in accordance with the result, and therefore the more rational interpretation should be that SLN with mean diameter of 46nm is greatly different from emulsion with mean diameter of 65 nm in entering tumor, namely, it is probably difficult for emulsion to enter and exit from tumor blood vessel as freely as SLN, which may be caused by the fact that the tumor blood vessel aperture is smaller.”
Policies regarding authorship can vary

One 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. **ALL three** conditions must be fulfilled to be an author!

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

Recognize those who helped in the research, but do not qualify as authors (you want them to help you again, don’t you?)

Include individuals who have assisted you in your study:

Advisors
Financial supporters
Proofreaders
Typists
Suppliers who may have given materials
Author names: common problems

- **Different Spellings**
  - Järvinen / Jaervinen / Jarvinen
  - Lueßen / Lueben / Luessen
  - van Harten / Vanharten / Van

- **First/Last Names**
  - Asian names often difficult for Europeans or Americans

- **What in case of marriage/divorce?**

**Be consistent!**

If you are not, how can others be?
Author Profiles...be consistent if you can, or correct

Van’T Veer, Laura J.

**Personal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Van’T Veer, Laura J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other formats</td>
<td>van’T Veer, Laura J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van’T Veer, L.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van’T Veer, L.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>van’T Veer, L.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>van’T Veer, Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van’T Veer, Laura J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van’T Veer, L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van’T Veer, Laura J.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author ID</th>
<th>7004922326</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>The Netherlands Cancer Institute, Amsterdam, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>204</th>
<th>View Author Evaluator</th>
<th>Add to my list</th>
<th>Set alert</th>
<th>Set feed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>4242</td>
<td>View citation overview</td>
<td>Set alert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>18676 total citations by 12726 documents</td>
<td>View citation overview</td>
<td>Set alert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Index</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>View h-Graph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-authors</td>
<td>150 (maximum 150 co-authors can be displayed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web search</td>
<td>8304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject area</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology</td>
<td>Agricultural and Biological Sciences</td>
<td>More...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**The Challenge:**
- The scholarly record is broken
- Name ambiguity is an issue

**The Solution:**
- Establish a researcher identifier registry (partnership between Univs, Publishers, funding bodies...)

**The Benefits:**
- Current authors can claim already published work
- New authors can establish unique identifier

---

Launched 16 October 2012

**ORCID Launches Registry**

ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) is excited to announce the launch of its Registry (http://orcid.org), where researchers can distinguish themselves by creating a unique personal identifier.

“ORCID addresses a problem shared by individuals and organizations across the research community: reliably connecting research with researchers. -- Hashtable, Executive Director of...
General 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)
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
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
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 K2MnF6 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.

What has been done

What are the main findings
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 where 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
• 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 criticize incomplete or incorrect descriptions, and may even recommend rejection
Results – what have you found?

- The following should be included
  - the main findings
    - Thus not *all* findings
    - 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*
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
- No duplication of results described in text or other illustrations

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

® Un-crowded plots
  Ŷ 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
  Ŷ Not in French, German, Chinese, Korean, ...

® Use color ONLY when necessary.
  Ŷ If different line styles can clarify the meaning, then never use colors or other thrilling effects.

® Color must be visible and distinguishable when printed in black & white.

® Do not include long boring tables!
Discussion – what do the 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:
  - How 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 summarize the paper
  - The abstract is for that purpose
- Avoid judgments about impact
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!

- **Check**
  - Referencing style of the journal
  - The spelling of author names, the year of publication
  - Punctuation use
  - Use of “et al.”: “et al.” translates to “and others”,

- **Avoid citing the following if possible:**
  - Personal communications, unpublished observations, manuscripts not yet accepted for publication
    - Editors may ask for such documents for evaluation of the manuscripts
  - Articles published only in the local language, which are difficult for international readers to find
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, ....

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

- Must relate to, and support, the article
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)

Final approval from all authors

Explanation of importance of research

Suggested reviewers

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

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

Sincerely yours,

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 version to submit.

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

http://www.pri.univie.ac.at/~derntl/papers/meth-se.pdf
Many journals use a system of initial editorial review. Editors may reject a manuscript without sending it 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
  - They may review your manuscript for the other journal too!
  - Read the Guide for Authors of the new journal, again and again.
The Peer Review Process – revisions


http://www.pri.univie.ac.at/~derntl/papers/meth-se.pdf
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!
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
  - 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!
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
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

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
**Fabrication**: Making up data or results, and recording or reporting them

“… the fabrication of research data … *hits at the heart of our responsibility to society*, the reputation of our institution, the trust between the public and the biomedical research community, and our personal credibility and that of our mentors, colleagues…”

“It can *waste the time of others*, trying to replicate false data or designing experiments based on false premises, and can lead to therapeutic errors. It can never be tolerated.”

Professor Richard Hawkes  
Department of Cell Biology and Anatomy  
University of Calgary

“The most dangerous of all falsehoods is a slightly distorted truth.”

G.C.Lichtenberg (1742-1799)
Falsification:

- Manipulation of research materials, equipment, processes
- Changes in / omission of data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record

“Select data to fit a preconceived hypothesis:

- We do not include (data from) an experiment because ‘it did not work’, or
- We show ‘representative’ images that do not reflect the total data set, or
- We simply shelve data that do not fit.”

Richard Hawkes
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.

- 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

- Two or more papers, without full cross reference, share the same hypotheses, data, discussion points, or conclusions

- An author should not submit for consideration in 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)
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Publication ethics – How it can end.....

Hungarian president resigns over doctorate plagiarism scandal

Pal Schmitt steps down after university revokes doctorate, saying Olympics thesis was mostly copied from two authors

Associated Press in Budapest
guardian.co.uk, Monday 2 April 2012 13.29 BST

The Hungarian president, Pal Schmitt, who has announced his resignation.
Photograph: Matej Divizna/EPA

The Hungarian president, Pal Schmitt, has announced he will resign after losing his doctorate in a plagiarism scandal.
Figure Manipulation – **some** things are allowed
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Figure Manipulation
Example - Different authors and reported experiments

Am J Pathol, 2001

Life Sci, 2004
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- **Rotated 180°**
- **Zoomed out?!**
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