The Agenda – Helping you on your publishing journey

- So you’re thinking of writing a paper?
  - Preparing to publish
  - Find an appropriate journal
  - Identify your target audience
  - Navigating online submission
  - Straight from the Editor: Tips for writing better papers
- The peer review process
- Publishing ethics
- Open Access
- Post-Acceptance: The journey continues
So you’re thinking of writing a paper?
1. **Registration** – Establish your ownership and priority

2. **Certification** – Acknowledgement of the quality of the work through publication in a specific journal

3. **Dissemination** – Inform your peer group (and others)

4. **Archiving** – Provide a permanent record of your work – “the minutes of science”

5. **Career** – Publication record is important for career progression

6. **Participation** – Be part of the scientific debate.
What DEFINITELY to publish:
• Original and significant results or methods
• Reviews or summaries of a particular subject area or topic.
• Basically: work that advances the knowledge and understanding in a certain scientific field, or provides a valuable resource

What NOT to publish:
• Reports of little scientific interest (but see below)
• Out of date work
• Duplications or part-duplications of previously published work

What to THINK CAREFULLY about publishing:
• Preliminary results (are they useful, or are they too inconclusive?)
• Replication of results but in a different system
• Ask yourself: where could I best publish these?
Basically, a “good story”, which - in more scientific terms - is:

- Scientifically sound, significant results that also represent a significant contribution (to the literature) in an area of research, and that would be of substantial interest and relevance to a large proportion of the journal’s readership.

- A scientific narrative that structures and binds the results together into an integrative picture that presents something new, be it an empirical observation, a proof, or an explicit hypothesis/model of predictive value.
Knowing whether you have a “good story”

**Easy:**
- Your supervisor says “I think we’ve got a good story here…” :-)
- You have solved a discrete and important “puzzle”
- Discovery of something completely novel and discrete, e.g. a new method, a new application

**Hard:**
- Incremental progress demonstrating improvements to existing results: is the work useful to know about?
- Circumstantial “evidence” in support of a hypothesis

**Bottom line:**
If in doubt, start writing immediately!
Full articles / Original articles: the most important papers. Often substantial and significant completed pieces of research.

Letters / Rapid Communications/ Short communications: quick and early communication of significant and original advances. Much shorter than full articles (check limitations).

Review papers / perspectives: summarize recent developments on a specific topic. Highlight important previously reported points. Not the place to introduce new information. Often invited. Always consult with editor before submission.

Conference papers: Excellent for disseminating early or in progress research findings. Typically 5-10 pages, 3 figures, 15 references.

Ask your supervisor and your colleagues for advice on manuscript type. Sometimes outsiders can see things more clearly than you.
Summary

- Are you ready? Do you have significant and original results, or are you providing a useful resource for the community?

- Think about the type of manuscript you are going to write – What results do you have? What do you want to achieve?
Choosing the right journal

A. The audience

B. Find journal

C. Online submission
Identifying your audience...
Which audience do I want to reach?

**Identify** the audience

**Verify** their interest in the topic

**Determine** the range of interest
Identify the right audience for your paper

Core of your field (very important for peer recognition and citation)

Community somewhat outside (broadening recognition of your research and research area)

Communities at interfaces between your discipline and other disciplines (could initiate interesting trans-disciplinary collaboration!)

Basically: don’t limit yourself to the community represented by your lab or the field-specific meetings that you attend. Think broad!
Which audience is right for me?

Where do you read papers related to your research?

Which journals do you like the most?

Where were your references published?

What do your peers suggest?
Find a suitable journal….
Which journal to approach first?
Evaluating the target journal

- Prestige
- Speed
- Audience
- Author Services / Experience
- Aesthetics
- Cost
- Likelihood of acceptance
- Identify your Audience – Ask yourself questions: what do you want to achieve? Who do you want to reach? Think broadly wherever possible.

- Self-Examination – Use the process of audience identification to compile a list of appropriate journals which meet your needs.

- Scope – Be sure that your paper is within the scope of the target journal.

- Create a Submission ‘Action Plan’ – Prioritise your submission focus.
You now have a list of Journals! It is time to prepare your manuscript for submission...

Read the author instructions and format your article appropriately – all major journals will have online instructions...
Straight from the Editor – Top Tips!

Tip 1: Impeccable presentation

Tip 2: Clearly explain the novelty

Tip 3: Structure (1)

Tip 4: Get to the point!

Tip 5: Look beyond the Impact Factor!
Straight from the Editor – Top Tips!

One Paper, One Idea

Rationalise Everything!

Structure (2)

Linear Narrative
Navigating online submission...
Do not ignore your Covering Letter – You will be selling yourself short!

Write for the EDITOR!

‘Sell’ your work

WHY did you submit the manuscript to THIS journal?

• State in a few sentences what the paper is about (not abstract)
• Mention what would make your manuscript special to the journal
• Why does it fit the scope of the journal? Why is it novel?
• Why will it be of interest to reviewers?

Mention special requirements

Clarify any point that may raise question

A good cover letter may accelerate the editorial process
Create an account in the journal’s online submission system (this is needed for each specific journal)

Carefully follow the process through - make sure the author list you input is complete, it should match the names on the manuscript.

Papers go through an initial checklist to make sure the author guidelines have been followed (format, length, language, figures etc.)

Papers are also checked for plagiarism using special software...

Contact the Editorial Office first with any queries
And *(please)* remember…

Decide on **ONE** journal

**DO NOT** submit to multiple journals
Summary

- **Novelty, Novelty, Novelty:** Clearly describe the novelty of your work in your abstract (refine your approach using the ‘one sentence sales pitch’)

- **Cover Letter:** Address the Editor directly.

- **Submission Guidelines:** Follow all submission instructions and guidelines to the letter.

- Submit to one journal at a time.
The peer review process....
What is Peer Review?

It is the process of screening a submitted manuscript. The manuscript will be reviewed by professionals in the same field before it is published in a journal.

The process is designed to assess the validity, quality and often the originality of articles for publication. Its ultimate purpose is to maintain the integrity of science by filtering out invalid or poor quality articles.
Why Peer Review Is Important

- Improves the quality of papers published
- Helps assess the importance of findings
- Determines the originality of the paper
- Can potentially detect plagiarism and fraud
- A better system has not yet been identified

84% of researchers believe that without peer review there would be no control in scientific communication

90% of researchers feel that peer review improves the quality of their published paper
What does a Reviewer look at?

Is your article within scope for the journal?

✓ Is the topic addressed by the research relevant and interesting?
✓ What does it add to the subject area?

Is it of sufficient quality e.g.

✓ Does it give a clear statement of aims and achievements?
✓ Are the methods used appropriate?

Does the paper meet ethical guidelines?

✓ Were any human, or animal, participants properly protected?
✓ Was any portion fabricated, falsified, or plagiarized?
How to Read a Referee Report

As an author…

• Treat it as a discussion of your paper
• Don’t take it personally
• Be self-critical
• Remember that everyone is human!
How to Read a Referee Report

Editors and authors read referee reports differently!

Accept, but only with major alterations

Accept, but only with major alterations

Accept, but only with major alterations

Author

Referee said “yes” but not accepted?

Editor/Reviewer

Needs revision and further review
Editors base their decisions on:

- The journal’s aims and audience
- The state of knowledge in the field
- The level of competition for acceptance and page space
- **Reviewer comments, but remember….. reviewers’ recommendations are not a vote**

The editor makes the final decision
How an Editor Reads a Submission

When a manuscript lands on my desk, I...

• read the title, authors / affiliations
• read the abstract
• read the cover letter
• read the conclusions
• look over the graphics / tables
• check the references / acknowledgments

“If I’m interested, the readers will be too!”
What Editors Look For

- Is the paper suitable for the journal? Is it too specialised?
- Is the research significant?
- Is it different to prior work?
- Does the paper adhere to the ethical guidelines?
Be Objective – Treat the process as a discussion of your work and always be looking to improve. Focus on where your article has been criticised and always aim to improve.

Editor’s Decision is Final – The Editor makes the final decision, the reviewers are simply providing support. It is not a vote!

Novelty and Scope - Editors are looking for novel material which fits well within the aims and scope and will be interesting to readers.
The decision has been made, now what?

- Rejection
- Revision
- Acceptance
This is an opportunity to improve your paper – take it!

Make the changes recommended by the referees because an unchanged paper…

• may be sent to the same referees by the next journal
• is likely to get the same or similar comments even from different referees
Rejection is disappointing, but it is part of the process.

Common Reasons for Rejection

- Paper **does not fit within a journal's scope**
  - Findings **cannot be generalized**
- Results **do not clearly show practical, clinical, or theoretical implications**
  - **Wrong methodology** was used
- Manuscript is **poorly written**, include spelling errors or jargon
  - Figures, tables, and images are **not clearly labeled**
- **High competition** for page space
Peer review adds value for everyone in the community but it’s not perfect!

You can appeal a rejection if you have **solid scientific reasons** for doing so, for example:

- a referee has misunderstood the concept of the paper
- a referee has scientifically inaccurate reasoning
How Do I Appeal a Rejection?

Write a detailed letter to the editor with **point-by-point responses** to the reviewers' comments.

Include evidence, citations, and data to back up your claims.

**Keep it objective**, avoid making things personal.

**Leave it a day or two!**

But think strategically! Is an appeal the right use of your time and energy? Look again at your submission plan.
The comments of the referees should be used to refine your work and improve the manuscript.

If you disagree with the comment, still consider revising the article in someway to clarify your argument.

Take time to respond to all comments, it could save further peer review.

Don’t just do the things specifically mentioned.

**Remember, reviewers are readers too!**
Before you respond REMEMBER

1. A request for revisions should be considered an opportunity. Take it!
2. Do not get angry or defensive
3. Editors and Reviewers are just trying to help
4. We all make errors that need to be addressed
5. When in doubt, seek advice from your supervisor or colleagues
6. Rejection or criticism does not automatically mean that your work is not good
Academic Publishing Depends on Trust!

There are ethical responsibilities for all actors in the publication process.
Editor responsibilities

- Ensure **efficient, fair, and timely** manuscript processing

- Ensure **confidentiality** of submitted manuscripts

- Make the **final decision** for accepting or rejecting

- Not use work reported in a submitted manuscript for their own research

- Ensure a **fair selection** of referees

- **Act upon allegations of scientific misconduct**

- **Deal fairly** with author appeals
• To gather and interpret data in an **honest** way

• **To give due recognition** to published work relating to their manuscript

• **To give due acknowledgement** to all contributors

• **Notify the publisher of any errors**

• **To avoid undue fragmentation of work** into multiple manuscripts (salami publishing)

• To ensure that a manuscript is submitted to **only one journal at a time**
• Ensure confidentiality of manuscripts and respect privileged information

• Not to withhold a referee report for personal advantage

• Return to editor without review if there is a conflict of interest

• Inform editor quickly if not qualified or unable to review

• Judge manuscript objectively and in timely fashion

• Explain and support recommendations with arguments and references where appropriate

• Inform editor if plagiarized or falsified data is suspected
**Fraud** – making up a report, not disclosing data, or changing data

**Duplicate submission**
- submitting the same article to more than one journal at the same time
- submitting two highly related papers without disclosure cross-referencing

**Duplicate publication** – publishing the same paper twice

**Inadequate citing**
- not citing appropriate previous works on the same subject
- not acknowledging another researcher’s contribution

**Plagiarism** – submitting a whole (or parts of a) published work as your own

**Self-plagiarism** – republishing your own work without proper citation

**PENALTIES CAN BE SEVERE!**
How is it Detected?

Peer review – Reviewers are very good at it!

Members of your community all read papers on similar topics

Specialist plagiarism detection software

Data analysis & analysts
The Internet!!
Bloggers and commentators are keen to catch unethical behaviour they are always watching!

How is it Detected?
A few golden rules

✓ Articles should always be submitted to one journal at a time

✓ The same article should not be published in more than one place

✓ Several articles based on the same research must each make a unique contribution

✓ Acknowledge all those that have contributed to the work
Ethics resources

Publicationethics.org

http://exchanges.wiley.com/ethicsguidelines
Open Access....
Open Access

Gold Open Access
Pay to Publish

Green Open Access
Self-Archiving

free, immediate, permanent online availability of published research, combined with the rights to share and use the content
Wiley offers three Open Access options

**Pay-to-Publish Open Access**

- **Wiley Open Access**
  - Fully open access journals

- **OnlineOpen**
  - Hybrid open access journals

**Fully Open Access Journals (launched 2011)**

Program of fully open access journals. Every article is published open access.

**Open Access Option (launched 2004)**

Hybrid model enables authors to make their article fully open in a subscription journal thus providing choice for authors to publish open access in the journal of their preference.

**Self-Archiving Open Access**

- **Self-Archiving**
  - Peer-reviewed versions on personal website

**Self-Archiving**

Allows peer reviewed (but not final) versions of a paper to be hosted on a personal website, or an institutional website after an embargo period.

---

Publishing Open Access with Wiley
Make your article **free to read / free to download / free to share** on Wiley Online Library and PubMed Central and PMC mirror sites if applicable

The author, author's funding agency, or the author's institution pays a fee to ensure that the article is made open access

Authors retain copyright and publish under a Creative Commons license

Compliance with funder requirements unless otherwise stated
Self-archiving open access policy

After an embargo period:
- 12 months for STM journals
- 24 months for SSH journals

Permits authors to self-archive on:
- Personal website
- Institutional repository
- PubMed Central (PMC)

For more information on our self-archiving policy, visit wileyauthors.com/selfarchiving
Whether publishing open access in a hybrid journal or in a fully open access journal, we provide several resources to help authors navigate open access publishing:

- Understanding Open Access video
- and Funder Open Access policy finder
- Compliance Road Maps
- Publishing Decision Tree for RCUK funded authors
Author choice of Creative Commons Licenses

✓ Author retains copyright

✓ Encourages sharing and reuse

✓ Author chooses one of three license types

- CC-BY
- CC-BY-NC
- CC-BY-NC-ND
Payments are covered by:

- **Authors**
  Out of grant funds
  APC waivers and discounts for certain countries

- **Funders**
  Provide dedicated funds for open access publishing

- **Institutions**
  Cover costs centrally with open access funds and/or arrangements with publishers

- **Societies**
  Some societies cover costs of journal APCs themselves
How Will Your Open Access Article Appear?

Open access license information

Funding Body

Open access label

Ecology and Evolution

An inducible offense: carnivore morph tadpoles induced by tadpole carnivory

Nicholas A. Lévéque, Sofia de la Serna Suárez, and David W. Plowman

Original Research

Environment

Ecology and Evolution

Volume 5, Issue 7, pages 1405-1411, April 2015

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Additional Information (Show All)

How to Cite | Author Information | Publication History | Funding Information

Funded by

• National Science Foundation. Grant Number: DEB-1014479

ARTICLE TOOLS

Get PDF (404K)

Save to My Profile

Email Link to this Article

Export Citation for this Article

Citation Alerts

Request Permissions
Open access articles are 4x more likely to appear in Wiley’s top 1,000 articles on a rolling basis

High-quality and authoritative publishing standards
- Maintain the rigor of your work through traditional peer review and clear editorial policies
- Dedicated editors and international editorial board members

Retain copyright for the articles you publish under a Creative Commons License

Increase the potential audience for your article, which can translate to:
- Higher readership
- Increased citations
- Greater visibility of your work

Publish quickly and efficiently

Automatically comply with open access mandates
After Acceptance....
How to measure impact

**Get Read**
Uses article views and downloads to track the reach of a paper online.

**Get Shared**
Collects mentions in social media and web-based media to track online attention.

**Get Cited**
Captures references to a published source to track validation of one's research by others.

**Usage**
Uses article views and downloads to track the reach of a paper online.

**Altmetrics**
Collects mentions in social media and web-based media to track online attention.

**Citations**
Captures references to a published source to track validation of one's research by others.
The importance of search engine optimization (SEO)

Visits to Wiley Online Library
June 2014-July 2015

- Search Engines: 53%
- Other Websites: 25%
- Typed/Bookmarked: 21%
- Social Networks: 1%
SEO in 4 easy steps

1. **Use keywords** - Choose relevant keywords and key phrases and use throughout article

2. **Choose a smart title** - Must be descriptive and incorporate key phrases related to your topic

3. **Write a good abstract** - Express key points and findings from your article in simple terms

4. **Build links** - Create a network of inbound links and citations to your article
Choose **15-20 keywords/phrases**

- **Test keywords** using free tools

- Use keywords in:
  - **Title** (2-4)
  - **Abstract** (3-4)
  - **Sub-headings**
  - **Keyword fields** (5-7)

- Let keywords flow naturally

- Avoid overuse
- Keep it to **15 words** or less
- Use **keywords and phrases**
- Place the **main concept at the beginning**
- Do **not use abbreviations or acronyms**
- Avoid using phrases such as “effect of,” “involvement of,” “evidence of”
Abstract best practices

- Capture **key points in simple language**
- Use **keywords**
- Place **essential findings first**
- 7-10 sentences:
  - Why did you do research/what is key conclusion?
  - What were your research aims and methods for gathering data?
  - How are findings valuable for your field?
Tips for building links

- Link to paper from your institution’s website
- Link to your article via Social Media
- Cite your previous work when appropriate
64% of authors have promoted their own published work in the past 12 months.

-2015 Wiley author survey
Self-promotional author toolkit

Maximize the impact of your published research!

7 promotional tools to help ensure your work gets seen, read and cited.

**Conferences**
- Think about simple messages to promote your article at your next conference—whether networking with colleagues, or presenting formally.

**SEO**
- Are your title and abstract clear and searchable? Have you used the most relevant keywords?
- Have you looked at off-page SEO strategies, such as link building, to promote your article?

**Publicity**
- Is your latest research newsworthy? Have you shared it with your local press office?
- No permission is required from Wiley for any press release, but we ask that you wait until the article is published online, refer to the relevant journal in the opening paragraph, and link to the final published version of the paper on Wiley Online Library.

**Social Media / Networking**
- If you run a blog, post about your article.
- Share a link to your article on Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook or other social media platforms.
- Engage with any existing Society / College social media accounts.
- Join academic social networking sites such as ResearchGate and Academia.edu.

**The Wider Web**
- Update your faculty or professional website with an entry about your article.
- Register for your unique ORCID iD and add your article details to your profile.
- Find a Wikipedia page on a topic related to your article, and add a reference to your paper.

**Multimedia**
- Talk directly to potential readers and create a short video or podcast which conveys the essence of your paper. Ask your Wiley contact for more details.

**Email**
- Use Wiley Author Services to nominate up to 10 colleagues to receive free access to your article, or email a link to key colleagues.
- Sign up for journal content alerts, so you know when your article is officially published online.
- Add a link to your email signature.

97% of authors stated they are likely or very likely to use the toolkit.
80% of survey respondents say that Kudos helped them achieve their goals of getting read, shared, and cited.

- 2015 Kudos survey

Helping authors explain, enrich, and share their articles for greater research impact.
87% of survey respondents said they would use altmetrics to gauge the popularity of an article.

_Wiley author survey_
ArticleShare

Exposé your paper to influential colleagues and maximize your research impact
Questions?