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Understanding and Benefiting from the Publishing Process
As the publisher and editors of the official journal of EurAgEng, we considered it important to engage with the scientists working in our research area to help them;

• Improve the effectiveness of manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in our discipline.
• Remain up to date with the publishing process and the ethical background to scientific publishing.

Purpose of presentation

Biosystems Engineering is published by Elsevier for the UK engineering society IAgrE.
Academic publishing
The publishing cycle

30-70% of submissions rejected by >13,000 editors

557,000+ reviewers

365,000 articles accepted

12.6 million production articles available

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

>700 million downloads by >11 million researchers in >120 countries!
What are the responsibilities of a Publisher?

- **Organisation:**
  - Providing the editorial infrastructure (peer-review process)
  - Arranging the publication of accepted manuscripts
  - Distribution and promotion of journals to readers/libraries
  - Archiving all published articles
  - Dealing with ethical and copyright issues
What are the responsibilities of an Editor?

- **Scientific responsibility:**
  - Defining the aims and scope of the journal
  - Handling new submissions
  - Sending out appropriate papers to reviewers
  - Accepting or rejecting papers
  - Communicating with authors and reviewers
  - Advising on strategy and direction of the journal
  - Dealing with ethical issues
What are your personal reasons for publishing?

Get funding?

Get promoted?

PhD degree?

...???

However, editors, reviewers, and the research community don’t consider these reasons when assessing your work.

Publishing Connect
What and what not 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

✗ Reports of little or 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✗ Out of date work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.
What to consider when building an effective manuscript

Dr. Steve Parkin
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.
Typical Structure of a Research Article

- Title
- Abstract
- Keywords

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

- Conclusion
- Acknowledgement
- References
- Supplementary 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)
Keywords

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

Avoid making them

❌ too general (“soils”, “greenhouse”, “tractor”, etc.)
❌ too narrow (so that nobody will ever search for it)

Effective approach:
Look at the keywords of articles relevant to your manuscript
Check using search tools to see whether your keywords return relevant papers but - neither too many nor too few.
Abstract

Tell readers what you did and the important findings

• One paragraph (e.g. maximum 250 words)
• Advertise your article
• A clear abstract will strongly influence if your work is considered further
• Some journals also use bulleted research highlights with specific requirements (e.g. 3-5 bullets and 85 characters)
Introduction

The place to convince readers that you know why your work is relevant and why it is important 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?

The last paragraph of your introduction is where you should set out your research aims or hypothesis – it will be crucial when your manuscript is being assessed.
Methods and Materials

Where details for others to allow your work to be reproduced and the determine suitability of your methods.

• Keep the section concise. If the methods have already been published then quote by reference.
• Do not cut and paste from previous publications as this can provide difficulties with plagiarism software checks.
• Provide sufficient details of materials that others can obtain the same.
• Ensure software version numbers are quoted to ensure the status of upgrades is clear.
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)
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

Publishing Connect
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

**Publishing Connect**
Cover Letter

Your chance to speak to the editor directly

- Submitted along with your manuscript
- Mention what makes 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 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 area of this paper are:

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

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

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. They should not be your supervisor or close friends.

• Be prepared to suggest 3-6 potential reviewers, based on the journal’s Guide to Authors.
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?
  - Who is this journal’s audience?
  - What is the journal’s Impact Factor?

- **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!)

If initial guidance on the general suitability of a manuscript is required – then why not contact editors?
What is the Impact Factor (IF)?

Impact Factor

[the average annual number of citations per article published calculated over a 2 year period]

- e.g. 600 citations = 2
  150 + 150 articles
Read the ‘Guide for Authors’!

You can find the Guide for Authors on the journal homepage
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.
First Decision: “Major” or “Minor” Revision

- Minor revision
  - Basically, the manuscript is worth to be published
  - Some elements in the manuscript must be clarified, restructured, shortened (often) or expanded (rarely)
  - Textual changes
  - “Minor revision” does NOT guarantee acceptance after revision!

- Major revision
  - The manuscript may be worth to be published
  - Significant deficiencies must be corrected before acceptance
  - Involves (significant) textual changes and/or minor experimentation or simulation
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 accepted, 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
  ▪ You spent weeks and months doing the research
  ▪ It took you weeks to write the manuscript

Why run the risk of avoidable rejection by not taking manuscript revision seriously?
Research & Publication Ethics – Get it Right

Dr. Bill Day
The problem

• There are huge career pressures & advantages to success in research and publication - *(publish or perish mentality)*.
• Education on ethics and malpractice has been weak.
• Fraud and malpractice in research and publication is widespread. It has often gone undetected.
• Actions and responses by individuals and institutions to problems have often been weak *(brush the problem under the carpet to avoid embarrassment)*
• Fraud & malpractice has been made much easier:
  ▪ By the massive expansion of journal titles
  ▪ By the internationalisation of research & journals
  ▪ By the loss of personal oversight of individuals and their behaviour
The response

• Highlighting the problem
• The voluntary actions of individuals & organisations, e.g. COPE
• Education & Engagement
• Editors & opinion formers
• Publishers
• Institutions, primarily University authorities
• The Press & Media: Public scandal
• Regulatory Bodies e.g. The UK General Medical Council
• Investigative authorities, including law enforcement agencies
• Governments & state institutions
Detection

- Self regulation, institutional discipline & oversight: BUT seniority is no bar to fraud
- “Whole of career” education & awareness (e.g. SCOPUS now mandates Ethics & malpractice statements from every journal)
- Whistleblowers: going outside the local “chain of command”
- Fraud/plagiarism/duplication detection systems: e.g. DEJAVU. Increasingly sophisticated & widely adopted by publishers & independent agencies
- Editors, Reviewers & Publishers: increasingly alert to fraud: BUT detection is still often opportunistic
- Police & Government agencies: reactive, not pro-active
- Detection is not yet systematic
Consequences

• You may get away with it in the short term but increasingly unlikely in the long term.

• When fraud is detected:
  ▪ The paper is **retracted** and registered.
  ▪ You are put on a “watch list” (e.g. Retraction Watch)
  ▪ Your institution may take effective action, damaging or ending your career
  ▪ Your behaviour may come to light in the media
  ▪ Public regulatory authorities may become involved

---

He was once a prominent cancer researcher. Then his gambling — and a finding of scientific misconduct — got in the way.

In September 2014, an investigation into the work of an award-winning cancer researcher in Illinois concluded that multiple papers had been affected by misconduct. Now, nearly four years later, two of those articles have been retracted.
RETRACTED: Matching pursuit-based approach

An article in which the authors committed plagiarism: it will not be removed ever. Everybody who downloads it will see the reason for the retraction…

Available online 24 August 2005.

This article has been retracted at the request of the Editor-in-Chief and Elsevier. For more information, please visit http://www.elsevier.com/locate/withdrawalpolicy.

Types of Ethics Complaints

- Fabrication of data or cases
- Wilful falsification of data
- Plagiarism
- No ethics approval
- Not admitting missing data
- Incomplete referencing
- No data on side effects
- Gift/ghost authorship
- Redundant publication
- Duplicate submission

**FFP** = Falsification, Fabrication, Plagiarism

**QRP** = Questionable Research Practice

---

**Publishing Connect**
What are the rules?

• No single universal international set of rules
  ▪ Universities have rules re plagiarism
  ▪ Funding agencies have rules for conflicts of interest
  ▪ COPE and ICMJE\(^1\) closest to a standard
  ▪ Publishers have overall policies & some journals/societies have their own rules

• How do authors learn the rules?
  ▪ Ethics in publishing not generally core curricula at university
  ▪ Publishers present workshops to advise authors

1 - International Committee of Medical Journal Editors
What is plagiarism?

Definition: to pass off another’s ideas and/or words as one’s own, without acknowledging the source.

- Can be blatant word-for-word copying or paraphrasing
- If a publisher publishes plagiarised material, they are violating the rights of the copyright owner
- Ignorance is not an excuse but may be a factor in determining the severity of sanction
- Re-hashing (parts of) your own published articles is known as self-plagiarism
What gets plagiarised?

- Words (language)
- Ideas
- Findings
- Writings
- Computer programs
- Graphic representations
- Graphs
- Illustrations
- Diagrams
- Information
- Lectures
- Printed material
- Electronic material
- Any other original work created by someone else.

Higher Education Academy, UK
How to avoid Plagiarism: Correct citation is key

✔ Crediting the work of others (including your advisor’s or your own previous work) by citation is important for at least three reasons:
  • to place your own work in context, and
  • to acknowledge the findings of others on which you have built your research
  • To maintain the credibility and accuracy of the scientific literature

“Previously we (Attwood and Florence, 2002) reported that the…

“The work of Illum and Davis (1988) drew attention to …..”

“The discovery of liposomes and their potential by Bangham (1966) has led..
Self Citations

What is acceptable use of your earlier material?

✓ You must mention all your relevant previous work briefly and give citations. Do not be selective or only mention a few papers due to space or modesty.

✓ Reproducing your earlier published figures or tables needs permission from the publisher of the original article even though you probably made the figure or table yourself. This is because of copyright (or ©)

Request permission here

Impact of freshwater inflow on bacterial abundance and activity in the estuarine system Ria de Aveiro

Luísa Santos*a, Leandro Vaz*b, Newton C. Marcial Gomes*c, Nuno Vazb, João Miguel Diasb, Ângela Cunha*c, Adelaide Almeida*a.

* Show more


Get rights and content

Publishing Connect
Unacceptable use of your earlier material

• Self-Plagiarism or Duplicate Publishing
  ✗ Do not mention your previous work without a citation.
  ✗ Do not take blocks of text and reuse them in your next paper.
  ✗ Reusing material previously published by yourself without citation is called “duplicate publishing”, “self-plagiarism”, “redundant publication”, or “recycling fraud”.

• Is it possible to republish my foreign language article in English?
  ✓ Yes, if done correctly.
Plagiarism Detection tools and Graphics checking software

CrossCheck
- CrossCheck checks submitted manuscripts against 20 million peer reviewed articles which have been donated by 50+ publishers.
- Journal not in CrossCheck? Researchers and reviewers often spot unethical behavior and report it. No time limit on correcting or retracting unethical scientific papers – even decades later.

Office of Research Integrity (ORI)
- The US Office of Research Integrity (ORI) has created a graphics checking software plug-in for Photoshop, it is freely available and used by publishers the world over.
Plagiarism - Conclusion

❌ Never be tempted! If in doubt, cite your source - even if the original authors have passed away.

❌ While drafting your papers, do not cut and paste to save time - you may forget what you have taken from where.

✅ If you suspect you have detected plagiarism, you must report it.

✅ Then we can rely on the literature and on the scientific community to relay the truth, which is after all our mission.
Authorship: Do’s and don’ts

General principles for who is listed first:

First Author:
✔ Conducts and/or supervises the data analysis and the proper presentation and interpretation of the results
✔ Puts paper together and submits the paper to journal

Co-Author(s):
✔ Makes intellectual contributions to the data analysis and contributes to data interpretation
✔ Reviews each paper draft
✔ Must be able to present the results, defend the implications and discuss study limitations

Abuses to be avoided:

Ghost Authors:
✘ Leaving out authors who should be included

Scientific Writers and Gift Authors:
✘ Including authors when they did not contribute significantly.

Co-author vs Acknowledgement?

Be consistent in how you write the authors’ names.
Authorship disputes

- **Must be resolved by authors**
- **Editors will not get involved**
- **Will delay publication as editor has to get agreement from all authors about any changes**
- **After publication - will be published as a correction, but needs agreement from all authors with justification**
- **A guide for new researchers. Tim Albert, Elizabeth Wager**

Conflict of Interest

Dr. Bill Day
Conflict of Interest?

Aim for transparency

• Any results and discussion in a paper, which may have benefits to any of the authors is a possible conflict of interest.

• Potential conflicts of interest are dealt with on submission. The editor and referees can take potential conflicts of interest into consideration whilst peer-reviewing a paper.

• The general standard for judging if a conflict of interest exists is whether a reasonable person with knowledge of all the relevant facts would have reason to question your impartiality in the matter.

• Many publishing houses have Conflict of Interest statements in their manuscript submission guidelines.
Elsevier Publishing Campus

Copyright

Dr. Lei Dries-Zhang
Without asking permission authors can… (1)

✓ Make copies (print or electronic) of their article for personal use or their own teaching
✓ Make copies of the article and distribute them to known research colleagues for their personal use - NOT for commercial use
✓ Present the article at a meeting or conference and distribute copies to attendees
✓ Allow their employer to use the article in full or in part for other intracompany use (e.g. training)
✓ Retain patent and trademark rights and rights to any process or procedure described in the article
✓ Include the article in a thesis or dissertation
✓ Use the article in a printed compilation of their work
✓ Use the article to prepare other derivative works, with full acknowledgment of original publication
Without asking permission authors can… (2)

✔ Post the (non-copyrighted) article to certain websites or servers under certain conditions
✔ Preprint posting is common practice in many fields, e.g. physics
✔ Submit papers that have already posted in preprint version, e.g. on ArXiv
✔ Authors can post a personal version of the (non-copyrighted) accepted article on their personal, institutional website or the ArXiV
✔ **BUT:** postings must include a link to the published article on and complete citation for the article
❌ Postings must not be for commercial purposes
Postscript

Elsevier Publishing Campus

Dr. Lei Dries-Zhang
What do you do if you, as an author, are a victim of ethical abuse?

• Plagiarism:
  ▪ If your paper has been plagiarised, contact the Editor of the journal the other article appeared in.
  ▪ Contact the Publisher of the journal your article appeared in – they often hold copyright and so can help you.
  ▪ Retractions of plagiarising papers do take place when the ethical breach is discovered or confirmed.

• Missing as co-author:
  ▪ If you think that you should be a co-author, quickly contact the Editor of the journal in which the paper appeared. Papers get corrected by publishing Corrigenda or Errata to reflect such changes.
Conclusions

• Advice on the preparation of manuscripts has been given. Treat the process of peer-review publication as a way of improving your research.

• Many kinds of ethical violations exist, but plagiarism and authorship disputes are the most common ethical complaints. There are resources and guidance available to authors.

• Copyright is vital to maintain the scientific record and protect the author. The author retains many rights to reproduce their article.
Download your personalized Certificate of Attendance for this workshop now!

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

• Go to www.researcheracademy.com/workshop
• Enter the claim code: INSERT CODE HERE
• Fill in the survey if requested

• Download your certificate
Thanks!!

Questions?

l.zhang.1@elsevier.com
csparkin@btinternet.com
bdelay40lea38@hotmail.com