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3.1 Submitting your article

Section objectives

✓ you set your publication context: why, what and when you should publish

✓ you know how to select the appropriate journal

✓ you discover the key points of a cover letter
Why should you publish?
What could you publish?
beside a traditional article

- Single observation
- Notebook
- Video abstract/journal
- Study protocol
- Data paper
When should you publish?

Too early → premature publication
Too late → beware of competitors

Our pieces of advice

- Complete 70% of your research before publishing
- Publish a short communication to mark your research territory
- Present something new
- Be strategic
- Do not publish anything if you plan to patent
- Do not split your research into too many publications to avoid «salami science»
- Do not forget proofreading
Where to submit your paper?
Journal typology

**MULTIDISCIPLINARY**
- Nature
- Science
- PNAS

**DISCIPLINARY GENERAL INTEREST**
- Cell
- Proceedings of the IEEE
- Landscape and Urban Planning

**SPECIALIZED**
- Diabetes
- Cell Stem Cell
- Cities

**MEGAJOURNALS**
- PLoS One
- Scientific Reports
- IEEE Access
Publishing business models

**SUBSCRIPTION-BASED JOURNAL = “TRADITIONAL JOURNAL”**

The author grants exclusive rights to the publisher

**Paying for readers**
- individual or institutional subscription (often through libraries)
- pay-per-view

**Free for authors** (except for additional charges: color charge, length, etc.)

**DELAYED OPEN ACCESS (OA)**

The author grants exclusive rights to the publisher

Subscription-based journals providing a free online access after a period of embargo (6 to 24 months)

**HYBRID OPEN ACCESS (OA)**

The author retains the rights

Subscription-based journals providing a Gold OA option (payment of an APC) allowing immediate and free access for readers

**GOLD OPEN ACCESS (OA)**

The author retains the rights

Free of charge for readers

**Paying for authors**
- Article Processing Charge (APC)
What is Open Access?

Green Open Access

“Open Access (OA) literature is digital, online, free of charge and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions.”

(Peter Suber, 2012)

Gold Open Access (full & hybrid)

Authors assign copyright to publishers, but retain the right to disseminate an OA copy (of the accepted manuscript) via open access repositories.

Published versions of articles accessible to journal subscribers immediately.

Accepted manuscript versions may be embargoed temporarily. After an embargo period, public can download the open access copies from repositories.

Accelerated scientific progress & maximised return on public investment.
Financial Support at EPFL for Open Access publications

For full Gold Open Access (not hybrid) publications -
- Partial (2/3) reimbursement of the APC up to 2500.-
  (Limited to 2 publications per lab annually)

Agreements with some editors (PLoS, BMC, SCOAP3, Wiley, Nucleic Acids Research, etc.)

http://library.epfl.ch/OA_Support/en

publish-support.bib@epfl.ch
Which criteria to select a journal?
Publishing business overuse

Publication Support Services

- Reviewers recommendation: $300
- Cover letter writing: $50 - $80
- Journal selection: $300
- Pre-submission - peer-review: $400
- Proofreading: $120 - $200
- Responses to reviewers’ comments: $ on demand

CAUTION
BEWARE OF PREDATORY JOURNALS

- Indexing by recognized bibliographic databases
- Read some published articles to evaluate the quality
- Editorial Board Members
- Peer-review process clearly described
- Fees charged clearly mentioned
- Ask your colleagues and the library

Translation service at EPFL

- contact: info@je-epfl.ch

Money by Pictures of money, CC BY 2.0
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Some journal selection tools

cofactor.science.com/journal-selector

Find a journal based on the subject, peer review, open access and publication speed of your paper

jane.biosemantics.org

Find a journal based on the title and abstract of your paper

edanzediting.com/journal-selector

Find a journal based on keywords, field, journal name, publisher or abstract of your paper

# 3.1.12
Ready to publish?
Before the submission

✓ Format your article

✓ Find an appealing title and catchy keywords

✓ Prepare an impactful cover letter

Remember that you only have one shot! Get it right!
Cover letter

Convince the editor

- Why the paper fits the journal’s scope
- Why readers would find it important
- Why the paper is important for the field
- Originality of the research

Highlight novelty and impact

- Give a brief, largely non-technical summary
- Put the work in context
- Explain briefly the specific advances over previous research and potential applications

# 3.1.15
Cover letter

- Submission type (article, review, report, etc.)
- Unique submission
- Agreement of all co-authors
- Potential conflict of interest
- Co-authors contact details
- History of the manuscript
- Independent reviewers suggestion (or exclusion)

Directly to the Editor in Chief

Other statements

Address
Cover letter

- Paste the abstract
- Avoid typo and spelling errors
- Use acronym and too technical terminology
- Provide the correct journal’s title and editor’s name
- Exceed two pages
- Speak negatively about other studies or researchers
- Complain about previous rejection
- Over-interprete your findings
3.2 Understanding the peer review process

Section objective

✓ you have an overall view of the traditional peer review process and its variants.
From preprint to final version

**PREPRINT**
- Your manuscript... once **submitted**
  - Your content

**POSTPRINT**
- Your preprint... once **reviewed**
  - Your content + **additional content based on the reviewers’ comments**

**FINAL VERSION**
- Your postprint... once **laid out**
  - Your content reviewed + **laid out by the publisher**
Traditional peer reviewing

SINGLE BLIND

Authors don’t know who reviewers are

Reviewers know who authors are

Editor knows who authors are

Authors

Reviewers

Editor
Authors don’t know who reviewers are
Reviewers don’t know who authors are
Editor knows who authors are
Traditional peer reviewing

TRIPLE BLIND

Authors don’t know who reviewers are
Reviewers don’t know who authors are
Editor doesn’t know who authors are
Variants: open peer review

• Author – reviewers – editor are known to each other.
• Article available online before the review process.
• Reviewers’ reports are disclosed along the article.
• Versions are available online.

Examples:

✓ BMC Pharmacology and Toxicology
✓ F1000 Research
A randomized, placebo-controlled trial to determine the course of aminotransferase elevation during prolonged acetaminophen administration

Kennon Heard, Jody I Green, Victoria Anderson, Becki Bucher-Bartelson and Richard C Dart

Received: 16 March 2014 | Accepted: 8 July 2014 | Published: 22 July 2014
Back to article

Open Peer Review reports

Pre-publication versions of this article and author comments to reviewers are available by contacting info@biomedcentral.com.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Submission</th>
<th>16 Mar 2014</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Original manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resubmission - Version 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Manuscript version 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmission - Version 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Manuscript version 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Apr 2014</td>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>Reviewer Report - Raja Venkatasubramanian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Apr 2014</td>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>Reviewer Report - Vikhyat Bhandari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 May 2014</td>
<td>Author responded</td>
<td>Author comments - Kennon Heard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex.1: BMC Pharmacology and Toxicology

Ex.2: F1000 Research
Variants: **interactive peer review**

- Public commenting online

---

**Interactive Public Peer Review™**

1. Submission
2. Access review
3. Technical corrections
4. Publication as D-paper
5. Comments
6. Revision
7. Revised submission
8. Peer-review completion
9. Final revised publication

---

**Ex.3: Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics**
Variants: post-publication review

- Quicker and more efficient?

Ex. 4: PubMed Commons

Misha Koksharov 2017 Mar 20 5:16 p.m.
The developed FPs are nice. However, the experimental details (and intermediate results) of mutagenesis procedures are very limited and insufficient. It's impossible to understand what exactly you were doing at this part of the study.

Permalink Share

Yi Shen 2017 Mar 30 11:32 a.m. (6 days ago) 1 of 1 people found this helpful
Thanks Misha for your interest in our work! We are happy to provide further detailed information regarding the experimental procedures. Please email me at yshen3@ualberta.ca.

Permalink Share

Misha Koksharov 2017 Apr 04 3:42 p.m. (yesterday)
Great! You can compose a pdf file with missed experimental details and intermediate results (primers, mutated regions, steps, library sizes, iterative mutants, etc) and upload it to figshare/researchgate. This way it would be available for everyone interested. If the editors will be cooperative this can be added as an addendum to the original paper. Thank you!

Permalink Share

Misha Koksharov 2017 Apr 05 1:47 p.m. (18 hours ago)
Although, maybe my expectations are unreasonable. Apparently, in your field people normally don't describe the mutagenesis part much (in contrast to protein engineering field per se) and focus on characterization of the final version. For example, here (Tantama M, 2013) they just state that their sensor was developed by extensive mutagenesis and proceed to deep characterization of that useful tool.

Permalink Share
Peer review – recap & perspectives

Remember that...
there are many ways to perform peer review:
• before and/or after online publication
• with various levels of anonymity
• with named referees or the online community

What comes next?
- No more publishers? *Trish Groves, BMJ Open*
- ???
The peer review process
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The peer review process

1. AUTHOR
   - Submits the manuscript (MS abbrev.)

2A. EDITOR
   - Sends out the MS for review
   - Revises

2B. EDITOR
   - Revises

3. REVIEWER
   - Reads the MS + writes review report

4. EDITOR
   - Assesses reviews

5A. AUTHOR
   - Sends reviews + asks for additional revisions

5B. AUTHOR
   - Sends reviews + rejects or encourages resubmission

5C. EDITOR
   - Sends reviews + accepts the paper for publication

6. AUTHOR
   - Sends the revised MS

7. REVIEWER
   - Reads the revised MS + writes review report

8. EDITOR
   - Assesses reviews

9. EDITOR
   - Sends reviews + rejects the revised MS

10A. AUTHOR
    - Submits the revised MS

10B. EDITOR
    - Sends reviews + accepts the paper for publication

10C. JOURNAL PRODUCTION DPT
    - Prepares proofs for authors

11. JOURNAL PRODUCTION DPT
    - Publishes the final version

START

DEAD END

HAPPY END
Reasons for REJECTION

- Inappropriate scope and audience
- Incorrect formatting
- "Salami" science
- Lack of novelty
- Flaws in methodology
- Inadequate literature citation
- Limited impact and urgency
- Conclusion not supported by the data
- (Self-)Plagiarism
- Premature publication
- Lack of interpretations
- Research data not available

# 3.2.12
3.3 Negotiating your contract

Section objective

✓ you discover tools to negotiate an editorial contract.
Editorial contract

✓ THINK about the needs you and your readers will have in the future (re-use). What are the most important ones?

✓ UNDERSTAND the contract.

✓ NEGOTIATE to avoid a total transfer of your rights (non-exclusive license).
  → addendum by SPARC & ARL / H2020 model amendment
  → CC licenses: related to the publisher or to the author.

✓ KEEP copies of everything.

Any question?
publish-support.bib@epfl.ch
3.4 Disseminating your article

Section objectives

✓ you understand what bibliometrics really is
✓ you understand what bibliometrics is used for
Impact Factor

Are you a good researcher if you publish in a top journal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>art. publ.</th>
<th>cited in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>29,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>41,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>71,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$IF_{2014} = \frac{71,677}{1,729} = 41.456$$

The case of **ACTA CRYSTALLOGRAPHICA SECTION A**: [http://go.epfl.ch/aca-if](http://go.epfl.ch/aca-if) (webpage accessible from EPFL)
The **h-index** (named after Jorge Hirsch) is **based on the database of your choice**.

The \( h \) of the \( h \)-index (named after Jorge Hirsch) means that a researcher has published \( h \) articles that have been cited at least \( h \) times.

The \( h \)-index is sometimes used for journals. Can also be used for a lab.

![Graph showing h-index = 5 with 5 citations at the 5th rank](# 3.4.2)
## Adopt a physicist

You have to choose a researcher for an open position in the Physics section. You have 4 candidates left.

What is your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>University</th>
<th># articles</th>
<th># citations</th>
<th>h-index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000-0003-2125-060X</td>
<td>University of Zurich (CH)</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>26,936</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qj74uXkAAAAAJ</td>
<td>University of Cambridge (UK)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>26,079</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000-0002-9776-6314</td>
<td>Université de Grenoble (FR)</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>7,707</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3133-2013</td>
<td>California Institute of Technology (US)</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>16,428</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metrics...

Is a paper good because it was published in a top journal?

Is a paper good because the author is a good researcher?

**JOURNAL-LEVEL METRICS**
- Impact Factor
- SJR Indicator

**ARTICLE-LEVEL METRICS (ALM)**
- altmetrics

**AUTHOR-LEVEL METRICS**
- $h$-index
Unlike other metrics, altmetrics don’t rely on citations only.

Altmetrics take social actions like **views, saves, posts** and **comments** as well as citations in account to measure the influence of an article on the scientific community.

Be aware that altmetrics are **not** computed the same way by all providers!
You published an excellent article last year. But, for now, it hasn’t received many citations...

How could you (ethically) increase the visibility of your paper?
Present your work in conferences  
Mention your paper on Twitter  
Deposit your paper in INFOSCIENCE*  
Cite your paper in further publications**  
Disseminate the news through EPFL channels  
Add your paper on academic social networks*  
Share your datasets  
Talk about your paper in your blog

* within the limits of your contract  
**when relevant
Further readings


This bibliography is regularly updated: go.epfl.ch/SmartPublishing
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