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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
What could you publish?
beside a traditional article

- Single observation
- Notebook
- Video abstract/journal
- Data paper
- Preprint
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- Do not publish anything if you plan to patent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 (Open Access)
- PLoS One
- Scientific Reports
- IEEE Access
# Publishing business models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCRIPTION-BASED JOURNAL = “TRADITIONAL JOURNAL”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REUSE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELAYED OPEN ACCESS (OA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REUSE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYBRID OPEN ACCESS (OA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REUSE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOLD OPEN ACCESS (OA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REUSE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To summarize
Open Access (OA) literature is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions.

(Peter Suber, 2012)
Green Open Access
Another way to disseminate your work

- For author ➔ Free deposit
- For reader ➔ Free access

- Embargo
- Reuse conditions
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?

- Very Important
- Moderately Important
- Not Important at All
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

- 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

TRADUCTIONS
Plus de 125 nationalités & devis rapide - Traduction & Relecture

contact: info@je-epfl.ch
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Ready to publish?
Before the submission

✓ Format your article → author’s guidelines
✓ 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
Cover letter

Other statements

• 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)

Address

• Directly to the Editor in Chief
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-interpret 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

**POSTPRINT**
- Your preprint... once reviewed → accepted version
  
**PUBLISHER’S VERSION**
- Your postprint... once laid out

Your content

Your content + additional content based on the reviewers’ comments

Your content reviewed + laid out by the publisher

# 3.2.1
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
Traditional peer reviewing

**DOUBLE BLIND**

- **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 L 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.

Original Submission
- 16 Mar 2014: Submitted: Original manuscript

Resubmission - Version 2
- Submitted: Manuscript version 2

Resubmission - Version 3
- Submitted: Manuscript version 3

- 14 Apr 2014: Reviewed: Reviewer Report - Raja Venkatasubramanian
- 12 May 2014: Author responded: Author comments - Kennon Heard

Scientific research is typically communicated via papers in journals, with an abstract presented as a summary of that explanation. However, in many instances they may be written in a manner which is non-communicatory to a lay reader (Halliday & Martin, 2003). This study begins to investigate if poetry could be used as an alternative form of communication, by first assessing if poetic verse is an effective form of communication to other scientists. In order to assess this suitability, a survey was conducted in which two different groups of participants were asked questions based on a scientific abstract. One group of participants was given the original scientific abstract, whilst the second group was instead given a poem written about the scientific study. Quantitative analysis found that whilst a scientific audience found a poetic interpretation of a scientific abstract to be no less interesting or inspiring than the original prose, they did find it to be less accessible. However, further qualitative analysis suggested that the poem did a good job in conveying a similar meaning to that presented in the original abstract. The results of this study indicate that whilst for a scientific audience poetry should not replace the prose abstract, it could be used alongside the original format to inspire the reader to find out more about the topic. Further research is needed to investigate the effectiveness of this approach for a non-expert audience.

Alternative version:
Variants: **interactive peer review**

- Public commenting online

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

- Quicker and more efficient?

---

**Ex.4: PubMed Commons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misha Koksharov</strong></td>
<td>2017 Mar 20 5:16 p.m.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yi Shen</strong></td>
<td>2017 Mar 30 11:32 a.m. (6 days ago)</td>
<td>Thanks Misha for your interest in our work! We are happy to provide further detailed information regarding the experimental procedures. Please email me at <a href="mailto:yshen3@ualberta.ca">yshen3@ualberta.ca</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misha Koksharov</strong></td>
<td>2017 Apr 04 3:42 p.m. (yesterday)</td>
<td>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!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misha Koksharov</strong></td>
<td>2017 Apr 05 1:47 p.m. (18 hours ago)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

START

1

STEP 1

2B

STEP 2

DEAD END

STEP 3

STEP 4

STEP 5

DEAD END

STEP 6

STEP 7

STEP 8

STEP 9

STEP 10

DEAD END

DEAD END

DEAD END

10 A

10 B

10 C

11

12

HAPPY END
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The peer review process

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

2B. **EDITOR**
   - Sends out the MS for review
   - Reverts without review

6. **AUTHOR**
   - Sends the revised MS
   - Submits the revised MS

7. **REVIEWER**
   - Reads the revised MS + writes review report
   - Sends reviews + asks for additional revisions

8. **EDITOR**
   - Assesses reviews
   - Sends reviews + accepts the paper for publication
   - Sends reviews + accepts the paper for publication

5A. **REVIEWER**
   - Sends reviews + asks for a first round of revisions
   - Sends reviews + accepts the paper for publication

5B. **EDITOR**
   - Sends reviews + rejects or encourages resubmission

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

10 A. **EDITOR**
   - Sends reviews + rejects the revised MS

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

11. **JOURNAL PRODUCTION DPT**
   - Prepares proofs for authors

12. **JOURNAL PRODUCTION DPT**
   - Publishes the final version

**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 Text + Image
- 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.
public domain equivalent [freely reusable]

free [reusable]

open [not always reusable]

closed [not reusable at all]
## How Open Is It?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Reader Rights</th>
<th>Reuse Rights</th>
<th>Copyrights</th>
<th>Author Posting Rights</th>
<th>Automatic Posting</th>
<th>Machine Readability</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Free readership rights to all articles immediately upon publication</td>
<td>Generous reuse &amp; remixing rights (e.g., CC BY license)</td>
<td>Author holds copyright with no restrictions</td>
<td>Author may post any version to any repository or website</td>
<td>Journals make copies of articles automatically available in trusted third-party repositories (e.g., PubMed Central) immediately upon publication</td>
<td>Article full text, metadata, citations, &amp; data, including supplementary data, provided in community machine-readable standard formats through a community standard API or protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Free readership rights to all articles after an embargo of no more than 6 months</td>
<td>Reuse, remixing, &amp; further building upon the work subject to certain restrictions &amp; conditions (e.g., CC BY-NC &amp; CC BY-SA licenses)</td>
<td>Author holds copyright, with some restrictions on author reuse of published version</td>
<td>Author may post final version of the peer-reviewed manuscript (“postprint”) to any repository or website</td>
<td>Journals make copies of articles automatically available in trusted third-party repositories (e.g., PubMed Central) within 6 months</td>
<td>Article full text, metadata, citations, &amp; data, including supplementary data, may be crawled or accessed through a community standard API or protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Free readership rights to all articles after an embargo greater than 6 months</td>
<td>Reuse (no remixing or further building upon the work) subject to certain restrictions and conditions (e.g., CC BY-ND license)</td>
<td>Publisher holds copyright, with some allowances for author reuse of published version</td>
<td>Author may post final version of the peer-reviewed manuscript (“postprint”) to certain repositories or websites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Free and immediate readership rights to some, but not all, articles (including “hybrid” models)</td>
<td>No reuse rights beyond fair use; limitations &amp; exceptions to copyright (all rights reserved copyright) to read</td>
<td>Publisher holds copyright, with no author reuse of published version</td>
<td>Author may post submitted version/draft of final work (“preprint”) to certain repositories or websites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Subscription, membership, pay-per-view, or other fees required to read all articles</td>
<td>No reuse rights beyond fair use</td>
<td>Publisher holds copyright</td>
<td>Author may not deposit any versions to repositories or websites</td>
<td>No automatic posting in third-party repositories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*HowOpenAccess*™ Open Access spectrum © 2013 SBMRC and F1000, licensed under CC BY
Publisher’s contract

WELCOME TO HELL!
Activity

> Work by group
> Read one of the publisher’s contracts
> Answer to the following questions:

1. Do **you** own the rights?
2. Do **you** have the right to reuse the article?
3. Has the **reader** the right to reuse the article?
4. Do **you** have the right to post the article?
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>

\[
\text{IF}_{2014} = \frac{71,677}{1,729} = 41.456
\]

The case of **ACTA CRYSTALLOGRAPHICA SECTION A** (2009-2010): [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.
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 ID</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>PhD</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>PhD</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>26,936</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qj74uXkAAAAAJ</td>
<td>University of Cambridge (UK)</td>
<td>PhD</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>PhD</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>PhD</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>16,426</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
altmetrics

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.

- views and downloads on the journal website (or another platform)
- reference saved in Mendeley (or another reference manager)
- posts and comments on scientific blogs, Twitter, Facebook, Google+, ...

Be aware that altmetrics are **not** computed the same way by all providers!
altmetrics

**PLoS ONE**

DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0086668](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0086668)

**Nature Physics**

DOI: [10.1038/nphys3005](https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys3005)
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?
Deposit your paper in INFOSCIENCE*

Mention your paper on Twitter

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

Present your work in conferences

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


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

Smart Publishing by EPFL Library (2017)

Library Training Team
Caroline Salamin
Mathilde Panès
Noémi Cobolet
Raphaël Grolimund
formations.bib@epfl.ch

Open Access Service at EPFL Library
Béatrice Marselli
publish-support.bib@epfl.ch

library.epfl.ch
facebook.com/EPFL.library
youtube.com/epfllibrary
@EPFLlibrary
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