



# How to Write Great Papers

*From title to references*

*From submission to acceptance*




**Presented by:** Anthony Newman, Publisher, Elsevier  
**Location/Date:** Technical University of Valencia, April 2015



# Workshop Outline

- **How to get Published**
  - Before you begin writing
  - Select your audience
  - Typical article structure
  - The review and editorial process
- **What not to do... (author responsibilities)**

# Peer –Reviewed Journal Growth 1665-2009



Primary Source:  
M A Mabe The number and growth of journals  
*Serials* 16(2).191-7, 2003



ELSEVIER

# Elsevier Journal publishing volume

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

• **600,000+ article submissions per year**

- Organise editorial boards
- Launch new specialist journals

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

• **11 million articles now available**

Archive and promote

Manage peer review

• **40%-90% of articles rejected**



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

Publish and disseminate

Edit and prepare

- 7,000 editors
- 70,000 editorial board members
- 6.5 million author/publisher communications /year

Production

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




# 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
  - 2014: 95+% e-only (in life sciences field over 99%)
  - 2016: ???
- **Changing role of “journals” due to e-access**
- **Increased usage of articles (more downloads)**
  - 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



## Green Open Access

- After publication and acceptance in a subscription journal, author publishes 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, so no costs to author.



# 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 – they change**

**Keep your  
AAM**

**See your journal's posting policy  
and what you can do with AAM**

**Make your  
article OA**

**Select a suitable CC license and pay an  
OA fee**

**Publish OA**

**Share the final version of your  
article!**



**ELSEVIER**

## Key funder developments:



- **European Commission - Horizon 2020**

- Every EU country to develop their own policy



- **Research Councils (UK) / Finch Report**



- **CIHR / NSERC (Canada)**

Draft Tri-Agency Open Access Policy

Canada



Natural Sciences and Engineering  
Research Council of Canada

- **Office of Science and Technology Policy (US)**



ELSEVIER

# Your personal reason for publishing



**However, editors, reviewers, and the research community don't consider these reasons when assessing your work – the content counts!**

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 writing*



# Refine your search strategies

Too many researchers have abandoned all the value of libraries when they stopped going there physically!

There is more than 

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.”**



ELSEVIER




# 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



Google Advanced Search

Advanced Search Tips | About Google

Use the form below and your advanced search will appear here

**Find web pages that have...**

all these words:

this exact wording or phrase:  [tip](#)

one or more of these words:  OR  OR  [tip](#)

**But don't show pages that have...**

any of these unwanted words:  [tip](#)

**Need more tools?**


Results per page: 10 results

Language: any language

File type: any format

Search within a site or domain:   
(e.g. youtube.com, edu)

[Date, usage rights, numeric range, and more](#)



Google scholar Advanced Scholar Search

Advanced Search Tips | About Google Scholar

**Find articles** with **all** of the words  10  Search Scholar

with the **exact phrase**

with **at least one** of the words

**without** the words

where my words occur anywhere in the article

**Author** Return articles written by   
e.g., "P.J. Hayes" or McCarthy

**Publication** Return articles published in   
e.g., J Biol Chem or Nature

**Date** Return articles published between  -   
e.g., 1996

**Subject Areas**

Return articles in all subject areas.

Return only articles in the following subject areas:

- Biology, Life Sciences, and Environmental Science
- Business, Administration, Finance, and Economics
- Chemistry and Materials Science
- Engineering, Computer Science, and Mathematics
- Medicine, Pharmacology, and Veterinary Science
- Physics, Astronomy, and Planetary Science
- Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities

# Practical Advice - Strategic Information Gathering

- **Find out what's Hot**
  - <http://info.scopus.com/topcited/>
  - <http://top25.sciencedirect.com/>
  - Almetrics Application
- **Find the trends of the subject area**
  - Search tips (including alerts)
  - Journals, authors, publications per year (Scopus)
  - PubMed, for example, shows number of papers per keyword per year published
- **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

Scopus

**SJR** SCImago  
Journal & Country  
Rank

**IF & SNIP & SJR**



ELSEVIER

# Find out what's Hot (downloads)

## ScienceDirect

www.sciencedirect.com

### select your interest

Medicine and Dentistry

[all journals]

### browse top 25 archive

Current: October to December 2013

### show my alerts

## sign up now!

 for the e-mail alerts

e-mail address

Request your free Top 25 certificate

Tell other people about this service

[Support](#) [About the Top 25](#) [Sitemap](#)

Download the  
**ScienceDirect**  
App today!  
Available for iPhone,  
iPad, BlackBerry and  
Android devices. >>



## Top 25 Hottest Articles

Medicine and Dentistry

October to December 2013

[RSS](#) [Blog This!](#) [Print](#) [Show condensed](#)

- 1. Imperfect information in a quality-competitive hospital market** \* Article  
*Journal of Health Economics*, Volume 29, Issue 4, July 2010, Pages 624-636  
Gravie, Hugh; Sivey, Peter  
[Cited by Scopus \(7\)](#)
- 2. Effects of vitamin D supplements on bone mineral density: a systematic review and meta-analysis** \* Article  
*The Lancet*, Volume 383, Issue 9912, January 2014, Pages 146-156  
Reid, I.R.; Bolland, M.J.; Grey, A.
- 3. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of 16 antipsychotic drugs in schizophrenia: a multiple-treatments meta-analysis** \* Article  
*The Lancet*, Volume 382, Issue 9906, September 2013, Pages 981-992  
Leucht, S.; Cipriani, A.; Spinelli, L.; Mavridis, D.; Orey, D.; Richter, F.; Samara, M.; Barbui, C.; Engel, R.R.; Geddes, J.R.; Kissling, W.; Stapf, M.P.; Lassig, B.; Salanti, G.; Davis, J.M.  
[Cited by Scopus \(21\)](#)
- 4. Childhood obesity: public-health crisis, common sense cure** \* Review article  
*The Lancet*, Volume 380, Issue 9331, August 2002, Pages 473-482  
Ebbeling, C.B.; Pawlak, D.B.; Ludwig, D.S.  
[Cited by Scopus \(1348\)](#)
- 5. The effects of violent video game habits on adolescent hostility, aggressive behaviors, and school performance** \* Article  
*Journal of Adolescence*, Volume 27, Issue 1, February 2004, Pages 6-22  
Gentile, Douglas A.; Lynch, Paul J.; Linzer, Jennifer Ruth; Walsh, David A.  
[Cited by Scopus \(224\)](#)
- 6. Exercise Induces Hippocampal BDNF through a PGC-1 $\alpha$ /FNDCC Pathway** \* Article  
*Cell Metabolism*, Volume 18, Issue 6, November 2013, Pages 649-659  
Wann, Christiane D.; White, James P.; Salogiannis, J.; Laznik-Bogoslavski, D.; Wu, J.; Ma, D.; Lin, Jiantie D.; Greenberg, Michael E.; Spiegelman, Bruce M.  
[Cited by Scopus \(4\)](#)
- 7. Asthma** \* Review article  
*The Lancet*, Volume 382, Issue 9901, October 2013, Pages 1360-1372  
Martinez, F.D.; Vercelli, D.  
[Cited by Scopus \(2\)](#)
- 8. An empirical comparison of methods for meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy showed hierarchical models are necessary** \* Article  
*Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, Volume 51, Issue 11, November 2008, Pages 1096-1103  
Harbord, R.M.; Whiting, P.; Sterne, J.A.C.; Egger, M.; Deeks, J.J.; Shang, A.; Bachmann, L.M.  
[Cited by Scopus \(43\)](#)
- 9. Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1980 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010** \* Article  
*The Lancet*, Volume 380, Issue 9959, December 2012, Pages 2095-2128  
Lozano, R.; Naghavi, M.; Foreman, K.; Lim, S.; Shibuya, K.; Aboyans, V.; Abraham, J.; Adair, T.; Aggarwal, R.; Ahn, S.Y.; Almazroo, M.A.; Avarado, M.; Anderson, H.R.; Anderson, L.M.; Andrews, K.G.; Atkinson, C.; Baddour, L.M.; Barker-Collo, S.; Bari, (...)  
[Cited by Scopus \(423\)](#)
- 10. Electronic cigarettes for smoking cessation: a randomised controlled trial** \* Article  
*The Lancet*, Volume 382, Issue 9906, November 2013, Pages 1629-1637  
Bullen, C.; Howe, G.; Laugesen, M.; McRobbie, H.; Parag, V.; Williams, J.; Walker, N.  
[Cited by Scopus \(19\)](#)
- 11. The empirical status of cognitive-behavioral therapy: A review of meta-analyses** \* Article  
*Clinical Psychology Review*, Volume 26, Issue 1, January 2006, Pages 17-31  
Butler, Andrew C.; Chapman, Jason E.; Forman, Evan M.; Beck, Aaron T.  
[Cited by Scopus \(912\)](#)
- 12. Social determinants of health inequalities** \* Article  
*The Lancet*, Volume 365, Issue 9454, March 2005, Pages 1099-1104  
Marmot, Sir



ELSEVIER

# Find out what is being cited and from where

**Scopus** Anthony Newman | Logout Brought to you by Elsevier Dayton IT

Search | Alerts | My list | Settings Live Chat | Help and Contact | Tutorials | Quick Link Test

TITLE-ABS-KEY (protein folding) Edit Save Set alert Set feed

77,871 document results View secondary documents View 592 patent results FSQSIM ACCT level link Analyze results Sort on: Date Cited by Relevancy

Search within results... Export Download View citation overview View Cited by More... Show all

Refine Limit to Exclude

Year

- 2014 (883)
- 2013 (4,143)
- 2012 (4,510)
- 2011 (4,509)
- 2010 (4,587)

Author Name

- Dobson, C.M. (306)
- Fersht, A.R. (275)
- Scheraga, H.A. (250)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Gene ontology: Tool for the unification of biology	Ashburner, M., Ball, C.A., Blake, J.A., (...), Rubin, G.M., Sherlock, G.	2000 Nature Genetics	10138
<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Mfold web server for nucleic acid folding and hybridization prediction	Zuker, M.	2003 Nucleic Acids Research	5151
<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Protein folding and association: Insights from the interfacial and thermodynamic properties of hydrocarbons	Nicholls, A., Sharp, K.A., Honig, B.	1991 Proteins: Structure, Function and Genetics	4902
<input type="checkbox"/> 4	SCOP: A structural classification of proteins database for the investigation of sequences and structures	Murzin, A.G., Brenner, S.E., Hubbard, T., Chothia, C.	1995 Journal of Molecular Biology	4361

**Scopus** Anthony Newman | Logout Brought to you by Elsevier Dayton IT

Search | Alerts | My list | Settings Live Chat | Help and Contact | Tutorials | Quick Link Test

TITLE-ABS-KEY (protein folding) AND (LIMIT-TO (AFFILCOUNTRY, "France")) Edit Save Set alert Set feed

4,264 document results View secondary documents View 592 patent results Analyze results Sort on: Date Cited by Relevancy

Search within results... Export Download View citation overview View Cited by More... Show all

Refine Limit to Exclude

Year

- 2014 (51)
- 2013 (196)
- 2012 (219)
- 2011 (216)
- 2010 (223)

Author Name

- Karplus, M. (74)
- Betton, J.M. (47)
- Blackledge, M. (47)
- Westhof, F. (43)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Crystal structure of the ribosome at 5.5 Å resolution	Yusupov, M.M., Yusupova, G.Zh., Baucom, A., (...), Cate, J.H.D., Noller, H.F.	2001 Science	1297
<input type="checkbox"/> 2	The complete general secretory pathway in gram-negative bacteria	Pugsley, A.P.	1993 Microbiological Reviews	1273
<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Structure of the MDM2 oncoprotein bound to the p53 tumor suppressor transactivation domain	Kussie, P.H., Gorina, S., Marechal, V., (...), Levine, A.J., Pavletich, N.P.	1996 Science	1065
<input type="checkbox"/> 4	Crystal structure of the ligand-binding domain of the human nuclear receptor RXR-α	Bourguet, W., Ruff, M., Chambon, P., Gronemeyer, H., Moras, D.	1995 Nature	896



ELSEVIER

# Find out who is being cited

Scopus - Search Results

Hub | ScienceDirect | Scopus | SciTopics | Applications

Anthony Newman is logged in | Logout | Go to SciVal Suite

Brought to you by The Scopus Team

Search | Sources | Analytics | My alerts | My list | My settings

Quick Search  Search

Library catalogue

Scopus: 97 More... Web Patents SelectedSources

Your query: 97 results found | Not the results you expected? Search Sabatini, David M. in Scopus | Edit | Save | Set alert | Set feed | View search history

Document results: 97 | Show all abstracts

Go to page: 1 of 5 Go | Next >

With selected: Download PDF | Export | Print | Email | Create bibliography | Add to My List | View citation overview | View citations | View references | Request to remove documents from author

Sort by Date (Newest)

Document title	Author(s)	Date	Source title	Citations
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 MTOR complex 1 regulates lipin 1 localization to control the srebp pathway	Peterson, T.R., Sengupta, S.S., Harris, T.E., Carmack, A.E., Kang, S.A., Balderas, E., Guertin, D.A., (...), Sabatini, D.M.	2011	Cell 146 (3), pp. 408-420	0
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 The TASC of secretion	Zoncu, R., Sabatini, D.M.	2011	Science 332 (6032), pp. 923-925	0
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 mTORC1 activates SREBP-1c and uncouples lipogenesis from gluconeogenesis (Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (2010) 107, 8, (3281-3282) DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1000323107)	Laplante, M., Sabatini, D.	2010	Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 107 (16), pp. 7617	0

Search within results  Search

Refine results Limit to Exclude

Year

- 2011 (10) >
- 2010 (12) >
- 2009 (13) >
- 2008 (5) >
- 2007 (5) >

View more | View fewer

Author Name



# Find out who is being cited – in more depth

Scopus - Citation overview

Search | Sources | Analytics | My alerts | My list | My settings Live Chat | Help

Quick Search   Library catalogue

## Citation overview

### Citations received since 1996

This is a citation overview for a set of 97 documents. Export | Print

**Overview options** Hide

Exclude from citation overview:  Self citations of all authors

Sort documents: Year descending Date range: 2009 to 2011

	Total	Citations					Total
		<2009	2009	2010	2011	Subtotal	
	6714	2280	2823	2463	7566	5	14285
						>2011	

**97 Cited Documents**

2011 Functional genomics reveal that ...

2011 MTOR complex 1 regulates lipin 1...

2011 A haploid genetic screen identif...

2011 The mTOR-regulated phosphoproteo...

2011 A radical role for TOR in longev...

**Document h index**

h index = 57

Of the 97 documents considered for the h index, 57 have been cited at least 57 times.

Scopus does not have complete citation information for articles published before 1996. [About h-Graph](#)

**h-Graph**

< Back

This is a h-graph for a set of 97 documents. The h-graph measures the impact of a set of articles and shows the number of citations per document.

**h index = 57** (of the 97 documents considered for the h-index, 57 have been cited at least 57 times.) Print

Note: Scopus does not have complete citation information for articles published before 1996. [About h-Graph](#)

**Document h-Graph** Line Chart | Table

# Questions to answer before you write

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/ Case reports;**
- **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 should 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)  
<http://scholarlyoa.com/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**



# Choose the right journal

- 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)

**BIOCHEMICAL PHARMACOLOGY**

Editor-in-Chief:  
**S.J. Enna**  
See [editorial board](#) for all editors information

Sign up for the Pharmacology Newsletters [Sign up here!](#)

**BCP Special Issues: Published and Future issues**

**January 2008 : Addictions Special Issue**  
Edited by David Weinschenker

**Description**

*Biochemical Pharmacology* is an international journal devoted to publishing original work on the interaction of drugs and nontherapeutic xenobiotics with biological systems. While particular emphasis is placed on reporting findings that relate to the actions and metabolism of drugs and toxic substances at the biochemical and molecular levels, submissions in the areas of behavioral and physiological pharmacology and toxicology are also encouraged if they describe studies directed at defining mechanisms of action. All areas of the field are represented in the journal including, but not limited to, cancer chemotherapy, neuropharmacology, inflammation/immunopharmacology, antimicrobials, behavioral, respiratory, gastrointestinal, cardiovascular, and endocrine pharmacology and toxicology. Submissions relating to either pharmacodynamics or pharmacokinetics are considered. Reports based on experiments conducted with mixtures, plant or animal extracts will not be considered for publication unless the chemical structures and concentrations of all substances are known. Submissions to the journal must be in English.

The journal publishes the following types of reports:  
(1) **Full-length Research Papers.** These contain the results of original research on an issue of relevance to the field of pharmacology.  
(2) **Commentaries.** These are commissioned articles that provide the author's view on a selected topic of

**Volume 54, Issue 2, Pages 193-318 (August 2007)**

**Article List** | **Full Abstracts**

Display Selected Articles | E-mail Articles | Export Citations

- Editorial Board**  
Page IFC  
[PDF \(582 K\)](#)
- Cloning, expression, purification and functional characterization of recombinant human...**  
Pages 193-203  
Seema Garde, Jennifer E. Fraser, Najib Nematpoor, Rebecca Pollex, Catherine Morin, A. Chandra Panchal and Madhulika B. Gupta  
[SummaryPlus](#) | [Full Text + Links](#) | [PDF \(397 K\)](#)

[SummaryPlus](#)

# 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 =  $A/B$
  - e.g. **600 citations** = **2.000**  
**150 + 150 articles**



# Impact Factor and other bibliometric parameters



# Influences on Impact Factors: Subject Area



Search | Sources

Quick Search

Journal A

Search

Limit


Show  s...

Results: 1362 Sc

Journal Title

- Sadhana - Acader
- Safety Science
- Sahara J
- Saudi Journal of B
- Scandinavian Jour
- Scandinavian Jour
- Scandinavian Jour
- Science
- Science China Che
- Science China Ear

Calculations Last U



About calculations

Note: Scopus does not have complete citation information for articles published before 1996.

Calculations Last Updated: 19 Oct 2010

Journals In Chart

Exclude journal self citations

Clear chart

Clear chart

◆ Nature

Show Info

Show Info

● Science

Show Info

Show Info

# Your Journals list for this manuscript

**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**




# Read the 'Guide to Authors'- Again and again!

- 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.



The screenshot shows the Elsevier website for the Journal of Molecular Biology. At the top, the Elsevier logo is on the left, and a search bar with 'Advanced search' and 'Follow us' links is on the right. Below the logo, there are navigation tabs: 'Journals & books', 'Online tools', 'Authors, editors & reviewers', 'About Elsevier', and 'Store'. The main content area features a large banner for the 'Journal of Molecular Biology' with a cover image showing molecular structures and the text '!!! Important information for NIH authors !!!'. To the right of the banner is a vertical menu with buttons for 'Guide for Authors', 'Submit Your Paper', 'Track Your Paper', 'Order Journal', and 'View Articles'. A red arrow points to the 'Guide for Authors' button. Below the banner, there are several informational boxes: 'Impact Factor: 4.001', '5-Year Impact Factor: 3.981', 'Imprint: ELSEVIER', and 'ISSN: 0022-2836'. There is also a 'Stay up-to-date' section with a registration form. To the right, there are 'Announcements' including 'Mendeley joins Elsevier' and 'How to publish Open Access in this journal'. Further right, there is a section for 'Publish your article Open Access in Journal of Molecular Biology' and 'Journal News' featuring a photo of a man and the text 'JMB publishes unpublished manuscript by Crick and Wyman'. At the bottom right, there is a link to 'On Demand Webinar: Biomarker Analysis'.

# Read the 'Guide to Authors'- Again and again!



**Jmb**  
molecular biology

protein interactions

[Guide for authors](#)

[Submit your paper](#)

[Track your paper](#)

[Order journal](#)


[View articles](#)

[Abstracting and indexing](#)

[Editorial board](#)

Browse journals > Journal of Molecular Biology > Guide for authors

## Guide for Authors




Author information pack

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Editorial policy</li><li>• Sharing of reagents and data</li><li>• Sequence data</li><li>• Structural data</li><li>• NMR assignments</li><li>• Cell lines</li><li>• Types of paper</li><li>• Contact details for submission</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Open access</li><li>• Language (usage and editing services)</li><li>• Submission</li></ul> <b>PREPARATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use of wordprocessing software</li><li>• Article structure</li><li>• Subdivision</li><li>• Essential title page information</li><li>• Abstract</li><li>• Graphical abstract</li><li>• Highlights</li><li>• Keywords</li><li>• Abbreviations</li><li>• Introduction</li><li>• Results</li><li>• Discussion</li><li>• Materials and methods</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Database linking</li><li>• Accession numbers</li><li>• Glossary</li><li>• Acknowledgements</li><li>• Footnotes</li><li>• Artwork</li><li>• Color artwork</li><li>• Tables</li><li>• References</li><li>• Journal abbreviations source</li><li>• Supplemental data</li><li>• Additional information</li></ul> <b>AFTER ACCEPTANCE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use of the Digital Object Identifier</li><li>• Proofs</li><li>• Offprints</li></ul> <b>AUTHOR INQUIRIES</b>
--	---	--

Advertisement

Understanding the Publishing Process in Scientific Journals




How to write a scientific article

Innovation

Open access solutions

Impact Factor and other quality measures

Authors' rights and responsibilities



ELSEVIER

# Common problems with submissions:

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*



# Why Is Language Important?

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.”

# Scientific Language – Overview

**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**



ELSEVIER

# Scientific Language – Sentences

- Write direct and short sentences – more professional looking.
- One idea or piece of information per sentence is sufficient
- Avoid multiple statements in one sentence – they are confusing to the reader.

## 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.”

# Authorship: Who is allowed to be an Author?

- Policies regarding authorship can vary
- Most common 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 - Sequence & 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



# 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
  - Spell out first name – do not use initial
- **How about marriage/divorce?**

## **Be consistent!**

If you are not, how can others be?

# ORCID: Author Profile 2.0

# ORCID

Connecting Research  
and Researchers

- **Open**
- **Researcher &**
- **Contributor**
- **ID**

## 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**

**ORCID Launches Registry** *October 16, 2012*


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." *Dr. Lauri Hask, Executive Director of...*

[Read more >](#)

**Launched 16 October 2012**

# 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


- 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

# Title: Examples

Original Title	Revised	Remarks
Preliminary observations on the effect of Zn element on anticorrosion of zinc plating layer	Effect of Zn on anticorrosion of zinc plating layer	<u>Long title</u> distracts readers. Remove all <u>redundancies</u> such as “observations on”, “the nature of”, etc.
Action of antibiotics on bacteria	Inhibition of growth of mycobacterium tuberculosis by streptomycin	Titles should be <u>specific</u> . Think to yourself: “How will I search for this piece of information?” when you design the title.
Fabrication of carbon/CdS coaxial nanofibers displaying optical and electrical properties via electrospinning carbon	Electrospinning of carbon/CdS coaxial nanofibers with optical and electrical properties	“English needs help. The title is nonsense. All materials have properties of all varieties. You could examine my hair for its electrical and optical properties! You MUST be specific. I haven’t read the paper but I suspect there is something special about these properties, otherwise why would you be reporting them?” – <i>the Editor-in-chief</i>

# Keywords

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 – a good guideline.

# Abstract

## Tell readers what you did and the important findings

- One paragraph (between 50-250 words) often, plus Highlight bullet points
- Advertisement for your article, and should encourage reading the entire paper
- A clear abstract will strongly influence if your work is considered further

**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  $K_2MnF_6$  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**




# Introduction

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. State purity and/or supplier if it is important.
- **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 method descriptions, and may even recommend rejection*

# 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)*



# Results – Appearance counts!

- Un-crowded plots
  - 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
  - Not in French, German, Chinese, Korean, ...
- Use color *ONLY* when necessary.
  - If different line styles can clarify the meaning, then never use colors or other thrilling effects.
- If used, color must be visible/distinguishable when printed in black & white.
- Do not include long boring tables!



# 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

# 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**
  - 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!
- 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



# Some Publishers are helpful!

"Imagine if contributors could submit their papers to a journal without worrying about formatting the manuscript, including those pesky references, to exacting specifications?" *Kelvin J.A. Davies, 2012*

Called **Your Paper Your Way**, introduced to the journal **Free Radical Biology & Medicine** and now offered in more than 640 Elsevier journals. More than half of authors find it easier and more helpful. Reviewers are equally happy as figures and tables can be put in the right place by authors to allow easier review.

## *Your Paper Your Way*

We now differentiate between the requirements for new and revised submissions. You may choose to submit your manuscript as a single Word or PDF file to be used in the refereeing process. Only when your paper is at the revision stage, will you be requested to put your paper into a "correct format" for acceptance and provide the items required for the publication of your article.

**To find out more, please visit the Preparation section below.**



ELSEVIER

# Reference Management Software helps

- Many journals are helpful in formatting the journal reference style for you (e.g. Elsevier's Your Paper Your Way service).
- If the publisher is not offering this service it is your responsibility to format references correctly!



Version  
12



zotero

[en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison\\_of\\_reference\\_management\\_software](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_reference_management_software)

# 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, ....
- **Original figure before color correction or trimming for clarity**
- **Not part of the printed article**
  - Will be available online with the published paper
- **Must relate to, and support, the article**

# Cover Letter

## Your cover letter

- **Submitted**
- **Mentioned**  
**to the journal**
- **Note special**  
**conflicts**

**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.

**Final approval from all authors**

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.

**Explanation of importance of research**

Three potential independent reviewers who have excellent expertise in the field of this paper are:

- Dr. Fernandez, Tennessee Tech, [email1@university.com](mailto:email1@university.com)
- Dr. Chen, University of Maine, [email2@university.com](mailto:email2@university.com)
- Dr. Singh, Colorado School of Mines, [email3@university.com](mailto: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



ELSEVIER

# 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!





# Initial Editorial Review or Desk Reject

Many journals use a system of initial editorial review. Editors may reject a manuscript without sending it out 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 and revise accordingly
  - They may review your manuscript for the next journal too!
  - Read the Guide for Authors of the new journal, again and again.



# The Peer Review Process – revisions



# 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, but often it is accepted if all points are addressed!



# 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*



ELSEVIER

# 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 or images

## 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



# Data fabrication and falsification

***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)



ELSEVIER

# Data fabrication and falsification

## ***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 as a whole.
- Plagiarism may result in *academic charges*, but will certainly cause rejection of your paper.
- Plagiarism will *hurt your reputation* in the scientific community.

No Copying



ELSEVIER

# Duplicate Publication

- Duplicate Publication is also called Redundant Publication, or Self Plagiarism
- Definition: Two or more papers, without full cross reference, share the same hypotheses, data, discussion points, or conclusions
- An author should not submit for consideration to 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)

**Manuscripts are automatically checked against a database of 30+ million peer reviewed articles which have been donated by 200+ publishers, including Elsevier.**



**More traditional approach also happens:**

- Editors and reviewers
- Your colleagues
- Readers
- "Other" whistleblowers
  - "The walls have ears", it seems ...




**ELSEVIER**





doi:10.1016/j.sigpro.2005.07.019 Cite or Link Using DOI  
 Copyright © 2005 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**RETRACTED: Matching pursuit-based approach**



Available online 24 August 2005.

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

Reason: This article is virtually identical to the previously published article "A novel matching pursuit-based signal processing method for improving SNR in ultrasonic NDT of highly scattering materials, such as steel and composites. Matching pursuit is used instead of BP to reduce the complexity. Despite its iterative nature, the method is fast enough to be real-time implemented. The performance of the proposed method has been evaluated using both computer simulation and experimental results, when the input SNR (SNR<sub>in</sub>) is lower than 0dB (the level of echoes from the microstructures is above the level of the echoes).

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

the echoes issuing from the flaws to be detected. Therefore, it cannot be cancelled by classical time averaging or matched band-pass filtering techniques.

Many signal processing techniques have been utilized for signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) improvement in ultrasonic NDT of highly scattering materials. The most popular one is the split spectrum processing (SSP) [1–3], because it makes possible real-time ultrasonic test for industrial applications, providing quite good results. Alternatively to SSP, wavelet transform (WT) based denoising/detection methods have been proposed during recent years [4–8], yielding usually to higher improvements of SNR at the expense of an increase in complexity. Adaptive time-frequency analysis by basis pursuit (BP) [9,10] is a recent technique for decomposing a signal into an optimal superposition of elements in an over-complete waveform dictionary. This technique and some other related techniques have been successfully applied to denoising ultrasonic signals contaminated with grain noise in highly scattering materials [11,12], as an alternative to the WT technique, the computational cost of the BP algorithm being the main drawback.

In this paper, we propose a novel matching pursuit-based signal processing method for improving SNR in ultrasonic NDT of highly scattering materials, such as steel and composites. Matching pursuit is used instead of BP to reduce the complexity. Despite its iterative nature, the method is fast enough to be real-time implemented. The performance of the proposed method has been evaluated using both computer simulation and experimental results, when the input SNR (SNR<sub>in</sub>) is lower than 0dB (the level of echoes from the microstructures is above the level of the echoes).

**2. Matching pursuit**

Matching pursuit was introduced by Mallat and Zhang [13]. Let us suppose an approximation of the ultrasonic backscattered signals  $x[n]$  as a linear expansion in terms of functions  $g_i[n]$  chosen from an over-complete dictionary. Let  $H$  be a Hilbert

space. We define the over-complete dictionary as a family  $D = \{g_i; i=0, 1, \dots, L\}$  of vectors in  $H$ , such as  $\|g_i\| = 1$ .

The problem of choosing functions  $g_i[n]$  that best approximate the analysed signal  $x[n]$  is computationally very complex. Matching pursuit is an iterative algorithm that offers sub-optimal solutions for decomposing signals in terms of expansion functions chosen from a dictionary, where  $\ell^1$  norm is used as the approximation metric because of its mathematical convenience. When a well-designed dictionary is used in matching pursuit, the non-linear nature of the algorithm leads to compact and sparse signal models.

In each step of the iterative procedure, vector  $g_i[n]$  which gives the largest inner product with the analysed signal is chosen. The contribution of this vector is then subtracted from the signal and the process is repeated on the residual. At the  $m$ th iteration the residue is

$$r^m[n] = \begin{cases} x[n] & m=0, \\ x[n] - \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a_{k,m} g_k[n], & m \neq 0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $a_{k,m}$  is the weight associated to optimum atom  $g_k[n]$  at the  $m$ th iteration.

The weight  $a_i^m$  associated to each atom  $g_i[n] \in D$  at the  $m$ th iteration is introduced to compute all the inner products with the residual  $r^m[n]$ :

$$a_i^m = \frac{\langle r^m[n], g_i[n] \rangle}{\langle g_i[n], g_i[n] \rangle} = \frac{\langle r^m[n], g_i[n] \rangle}{\|g_i[n]\|^2} = \langle r^m[n], g_i[n] \rangle. \quad (2)$$

The optimum atom  $g_{k,m}[n]$  (and its weight  $a_{k,m}$ ) at the  $m$ th iteration are obtained as follows:

$$g_{k,m}[n] = \underset{g_i \in D}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\langle r^{m-1}[n] \rangle\|^2 = \underset{g_i \in D}{\operatorname{argmax}} |\langle r^{m-1}[n] \rangle|^2. \quad (3)$$

The computation of correlations  $\langle r^m[n], g_i[n] \rangle$  for all vectors  $g_i[n]$  at each iteration implies a high computational effort, which can be substantially reduced using an updating procedure derived from Eq. (1). The correlation updating procedure [13] is performed as follows:

$$\langle r^{m+1}[n], g_i[n] \rangle = \langle r^m[n], g_i[n] \rangle - a_{k,m} \langle g_{k,m}[n], g_i[n] \rangle. \quad (4)$$



# Publication ethics – How it can end .....

**theguardian**

News Sport Comment Culture Business Money London 2012 Life & style Travel

News World news Hungary

## 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.

Share 554  
Tweet 37  
+1 33  
Email

Article history

**World news**  
Hungary · Europe

**Education**  
Plagiarism · Higher education

**More news**

**Related**

**14 Jul 2011**  
German politician loses doctorate for plagiarism

**24 Feb 2011**  
German defence minister stripped of doctorate for plagiarism

**20 Oct 2009**  
University standards row deepens

**21 Jan 2009**  
King's students stage sit-

**BBC**

## NEWS EUROPE

Home UK Africa Asia-Pac Europe Latin America Mid-East South Asia US & Canada Business Health

24 February 2011 Last updated at 11:38 GMT

## German minister loses doctorate after plagiarism row

Germany's defence minister has been stripped of his university doctorate after he was found to have copied large parts of his work from others.



Mr Guttenberg failed to name sources for parts of his PhD thesis

Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg, an aristocrat who lives in a Bavarian castle, admitted breaching standards but denied deliberately cheating.

Analysis revealed that more than half of his thesis had long sections lifted word-for-word from the work of others.

So far the German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, has stood by the minister.

The University of Bayreuth decided that Mr Guttenberg had "violated scientific duties to a considerable extent".

It deplored the fact that he had lifted sections of text without attribution.

Last week Mr Guttenberg said he would temporarily give up his PhD title while the university investigated the charges of plagiarism. He admitted that he had made "serious mistakes".

His thesis - Constitution and Constitutional Treaty: Constitutional Developments in the US and EU - was completed in 2006 and published in 2009.

Chancellor Merkel insisted on Monday that she was standing by her defence minister, who was seen as something of a rising star in her conservative coalition.

**Related Stories**

Germany's Baron without a title  
Plagiarism row minister drops PhD  
German minister denies plagiarism

# Figure Manipulation – some things are allowed

As long as they don't obscure or eliminate info present in the original image



Must be disclosed in the figure legend






# Figure Manipulation


Example - Different authors and reported experiments




Am J Pathol, 2001



Images worked on, added to, rotated 180°, to become:



Life Sci, 2004



ELSEVIER

# References and Acknowledgements

- **Guide for Authors of Elsevier journals.**
- <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/>
- <http://www.physics.ohio-state.edu/~wilkins/writing/index.html>
- **Petey Young. Writing and Presenting in English. The Rosetta Stone of Science. Elsevier 2006**
- **EDANZ Editing training materials. 2006**
- **Jullian Eastoe. Co-editor, Journal of Colloid and Interface Science**
- **Peter Thrower. Editor-in-chief, Carbon**
- **Roel Prins. Editor-in-chief, Journal of Catalysis**
- **Nigel Cook. Editor-in-chief, Ore Geology Reviews.**
- **Frans P. Nijkamp, Journal of Ethnopharmacology**
- **Wilfred CG Peh. Editor, Singapore Medical Journal**
- **Malcolm W. Kennedy. Professor, Institue of Biomedical and Life Sciences, University of Glasgow, UK**

# Further reading for you

- Mark Ware Consulting Ltd, Publishing and E-learning Consultancy. Scientific publishing in transition: an overview of current developments. Sept., 2006. [www.stm-assoc.org/storage/Scientific\\_Publishing\\_in\\_Transition\\_White\\_Paper.pdf](http://www.stm-assoc.org/storage/Scientific_Publishing_in_Transition_White_Paper.pdf)
- Ethical Guidelines for Journal Publishing, Elsevier. [http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/intro.cws\\_home/ethical\\_guidelines#Duties%20of%20Authors](http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/intro.cws_home/ethical_guidelines#Duties%20of%20Authors)
- International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publication. Feb. 2006
- <http://www.publicationethics.org.uk/guidelines>
- <http://www.icmje.org/index.html#ethic>
- <http://www.onlineethics.org/>
- <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/>
- <http://www.physics.ohio-state.edu/~wilkins/writing/index.html>
- George D. Gopen, Judith A. Swan. The science of Scientific Writing. American Scientist (Nov-Dec 1990), Vol. 78, 550-558.
- Michael Derntl. Basics of Research Paper Writing and Publishing. <http://www.pri.univie.ac.at/~derntl/papers/meth-se.pdf>
- Thomas H Adair. Professor, Physiology & Biophysics Center of Excellence in Cardiovascular-Renal Research, University of Mississippi Medical Center. <http://dor.umc.edu/ARCHIVES/WritingandpublishingaresearcharticleAdair.ppt>
- Bruce Railsback. Professor, Department of Geology, University of Georgia. Some Comments on Ethical issues about research. [www.gly.uga.edu/railsback/11111misc/ResearchEthics.html](http://www.gly.uga.edu/railsback/11111misc/ResearchEthics.html)
- Peter Young. Writing and Presenting in English. The Rosetta Stone of Science. Elsevier 2006.
- Philip Campbell. Editor-in-Chief, Nature. Futures of scientific communication and outreach. June 2007.
- <http://scholarlyoa.com/2012/12/06/bealls-list-of-predatory-publishers-2013/>
- [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kges3mN5rDk&feature=youtube\\_gdata\\_player](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kges3mN5rDk&feature=youtube_gdata_player)
- Yaoqi ZHOU. Recipe for a quality Scientific Paper: Fulfill Readers' and Reviewers' Expectations. <http://sparks.informatics.iupui.edu>
- EDANZ Editing training materials. 2006 <http://liwenbianji.com>, <http://www.edanzediting.com/english.html>
- **Anthony Newman, Ethics White Paper** <http://www.ifcc.org/media/161822/IFCC%20Ethics%20in%20Science.pdf>



# Questions? Slide set, certificate, and resources

Or for questions later, please contact [a.newman@elsevier.com](mailto:a.newman@elsevier.com)



This set of slides as a PDF will be available through your institute. There is full permission granted to distribute them as long as they are not edited.

A personal certificate of attendance will be provided after filling in the online survey [https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/2015\\_43\\_sur](https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/2015_43_sur)

Also see: <http://www.elsevier.com/early-career-researchers/home>

**Elsevier Publishing Campus** - [www.publishingcampus.com](http://www.publishingcampus.com)