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Choosing a journal

- **Impact Factor**
  - Be aspirational-always aim higher
    - But be realistic

- **Potential acceptance**
  - Will you cite this journal?
  - Check your reference list

- **Scope of journal**
  - Consider instructions for authors, previous issues and whether your manuscript is similar in content, methodology and importance
Choosing a journal

• Audience
  – Who do you want to get this message to?
  – Think beyond your own discipline

• Speed of response
  – How long will you wait for your answer?

• Speed of publication
  – What is the current backlog?
Choosing a journal

• Publication mode
  – Can you pay for open access?
  – Are you OK with on-line only?
  – Predatory journals

• Copyright considerations
  – Check the fine print
Predatory Journals

• Expectant submission: MOJPH
• MOJ Public Health <health@medcraveonline.org>
• Thu 14/09/2017 21:43
• To: Debra Waters;

• Dear Dr. Debra L Waters,

• Hope everything is fine at your end.

• At first, I feel happy if you could spare 2 minutes of your valuable time to concern on my request.

• Well, having glance at your interesting articles in online, we are approaching you for an eminent contribution towards my Journal. In fact my Journal, MOJ Public Health had retained successful issues in its bag, but there would be a small grief of lacking contributions from well-known persons like you. Consequently, I wish to have your 2 Page article as a token of gesture and it would be very helpful.

• Await your rapid comeback.

• Best Regards,
• Alice Glover
Dear Dr. Debra Lynn Waters,

We on behalf of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation - Annals of Medical Case reports journal would like to bring to your kind notice about the Inaugural issue.

As an eminent researcher/physician in the field of “Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation”. We kindly request you to submit a manuscript for the Inaugural issue of journal Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Case Reports.

This Inaugural issue will exclusively consider Original Research, Review, Mini Review, Case reports, Case Series, Clinical Image, Commentaries and Perspectives. Timeline for the submission of manuscripts would be on or before October 10, 2017.

Kindly submit your manuscript as an email attachment to: physicalmed@medcaserep.com.

Please respond to this invitation within 48hrs. We are looking forward for a positive reply.

Best Regards,
Patricia Ventura
Editorial Manager
Remedy Publications LLC
820 EL Camino Real
Belmont, CA 94002, USA
Tel: +1-415-690-1011
Email: physicalmed@medcaserep.com
Web: www.medcaserep.com

This is not a Spam E-mail- if you do not want to get any further emails from the journal, please unsubscribe by sending us a confirmation email.
I hope this e-mail finds you well. I want to take a moment to congratulate you on your ongoing research.

As a scholarly publisher of progressive research materials, IGI Global, based in Hershey, PA, USA, is committed to staying abreast of the latest scientific and research movements within the community. IGI Global is currently accepting proposals for new publication material. Based on your expertise and prominence as an active researcher in your field, I believe you would offer valuable contributions as an editor of a new book project.

Book project editors have the valuable opportunity to produce in-depth reference sources that promote and disseminate research to an international audience and act as exemplary works significant to an emerging field of study. Edited books are a wonderful opportunity to collaborate with fellow researchers and explore diverse perspectives on innovative topics.

IGI Global books are included in several prestigious indices and abstracting services, including but not limited to: SCOPUS, PsycINFO®, the Book Citation Index (Clarivate Analytics Web of Science), Australian Education Index, INSPEC, Reference Universe, ERIC – Education Resources Information Center, ACM Digital Library, to name a few.

Follow us on Facebook & Twitter for company updates and events!
Editors receive royalties and special discounts, as well as support from both our development and marketing teams ensuring that the highest quality publication is disseminated and discoverable to numerous markets. All editors of IGI Global utilize a manuscript submission system, eEditorial Discovery®, to ease the submission and review of materials for their book publications.

Should you be interested in submitting a book project proposal, you can find the proposal form here: https://www.igi-global.com/publish/submit-a-proposal/book-proposal/.

For more information on these and other opportunities, please visit our Publish with IGI Global webpage.

I sincerely appreciate your time and commend you on the progress you are making in your field.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this opportunity.

Kind Regards,
Ms. Katelyn Hoover
Editorial Assistant
International Publisher of Information Science and Technology Research
701 E. Chocolate Avenue
Hershey, Pennsylvania 17033-1240, USA
E-mail: khoover@igi-global.com
Websites: www.igi-global.com
Impact Factors

• Do you know the top 5 journals (by Impact Factor) in your discipline?

• What is the impact factor of the New England Journal of Medicine?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Abbreviated Journal Title (linked to journal information)</th>
<th>ISSN</th>
<th>JCR Data</th>
<th>Eigenfactor® Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J GERONTOL A-BIOL</td>
<td>1079-5006</td>
<td>12069</td>
<td>4.984  5.023  0.940  182  8.0  0.02073  1.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J AM GERIATR SOC</td>
<td>0002-8614</td>
<td>22341</td>
<td>4.216  4.679  0.678  270  8.9  0.03811  1.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AM J GERIAT PSYCHIAT</td>
<td>1064-7481</td>
<td>4842</td>
<td>3.519  4.097  1.423  123  6.0  0.01166  1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>INT J GERIATR PSYCH</td>
<td>0885-6230 0885-6230</td>
<td>6452</td>
<td>3.086  2.831  0.551  158  7.6  0.01199  0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PSYCHOL AGING</td>
<td>0882-7974 0882-7974</td>
<td>7141</td>
<td>2.913  4.055  0.349  109 &gt;10.0  0.01283  1.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>J GERONTOL B-PSYCHOL</td>
<td>1079-5014</td>
<td>5163</td>
<td>2.852  3.434  0.472  106  8.7  0.00925  1.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>GERONTOLOGIST</td>
<td>0016-9013</td>
<td>5937</td>
<td>2.772  3.279  0.453  95 &gt;10.0  0.00780  1.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>BMC GERIATR</td>
<td>1471-2318</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>2.000  0.206  136  4.3  0.00478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>INT PSYCHOGERIAT</td>
<td>1041-6102</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>1.892  2.306  0.344  195  5.1  0.00835  0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>J AGING HEALTH</td>
<td>0898-2643 0898-2643</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>1.832  2.057  0.176  85  6.8  0.00337  0.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EIC believes it should be rejected out of hand (low priority).

2nd editor

EIC believes it should be rejected out of hand (low priority).

Edtor believes it should go to external reviewers.

Outside reviews

Agrees: paper is rejected

Disagrees
What to do with the feedback

• Chances are you will get some kind of rejection
  – the 1st time you submit

• However, a rejection might not be a rejection
  – Often invited by journal editor to make changes to your manuscript and resubmit

• You need to be patient
  – it can take a while to get the reviewers’ comments
    • two-three months
    • Top journals will get back to you more quickly

• Many reviewers are courteous and try to be helpful

• You may get comments which you believe to be unfair

• You may have to write two or even three revised versions of your article before it’s finally accepted
Responding to Reviewer Comments

• In cover letter thank the editor for the opportunity to revise and resubmit.
• Answer EACH critique/comment made by reviewers.
• Highlight changes in the revised paper
  – Or as the journal instructs
• Be courteous. A good idea is to start your response with, “Thank you for this thoughtful suggestion…”
  – that is, if you think it is thoughtful
Responding to Reviewer Comments

• If you disagree, but it is easy to change and it does not affect the science...do it!

• If you disagree entirely and believe it is scientifically sound, explain why.
  – Respectfully

• Don’t give up!
  – People who have never published before often have a number of mistaken ideas about publishing.
Common misconceptions

Misconception
• ‘Everyone else writes better than me—look how beautifully written the articles in this journal are’

Reality
• Articles are redrafted and rewritten.

Misconception
• ‘If my article is rejected it means my work is no good’

Reality
• It does not necessarily mean this.
  – Reviewers should provide direction if there are methodological concerns that need to be addressed.
  –
• High impact journals have extremely high rejection rates.
RePLYing to Reviewer Comments

• Journal wishes trumps your wishes!
• Editors have a responsibility to the journal and the readers
• The reviewers may not agree with each other
• The editors will decide on what they think is important and what is not
• Address everything even if no changes are made
Reaching out and responding to Reviewer Comments

• Deconstruct each of the messages into individual items that you can respond to
• Try to make the majority of the changes requested
• If the reviewer has asked a question or makes a point – think if the manuscript will be improved by including/editing text even if not explicitly asked for by the reviewer
• Give reasons if don’t accept suggestions
• Polite and pragmatic
**Format**

- Cover letter
- Use table form with 4 columns: Number, Reviewer’s comments, Location, Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reviewer’s Comments</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“active group” may not be best term</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
<td>term changed to “intervention group”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It remains unclear why the authors have chosen these risk factors for institutionalization.</td>
<td>Page 9</td>
<td>The risk factors have been chosen based on previous studies that have identified factors for institutionalization. The following text has been included: “These predictors have been identified based on the clinical significance….”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Agreement
(from: “Scientific Writing easy when you know how”)

• There should be discussion of the safety and possible side effects of XX

• A comment about the safety has been added as follows: Side effects of XX have only been reported when this compound has been applied directly to the skin or used to treat clothing at higher concentrations (10%). The concentration used in this study is 0.03% and is unlikely to cause these effects
• *The term “active group” may not be the best term*
• The term has been changed to intervention group

• *Figure 2 is excellent but could be made clearer*
• We have made the suggested changes to Figure 2 and agree that this makes the figure easier to understand

• *A summary paragraph would be helpful*
• A summary paragraph has been added
“Agree but nothing you can do about it”

• *How did you assess self-report information in individuals with cognitive impairment? How can you assure validity of such information?*

• We thank the reviewer for raising this point. Unfortunately, we cannot assure the validity of self-report information amongst individuals with cognitive impairment. Moreover, it would be impractical to check this in the study sample. However, we have added the following comment in the Discussion section, study limitations, page 21:
“Meeting half-way”

- The long section on ZZ is not useful in the introduction. The paragraphs should be deleted.

- This section has been shortened but not removed because one of the studies forms the basis of our hypothesis that.......
“Reviewer was not clear”

- *If sampling was by residential area, then there is a potential statistical issues to do with cluster design*

- we apologise for unintentionally being misleading. This study was not a cluster design and we have altered our wording accordingly. Participants were selected who lived within a specified distance from the hospital. This has been made clear.
“Let the Editors decide”

- In my opinion, Figure 3 could be deleted.
- Figure 3 defines the allergen avoidance intervention in detail, as figure 4 does the diet intervention. We have retained the figure but are happy for it to be deleted if the editor wishes to do this.
“You think you are correct and do not want to edit”

- **Statistical analyses: what was the rationale to include variables had p<0.25 in the multivariate analyses?**

- The significance cut-off of p<0.25 or p<0.20 is acceptable cutoff to rule in covariates to include in the multivariate model. A number of studies have used this significance cutoff [1-3].
“Don’t be shy about providing extra data to even if it will not appear in manuscript”

- The use of a mixed sampling frame, namely, a random sample drawn from the electoral roll and a smaller sample of volunteers. The reason for inclusion of the latter group is unclear and the study would be more convincing if this group were excluded or if there was evidence that they did not differ from the random sample in any significant way.
We assessed this group and do not believe they bias the results. We have added information to the text to show they are no more likely to have low BMD or fractures than the group recruited by invitation letter.

In addition below is an outline of their characteristics FYI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recruited by word of mouth</th>
<th>Recruited by invitation letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>76.5 yrs</td>
<td>77 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self rated health</td>
<td>76 %</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;excellent&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hx of heart attack</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hx of stroke</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hx of diabetes</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoporsis T&lt;-2.5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary: Important tips and tricks

- The cover letter is a **very useful** tool
- The (one) main message should be “news”
- The abstract needs to “sell” the manuscript
- Be coherent and logical in your writing
- Choose an appropriate journal
- Follow guidelines- best practice and journal
- Get good feedback before submission
- Don’t give up if you are rejected
- Be thoughtful and thorough addressing the feedback