The submission process from the Publisher’s point of view

Presented at a MedComms Networking event
13th June 2018

http://www.medcommsnetworking.com
Jonathan Patience
Senior Editor
Taylor & Francis

https://tandfonline.com/
Agenda

• Pathway to publication
• What to think about before you submit
• Insight into peer review
• Revisions & reducing risk of rejection
• Post publication
• Alternate publication options
Pathway to publication

- **Initial Decision**: How to get your paper through initial review
- **Peer Review**: How to get your paper through peer review
- **Revision**: How to get a quick decision following revision
- **Acceptance**: How to measure + improve your papers success post publication
Presubmission inquiries

• Please send them!
• Saves everyone time
• Avoids outright rejections
• We will recommend appropriate journals and contact editors if appropriate
• We can make sure you have all the right disclosure forms etc.
Submitting agent function

• Agencies can submit papers on behalf of the authors.
• The submitting agent is sent all important decision emails along with the authors.

Submitting Agent

* Agent Question • Edit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>I, Miss Elizabeth Knowles, am submitting this manuscript on behalf of myself and my co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitting Agent</td>
<td>I, Miss Elizabeth Knowles, am not an author on this manuscript. I am submitting this manuscript on behalf of an author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What our editors like to see

**What we want**

- Within journal scope
- House-style sections present
- Objectives clearly stated
- Language at high standard
- Novel conclusion or methodology
- Message of paper same throughout
- References complete and up-to-date
- All funding information fully disclosed

**What we don’t**

- Poor organization
- Objective/conclusion mismatch
- Adds nothing to literature
- Sample size too small
- “Salami publication”
- Evidence of citation chasing

Remember: Any questions, just ask the editorial office!
Insight into peer review

1. Just a marketing piece, or attempt to find a marketing niche
2. Minimizes negative results; overstates efficacy
3. Unclear objective
4. Ignores conflicting studies
5. “no duh” conclusions
6. Flawed analysis
7. Wrong analysis, often appears to favor product
8. Unclear inclusion/exclusion criteria
9. Missing references or too much data on file
10. No p-values to back claims of significance
Reduce rejection risk

Initial Decision

Peer Review

Revision

Acceptance

Replies to ALL comments

Revision submitted in timely fashion

No amendments, no rationale

Includes new data

Quick decision

Uses track changes

Point-by-point response

Slower/Further review/Rejection

Confusing responses

Taking > 4 months to revise
How do we measure an article's impact?

Abstract

Aging is commonly associated with a loss of muscle mass and strength, resulting in falls, functional decline, and the subjective feeling of weakness. Exercise modulates the...
Alternate publication options

Video abstracts
- Gaining popularity
- A short video that engagingly introduces readers to an article
- Published in front of the pay wall (at Taylor & Francis)
- Inclusion of additional relevant material such as images, animations and simulations are strongly encouraged
- Can help to engage readers and may lead to increased usage and citation
- Either the completed video or a video transcript is peer reviewed alongside the article
- Company can keep copyright if desired (journal-dependent)
With video:
- Peer review of article and video
- New video created if reviewers request changes
- New video reviewed by original reviewers
- Video and article published

With transcript:
- Peer review of article and transcript
- Transcript altered if requested by reviewers
- Video made
- Video approved by editor and peer reviewers
- Video and article published

With neither:
- Editor informed of desire to create video with submission
- Reviewers briefed that they will be asked to review a video abstract/transcript
- Article peer reviewed as normal
- Video abstract/transcript sent to reviewers of article for evaluation once created
- Video and article can be published at different times
Accompanying video clips

- Supplementary material e.g. videos of procedures, live EEGs, sound clips to aid diagnostics etc.
- Must be submitted with the original submission
- Peer reviewed along with article
- In front of the pay wall (at Taylor & Francis)
- Can aid the readability of articles and make them more useful to readers and clinicians in real-world settings
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