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Highlights

- 924 new submissions in 2014 from 54 countries (using country of corresponding author)
- 34 days average from submission to first editor’s decision (was 37 days in 2013)

- “New” countries with submissions in 2014:
  - Cuba
  - Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - Ecuador
  - Vietnam
Submissions by Country (2009-2013)
## Journal Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#Manuscripts received</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># reviewers invited</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>3837</td>
<td>4382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of completed reviews</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Acceptance rate</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%  (84 still outstanding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Factor</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.127</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>2.134</td>
<td>2.498</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Journal Performance - Other metrics (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 year Impact Factor</td>
<td>2.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNIP</td>
<td>1.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJR</td>
<td>1.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article influence</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SNIP** = Source Normalized Impact per Paper: measures contextual citation impact by weighting citations based on the total number of citations in a subject field.

**SJR** = SCImago Journal Rank: # times an average paper in a particular journal is cited…but assigns each citation a value greater or less than 1.00 based on the *rank* of the citing journal. (Uses three-year window of measurement.)

**Article influence** = calculated by dividing the Eigenfactor® score by the percentage of all articles recorded in the Journal Citation Reports that were published in a specific journal.

**The Eigenfactor® score** is a rating of the total importance of a specific journal. Journals are rated according to the number of incoming citations, with citations from highly ranked journals weighted to make a larger contribution to the Eigenfactor® than those from poorly ranked journals. (Article influence and Eigenfactor® exclude self-citations.)

More info? Go to [http://journalinsights.elsevier.com/journals/0883-9441/impact](http://journalinsights.elsevier.com/journals/0883-9441/impact)
Other metrics (2009-2013)

5 Year Impact Factor & Ranking

Impact Factor based on 5 years of history. Copyright Thomson Reuters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://journalinsights.elsevier.com/journals/0883-9441/impact
Source: Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP) measures the impact of a paper within a subject field. Impact Per Publication (IPP) is the average number of citations received in a particular year by papers published in the journal during the three preceding years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SNIP</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1.2030</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1.1850</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.1800</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.8310</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.9290</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://journalinsights.elsevier.com/journals/0883-9441/impact
SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) is a prestige metric based on the idea that 'all citations are not created equal.'
Citations from highly ranked journals are more important and influential than those from lowly ranked journals.
Publishing and Patient Care Requirements are Similar

- Hypothesis = Diagnosis
- Experimental Method = Therapeutic Trial
- Data Analysis = Quality Improvement
- Discussion = Peer Review/Enhancement
- Conclusions = Outcome
Process

- To publish or not to publish…
- Writing a quality manuscript
  - Preparations
  - Article construction
  - Language
  - Technical details
- Revisions and response to reviewers
- Ethical issues
- Conclusions: getting accepted
Scientists publish to share with the research community findings that advance knowledge and understanding.

- To present new, original results or methods
- To rationalize published results
- To present a review of the field or to summarize a particular topic
Publishers do not want zero-cited articles

Editors now regularly analyze citations per article

“The statistic that 27% of our papers were not cited in 5 years was disconcerting. It certainly indicates that it is important to maintain high standards when accepting papers... nothing would have been lost except the CV's of those authors would have been shorter…”

– Marv Bauer, Editor, *Remote Sensing of Environment*
Publishers do want quality

WANTED
- Originality
- Significant advances in field
- Readability

NOT WANTED
- Duplications
- Reports of no scientific interest
- Work out of date
- Unreadable
“Just because it has not been done before is no justification for doing it now.”
– Peter Attiwill, Editor-in-Chief, Forest Ecology and Management
Can I publish this?

- Have you done something new and interesting?
- Have you provided solutions to any difficult problems?
- Have you checked the latest results in the field?
- Is the result interesting or useful for others in the field?
- Do your findings tell a nice story or is the story incomplete?

If all answers are “yes”, then start preparing your manuscript.
DO NOT gamble by scattering your manuscript to many journals

Only submit once!

International ethics standards prohibit multiple simultaneous submissions, and editors DO find out!
Consult and apply the list of guidelines in the “Guide for Authors”

Ensure that you use the correct:

- Length and page margins (stick to word and page limits)
- Reference format (LaTex can do this automatically)
- LaTex template if appropriate:

The article should preferably be written using Elsevier's document class 'elsart', or alternatively the standard document class 'article'. The Elsevier LaTex package (including detailed instructions for LaTex preparation) can be obtained from the Author Gateway's Getting Published with Elsevier: http://www.elsevier.com/latex
Consulting the Guide for Authors will save your time and the editor’s

All editors hate wasting time on poorly prepared manuscripts

It is a sign of disrespect
A good title should contain the fewest possible words that adequately describe the contents of a paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DO</strong></th>
<th><strong>DON’T</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convey main findings of research</td>
<td>Use unnecessary jargon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be specific</td>
<td>Use uncommon abbreviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be concise</td>
<td>Use ambiguous terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be complete</td>
<td>Use unnecessary detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract readers</td>
<td>Focus on part of the content only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The quality of an abstract will strongly influence the editor’s decision

A good abstract:
• Is precise and honest
• Can stand alone
• Uses little to no technical jargon
• Is brief and specific
• Cites no references

Use the abstract to “sell” your article
Provide the necessary background information to put your work into context

It should be clear from the introduction:

• Why the current work was performed
  – aims
  – significance
• What has been done before
• What was done (in brief terms)
• What was achieved (in brief terms)
Introduction

**DO**
- Consult the Guide to Authors for word/page limit
- “Set the scene”
- Outline the problem and describe the results
- Ensure that the literature cited is balanced, up to date and relevant

**DON’T**
- Write an extensive review of the field
- Cite your own studies or those of colleagues disproportionately while ignoring contradictory studies or those of competitors
- Minimize or dismiss contributions made by others
- For theoretical papers, experiments should illustrate and complement the main results

**DO**
- Cite source of data
- Use figures and tables to summarize results
- Explain setup clearly

**DON’T**
- Duplicate data among tables, figures and text
- Use graphics to illustrate data that can easily be summarized with text
Conclusion

Put your results into CONTEXT

Summarize concisely

Describe how it represents an advance in the field

Suggest future directions and open problems

BUT

Avoid repetition with other sections

Avoid being overly speculative

Don’t over-emphasize the impact of your work
“Journal editors, overloaded with quality manuscripts, are looking for any reason to reject even good science”

Thus, both the science and the language need to be sound.
Checklist Requirements

- SIMPLICITY
- APPLICABILITY
- MEASURABILITY

  - www.who.int/patientsafety/challenge/safe.surgery
Good writing possesses the following three “C”s:

- Clarity
- Conciseness
- Correctness (accuracy)

The key is to be as brief and specific as possible without omitting essential detail.
Know the enemy

Good writing avoids the following traps:

• Repetition
• Redundancy
• Ambiguity
• Exaggeration

These are common bugbears for editors
Final checks

Revision before submission can prevent early rejection
What can I do to ensure my paper is in the best possible state prior to submission?

• Ask colleagues to take a look and be critical

• Check that everything meets the requirements set out in the Guide for Authors – again!

• Check that the scope of the paper is appropriate for the selected journal – change journal rather than submit inappropriately
Accepting rejection

Don’t take it personally!

• Try to understand why the paper has been rejected
• Evaluate honestly – will your paper meet the journal’s requirements with the addition of more material or is another journal more appropriate?
• Don’t resubmit elsewhere without significant revisions addressing the reasons for rejection and checking the new Guide for Authors
What gets you accepted?

A - Attention to details
C - Check and double check your work
C - Consider the reviews
E - English must be as good as possible
P - Presentation is important
T - Take your time with revision
A - Acknowledge those who have helped you
N - New, original and previously unpublished
C - Critically evaluate your own manuscript
E - Ethical rules must be obeyed

– Nigel John Cook, Editor-in-Chief, Ore Geology Reviews