



RESEARCH MANAGEMENT TRAINING

Journal Identification and Peer Review
Process

Jonathan Kayondo, 28th June 2023

BACKGROUND

Why Publish?

- Knowledge dissemination/ Contribution to Science
- Career advancement
- Obligations to funders
- Citations

Types of Manuscripts

Many but shall focus on two common types:

- Research Manuscript
 - Article published to illustrate outcome of a well planned scientific study. Mostly written for the scientific community. Journals provide protocol on structure
- Review Manuscript
 - Attempts to sum up the current state of research on a particular topic. Sort of a letter of opinion on:
 - Recent major advances and discoveries
 - Significant gaps in the research
 - Current debates and ideas where research might go next

PICKING A JOURNAL TO PUBLISH IN

Journal Selection

Very important and becoming very complex due to the proliferation of journals, areas of specialization, emergence of interdisciplinary topics, and funders requirements.

Tips:

1. Make a list of available potential journals of interest- Consult:
 - Supervisors
 - Peers
 - Online listings
 - Professional associations etc.
2. Consider impact or reach of candidate journals-many ways to judge this including:
 - Impact factor (But not most critical)
 - Journal rank e.t.c.
3. Make sure Journal scope and policies meet your needs

Journal Selection: Tips Cont..

4. Check journal requirements and distributions e.g.:
 - Print or online
 - Open source

5. Check the peer review process:
 - Reviewers
 - Rejection rates
 - Turn-around time e.t.c.

6. Check instructions for authors for additional information e.g:
 - Topics that are welcome/ discouraged
 - Article Structure
 - Page limits e.t.c.

Submission

Approach:

- Journal specific- different submission requirements for different journals
- Follow guidelines for authors on:
 - File format: DOC, DOCX, PDF e.t.c
 - Length- some have size limit others don't
 - Font
 - Headings
 - Layout and spacing
 - Page and line numbers
 - Reference Style
 - E.t.c.

PEER REVIEW

What is it?

- An evaluation process by peers to determine quality of an academic paper
- Allows identification of grey areas or weakly supported assertions for stronger validation
- Involves :
 - Detailed analysis including statistics
 - Critical review with well organized points of concern
 - Providing feedback including suggestions for further improvements
 - E.t.c.

REASONS FOR PUBLICATION DENIAL

Research Articles

1. Lack of Novelty, originality, and presentation of obsolete study
 - Must really add to existing knowledge
 - No need for obsolete study (e.g. work on d4T) when new methods or practices are already available
2. Improper rationale:- must emphasize with proper
 - Justifications
 - Supporting data e.t.c.
3. Unimportant or irrelevant subject matter:
 - Article must have significant scientific value worth disseminating
4. Flawed methodology/ study design- If flawed or questionable, then:
 - Results bound to be flawed
5. Lack of interpretations
 - Don't just report results- answer the **so what/** and synthesize into existing knowledge
6. Inappropriateness of the Journal
 - Check scope of the study with respect to journals scope
7. Lack of In-vivo studies
 - Sometimes In-vitro alone not enough

Review Articles

1. Lack of critical reviews, propaganda, and promotion of the techniques discussed
 - Must really assess with regards to current state of the field not just compile
 - Must add expert opinions
2. Inadequate or obsolete literature survey
 - Review article really needs time
 - Reviewed literature must include the most recent one
3. Reviewer must be an expert of the subject:
 - Or assemble an author team comprised of experts.

Post Review: Revision- I

1. Thorough addressing of the reviewers comments
 - Minor comments
 - Major comments
2. Involves point by point response to the comments
 - Follow journal's guideline on how to respond
 - Observe set deadlines/ if need more time communicate and request for it.

3. Do's and Don'ts:

Do's:

- Take time to digest the comments
- Consult with co-Authors and colleagues familiar with the work to navigate through complex comments
- Address each of the comments in entirety, if suggestion is out of scope of current study mention this too
 - Where required cite references or include supplementary data in support of your argument
 - Ensure changes made to the manuscript based on the reviewers suggestions are clearly indicate

Post Review: Revision- II

Dont's:

- Don't argue every single comment-
 - A suggested minor revision that you might not entirely agree with, but is easy to comply with and does not take away any value from your study, could be accommodated rather than arguing your case.
- Don't take a negative comment from the reviewer as a personal attack.
 - Try to look at it with a neutral perspective and [address it to the best of your ability.](#)
- Avoid using phrases like “we completely disagree” in your [rebuttal letter](#). You can find other useful phrases to answer critical comments
- Do not deny request of reviewers for original raw data
- Even where Ms being directed for publication elsewhere revise it according to the comments as much as possible

Good luck on your authorship journey



May you never need to defend your scientific paper as vigorously!



May you be spared from bothersome reviewers!