Winning the Publishing Game:
Welcome to Day 2!

Jocalyn Clark MSc PhD FRCPE FCAHS

International Editor, The BMJ
Honorary Associate Professor of Global Health, University College London, UK
Adjunct Professor of Medicine, University of Toronto, Canada
former Executive Editor, The Lancet
former Executive Editor icddr,b, Bangladesh
former Senior Editor, PLOS Medicine

Our programme

Yesterday

Understand the game and the players

Make a plan for your paper

Take a 4-Step Process

Today

Continue to develop your draft

Publication ethics
Writing editorials

Commit to your plan

4 RECAP AND PEER REVIEW

Recap

- What is the most important ingredient?
  message
- What is a good paper?
  a published paper
- Every manuscript finds a home → You need to make the match between your paper and an appropriate target journal
- Style = short sentences, short words, active rather than passive voice
- Structure is everything (IMRaD)

EXERCISE

5 PUBLICATION ETHICS

AUTHORSHIP

Who should be an author?

Seven of you have worked on a paper together. Ali had the idea but took no part in data collection or writing the paper. Farida collected data but had nothing to do with the analysis or the writing. Hassan designed the study and analysed the data but wasn't able to approve the final version of the paper as he was out of touch on a Himalayan trek. Jena wrote the paper after interviewing all the authors. Benedicta, the head of department, didn't work on the study but did read the paper critically before publication. Joe looked after the patients included in the study. May, who works for the drug company that funded the study, analysed the data and read the paper critically before publication.

ICMJE guidelines on authorship

- Authorship credit should be based on:

    1) Substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data;

    2) Drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and

    3) Final approval of the version to be published.

- Authors should meet conditions 1, 2, and 3.

Authorship, cont'd.

- Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group alone does not constitute authorship.

- All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship, and all those who qualify should be listed.

- Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content.

Why does authorship matter?

- Authorship is about credit and responsibility
- Authorship means you are accountable
- Readers care about the provenance and who is responsible
- Academic life revolves around publication

Problems with authorship

- Gift authorship (also called guest authorship, theft authorship)
- Ghostwriting (where someone has made a substantial contribution to the paper but is not listed as an author)
- People are left off papers
- Misunderstanding of criteria

The Contributorship Model

- Author list and/or

- List of contributors (some of whom may not be included as authors), giving details of who did what in planning, conducting, and reporting the work

- Like film credits

- *Guarantor(s)* - accepts full responsibility for the work and/or the conduct of the study, had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish

but also medical records may contain substantial inaccuracies regarding the main diagnoses causing or contributing to death. It is noteworthy that studies based on these methodologies tend to underreport infectious diseases [2,46]. Since diagnoses and causes of death are determined without autopsy in the vast majority of cases, especially in sub-Saharan-Africa, vital statistics, clinical registries, and even randomized trials, may capture incorrect causes of death. These inaccuracies have important policy implications, as major funding and policy decisions are derived in part from vital statistics and other registries of disease burden.

Acknowledgments

References

1. Rutstein DD, Berenberg W, Chalmers TC, Child CG III, Fishman AP, et al. (1976) Measuring the quality of medical care. A clinical method. N Engl J Med 294: 582–588. ⓘ FIND THIS ARTICLE ONLINE

2. WHO (2004) Maternal mortality in 2005: estimates developed by WHO, UNICEF UNFPA and the world

AI USE

What is AI use?

- Artificial intelligence (AI) includes large language models such as Chat GPT, and any other technologies which use machine learning, deep learning or others that make automated decisions

- It is well recognised that AI use has the potential for both benefit and harm to academic literature

Can AI be an author? No.

- Example policy:

AI technologies will not be accepted as an author(s) of any content submitted to BMJ for publication. BMJ only recognises humans as being capable of authorship since they must be accountable for the work.

- When AI has been used, disclose and describe it:
  a) The name of the technology
  b) The reason for its use
  c) What the task of the technology was

- Editors will decide whether AI use as declared is reasonable, consistent with, and acceptable per editorial policies.

- Authors remain accountable for the material and its accuracy

Examples of AI use by authors

- To improve word processing or language (checking grammar, for example)
- To generate ideas or text
- To generate tables or figures or images
- To do background research

Authors are fully responsible for the content of their manuscript, even those parts produced by an AI tool, and are thus liable for any breach of publication ethics.

Resources

- Committee for Publication Ethics (COPE)
  - www.publicationethics.org.uk
- ICMJE
  - www.icmje.org
- Council of Science Editors (CSE)
  - www.councilofscienceeditors.org
- World Association of Medical Editors (WAME)
  - www.wame.org

TEAM WRITING

PubMed.gov

U.S. National Library of Medicine
National Institutes of Health

Search: PubMed

Search   Clear

Display Settings: ⊙ Abstract

Send to: ⊙

Science ▪AAAS

Radio imaging of the very-high-energy gamma-ray emission region in the central engine of a radio galaxy.

VERITAS Collaboration; VLBA 43 GHz M87 Monitoring Team; H.E.S.S. Collaboration; MAGIC Collaboration, Acciari VA, Aliu E, Arlen T, Bautista M, Beilicke M, Benbow W, Bradbury SM, Buckley JH, Bugaev V, Butt Y, Byrum K, Cannon A, Celik O, Cesarini A, Chow YC, Ciupik L, Cogan P, Cui W, Dickherber R, Fegan SJ, Finley JP, Fortin P, Fortson L, Furniss A, Gall D, Gillanders GH, Grube J, Guenette R, Gyuk G, Hanna D, Holder J, Horan D, Hui CM, Humensky TB, Imran A, Kaaret P, Karlsson N, Kieda D, Kildea J, Konopelko A, Krawczynski H, Krennrich F, Lang MJ, LeBohec S, Maier G, McCann A, McCutcheon M, Millis J, Moriarty P, Ong RA, Otte AN, Pandel D, Perkins JS, Petry D, Pohl M, Quinn J, Ragan K, Reyes LC, Reynolds PT, Roache E, Roache E, Rose HJ, Schroedter M, Sembroski GH, Smith AW, Swordy SP, Theiling M, Toner JA, Varlotta A, Vincent S, Wakely SP, Ward JE, Weekes TC, Weinstein A, Williams DA, Wissel S, Wood M, Walker RC, Davies F, Hardee PE, Junor W, Ly C, Aharonian F, Akhperjanian AG, Anton G, Barres de Almeida U, Bazer-Bachi AR, Becherini Y, Behera B, Bernlöhr K, Bochow A, Boisson C, Bolmont J, Borrel V, Brucker J, Brun F, Brun P, Bühler R, Bulik T, Büsching I, Boutelier T, Chadwick PM, Charbonnier A, Chaves RC, Cheesebrough A, Chounet LM, Clapson AC, Coignet G, Dalton M, Daniel MK, Davids ID, Degrange B, Deil C, Dickinson HJ, Djannati-Ataï A, Domainko W, Drury LO, Dubois F, Dubus G, Dyks J, Dyrda M, Egberts K, Emmanoulopoulos D, Espigat P, Farnier C, Feinstein F, Fiasson A, Förster A, Fontaine G, Füssling M, Gabici S, Gallant YA, Gérard L, Gerbig D, Giebels B, Glicenstein JF, Glück B, Goret P, Göhring D, Hauser D, Hauser M, Heinz S, Heinzelmann G, Henri G, Hermann G, Hinton JA, Hoffmann A, Hofmann W, Holleran M, Hoppe S, Horns D, Jacholkowska A, de Jager OC, Jahn C, Jung I, Katarzyński K, Katz U, Kaufmann S, Kendziorra E, Kerschhaggl M, Khangulyan D, Khélifi B, Keogh D, Kluźniak W, Kneiske T, Komin N, Kosack K, Lamanna G, Lenain JP, Lohse T, Marandon V, Martin JM, Martineau-Huynh O, Marcowith A, Maurin D, McComb TJ, Medina MC, Moderski R, Moulin E, Naumann-Godo M, de Naurois M, Nedbal D, Nekrassov D, Nicholas B, Niemiec J, Nolan SJ, Ohm S, Olive JF, de Oña Wilhelmi E, Orford KJ, Ostrowski M, Panter M, Paz Arribas M, Pedaletti G, Pelletier G, Petrucci PO, Pita S, Pühlhofer G, Punch M, Quirrenbach A, Raubenheimer BC, Raue M, Rayner SM, Renaud M, Rieger F, Ripken J, Rob L, Rosier-Lees S, Rowell G, Rudak B, Rulten CB, Ruppel J, Sahakian V, Santangelo A, Schlickeiser R, Schöck FM, Schröder R, Schwanke U, Schwarzburg S, Schwemmer S, Shalchi A, Sikora M, Skilton JL, Sol H, Spangler D, Stawarz Ł, Steenkamp R, Stegmann C, Stinzing F, Superina G, Szostek A, Tam PH, Tavernet JP, Terrier R, Tibolla O, Tluczykont M, van Eldik C, Vasileiadis G, Venter C, Venter L, Vialle JP, Vincent P, Vivier M, Völk HJ, Volpe F, Wagner SJ, Ward M, Zdziarski AA, Zech A, Anderhub H, Antonelli LA, Antoranz P, Backes M, Baixeras C, Balestra S, Barrio JA, Bastieri D, Becerra González J, Becker JK, Bednarek W, Berger K, Bernardini E, Biland A, Bock RK, Bonnoli G, Bordas P, Borla Tridon D, Bosch-Ramon V, Bose D, Braun I, Bretz T, Britvitch I, Camara M, Carmona E, Commichau S, Contreras JL, Cortina J, Costado MT, Covino S, Curtef V, Dazzi F, De Angelis A, De Cea del Pozo E, Delgado Mendez C, De los Reyes R, De Lotto B, De Maria M, De Sabata F, Dominguez A, Dorner D, Doro M, Elsaesser D, Errando M, Ferenc D, Fernández E, Firpo R, Fonseca MV, Font L, Galante N, García López RJ, Garczarczyk M, Gaug M, Goebel F, Hadasch D, Hayashida M, Herrero A, Hildebrand D, Höhne-Mönch D, Hose J, Hsu CC, Jogler T, Kranich D, La Barbera A, Laille A, Leonardo E, Lindfors E, Lombardi S, Longo F, López M, Lorenz E, Majumdar P, Maneva G, Mankuzhiyil N, Mannheim K, Maraschi L, Mariotti M, Martínez M, Mazin D, Meucci M, Miranda JM, Mirzoyan R, Miyamoto H, Moldón J, Moles M, Moralejo A, Nieto D, Nilsson K, Ninkovic J, Oya I, Paoletti R, Paredes JM, Pasanen M, Pascoli D, Pauss F, Pegna RG, Perez-Torres MA, Persic M, Peruzzo L, Prada F, Prandini E, Puchades N, Reichardt I, Rhode W, Ribó M, Rico J, Rissi M, Robert A, Rügamer S, Saggion A, Saito TY, Salvati M, Sanchez-Conde M, Satalecka K, Scalzotto V, Scapin V, Schweizer T, Shayduk M, Shore SN, Sidro N, Sierpowska-Bartosik A, Sillanpää A, Sitarek J, Sobczynska D, Spanier F, Stamerra A, Stark LS, Takalo L, Tavecchio F, Temnikov P, Tescaro D, Teshima M, Torres DF, Turini N, Vankov H, Wagner RM, Zabalza V, Zandanel F, Zanin R, Zapatero J.

Fred Lawrence Whipple Observatory, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Amado, AZ 85645, USA.

Related articles

▶ Observational evidence for the accretion-disk origin for a radio jet in an active [Nature. 2002]

▶ Discovery of very high energy gamma rays associated with an x-ray binary [Science. 2005]

▶ Chandra Uncovers a Hidden Low-Luminosity Active Galactic Nucleus in t [Astrophys J. 2000]

▶ Large-scale, decelerating, relativistic x-ray jets from the microquasar XTE J15 [Science. 2002]

▶ Review Jets, hotspots and lobes: what X-ray ot [Philos Transact A Math Phys Eng Sci. 2005]

» See reviews... | » See all...

Recent activity

Turn On   Clear

Activity recording is turned off.

Turn recording back on

What are the benefits of team writing?

- Reflects the nature of scientific research
  - Collaborative, not singular
- Brings multiple perspectives
- Encourages collaboration, debate
- Facilitates learning

- It's the norm in our field

- Multidisciplinary

- Multi-authors

- Division of labour

- Raises authorship issues: *credit* and *responsibility*

What are some models?

- *Scenario 1*: First author takes lead on first and subsequent drafts, last (senior) author guides and approves, and co-authors contribute along the way.

Why are the pros and cons?

- *Scenario 2*: Sections of paper are delegated to team members, with first author having coordinating role.

What are the pros and cons?

- *Scenario 3*: Sole authorship and responsibility for writing and publishing.

What are the pros and cons?

Challenges: intellectual

- Control over work and "the message"
- Role of co-authors
- Unfair division of labour?
- Different contributions

Challenges: practical

- Managing differing opinions (*AME tells you to delete Table 1 and JC tells you to keep it*)
- Meeting deadlines, getting co-authors to meet deadlines
- Agreement on target journal

Best Practices

- Define team at outset
  - *Writing group may be different than research team*
- Define paper (outline, message) before writing begins
- Agree on authorship
  - Might need provision if project changes
- Clarify publication goals
  - Journal choice, article type

Best practices, cont'd

- Agree on team members responsibilities
- Agree on deadlines
- Devote whole team meeting to discussion – not just email!

6 WRITING EDITORIALS AND COMMENTARIES

7 RETURN TO DRAFTS

Big picture-editing

1. Is there a clear message?

- Is that message worth saying (new and important)? Is it justified?

2. Is the market appropriate?

- Have you selected an appropriate journal? What is the evidence?

3. Is the structure developed?

- IMRaD? and are the paragraphs written clearly?

4. Is the style appropriate?

- Short sentences, short words?

Tidy-editing

- Check your facts and add all references

- Re-check you conform with the journal's Instructions to Authors.

- Add all author, funding, and competing interests statements.

- Check the grammar and spelling to avoid little mistakes.

Constructive peer review

- Frame your feedback and criticism positively. Put yourself in their shoes.

- Be as specific as possible.

- Focus on main ideas (not grammar or spelling).

- Offer suggestions and alternative ideas or arguments (not just say theirs are bad).

PEER REVIEW

8

WRITING HACKS
WRITING COVER LETTERS

Writing for medical journals has nothing to do with natural talent. It is about discipline and time management.

- If you want to publish, you have to make it a priority
- Know yourself and when how you write best
    - Time of day
    - Deadlines
    - Rewards
    - Break up with your phone

How to write

"The NYT method"

- Write for 90 minutes, break for 30 minutes
- 2 sessions equivalent to an 8 hour day writing

OPINION

Relax! You'll Be More Productive

By Tony Schwartz
Feb. 9, 2013

Set quotas

Every day for 1 hour or 200 words each day

Set habits

Every day same time

Seize the moments, Respect the blocks. But just do it.

Stop pushing papers around.

There is no "one" way.

If it's not working, start over.

COVERING LETTERS

Why do we write covering letters?

- To comply
- To introduce
- To explain
- To summarize
- To persuade

The value of covering letters: editor's perspective

- An essential and vital component

- Along with abstract, always the first and sometimes the only thing read by the editors

- Worth spending time thinking and crafting carefully (but not too much time)

The role of covering letters: editor's perspective

- To summarise your work succinctly

- To 'sell' the suitability of your work to the specific journal

- To disclose information related to paper

Summarise

- Helps the editor quickly identify the message of the paper

- Helps navigate its relative novelty, context, relevance

- Three short paragraphs
  'the longer the covering letter the worse the paper'

Sell

- Helps editor understand the suitability of your paper to their journal

- Can include previous contact/correspondence with editor or journal

- Identifies journal section or 'call for papers'

- Should not be a hard sell-job

Disclose

- Should contain and alert editor to disclosures

- Especially when there is not a place for them in the online submission fields

- Demonstrates transparency and expedites the review process

Disclosures

- Related or previous publications (including reports)
  - To help assess overlapping or redundant publications
  - Can help put into context and understand 'the thread'
- Statement of funding/relationship to funder
- Previous reviews and how you responded

What to Avoid

Avoid overselling or exaggerating

- Usually seen in claims about
  - Conclusions
  - Significance/importance
  - Novelty

- Can also be found in authors' attempts to ingratiate

These findings will have immediate clinical applicability for immunization practice in developing countries.

The esteemed research team has published 150 papers in the New England Journal of Medicine.

Our paper will be highly cited, thus raising the impact factor of your journal.

We have shown for the first time that sugar causes hyperactivity.

This is the first ever qualitative study of women's perceptions of facility birth.

Other things to avoid

- Spelling or grammatical errors
- Language that is too technical
- Jargon, abbreviations
- Wrong journal mentioned
- Lack of white space
- Citations, graphics

Writing it at last minute

Consider

- What is the main message of your paper
  - Single sentence
  - What your paper says
- Why does it matter and why this journal
  - Relevance to 'a thread'
  - Topical issue in practice or policy
  - Addresses a knowledge gap or controversy
  - Contrasts previous findings
  - 'Bigger and better'

Covering letters

- Less important than the abstract

- Shouldn't be "over-selling"

- Contains your message

- Helps navigate the paper, especially its novelty, context, and relevance to the journal's audience

- 3 short paragraphs

Covering letters

- Three short paragraphs:
  - What you found
  - Why it matters
  - Why *Journal X*

(Keep it short & sweet*: the longer the covering letter the worse the paper*)

Return to original plan

- Revise message, target journal, deadlines

- Add:
  - 1 commitment to your writing practice
  - 1 commitment to your paper
  - 1 goal for 2025

Thank you!
Questions?