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Origins of scholarly publishing

1439
Gutenberg and moveable type

Henry Oldenburg (1618-1677)
Founding Editor and Commercial Publisher of the first scientific journal

1580
Founding of the House of Elzevir

March 6, 1665
Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society

First true scholarly journal
Scholarly publishing today
Scientific, technical and medical (STM) publishing

- 2,000 STM publishers
- 1.4 million peer-reviewed articles
- 20,000 peer-reviewed journals
What is a scientific journal

Not just a “magazine”
- It serves the purpose of scientific communication

Peer-review
- Perform peer-review to ensure the validity and integrity of submissions

Production process
- Content innovations, linkage

Physical/Online Publication
- Online prevailing, html growing
Academic publishing
The publishing cycle

- Solicit & manage submissions
- Manage Peer Review
- Edit & prepare
- Production
- Publish & Disseminate

Elsevier Publishing Campus
Publishing Connect
Academic publishing
The publishing cycle

30-60% rejected by > 13,000 editors

>700 million downloads by >11 million researchers in >120 countries!

557,000+ reviewers

12.6 million articles available

365,000 articles accepted

>700 million downloads by >11 million researchers in >120 countries!
The publisher’s role

How do Publishers add value to the scientific and health community?

- Registration
- Certification
- Dissemination
- Preservation
- Use
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The journal publishing cycle – role of editor

- Solicit and manage submissions
- Archive and promote use
- Manage peer review
- Publish and disseminate
- Edit and prepare
- Production
Editor role & responsibilities

The Editor is responsible for and has control over:

- the scientific content of the Journal, taking into account the Aims and Scope,
- the editorial policy of the Journal and the specific requirements
- conformity to publishing ethics policy
- peer review process
- selection and appointment of the Editorial Board
Editor role & responsibilities

Your role as an Editor also includes:

- ensuring high scientific standards of Articles
- sufficient copy flow,
- responsibility for promotion of the Journal,
- solicitation of submissions
- efficient, timely and confidential coordination of the editorial process of handling, editing, and refereeing Articles and communications with authors
Editor role & responsibilities

To make your journal internationally renowned and successful, in your role as an Editor you should focus in particular on:

- Ensuring that there are no conflicts of interest and ethical standards are respected
- Attracting top quality Authors
- Ensuring that good reviewing standards are kept
Editor role & responsibilities

To ensure that there are no conflicts of interest and ethical standards are respected, you should become a member of COPE – http://publicationethics.org/
Editor role & responsibilities – for medical subject areas

To ensure that there are no conflicts of interest and ethical standards are respected, you should visit regularly the website of ICMJE – International Committe of Medical Journal Editors http://www.icmje.org/
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Editor role & responsibilities - Attracting top Authors

In your role as an Editor, you should always think about Attracting top Authors:

- to enhance the scientific quality of your journal
- to increase citations potential
- to be up to date with the latest research
- to look for potential Co-Editors / Reviewers / Editorial Board Members for your journal
Editor role & responsibilities - Attracting top Authors

Where to look for top Authors

- Top institutes in the country / region / worldwide
- Emerging / novel / innovative research areas
- Conferences
- Your best Reviewers/ Editorial Board Members
- Research databases (e.g. Scopus)
  - Alerts
  - Search
- Stay up-to-date
  - Awards, news, management of institutions
Editor role & responsibilities - Attracting top Authors

Where to look for top Authors (Scopus data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Serbia - Top 200 Institutes for a Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication Year(s)</td>
<td>2013;2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Year(s)</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Institute Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Institute h-index</th>
<th>Article Count</th>
<th>Citation Count</th>
<th>Average Citations</th>
<th>Self Citation Count</th>
<th>Self Citation %</th>
<th>Institute Collaboration Count</th>
<th>Collaboration %</th>
<th>Field Weighted Relative Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Belgrade(60068815)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>108,00</td>
<td>6983</td>
<td>14145</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>30,3 %</td>
<td>4710</td>
<td>67,4 %</td>
<td>0,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institut za nuklearne nuke Vinca(60068792)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>61,00</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>42,2 %</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>94,0 %</td>
<td>1,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Novi Sad(60068801)</td>
<td>Novi Sad</td>
<td>59,00</td>
<td>2209</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>35,2 %</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>62,4 %</td>
<td>0,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade University School of Medicine(600688)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>51,00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24,2 %</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54,0 %</td>
<td>1,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matematicki Institut SANU(60068830)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>48,00</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>59,4 %</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>67,6 %</td>
<td>1,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kragujevac(60068809)</td>
<td>Kragujevac</td>
<td>47,00</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>33,9 %</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>73,6 %</td>
<td>0,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univerzitet u Nwu(60068806)</td>
<td>Nis</td>
<td>44,00</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>35,0 %</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>63,3 %</td>
<td>0,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klinicki Centar Srbije(60069683)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>41,00</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21,4 %</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>79,8 %</td>
<td>0,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Chemistry, Technology and Metallurg</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>36,00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62,5 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100,0 %</td>
<td>0,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Technical Sciences of the Serbian Academy</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>32,00</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38,3 %</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>97,1 %</td>
<td>0,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Oncology and Radiology of Serbia</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>31,00</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20,4 %</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80,9 %</td>
<td>0,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Medical Research Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>29,00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38,5 %</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100,0 %</td>
<td>0,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vojnmedicinska Akademija(60068791)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>29,00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33,3 %</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomical Observatory Belgrade(60068825)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>24,00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28,6 %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75,0 %</td>
<td>0,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Center of Serbia(106429922)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>23,00</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21,3 %</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>95,5 %</td>
<td>0,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy(1051696)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>23,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,5 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100,0 %</td>
<td>0,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universiteti i Prishtines(60068800)</td>
<td>Prishtina</td>
<td>23,00</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46,8 %</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>67,8 %</td>
<td>0,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti(60068829)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>22,00</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37,0 %</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>87,7 %</td>
<td>0,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Nikola Tesla(60068829)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>20,00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25,0 %</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80,0 %</td>
<td>0,20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Editor role & responsibilities - Attracting top Authors

**Country**
Serbia - top 200 Authors for a Coun

**Publication Year(s)**
2012;2013

**Citation Year(s)**
2014

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Full Institute Name</th>
<th>Author h-index</th>
<th>Article Count</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Average Citations</th>
<th>Self Citation Count</th>
<th>Self Citation %</th>
<th>Author Collaboration Count</th>
<th>Collaboration %</th>
<th>Field Weighted Impact (excl. self-cites)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rekovic V. (3522785222)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics(1136)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>16,5</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>22,0 %</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>6,89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åživković L. (1843563)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>9,9</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>26,6 %</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>4,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milojević J. (66037257)</td>
<td>Institut za nuklearne nauke Vinca(60068792)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovanović P. (70053490)</td>
<td>Astronomical Observatory(105216910)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36,4 %</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69 %</td>
<td>1,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevic S. (6701638501)</td>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>23,6 %</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>0,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djordjević M. (55397808)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>9,9</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>26,6 %</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>4,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milević P. (157282378)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykova I. (700672457)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krpić D. (6506388639)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krstić J. (22733946700)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adžic P. (37092413700)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Đijač D. (2302308560)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borjanović L. (31967483)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamuzić J. (319677224)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popović D. (3551779991)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simić L. (54904233500)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade, Institute of Physics(1129)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutman I. (7102569638)</td>
<td>State University of Novi Pazar(105608679)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bošković-Jelišavčić L.</td>
<td>University of Belgrade(60068815)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudenrić M. (230615026)</td>
<td>University of Belgrade(60068815)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32,7 %</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>5,44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Ask for top 100 report from Serbia in your research field today - Write to l.boudova@elsevier.com
Bibliometric indicators

Impact Factor
Eigenfactor
SJR
SNIP
H-Index
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Opening question

Why is peer review a part of the scholarly publishing process?
History of peer review

- Cornerstone of the whole scholarly publication system
- Maintains integrity in the advancement of science
- Well-established process over 300 years old
Peer review

- Helps to determine the quality, validity, significance, and originality of research
- Helps to improve the quality of papers
- Publishers are outside the academic process and are not prone to prejudice or favour
- Publishers facilitate the review process by investing in online review systems and providing tools to help Editors and Reviewers
Who conducts peer review?

- Scientific experts in specific fields and topics
- Young, old, and mid-career
- Average number of completed reviews is 8 per year*
Why do reviewers review?

- Fulfil an “academic duty”
- Value from mentoring young researchers
- Enjoyment in reviewing
- General interest in the area
- Awareness of new research and developments before their peers
- Career development
- Help with own research or new ideas
- Build association with journals and Editors
- Keep updated with latest developments
- Advance given field of science
Role and tasks of reviewer

- The peer review process is based on trust
- The scientific publishing enterprise depends largely on the quality and integrity of the reviewers
- Reviewers should write reports in a collegial and constructive manner
- Reviewers should treat all manuscripts in the same manner
Online peer review systems

Online systems can handle hundreds of thousands of submissions and reviews per year.
Different Types of Peer Review

1. “Single blind” peer review – reviewer knows author, author doesn’t know reviewer
2. “Double blind” peer review – neither reviewer knows author, nor author knows reviewer
3. Open peer review - reviewer knows author, author knows reviewer

Experimental
- Post-publication peer review
  - Helyion
  - PlosOne
  - stars etc.

- Dynamic peer review (Arxiv.org, naboj.com

Comments:
1. “………” 5 star rating
2. “………” 3.5 star rating
Etc.
Different Types of Peer Review – popularity and experience
Considerations upon being asked to review

- Expertise/ competence to review the article

- Necessary amount of time
  - Reviewing can be time consuming
  - Deadline stipulated by Editor may be soon

- Conflicts of Interest
  - Examples:
    - if you work in the same department or institute as one of the authors
    - worked on a paper previously with an author
    - have a professional or financial connection to the article
Dear <Reviewer name> 

Re: <Name of journal Paper> 

I would appreciate your critical review of the enclosed manuscript that has been submitted for publication in <journal name>. <journal name> wishes to be a natural choice for the publication of original papers of high quality in a broad range of <journal subject area> research. Consequently in reviewing the manuscript do not hesitate to reject it if it is scientifically flawed, provides no new insights, merely sets out observations with no analysis or is of insufficient priority to warrant publication.

If you recommend revision, please make your comments as constructive as possible to help the authors improve their paper. Do not attempt to re-write the paper. It is the responsibility of the authors to produce a clear manuscript in correct English. Extensive editing and/or rephrasing is not your task. It is however helpful if you can mark typographical, spelling and grammatical errors on the manuscript, but this is not essential. Authors are allowed to submit only one revision and therefore your comments should be sufficiently detailed for the authors to make all necessary changes that can eventually lead to acceptance. If a revised manuscript is sent back to you the only response required will be a simple yes or no to the question, ‘Is the paper now suitable for publication’?

If the modifications you request do not necessitate the return of the manuscript please destroy it since it has been submitted in confidence. Please return the checklist and your detailed comments to me within 14 days. If you are unable to complete the review within this time, please return the manuscript to me immediately.

Thank you for your help.

Yours sincerely
Overview of Peer Review Process

• Possible reviewer recommendations
  ▪ Rejected due to poor quality, or out of scope
  ▪ Accept without revision
  ▪ Accept, but needs revision either:
    - Minor
    - Major
Overview of Peer Review Process

1. **Article Submitted**
2. **Confirmation of Receipt**
3. **Initial Decision by Editor**
   - **Reject**
   - **Decide to Review**
4. **Reviewers Assigned**
5. **Reviewers Accept Invite**
6. **Reviews Completed**
7. **Notification to Author**
   - **Revise**
   - **Accept**
   - **Reject**
8. **Revision Received**
9. **Revision Checked**
10. **Article sent to Publisher**
    - **Accept**
    - **Revise**
    - **Reject**
Conducting the Review – General Points

**Sample Review Form**

**TITLE:**

**AUTHORS:**

**REFERENCE NUMBER:**

Is the paper of sufficient originality to warrant publication in *<journal name>*?
(Papers that are scientifically flawed, provide no new insight, merely report observations without analysis or comment, are incomplete or of insufficient priority should be rejected)

Can the paper be shortened without detriment?
(If yes, please indicate in your report what can be removed)

Is the paper clearly and sensibly arranged?
(If not but is otherwise acceptable, please suggest necessary improvements in your report)

Are the analysis and conclusions a logical outcome of the data and discussion?
(If the above is not the case, please state the errors clearly in your report)

**Evaluation of originality**

**Assessment of paper’s structure**
Conducting the Review – General Points

In your judgement where does this paper lie in relation to cognate papers in primary \textit{journal subject area}?

- Top 25%
- Top 50%
- Bottom 50%
- Bottom 25%

If in the top 25% should the paper be ‘fast tracked’ for publication? [YES] [NO]

If in the bottom 25% give brief reason why it should be published in \textit{journal name}.

\underline{Recommendation} (This response form should be accompanied by detailed comments on the enclosed sheet.)

- Publish as submitted
- Publish with major revision
- Publish with minor revision
- Reject because .................................................................

Signature ................................................................. Date ..........................
Conducting the Review - Originality

- Sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication?
- Adds to the canon of knowledge?
- Answers an important research question?
- Satisfies the journal’s standards?
- Falls in the top 25% of papers in this field?
- A literature scan of review articles can help the reviewer determine originality
## Conducting the Review - Structure

Key sections are included and are laid out clearly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does it clearly describe the article?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does it reflect what was done and what the major findings were?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does it clearly state the problem being investigated and accurately describe what the author hopes to achieve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Normally, the introduction is one to two paragraphs long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does it summarize relevant research to provide context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does it explain what findings of others, if any, are being challenged or extended?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conducting the Review - Structure

Key sections are included and are laid out clearly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology
- Does it accurately explain how the data was collected?
- Is the design suitable for answering the question posed?
- Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research?
- Does the article identify the procedures followed? Are these ordered in a meaningful way?
- If the methods are new, are they explained in detail?
- Was the sampling appropriate?
- Have the equipment and materials been adequately described?
- Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded; has the author been precise in describing measurements?
Conducting the Review - Structure

Key sections are included and are laid out clearly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>• Clearly laid out and in a logical sequence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>• The appropriate analysis has been conducted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>• Are the statistics correct? If you are not comfortable with statistics advise the editor when you submit your report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>• If any interpretation has been included in this section – it should not be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Conclusion</td>
<td>• Discussion/ Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>• Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the article support or contradict previous theories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Conducting the Review - Structure

Key sections are included and are laid out clearly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>References/Previous Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>• If the article builds upon previous research does it reference that work appropriately?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>• Are there any important works that have been omitted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>• Are the references accurate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conducting the Review – Tables & Figures

- Relevant and important
- Consistency
- Color
- Caption length and appropriateness
- Figures describe the data accurately

Fig. 3. FE-SEM images of RFP-50 at 1,000×
Conducting the Review – Ethical Issues

- Plagiarism
- Fraud
- Medical ethical concerns

Profile: Hwang Woo-suk

South Korea's Hwang Woo-suk was feted as a national hero when, in 2004, his research team said it had successfully cloned a human embryo and produced stem cells from it, a technique that could one day provide cures for a range of diseases.

But allegations he used unacceptable practices to acquire eggs from human donors, then faked two landmark pieces of research into cloning human stem cells, have left his reputation in tatters.

BBC News
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Title: Structure and electrochemical properties of resorcinol-formaldehyde polymer-based carbon for electric double-layer capacitors
CARBON

Dear Ms. Jones,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are attached and should be carefully followed and answered.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript.

To submit a revision, please go to http://ees.elsevier.com/carbon/ and login as an Author.
Your username is: *****
Your password is: *****

On your Main Menu page is a folder entitled "Submissions Needing Revision". You will find your submission record there.
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Dr. Smith
Editor in Chief
CARBON

Reviewers' comments:
Editor’s Letter to Authors

Dear Ms. Jones,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are attached and should be carefully followed and answered.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript.

To submit a revision, please go to http://ees.elsevier.com/carbon/ and login as an Author.
Your username is: ******
Your password is: ******

On your Main Menu page is a folder entitled "Submissions Needing Revision". You will find your submission record there.
Response to Reviews
CARBON-D-06-00903
Title: Structure and electrochemical properties of resorcinol-formaldehyde polymer-based carbon for electric double-layer capacitors

Dear Dr. Smith and Reviewers,

Thank you very much for your consideration. We have revised the manuscript according to the comments of the reviewers. The replies are listed as follows:

Reviewer #1:

1) The curing agent must be identified before this work can be accepted for publication in Carbon. It is unacceptable that the authors left this information out of the manuscript. How do they expect other researchers to reproduce this work without this information? This should not be allowed by the Editor of Carbon.

Answer 1:

In the manuscript, we have added the name of this curing agent with blue color (please see page 3, paragraph 2, line 2).

2) Clarify in the caption of Table 2 that the capacitance values in F/g are indeed those for a single electrode as explained at the bottom of page 11.

Answer 2:

According to the reviewer’s comments, we have clarified in the caption of Table 2 that the capacitance values are for single electrode.
Structure and electrochemical properties of resorcinol–formaldehyde polymer-based carbon for electric double-layer capacitors

A. Jones, Y. Lee, R. Lopez

Southern University, Main Road, UK

Received 18 September 2006; accepted 14 March 2007
Available online 20 March 2007

Abstract

A nano-porous carbon was prepared by carbonization of a novel synthetic resorcinol–formaldehyde (RF) polymer without any additional activation process, and used as electrode materials for aqueous electric double-layer capacitors (EDLCs). This novel RF polymer-based carbon shows high specific surface area with large carbonization yield (~50%), and excellent specific dc capacitance over 200 F/g. The effect of R/CA ratio (i.e. molar ratio of resorcinol to curing agent) on the specific surface area, pore size distribution, nanostructure and electrochemical capacitance was studied, respectively. The results showed that a higher R/CA ratio yielded carbon with higher specific surface area, larger specific capacitance, and broader pore size distribution. The highest specific surface area of 825 m²/g and specific capacitance exceeding 200 F/g were found to occur at R/CA ratio of 50. The electrochemical behaviors were characterized by means of galvanostatic charging/discharging, cycle voltammetry and impedance spectroscopy. The correlation between electrochemical properties and pore structure was investigated. Due to the excellent capacitance properties, low cost and simple process, this RF polymer-derived carbon would be a promising material for EDLCs applications.

1. Introduction

Electric double-layer capacitors (EDLCs) are unique such as high specific surface area and large pore volume [5,6]. Almost any carbonaceous material can be converted into porous carbon including natural precursors (e.g.,
How to reward your best Reviewers - Reviewer Certificates
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Attracting top Authors

Peer review for Editors

Importance of applying for international indexation
The journal publishing cycle

- Solicit and manage submissions
- Manage peer review
- Edit and prepare
- Publish and disseminate
- Archive and promote use
- Production

Elsevier Publishing Campus
Growth of scholarly literature

- “This is truly the decade of the journal and one should seek to limit their number rather than to increase them, since there can be too many periodicals.”

- “It is certainly impossible for any person who wishes to devote a portion of his time to [research], to read all the books and papers that are published in connection with his pursuit; their number is immense, and the labour of winnowing out the few [of interest], is such that most persons who try […], pass by what is really good.”
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Methods of dissemination

Traditional print journals

and

Electronic journal platforms like Elsevier’s ScienceDirect improve online dissemination and access
Other methods of dissemination

Advertising-supported portals
- Journal articles
- Expert commentary
- Conference coverage

Mobile apps
- Articles feeds
- Podcasts
- Blogs

- Mendeley
- LinkedIn
- Website
- Facebook
- SlideShare
Other publishing models

Traditional publishing

- Authors publish free of charge
- Institutions or individuals subscribe to journals

Open access publishing

- Author (or institution/funding agency) pays an article publication fee
- Article is made freely available to all online
- Some journals publish exclusively open access
- Other subscription journals offer open access options
What is open access?

Free and permanent access to scholarly research combined with clear guidelines (user licenses) for users to re-use the content.

Gold open access

- After submission and peer review, an article publishing charge (APC) is payable
- Upon publication everyone can immediately and permanently access the article online

Green open access

- After submission and peer review in a subscription journal, the article is published online
- Subscribers have immediate access and the article is made open access either through author self-archiving, publisher deposit or linking.
Promoting research

Looking through researcher’s glasses

- The volume of research articles is growing at an accelerated pace
- For most researchers, it’s a real challenge to keep up with the literature
- Your job: make sure your research reaches them through many channels!

Promotion of research

- Conferences
- Newsletters
- Alerts
- **Abstracting and indexing databases**
Assessing Research Performance

The added value of abstract and indexing databases

Why?

• To gauge return on investment and to reward high performance

• Metrics include quantity and quality at various levels (researchers, journals, institutes, states, countries)

• Commissioned by government agencies, research funders, research institutes, and publishers
Abstracting and indexing databases

- Scopus
- Web of Science
- MEDLINE

- There are of course others…
One common database with different applications on top

Scopus  SciVal  Analytical Services & Custom Data  API’s

SCOPUS DATABASE

RESEARCH OUTCOMES

METRICS
What content does Scopus include?

58.3M records from 22,245 serial titles and over 94,900 books
21.6M pre 1996 records | 36.7M post 1995 records

- Content from > 5,000 publishers
- “Articles in Press” from >5,000 titles
- Titles from 105 different countries in all geographical regions
- 40 “local” languages covered
- More than 3,780 Gold Open Access journals indexed

Scopus is ideal compared to other products because it has the broadest coverage of global, curated, relevant research, with smart, simple tools to help track, analyze and visualize research.

Source: Scopus (August 2015)
Different source types to ensure coverage in all subject fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOURNALS</th>
<th>CONFERENCES</th>
<th>BOOKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences 11,591</td>
<td>22,245 peer-reviewed journals</td>
<td>521 book series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences 12,862</td>
<td>362 trade journals</td>
<td>- 28K Volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences 9,633</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 1.1M items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences 6,276</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,919 stand-alone books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Physical Sciences**: 11,591 journals
- **Health Sciences**: 12,862 journals
- **Social Sciences**: 9,633 journals
- **Life Sciences**: 6,276 journals

**JOURNALS**
- Full metadata, abstracts and cited references (ref’s post-1995 only)
- Pre-1996 cited ref’s expansion >4M out of 12M
- Going back to 1823
- Funding data from acknowledgements

**CONFERENCE**
- 85,5K events
- 7.0M records (12%)
  - Conf. expansion (2005 – 2013)
  - 1,017 conferences
  - 6,022 conf. events
  - 410K conf. papers
  - 5M citations

**BOOKS**
- Mainly Engineering and Physical Sciences
- 521 book series
- 28K Volumes
- 1.1M items
- 94,919 stand-alone books
- 765K items

Books expansion:
- 120K books by 2015
- Focus on Social Sciences and A&H

**Source:** Scopus title list (August 2015)
Ratio of titles per Publisher in Scopus

Source: Scopus title list (February 2015)
High quality journals due to selection by the independent Content Selection & Advisory Board (CSAB)

The CSAB is chosen for their expertise in specific subject areas; many have (journal) Editor experience.

Focus on quality through content selection by the independent CSAB, because:

- Provide accurate and relevant search results for users
- No dilution of search results by irrelevant or low quality content
- Support that Scopus is recognized as authoritative
- Support confidence that Scopus “reflects the truth”
Transparent Scopus selection criteria for serial content

1. **All** titles should meet **all** minimum criteria in order to be considered for Scopus review:
   - Peer-review
   - English abstracts
   - Regular publication
   - Roman script references
   - Pub. ethics statement

2. Eligible titles are reviewed by the **Content Selection & Advisory Board** according to a combination of 14 quantitative & qualitative selection criteria grouped in 5 categories:
   - Journal Policy
   - Quality of Content
   - Journal Standing
   - Regularity
   - Online Availability

3. As a primary publisher and information aggregator, Elsevier understands the needs of Authors, Editors and Publishers and provides resources to support the community:
   - Review comments from CSAB
   - FAQs
   - Publication ethics resources
   - Publishing services
   - Research Trends, Editor Update newsletters

Continuous review process using the online Scopus Title Evaluation Platform (STEP)
Info: [http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/scopus/content-overview](http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/scopus/content-overview)
Questions: titlesuggestion@scopus.com
How to keep track of your suggested title?

Via the unique Title Tracking ID journal suggestors can monitor the evaluation of their title(s): Scopus Title Suggestion Tracker
Scopus article growth over years

Source: Scopus data March 2015
Open Access (OA) Journal indicator

Re-evaluation

Identify and Evaluate Titles

Discontinue poor performing titles

Select only high quality content

Re-evaluate Titles

Index titles

- **OA in Scopus** = **Gold Open Access** and registered at [DOAJ](https://doaj.org) / [ROAD](https://road.gov.au)
- Currently: out of >21,000 journals = 4,240 OA
- OA list **updated 3-4x per year**
- Search via **Browse Sources** (journal page)
  - On **Journal level** only
  - Not present in Article Results page yet
- **Future** hopes: cover OA on **article level**

- **Annual** rolling initiative:
  - **Identify** and notify **underperforming journals**
  - One year to improve quality based on **metrics** & set **benchmarks** (output, usage, citations, self-citations)
  - If red flag remains, the journal will be reviewed by the CSAB with the possible consequence of **discontinuation** in Scopus
- **Incentive** for continuous journal performance
- Launch Q1 2015, re-evaluation to start Q1 2016
Comparison with nearest peer

Scopus

~22K titles
>5,000 publishers
Updated daily

Web of Science

~12K titles (Core Collection)
3,300 publishers
Updated weekly

Source: Web of Science Real Facts, Web of Science title list and Scopus’ own data (April 2015)
Scopus is the Gold standard: more than 150 leading research organizations rely on Scopus data
Pre-1996 cited reference expansion

Coverage years
- Pre-1996, going back to 1970

Number of articles
- Around 8M+ articles will be reprocessed to include cited references. In addition around 4M pre-1996 articles will be backfilled

Scope
- Archives from major publishers with available digital archives

Already 4.4M pre-1996 documents loaded in Scopus leading to additional 84.8M cited references:

H-index for senior researchers increases:

2015 processing planning:

Source: Scopus (August 2015)
Books expansion program

Coverage years
- Back to 2005 (2003 for A&H)

Number of books
- 120,000 by the end of 2015; at least 20,000 each year thereafter

Book types
- Monographs, edited volumes, major reference works, graduate level text books

Books target in Scopus
Actual books in Scopus

Document Type
- Book Chapter (621,023)
- Book (94,919)

(plus ± 26K book Volumes from series)

All major publishing houses are part of the Books expansion program, adding up to a total of ±40 publishers who are contributing
Evaluation & Selection

- Qualitative and quantitative factors:
  - Timeliness of Publication
  - Citation activity

- Other Factors:
  - Acknowledgement of Grant Support
  - International scope
  - Citation data for authors and editorial team

- No single factor considered in isolation

- Combination / Interrelation of data towards evaluation by subject editor (information scientist with background in the field)
How important is the Impact Factor (IF)?

- It indicates how many times the more recent papers in a journal are cited on average in a given year.
- It is influenced by editorial policies of journals.
- It is inflated by counting citations to non-source items (editorials, letters, news items, book reviews, abstracts, etc).
- It varies by field and the turnover of research in that field.
- It varies by the types of papers published.

**IF year x =** cites in year x to source items published in years x-1 and x-2
number of source items published in years x-1 and x-2
Influences on the IF: Subject Category

- Multidisciplinary
- Biochemistry, Genetics & Molecular Biology
- Neuroscience
- Immunology & Microbiology
- Chemistry
- Pharmacology, Toxicology & Pharmaceutics
- Medicine
- Chemical Engineering
- Environmental Science
- Agricultural & Biological Sciences
- Psychology
- Earth & Planetary Science
- Materials Science
- Physics & Astronomy
- Nursing
- Health Professions
- Energy
- Computer Science
- Veterinary
- Engineering
- Mathematics
- Economics, Econometrics & Finance
- Social Sciences
- Business, Management & Accounting
- Arts & Humanities
Elsevier’s philosophy on the IF

“Elsevier uses the Impact Factor as one of a number of performance indicators for journals. It acknowledges the many caveats associated with its use and strives to share best practice with its authors, editors, readers and other stakeholders in scholarly communication. Elsevier seeks clarity and openness in all communications relating to the IF and does not condone the practice of manipulation of the IF for its own sake.”
Medline – National Library of Medicine

~5,500 journals in:
• Biomedical Science
• Life Science (including Veterinary Science)
• Allied Health (including Nursing and Psychology)

Portal for free access to MEDLINE (IM & PMC)

Free access to articles in participating journals and NIH-funded articles in all other journals
What is indexed

MEDLINE

Model of interactions in biology and application to heterogeneous network in yeast

Serge Smidtas, Anastasia Yartseva, Vincent Schächter, François Képès

Abstract

A major challenge for bioinformatics and theoretical biology is to build and analyze a unified model of biological knowledge resulting from high-throughput experiment data. Former work analyzed heterogeneous data (protein–protein interactions, genetic regulation, metabolism, synexpression) by modelling them by graphs. These models are unable to represent the qualitative dynamics of the reactions or to model the n-ary interactions. Here, MIB, the Model of Interactions in Biology, a bipartite model of biological networks, is presented. It models the interactions n-aires, responsible for the dynamics of whole biological system. To cite this article: S. Smidtas et al., C. R. Biologies 329 (2006).

Résumé

Modèle de réseaux d'interactions biologiques. Un défi important pour la bioinformatique et la théorie biologique est de construire un modèle unifié qui intègre de nombreuses connaissances biologiques, issues notamment d'expériences haut débit, et qui permette leur analyse. Des travaux antérieurs ont analysé des données hétérogènes (interactions protéiques, régulation génétique, métabolisme, synexpression), en les modélisant par des graphes. Toutefois, ces modèles ne sont capables ni de représenter la dynamique qualitative des réactions biochimiques, ni de modéliser les interactions n-aires. Un modèle bipartite des réseaux hétérogènes MIB (modèle d'interactions biologiques), est présenté et illustré par les résultats d'analyses de boucles régulatrices hétérogènes ainsi que des mécanismes moléculaires sous-jacents à la synexpression des gènes. Pour citer cet article : S. Smidtas et al., C. R. Biologies 329 (2006).

Keywords: Formal model; Biological network; Heterogeneous data

Mots-clés: Modèle formel ; Réseau biologique ; Données hétérogènes

© 2006 Académie des sciences. Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.
Model of interactions in biology and application to heterogeneous network in yeast.

Smidtas S, Yartseva A, Schachter V, Kepes F.

Genoscope and CNRS UMR 8030, 91057 Evry cedex, France. sergi@sergi5.com

A major challenge for bioinformatics and theoretical biology is to build and analyze a unified model of biological knowledge resulting from high-throughput experiment data. Former work analyzed heterogeneous data (protein-protein interactions, genetic regulation, metabolism, synexpression) by modelling them by graphs. These models are unable to represent the qualitative dynamics of the reactions or to model the n-ary interactions. Here, MIB, the Model of Interactions in Biology, a bipartite model of biological networks, is introduced, and its use for topological analysis of the heterogeneous network is presented. Heterogeneous loops and links between synexpression pattern and underlying molecular mechanisms are proposed.

PMID: 17126798 [PubMed - in process]
Requirements for indexation
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- Peer-reviewed
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- International authors/editors
- Clear aims and scope
- Acknowledge funding sources
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- Offer something unique
Content types

- Reports of original research
- Original clinical observations accompanied by analysis and discussion
- Analysis of philosophical, ethical, or social aspects of the health professions or biomedical sciences
- Critical reviews
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- Very strict with peer review process (digital era, ease of plagiarism, gossip)
- Innovate
- Use bibliometric data – everything is available!
- Editor is the best ambassador of the journal
Elsevier Publishing Campus

Packed with free online lectures and interactive courses, together with expert advice and resources to help on your way to publishing a world-class book or journal article.

College of Skills Training
Boost your publishing skills in journals and books

College of Big Ideas
Discuss trending topics in publishing and academia

College of Networking
Make the most of every opportunity

College of Research Solutions
Training for effective and efficient research skills

College of Career Planning
Get ahead in your academic career

College of Recommended Organizations
Reach your potential with support from global resources

publishingcampus.com
Thank you

Elsevier Publishing Campus
www.publishingcampus.com

Information for editors
www.elsevier.com/editors

Contact me:
l.boudova@elsevier.com