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Overview

Part Two

- The importance of research *communicated*
- Submission
- Peer review & peer reviewers
- The decision
- Page proofs
- Publication
- Post publication opportunities
Research defined includes research communicated

“A formal procedure which contributes to the expansion of basic knowledge or applies such knowledge to the solution of problems in society or exemplifies creative expression in a specific field of study. The results of research are communicated to professionals outside the University through a peer review process in a manner appropriate to the discipline.”^1
Before submission

- Read the journal’s Instructions for Authors
- Still have questions?
  - Author rights
  - Citation style
  - Instructions for preparing figures and tables, inc. color vs. grayscale
  - How to ‘blind’ your manuscript, if that is required
  - Opportunities to include supplemental files (e.g., images, data, video)
  - Expected turnaround time
  - Expected time to publication
- Ask the editor whatever is not covered or still unclear to you
Peer-reviewed journals

- One that uses individuals with the professional expertise to evaluate a manuscript. These experts are selected by the journal staff in accordance with the expertise needed or are composed of a pre-established group of reviewers. The decision on the manuscript is based on a minimum of three reviews, and the ultimate responsibility for the decision on the manuscript is with the editor. The editor also routinely shares with the author the reasons for rejected and the reviewers’ comments.

- One that has a portion of submitted manuscripts evaluated by someone other than the editor of the journal.

- Refereed journal: not a precise term, but rather covers a continuum of peer-controlled quality assessment that reaches its most strict definition with double-blind peer review by several scholars who work in the research area, and minimal ability of the editor to override clear decisions by the peer reviewers on which articles are appropriate for a given journal.³
Reviewers, a.k.a. Referees

- Typically nonpaid members of an editorial board, a diverse roster of experts
  - Well-versed in the professional literature
  - With solid research skills of their own
  - With a strong interest in the work (and time to pursue it)
  - Who as a group are from diverse geographic regions with diverse responsibilities (educators, practitioners) and diverse areas of expertise
Reviewers – What they do

- Agree to review manuscripts as assigned (within a given quantity per year)
- By a deadline (for example, 4 weeks from date of assignment)
- Maintain anonymity (double-blind)
- Write reviews based on the journal’s guidelines
Peer review: definitions

- Review of a manuscript by someone other than the editor
- The expert assessment of articles for publication
Common Criteria

- Scope (appropriateness to readership)
- Content (quality of writing, documentation, soundness of research methodology, analysis)
- Organization and presentation (including illustrations, tables, and figures)
- Bibliography (timeliness & coverage)
- Value (is it a useful contribution to the literature?)

\(^4\)
A well done review ...

- Thoroughly addresses/answers the criteria just mentioned
- Provides comments on both strengths and weaknesses
- Addresses copy editing problems if necessary (typos, punctuation, grammar) without letting this ‘take over’ the review
The Decision

- An editor’s role
- Rejection decisions
  - Potentially correctable: Reject & resubmit
    - Resubmission goes back out to reviewers
  - Not correctable: Reject
- Accept decisions
  - As is
  - Pending minor revision
  - Pending major revision
Request for revisions

■ Don’t let a reject & resubmit decision stop you from revising your work
■ Do address each concern expressed by a reviewer
■ Remember that there will likely be more than one way to do that
■ Decisions that require revision may come with timelines, e.g., 30 days for minor, 90 for major, etc.
Publication: Final mile-markers

- Page proofs through a galley correction system
- Early release of version of record with DOI: accepted, peer reviewed articles that are not yet assigned to a journal issue, e.g.,
  - Elsevier’s “Articles in Press” for LISR
  - Taylor & Francis’ “Latest Articles” for CCQ
Post Publication Opportunities

- Share, share, share
  - Within your organization
  - To community outside your organization (social media, lists, etc.)
  - Distribute whatever you are given in the way of complimentary downloads, etc. (formerly ‘reprints’)

- If permitted, deposit the appropriate version with the appropriate attribution to your IR

- Track your article’s views, citations, and social media metrics available from the publisher and/or your IR
Notes


2. Taylor & Francis enacted new author rights policies for their Library and Information Science journals on November 1, 2011. They are available at https://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/publishing-open-access/zero-embargo-green-open-access/


4. See examples of reviewer forms at “Peer review and reviewers,” Library & Information Science Editors website, http://www.lis-editors.org/resources/peer_review/.

5. The Altmetric image was captured on March 19, 2019 from https://www.altmetric.com/about-us/logos/
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