

Notes for Editors leading the workshop for Authors and Referees, IAU Beijing August 2012

Timetable:

10:00 Registration

10:30 Session A: Writing a good paper

12:30 Lunch

14:15 Session B: Submitting to a journal and the review process

15:30 General questions and answers with the Editors.

Information

To fit in with the IAU timetable the workshop has been split into two sessions, A and B. Session A will run from 10:30 - 12:30, followed by Lunch. Session B will begin around 14:15 (or earlier if possible) and finish at 15:30 with an open question and answer session with the Editors.

Any examples used in the presentation are not meant to favour any journal above another; they have been added depending on the examples used previously by the authors of the original source presentations.

Please thank Paula Szkody, PASP and James Wicker, RAA for their contributions to this presentation and staff at IOP.

Any typos or errors are the responsibility of the person who consolidated the information, Nicola Gulley!

Session A: Writing a good paper (total time ~ 2 hours)

Approximate running times for slides

Slides 1- 2:	5 minutes
Slide 3:	10 – 15 minutes
Slides 4 – 6:	25 minutes
Slides 6 – 10:	25 minutes
Slides 10 – 46:	40 minutes

Slide 3 **** Audience Participation ****

To kick off this session the workshop leaders and other workshop staff should introduce themselves and say what they do. Also ask the participants to introduce themselves to their neighbours (whoever they are sat next to). Allow 10 – 15 mins for this.

Slide 6 **** Audience Participation ****

Get the participants to talk in groups of 2, 3 or 4 about what sort of things they consider or think they should consider before writing a paper. Allow about 20 mins total for this.

Slide 8

What is important to note here is that different approaches work for different people and you will need to find what works best for you but some of the guidelines and tips we present here will help you to ensure that you are considering all of the key points.

Slide 10 ** Audience Participation ******

Allow about 20 mins for discussion to get the participants thinking about this before going on to explain in more detail.

**** Should be around 11:15 by this point ****

Slide 11

What counts as a major advance and what is incremental? For example 10 objects to a previous survey of 150 is not a major new result. Finding one new Algol system or quasar is not major unless there is some peculiarity or modelling that advances the field.

Slide 13

Talk through why each of these is important

Slides 19 – 22

Suggest they look at the four different abstract and assess what is good and not so good about them. Depending on time could get them to read through these and discuss for 10 mins but I have not factored this into the timing.

Notes from Paula to accompany the PASP abstracts: Two of them match the titles that you have in your example (absao.tiff,absnsv.tiff) and the 3rd is one I use to give an example of too much detail about lines (abslines.tiff). I show absao as an example of one with too little info, absnsv is a good one and the lines one is good except for the detail. I usually give the class a chance to read each one and comment on what is good and not so good with each.

Slides 23 – 38 outline the introduction and the different approaches for computational, observational or experimental work, moving through to the Results, Discussions and conclusions and finishing with References and Figures and Tables.

Slides 39 – 40 look at how to get feedback and provide a summary table of what to consider in preparing your manuscript.

Slide 41 is blank – depending on time this is a possible break point for lunch. If there is still time left can cover the next section on Common Errors in language.

Slide 42 Some Common Errors

It may be worth pointing out that these are common mistakes from both native and non-native English speakers.

Slide 44 there are a few examples of abbreviations such as WWF (World Wild Life Fund or World Wrestling Federation); CCTV (Closed circuit TV or a Chinese television network); STM (Science, Technology and Medical publishing or Scanning Tunnel Microscopy).

Slides 45 – 47 have more examples of common errors. If finishing here before lunch perhaps suggest they discuss the differences and any difficulties they have encountered themselves or if this is after lunch in Session B maybe spend 15 mins discussing in groups.

Slide 48 is blank as this is where session A must end if before lunch. If the Common Errors are picked up in Session B then ignore this.

Session B: Submitting to a journal and the peer review process (total time ~ 45 minutes – 1 hour)

Slide 49 ** Audience Participation ******

If this is where session B starts after lunch it might be a good idea to kick off with some warm up questions covering some of the key points from the morning, possibly get them working together again in groups for about 10 – 15 mins?

For example:

Q. What do you need to consider before writing a research article?

A. Audience, Do you have original results to report to your peers?

What should the format of the article be? Do you have all of the references?

Which journal do you want to publish in and do you understand their submission procedures?

Do you understand the process and requirements? E.g. do you need specific permissions to publish figures?

Q. What structure should all articles have?

A. Title/Abstract/Intro/ Method/ Results/ Discussion/ Conclusion

Q. Why are the Title and Abstract so important?

A. Generally most read; indexed; most visible; first introduction to paper etc.,.

Slide 50 is an example of good journals but not the right subject areas and is useful to kick off the discussion around why it is important to choose the right journal!

Slides 51 – 53 cover choosing a journal and things to consider before you submit your article

Slide 54 covers submitting your paper and details you need to provide.

Slide 55 covers ethics to consider when writing and is a good opportunity to talk about plagiarism etc.

Slide 56 covers copyright. Many publishers will ask for copyright to be transferred to them. This enables them to defend your work in cases of plagiarism, allow them to update formats in the future and distribute your work.

Creative commons is not copyright replacement. Copyright stays with the copyright owner, creative commons licences outline what the USER can do with the content not what the owner can do. Please note that the most open licence, which is generally recommended by many funders, is called creative commons attribution or cc-by. This allows a user to reuse your content in any way provided they cite the original source.

Slide 57 The review process and what to expect.

This is the section where there is more variation by journal and more opportunities to talk specifically about different journals perhaps?

Slides 58 – 61 outline the peer review process and explain a bit more about what it is.

Slides 62 and 63 outline briefly what the referee will be asked to assess in the paper.

Slides 64 – 66 cover the publication decision, responding to referees and what to do if your paper is rejected.

Slide 67 is a well know cartoon of the peer review process and usually gets a laugh. I was once asked if I was the figure right at the end with the scythe!

Slides 69 – 72 focus on how to be a reviewer, what is required and what to do or not to do.

Slide 73 is a reminder of what is on the USB they have

Slide 74 is the final slide but **Slide 75** has some useful links if you want to show them or discuss.

This session can then run on to general questions and answers and can either finish by 16:00 or go through till 18:00.

The end.