“Getting published in an international journal" from the perspectives of Editors and Publishers
Panellists

- Neven Duic, Editor, *Energy Conversion and Management* & Subject Editor, *Energy*

- Soteris Kalogirou, Editor-in-Chief, *Renewable Energy*

- Jiří Jaromír Klemeš, Co-Editor-in-Chief, *Journal of Cleaner Production*

- Eleonora Riva Sanseverino, Editor UNIPA SPRINGER series, Guest Editor *Energies*

Moderator

- Adam Fraser, Senior Publisher, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Journals, Elsevier
The role of a publisher (me)

- A.k.a. “publishing editor” or “journal publishing manager”
- Focus on a particular, but quite broad subject area
- Oversee editorial office, submission system, production of journal, distribution, legal issues, ethics issues, recruitment, outreach budgeting & payments, contracts etc.
- **No hands-on work on peer review**
- Editorial independence
What to expect when you try to publish…

Most scientists regarded the new streamlined peer-review process as “quite an improvement.”

By Nick D. Kim, PhD
“Typical” peer-review process

1. Author submits article to journal
2. Journal Editor screens paper
3. Reviewer: makes revisions
4. Editor: assessment of reviews
5. Accepted: no revisions required
6. Rejected: after screening

More options: Rejected or Accepted requiring revisions.
Read The ‘Guide for Authors’ and the Aims and Scope

• Find it on the journal homepage of the publisher

• Editors do not like wasting time on poorly prepared manuscripts

• Each journal can have unique, or specific requirements (e.g. about reporting of data, word length etc)

• Submitting to an incorrect journal costs you time, and effort, think carefully and then submit!
The main forms of peer review

- **Single or double blind peer review**
  - Varies massively across disciplines
  - Single most common

- **“Sound science” peer review**
  - PLOS One, Heliyon, Frontiers, etc

- **Pre-publication or post-publication**
  - Pre-pub: vast, vast majority
  - Post-pub: e.g. F1000, Copernicus
References and further reading


• 7 tips for dealing with reviewer comments. ECR2STAR. http://ecr2star.org/blog/2013/10/15/7-secrets-for-dealing-with-reviewer-comments


Getting the slides

Search for “Researcher Academy Elsevier Workshop” or
www.researcheracademy.com

Enter this code: SRKXFI
How to write a research paper that gets through prescreening?

Prof.dr.sc. Neven Duić
Editor – Energy Conversion and Management, Q1, IF = 6.377
Subject Editor – Energy, Q1, IF = 4.968
Editorial Board – Applied Energy, Q1, IF = 7.900
Regional Editorial Board – Thermal Science, Q3, IF = 1.093
Editor-in-Chief – JSDEWES, Scopus Q2, CiteScore 1.10
Prescreening

• Did you check the journal **scope**?
• Did you actually read the journal **guidelines**?
• Did you **structure** it properly? IMRAD?
• What is the **hypothesis**? Is it unique and **novel**? Did you actually prove it in the paper?
• Did you check for **similarity**?
• Can your **English** be easily understood?
Ethics in publishing

Professor Soteris Kalogirou
Cyprus University of Technology
Editor-in-Chief – Renewable Energy journal
Important things to note:

• Do not copy parts from other papers.
  – Plagiarism is a scientifically wrong behavior.
  – Similarity is now checked as part of the initial screening and papers are rejected automatically because of that-including even own papers.

• Cite properly material taken from other papers.

• Cite equations taken from other sources not derived by the authors.
  – This does not apply to standard well-known relations.

• A usual cause of problems is self-plagiarism – usually involving papers initially presented in conferences.
Similarity check

• All papers pass through similarity check.
• The tool used is ithenticate which compares the paper with millions of other published sources.
• Usually single words and bibliography are excluded.
• The tool does not compare equations, tables and figures.
• The interpretation of results is responsibility of the Editor.
• Some examples.....
Example 1 – no problem
Example 2 – problematic case
A submitted paper with a high similarity percentage does not mean that the author has intended to copy work. For example, re-use of standard phrases within a subject area may give an article a high percentage match when there is a valid reason for the sections of text being the same or similar to other published work.
Sometimes small similarity but in crucial area of the paper....
Plagiarism

• Very serious accusation affecting the academic career of the researcher/academic.

• For this reason we must be very careful.
This article has been retracted: please see Elsevier Policy on Article Withdrawal (http://www.elsevier.com/locate/withdrawalpolicy).

This article has been retracted at the request of the Editor-in-Chief.

This article plagiarizes previously published material and used confidential data without permission. Considerable parts of the paper have been taken directly from BOTEC Solar.
The problem of self-plagiarism

• Usually apply for papers initially presented in conferences and with little or no change they are submitted to journals.
  – These are usually not identified by ithenticate unless proceedings are published internationally but as the reviewers are experts in the field usually they were present at the conference.

• Not as serious as plagiarism – coping materials from other people and claim it as yours

• Still problematic because:
  – Originality is questioned
  – Avoid retraction possibility in the future – many times people reading papers in a specific area come across the similar papers – usually published in different journals and they ask for measures.
  – In this case retraction is the only possibility....
One example:
Other areas of ethical problems

• Using inappropriate data
  – In one case one paper was using data from a real system from 2010-2016, but the system was put in operation in mid-2016.

• Authorship problems
  – Authors added or subtracted between resubmissions
  – Both publisher and the editor/s are against “gift-authorship”
  – Usually problems between supervisors and students

• Salami publishing
  – Basically the same paper published with minor additions, not necessarily of high similarity – attempt to increase the number of papers

• Submission of the same paper in two different journals
  – Impossible for the tool to identify similarity....

• Cases where similarity is low but most of the tables and figures are the same.
Ethical problems related to the review process

• Reviewers asking authors to cite their papers
  – Most of the times the papers are irrelevant to the paper under evaluation.
  – Sometimes it is very difficult to identify in the review comments – many tricks are used.
  – We send a warning letter to such reviewers – and removed if this behaviour is repeated.

• Preparation of a discussion paper just to reduce the credit of an author or to publish even in this way a “paper”.
Thank you for your attention.....

I will be happy to answer any questions.....

Professor Soteris Kalogirou

Emails:
 soteris.Kalogirou@cut.ac.cy
 Rene-editor@cut.ac.cy
Peer Review

• One of the main outputs of research work.
• Important to maintain the integrity of science by filtering out invalid or poor-quality papers
• R-index (Logan 2014)
• There can be various R-indices: R-factor, R 5 - over 5 years, R 2 - over two years and R 1 - over a calendar or running year
• The quality of content is not captured by quantitative measures
• Poor reviewers usually do not get re-invited, delay reviewing process
Peer Review Process

Peer review

...is critical because it
- Improves the quality of the published paper
- Ensures previous work is acknowledged
- Determines the importance of findings
- Detects plagiarism and fraud
- Plays a central role in academic career development

...adheres to the principles that
- It is a well understood concept
- Without it there is no control in scientific communication
- Journal editors evaluate and reject certain articles prior to external peer review

Why should you review?

Yes! Novelty
- Clear research gaps
- Clear scope
- Concise abstract
- Clear conclusion
- Presentation and structure
- Scientific English
- Formatting
- Similarity check

Editors' view: what makes a good reviewer?
- Provides a thorough and comprehensive report
- Submits the report on time
- Provides well-founded comments for authors
- Gives constructive criticism
- Demonstrates objectivity
- Provides a clear recommendation to the editor

Elsevier Publishing Campus
Reviewer Recognition Platform

My Elsevier Reviews Profile BETA

Peer review is the cornerstone of science, and Elsevier is dedicated to supporting and recognizing our journals’ reviewers. My Elsevier Reviews Profile aims to create a standard way of recording and acknowledging your efforts.

Outstanding reviewer
Journal of Cleaner Production

Achieved: October 2016
You have been awarded this recognition as you are within the top 10th percentile of reviewers for the Journal, in terms of the number of manuscript reviews completed in the last two years. For Journal of Cleaner Production, this meant a minimum of 8 manuscript reviews in two years.

Download your certificate

Review Record

![Graph showing review record over time]
### Publication and review record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media mentions</th>
<th>h-index</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5,229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Media mentions** powered by NewsFla
- **h-index** powered by Scopus
- **Citations** powered by Scopus
- **Readers** powered by Mendeley
- **Views** powered by ScienceDirect

#### Reviewed Publications

1. **Private**
   - *A carbon emission evaluation model for a container terminal*
     - Sim, J
     - *Journal of Cleaner Production* (2018)
   - 8 Readers
   - 0 Citations
   - View stats

2. **Private**
   - *A comparative Life Cycle Assessment between organic and conventional barley cultivation for sustainable agriculture pathways*
     - *Journal of Cleaner Production* (2018)
   - 23 Readers
   - 2 Citations
   - View stats

3. **Private**
   - *A critical review of the life cycle assessment studies on solid waste management in Asian countries*
     - Vidyasagar, S
     - *Journal of Cleaner Production* (2018)
   - 33 Readers
   - 2 Citations
   - View stats

4. **Private**
   - *A novel HAZOP approach for literature review on biomass supply chain optimisation model*
     - Lim C, Lou H, Ng W
   - 14 Readers
   - 1 Citations
   - View stats
Reviewer Recognition Platform

Speed up research by harnessing the power of peer review

• Reviewer profile and merits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWS</th>
<th>RECENT REVIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1090</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWS (AVERAGE PER YEAR)</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPENNESS</th>
<th>REVIEW TO PUBLICATION RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.3:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-index
Reviewer Recognition Platform

Speed up research by harnessing the power of peer review

• Peer review awards
• Statistics/ranking (by field of study, by country, by institution etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RESEARCHER</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th># VERIFIED REVIEWS</th>
<th># REVIEWS LAST 12 MONTHS</th>
<th># VERIFIED EDITORIAL RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jiří Jaromír Klimeš</td>
<td>Brno University of Technology</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peter S Abev Varbanov</td>
<td>Brno University of Technology</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Timothy G. Walkinsley</td>
<td>Brno University of Technology</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yee Fan Van</td>
<td>Brno University of Technology</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vaclav Kasicka</td>
<td>Institute of Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry of Th...</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bestoun S. Ahmed</td>
<td>Czech Technical University in Prague</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dan Wichterle</td>
<td>IKEM, Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Milan Jirasek</td>
<td>Czech Technical University in Prague</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ondrej Kreyčar</td>
<td>University of Hradec Králové</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Xuesiu Jia</td>
<td>Brno University of Technology</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kamill Kuca</td>
<td>University of Hradec Králové</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Manlio Vinciguerra</td>
<td>Masaryk University</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Xuanchao Wang</td>
<td>Brno University of Technology</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Libor M. Hlaváč</td>
<td>VŠB - Technical University of Ostrava</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now that we have seen the reviewers viewpoint.... What if I am reviewed?

Acknowledge and appreciate suggestions and contribution from reviewers

If you have been unclear, admit it and apologize

It is necessary to agree on everything - but if you disagree, try to make a convincing point!

Back up disagreement with reference to the data ("in theory, yes; in practice, no..."")

Remind about widely accepted conceptualizations and remind current state of the art
Now that we have seen the reviewers viewpoint.... What if I am reviewed? (2)

Remind reviewers about the existence of diverging – but equally legitimate – theoretical perspectives.

Give reviewers “extra treats” – additional tables, analyses, discussions, etc... not included in the manuscript – that give them extraordinary insight into the methodology.

Explore all the literature they refer to and try to find a way to USE the literature they suggest. Do not just cite it!

Show how their comments pushed you to collect extra data, question your interpretations, apply other analytical methods.

Emphasize reviewers’ appreciation. Remind the editor and the other reviewers about the good things they saw in your paper.
Getting the slides

Search for “Researcher Academy Elsevier Workshop” or

www.researcheracademy.com

Enter this code: SRKXFI