In this next module, I'm going to give you an overview of the submission process.,In the three modules that follow, I will interview longtime journal editors who will give you more information about the publication process.,So I'll just set it up for you here, and then you can listen to them for more advice and tips.,So how does the submission process work?,The 1st thing you should do, even before you start writing your manuscript, you should identify the journal where you're going to be submitting to.,And that is a whole art in itself.,You need to spend some time thinking about what's the appropriate journal.,You have to figure out who is the audience that's going to care about my data?,And it may not be the most prestigious journal.,It may be more of a niche journal.,If you're junior, talk to some more senior people about what journal is really appropriate for your submission.,You want to aim high, but be realistic about where your paper belongs.,The 2nd step is to go online and look at the online instructions for authors of the journal you are targeting.,Journals give you detailed tips for how to write informat the manuscript.,How many references are allowed? How should those references be formatted?,How should tables and figures be formatted?,It's critical to follow these instructions as you write up your manuscript.,Then, once you've written your paper and all of your co authors have signed off on it, if you are the corresponding author, then you are going to be the one submitting the manuscript online.,Online submission is wonderful. Way back when, when I was a graduate student, we still had to photocopy the papers and put them in an envelope and nail them to the journal in snail mail.,Months later, you'd get a letter back In snail mail.,It was a much less efficient process.,Nowadays, the online submision process has streamlined everything it does.,Usually take a couple of hours to enter all the information online.,So just be aware that it still takes some time and thought to submit the manuscript. You also need to collect conflict of interest and copyright forms with signatures from all your authors, and this can take some time.,Such as factor that in as well.,Once you've submitted your manuscript, you may hear from the editor rather quickly if the editor decides to reject the paper outright?,Maybe you shot too high, or it's just not a topic of interest to the journal,, so the paper is not even sent for review, barring that, ,assuming your manuscript goes out for review, then it usually takes at least a few weeks before you hear back, and your paper is going to be put in one of four categories.,You might get the paper accepted outright with no changes.,That hardly ever happens. Almost never.,Uh. You could also get the paper accepted pending some minor revisions.,This is an extremely positive outcome that does occasionally occur, but it's also rare.,Most papers that are eventually published in journals go through the 3rd category rejected.,But resubmission possible, also called revise and resubmit the 1st time you get a revise and re submit letter, it sounds terrible.,The letter basically says that your paper has been rejected, so it sounds like a rejection,, but you have to read the fine print, because if they are inviting you to revise and resubmit, that's actually a positive outcome.,That means that the editor believes your paper will likely be publishable.,If you can address the concerns of the reviewers, ,journal editors actually want you to have to go through a round of revision to make sure that the paper has been thoroughly vetted and that the paper is as good as it can be.,So that's really what you're aiming for when you submit an original research manuscript.,You're aiming for that reject, but re submit category, and then finally, you may get an outright rejection.,This means that you will have to try submitting elsewhere.,Now you're going to be tempted to just send it elsewhere as is without addressing the reviewer's comments.,But don't do that. Make sure that you read through those reviewers comments, even though you don't have to respond to them. because if you send it somewhere else, the same problems are just going to pop up again.,Use the feedback to make the paper better and increase your chances of getting it published elsewhere.,If you get in that Revise and Resubit category, you're going to have to submit a cover letter that addresses the reviewers critiques, point by point.,I'll go over this in just a minute.,And then hopefully your paper will get accepted.,Congratulations. Once it's accepted, the last step is that you will have to review the final proofs from the journal.,They will form out the paper in journal style, and then send you the proofs.,Make sure you look at those carefully, because it is almost always the case that small errors get introduced in that formatting and layout process, and you want to catch those.,Ive also caught just silly mistakes in the proofs and managed to catch them before they went to publication.,So make sure you review those proofs carefully.,Again. The revise and resimit categories sounds pretty bad When you 1st read the letter from the editor, it sounds very negative.,The 1st paper I ever,submitted as a graduate student, I got this letter back in snail mail.,It said The paper was rejected.,And I was like, oh, I guess my paper was rejected.,But I showed the letter to somebody more senior, and they said, no, no, no, no no.,This is actually a good outcome.,Because if you read further in the letter, it says that they are allowing you to revise and res a bit.,This is the outcome you're actually shooting for with that initial submission.,But it feels negatively. Will say something like, your manuscript is not acceptable for publication.,But if you keep reading it'll say something like, if you feel that you can suitably address the reviewers comments, then I invite you to revise and resimit your manuscript that's positive.,That means they're interested in the paper, so don't be discouraged by the negative tone these letters usually have.,This is actually a positive outcome.,If you are asked to revise and resmit, you are going to prepare detailed point by point responses to the reviewers. You'll want to be polite and appreciative.,As I'm showing you in the example here, you would say, dear editor, we appreciate your helpful comments and those of the reviewers.,We feel that the manuscript is now greatly improved.,You want to be polite, because the review process is meant to make your paper better.,And ultimately, you believe it does make your paper better.,When you get that 1st of criticisms from the reviewers, it won't be your 1st instinct to be polite and courteous and to thank the reviewers.,Most of us respond to criticisms defensively.,It's everybody's natural instinct, when you get a bunch of criticisms about your paper, to get defensive.,But you need to get over that defensiveness as fast as you can and use the reviewers feedback to improve your paper.,The funny thing is, reviewers don't always hit the problem on the head.,Sometimes they are off the mark.,That is, they don't quite identify the flaw in your paper correctly.,They get it wrong. But what's really interesting is, even when they get it wrong, they usually identify some other flock, e.g.,a reviewer might think you did your analysis wrong, but it's not that you did your analysis wrong, it's just that you explained it poorly.,You weren't clear in your writing.,Even when the reviewers don't pinpoint the problem quite right, they usually get somewhere in the vicinity.,By them raising an issue, it leads you to find something that was wrong in the paper that needs to be fixed.,I had a situation with one paper where we screwed up on the numbering of some references, ,and the way that was found is one of the reviewers was talking about the background literature, and they had the literature mixed up.,And my 1st instinct was to say, well, this reviewer just doesn't know the literature.,They're ignorant. They don't know what they're talking about.,But then when I looked more carefully, what I realized is that they were quoting the literature wrong because we had numbered our references wrong.,The reason they were miscoding a particular paper is because we had attributed a fact to the wrong paper through our mis numbering. So even though they didn't identify the actual mistake we had, it led me to finding that mistake and thankfully fixing it before it went to publication.,Its human nature to react to criticism defensively, ,but the faster you can see the reviewers critiques as an opportunity to learn and to improve your paper, the easier your life is going to be.,In fact, I think this is one of the life skills that, if you can master, it is absolutely essential to success.,For any type of criticism you receive, the faster you can separate yourself from the criticisms, ,not take them personally, not take them as a critique of you as a person, but change your perspective and view it as an opportunity to improve and learn.,The better off you're going to be.,By the time you respond to the reviewers in a formal cover letter, hopefully you will see how they have helped your paper.,So be polite and acknowledge that help.,You need to then address each comment point by point, with numbers, e.g.,Reviewer one said, there's little discussion of X, respond very specifically.,We agree with Reviewers one and maybe Reviewer two that the section on X was two abbreviated.,Therefore we have added a paragraph that highlights this, and then you point out the exact location of that specific paragraph.,You don't need to make every change the reviewers ask for, but if it's something small and inconsequential, just make the change.,If it's a change that you disagree with, and you think the reviewers,got it wrong, which certainly happens, then just explain to the reviewer why you're not making that change, but give a thoughtful,and respectful response to each specific comment.,Most journals also want you to include a copy of the paper with the changes tracked.,This is helpful for editors and reviewers, so they can go back and see exactly where you made those changes.,When I'm reviewing a paper, I like to verify that the authors actually did make the changes I requested.,So track changes is helpful, and it's required by many journals. Finally, as I was preparing these lectures, I was looking at this book, guidebook to Better Medical Writing.,And he said something interesting in it.,He didn't have a citation for this, so I'm not sure where this statistic came from, but it resonates with me.,He says, about 60% of reviewers criticisms pertain to the quality of the writing or the tables and graphs, and only about 40% pertain to the quality of the scientific work.,This just reinforces the point of this course, to get published.,Good writing and good data presentation are key.,Again, I don't know where he got those numbers from, ,but I would say that it's true for me that more than half of the time when I'm reviewing papers, ,more than half of my comments have to do with writing and presentation, rather than with method logic problems in the science.

在下一个模块中，我将向你概述提交过程。在接下来的三个模块中，我将采访长期的期刊编辑，他们将为您提供有关出版过程的更多信息。所以，我就在这里为你设置好然后你可以听他们讲更多的建议和小贴士。那么，提交流程是如何运作的？你应该做的第一件事，甚至在你开始撰写稿件之前，你就应该确定要投稿到哪个期刊。这本身就是一门完整的艺术。你需要花点时间思考什么是合适的期刊。你必须弄清楚谁是会关心我的数据的受众，而这可能不是最负盛名的期刊。它可能更像是一本利基期刊。如果你是大三学生，可以和一些资深人士谈谈哪种期刊真正适合你投稿。你想瞄准更高的目标，但要现实地看待你的论文属于哪里。第二步是上网查看针对目标期刊作者的在线说明。期刊为您提供有关如何撰写和格式化手稿的详细提示。允许多少参考文献。应如何格式化这些参考文献。表格和图表应如何格式化。撰写稿件时，务必遵循这些说明。然后，一旦你写完论文并且所有合著者都签署了论文，如果你是通讯作者，那么你将成为在线提交手稿的人。在线提交真是太棒了。很久以前，当我还是个研究生的时候，我们还得复印论文然后把它们放在信封里，然后用蜗牛邮寄到日记里。几个月后，你会收到一封通过蜗牛邮件回来的信。这个过程的效率要低得多。如今，在线提交流程已经简化了所有内容。在线输入所有信息通常需要几个小时，因此请注意，提交手稿仍然需要一些时间和思考。您还需要收集利益冲突和版权表格，并附上所有作者的签名，这可能需要一些时间，因此也要将其考虑在内。提交稿件后，如果编辑决定直接拒绝该论文，您可能会很快收到编辑的来信。也许你射得太高了，或者这不是期刊感兴趣的话题，所以这篇论文甚至没有送审稿。除此之外，假设你的稿件出来审阅，通常至少需要几周的时间才能收到回复。你的论文将分为四个类别之一。你可能会不加修改地直接接受这篇论文，这种情况几乎从未发生，几乎永远不会发生。你也可以让这篇论文被接受，等待一些细微的修改。这是一个非常积极的结果，偶尔会发生，但也很少见。大多数最终在期刊上发表的论文都属于第三类。已拒绝，但可以重新提交，也称为修改和重新提交。当你第一次收到修改并重新提交信件时，听起来很糟糕。这封信基本上说你的论文已被拒绝，所以听起来像是拒绝。但是你必须阅读细则，因为如果他们邀请你修改并重新提交，那实际上是一个积极的结果。这意味着，编辑认为，如果你能解决审稿人的担忧，你的论文很可能会出版。期刊编辑实际上希望你必须进行一轮修订，以确保论文经过彻底审查，并且论文尽可能好。所以，这正是你提交原创研究稿件时的目标。你的目标是那个“拒绝但重新提交”的类别。然后，最后你可能会被彻底拒绝。这意味着你必须尝试在其他地方提交。现在，你会很想把它照原样发送到其他地方，而不回应审稿人的评论，但不要那样做。即使您不必回复这些审稿人的评论，也请务必通读这些评论。通读它们，找出论文中的问题并进行修改，然后再将其发送到其他地方。因为如果你把它寄到其他地方，同样的问题就会再次出现。利用反馈使论文变得更好，并增加在其他地方发表论文的机会。如果你进入了修改并重新提交的类别，你必须提交一封求职信，逐点解决审稿人的批评——过一会儿我会详细介绍这个问题——然后希望你的论文能被接受。恭喜你。一旦被接受，最后一步是你必须查看期刊的最终证据。他们会将论文格式化为期刊风格，然后将校样发送给您。一定要仔细看待这些错误，因为在格式和布局过程中几乎总是会引入小错误，而你想抓住这些错误。我还发现了校样中的一些愚蠢的错误，并在它们出版之前设法发现了它们。因此，请务必仔细查看这些证据。再说一遍，当你第一次阅读编辑的信时，修改和重新提交类别听起来很糟糕。听起来很消极。这是我作为研究生提交的第一篇论文，我收到了这封信是通过蜗牛邮件回来的。上面写着：“报纸被拒绝了。”然后我想，“哦我猜我的论文被拒绝了。”但是我把这封信交给了更资深的人，他们说：“不不不不不，这实际上是一个不错的结果，因为如果你在信中进一步阅读，它会说他们允许你修改和重新提交。”这是你在最初提交的作品中实际想要的结果，但感觉是负面的。它会说“你的手稿不允许出版”之类的话。但是，如果你继续阅读，它会说一句话，比如如果你觉得自己可以适当地回应审稿人的评论，那么我邀请你修改并重新提交你的手稿。这是积极的。这意味着他们对这篇报纸很感兴趣。因此，不要因为这些字母通常的负面语气而灰心丧气。这实际上是一个积极的结果。如果您被要求修改并重新提交，则需要为审阅者准备详细的逐点回复。正如我在此处的示例中向你展示的那样，你需要保持礼貌和感激之情。所以，你会说：'亲爱的编辑，感谢你和审稿人的有用评论。我们觉得手稿现在有了很大的改进。”你要保持礼貌，因为审阅过程旨在让你的论文变得更好。归根结底，我相信它确实能让你的论文变得更好。当你收到审稿人的第一批批评时，保持礼貌和礼貌并感谢审稿人并不是你的第一本能。我们大多数人对批评的回应都是防御性的。当你收到一大堆关于报纸的批评时，这是每个人的天生本能，以进行防御。但是你需要尽快克服这种防御情绪，并利用审稿人的反馈来改进你的论文。有趣的是，评论者并不总是直言不讳地找到问题。有时候，它们是不准确的，也就是说，他们不能完全正确识别出你论文中的缺陷。他们弄错了。但真正有趣的是，即使他们弄错了，他们通常也会发现其他一些缺陷。例如，审阅者可能会认为您的分析做错了。但这并不是说你的分析做错了，只是你解释得不好。你的写作不清楚。即使审稿人没有完全正确地指出问题，他们也通常会在附近找到某个地方。通过他们提出问题，它会引导你在论文中发现一些需要修复的错误。我在一篇论文中遇到了这样的情况，我们搞砸了一些参考文献的编号。发现的方式是，其中一位评论家在谈论背景文献，他们把文献混为一谈。我的第一个直觉是说：'好吧，这位评论家只是不了解文献。他们一无所知。他们不知道自己在说什么。”但是，当我更仔细地观察时，我意识到他们错误地引用了文献，因为我们编错了参考文献。他们之所以错误地引用某篇论文，是因为我们通过错误的编号将事实归因于错误的报纸。因此，尽管他们没有发现我们犯的实际错误，但这使我发现了这个错误，值得庆幸的是，它在出版之前就修复了这个错误。防御性地对批评做出反应是人的天性。但是，你越快地将审稿人的批评视为学习和改进论文的机会，你的生活就会越轻松。事实上，我认为这是生活技能之一，如果你能掌握，它对成功绝对是必不可少的。对于你收到的任何类型的批评，你越快地将自己与批评区分开来——不要把批评当作个人批评，不要把它们当作对你个人的批评，而是改变你的视角，将其视为改进和学习的机会——你的生活就会越好。当你在正式的求职信中回复审稿人时，希望你能看到他们对你的论文有何帮助。因此，请保持礼貌并承认这种帮助。然后，你需要用数字逐点处理每条评论。例如，一位审稿人说对x的讨论很少。非常具体地回答：“我们同意一位审稿人，也许还有第二位审稿人的看法，即关于X的部分过于简短。因此，我们添加了一个段落来强调这一点。”然后，你指出该特定段落的确切位置。您无需按照审阅者的要求进行所有更改。但是，如果这是一件小而无关紧要的事情，那就做出改变吧。如果这是你不同意的改动，并且你认为审稿人弄错了（这种情况肯定会发生），那么只需向审阅者解释为什么你没有做出这样的改动即可。但是，对每条具体的评论都要给予深思熟虑和尊重的回应。大多数期刊还希望你附上一篇论文的副本，其中包含所跟踪的更改。这对编辑和审阅者很有帮助，这样他们就可以回过头来查看你在哪里做了这些更改。当我审阅一篇论文时，我想验证作者是否确实做了我要求的修改。因此，追踪变更很有帮助，而且许多期刊都要求这样做。最后，在我准备这些讲座时，我正在看这本书《指导手册》，以改善医学写作。然后他在里面说了一些有趣的话。他对此没有引文，所以我不确定这个统计数据来自哪里，但它引起了我的共鸣。他说：“大约60％的评论者的批评与写作或表格和图表的质量有关；只有大约40％与科学工作的质量有关。”这只是强化了这门课程的重点。要获得发表，良好的写作和良好的数据呈现是关键。再说一遍，我不知道他从哪里得到这些数字，但我想说的是，在我审查论文时，有一半以上的时间，一半以上的评论与写作和演讲有关，而不是与科学中的方法论问题有关。因此，良好的写作和良好的数据呈现是出版的核心。