So welcome. In this next module, I'm going to be talking with dr Gary Freedman, and thrilled to have him here,today. I've mentioned his name a few times in this course.,He provided a number of the examples that I've shared with you, and he's been a long time champion of good writing in the medical literature, so it's great to have him here today.,He has been an editor at the American Journal of Epidemiology for over two decades.,Em was the director of the division of Research at Kaiser Permanente Northern California for almost a decade,, and also is on the editorial board of a number of other journals, and currently a consulting professor at Stanford.,So I really appreciate you being here today, gary, it's a pleasure.,So I'm going to start by asking, obviously, we need to do good science, ,but besides good science, what are those some of the key elements that journal editors are looking for when they get a paper?,Well, one is novelty that we will often reject a paper without even sending it out for peer review, if it's just a repeat of findings that are already well known.,I mean, if you're writing the 30th paper alcohol and how alcohol is related to high blood pressure, or obesity is related to mortality, don't expect people to be very enthusiastic about it.,So we will often reject a paper right away and novelly.,And let me just tell you the process that we go through with The American Journal of Epidemiology.,At 1st he looked at by the editor in chief, ,and then he assigns it to one of the other editors who really makes the final decision, and I happen to play that role as a general epidemiology edito,There are other more specialized editors that work just in cancer, ,or just in cardiovascular disease or just an infectious disease, but I tend to be more general, ,and so if the two of us think that the paper is not going to be a sufficient priority to be accepted,, even if it's good science and well reviewed, then as a favor to the authors, we won't delay a rejection of it.,Another beside novelty. Another criterion that we look at is interest to the readers of this particular journal, E.G. Sometimes we'll get a paper that really is not so much an epidemia logic study, ,but a way to improve public health, and we will decide, you know, this is really more suitable to a public health journal than to the American Journal of Epidemiology.,Um. We also look for good writing, and this can be especially a problem with a non English speaking author.,Usually, when paper comes from a foreign country, often the English is really bad, and we know it's gonna need a lot of work, and we think it's a good study.,We will often send it back and say, please have a someone, a native English speaker, go through this and edit it.,And occasionally it comes when a foreign person who is English, who is a native language, is not English, it works in an American institution, and submits a paper.,So, you know, usually that is not a problem.,But another factor is that, you know, don't make the paper too long, Don't put in too much excess material that's not needed.,And another important problem is what we call slicing the salami too thin.,You know, if you have a study that involves both men and women, and want to try to get two papers out of it, say, here is what this respect.,Here is the effect of this risk factor in men.,And then another paper, here's the effect of this risk factor in women.,That is really frowned upon by journals and my own personal experiences that I was, ,I had to deal with this as an author, A colleague and I each wrote a paper about health effects of cigar smoking.,This was the Kaiser permanent day.,His was on cardiovascular disease. Mine was on cancer.,I submitted mine to the Annals of Epidemiology.,Was accepted. He submitted his to the New England Journal.,It was accepted, but they they said, you know, do you have something on cancer?,So naturally, he was younger and needed publications more than I did, so I sort of fell on my sword withdrew my paper from the Annals of Epidemi, and combined it with his.,The New England Journal took it so um, even I was faced with a salami problem as an author. So those are, yeah, starting those things early can be very helpful.,And what do you think is, if you had to .1 thing, the number one mistake that scientists make when submitting their paper?,I think it's over confidence in how important and good their study is.,You know, you've worked,on it really hard, and you've done your best to write it up anything and this was a topic or a question that was really important to you, and you think, oh gosh,,this is really an important finding, but others may not value it so high, so if it gets rejected, have due to some factor like that, I would persist.,I think it's important to persist and submit it elsewhere, fix it and submit it.,Yeah, finding the right journal for it might be the right but, you know, ,because you've devoted a year or two to this project and you think it's really important, don't assume that other people will place it as high priorities you do.,That's a good point. And I have to, of course, ask you to give some advice to authors about writing style, because you've written a number of editorials in America, right?,Well, I guess clarity and conciseness, or what I would put as the highest priority characteristics of writing.,Avoid repetitions. Sometimes people will say something in the introduction and then repeated in the discussion.,Avoid that. Or they'll say something in the method section, which gets repeated in results.,So avoid repetition, avoid excess verbiage.,And ive written editorials about that, which I think youve used in your teaching and avoid, ,you know, sometimes people will read a rather long discussion in the introduction of the paper, ,where it's really the introduction should be brief, Say why you did this study, and basically what you what you tried to accomplish.,But leave all the discussion the review of the literature for the discussion section.,Don't try to put too much in the introduction.,Some things is certainly you need some background as to why you did this study, which may involve citing some previous literature. Don't go into it in detail if that's in the introduction.,And, um, don't repeat numerical data in the text.,You know, you'll have a table which has nice numerical data with ads, ratios and so on, ,and then in the results, say, table one shows the blah, blah, blah, and the odds ratio was this and that.,And so avoid repeating that, we will often ask authors, you know, just describe the finding of the table in words, and they can see the reader can see the numerical examples.,So those are my main suggestions.,And, you know, one of the fears, I think, that comes up often when I am teaching, of course, like this, ,and has already come up in this classes, a lot of scientists will say to me, well, I've been teaching them to write and simple and concise language.,And they'll say, well, if I simplify it too much, I'm going to dumb down the science.,It's going to lose precision. So there's this kind of fear that a lot of scientists have.,So I was hoping you could comment on that.,Well, I-I don't think you'll necessarily dumb down the science.,Of course, you do want precision and clarity, but I think you should avoid jargon and things that are really hard to understand.,George Comstock, who is no longer alive, but he used to be the editor in chief of the American Journal of Epidemiology, ,used to say that papers should be understandable by someone with a good college education, or someone who reads the Scientific American.,It does not have to be full of jargon that's only understood by your peers and your particular specialty.,So I would, you know, we welcome things that are very readable and easy to read.,I don't, I-I would not have that fear at all.,Yeah, and, uh, in terms of getting published, when you get two papers in, let's say they were the same science, ,and one was very jargony, and, you know, sounds sort of the way think they has to have to write.,And you have one that's clear, can you comment on your chances of publication?,Well, you know, if both of them get peer reviewed and very highly rated, and they seem like they seem important to the editors. We might ask, you know, to please explain what you mean by this word or this sentence.,So it will take an extra step if it's really hard to understand and not clear to most readers.,And what ice can give specifically to 1st time authors?,I imagine a lot of the students in this course are early in their career and having had a chance to get published yet, or in the process of submitting their 1st papers.,What bothers me most is when I get a paper, it will often be from a really good institution, ,and the senior author at the end of the list of someone who is well known, but it's clear that it's been written by a student.,And it sounds like a thesis.,It sounds like a phd thesis, or masters thesis, which contains every conceivable strength of the study, every conceivable weakness, so that,to prove in writing the thesis, that they learned what they were supposed to learn in the school public Health, in their graduate program.,So right, as if you were more established senior scientists, who knows what other scientists understand, and you don't have to explain something to everything.,I just happened to see a paper this morning in the latest journal of the American Journal of Epidemi,, a latest issue of the American Journal of Epidemiology, that was going over the strength and limitations of their study.,And it was a study about mortality in whites and African Americans, and we related to a certain factor.,And I was saying, one of the strengths of our study is that we had a large African American population is part of this study group.,Well, it's sort of obvious you wouldn't be writing about mortality in them.,So you don't have to say that.,I mean, things that are sort of obvious, don't say, just say the important limitations of your study, the important strength.,And you don't have to label them as strength and limit.,It's sort of a jargon. Now, every epidemilogic paper, you have to find the word limitation, you know, just to say what they are.,So I guess, um, you know, I guess just avoid making your paper seem like a thesis. Yeah? Ive encountered that as well.,In reviewing papers, where you can tell that somebody had taken the thesis and just tried to turn it into a paper, its a very different product.,So paying attention to the actually writing like a paper, right, he says, is a great tip.,And let's talk a little bit about resubmission.,So let's say that you are offered the opportunity the papers rejected, but you're offered the opportunity to re submit.,With a lot of comments from reviewers, what kinds of tips can you give people who are in that stage of the publication process?,Well, 1st of all, although acceptance of the revision is not guaranteed, and that will say so in the letter.,I think you should take that as encouraging.,The fact that it got past that 1st reviewing stage is really a good sign, and you should work hard to improve the paper so that get accepted.,And the 1st of all, either whatever, the you know, 1st of all list each comment that the reviewers make and respond to that.,either that both reviewers, or as many reviewers who are involved, made, and the editor will often make comments to enlist them and respond to each one separately.,And, um, either whatever the common says, either fix it, fix what the problem is, ,or explain why you don't think that that criticism is valid or important, explain why you don't want to fix it, and make, you know, give a good argument for that show.,And also, please show the editor where you made the changes in the manuscript.,You know, if someone says, well, I just changed the method section to reflect this, that's sort of hard for us to find what exactly you did.,So either highlight the change, list the changes in when you respond to the comments, ,either highlight them in the manuscript, say, you know, say where they occur, highlight them, ,or use track change and supply, in addition to the version where you get rid of the track changes,, also provide the version that has the track changes so that the editor can see exactly what you did.,Or sometimes sometimes the paper will be sent out for further review, further peer reviews. Sometimes peer reviewers have really strong concerns, and I, as an editor, will say, we'll send it back to them and said, did the author really satisfy your concerns about this?,And be polite. You know, this reviewer is stupid.,You know? We didn't really just say, oh, we thank the reviewers for their constructive criticisms.,I'm sure you know, the paper is improved as a result of this.,So, you know, that that does not hurt.,Is everybody's instinct, I think, to at 1st be a little defensive when you get your review back.,And can you give some words of encouragement for young scientists who might have submitted their 1st paper and actually got an outright,rejection. Can you what are some words of encouragement?,Well, I would just say,,fix it. And if it's totally rejected by that journal, they're not asking for resubmission.,Fix it. Try to respond to the reviewers comments that you feel are justified and submitted elsewhere.,And persist.,I've had, as an author, I've had to submit papers to as many as four journals till finally got accepted.,So I think persistence is important.,Don't take the rejection personally. It's hard not to, and I sometimes do.,But it realize that some reviewers may not be very competent, may not really understand what you are doing.,This will often happen if you submit an epidemia logic paper and, it gets reviewed by a clinician who does not really understand principles of epidemaology, ,they'll feel that if you write a paper about stroke, if every case was not reviewed by a neurologist, then it's not a valid paper.,So or maybe they're competent, but they just had a bad day and didn't really pay close attention to what you wrote and missed some passages that really would have answered their question.,So just realize that reviewers are human, just like you, just like authors, and and that's just the way the system works.,Yeah, it's not perfect. And then talking about the system a little bit, what changes do you anticipate are going to occur in the publication process? There's kind of a lot going on now with the online and open accent, Right?,A little bit about what's going to happen in the future.,So I think you have described it, you know, more less paper, more electronic publications at a look here, faster like e pub before, before it appears in the paper version.,There will be more new journals.,I keep getting emails from journals that just started up, you know, and make it sound like it's your field, and there's probably not such great peer review with them.,They want, they want to get some known authors and publish.,But I've had a paper, you know, which was submitted to a journal that's supposed to be peer reviewed, and the acceptance came back in about five days, you know.,So I don't think it was really, I fear reviewed.,I of course, you know, I'm biased, but I thought it was a decent paper, but I don't think it got the kind of peer review that papers normally get from good journals.,Do you think peer reviews are going to be going to change in somewhat in the future because of this proliferation of online drinking?,Say that again. Do you think that the peer review process itself is going to change somewhat because of the proliferation of online journal Well, it shouldn't, but it might.,I'm not sure how. You know if they're really in a hurry to publish.,They might say, you know, get your review back in a week.,Or, you know, and a lot of people just can't do that.,There was another point I want to make.,Now. NIH has a policy that if your paper is supported by them as part of a grander contract, the finished men, ,even if the journal wants to charge money for downloading the paper, after a year,, NIH will put it on pub med as a finished manuscript,, which may not have had the kind of copy editing that will finally appear in the journal, but it least be your final version of the manuscript.,And so you'll be able to read papers that have been out for a year, even if for no cost, even if the journal, it is a kind that wants to charge money for it.,Yeah. And if you can change one thing about the publication process, what would you change? Well, I had, when you asked me the question before I got to I had to in my Yeah.,1st of all, I think there should be greater valuation of negative findings by both researchers and by the journals.,You know, when you do studies, you're going to have this great idea that ,you think something is a cause or prevention of of some disease, and you're going to do a study, and it's not going to pan out.,That is the most common experience that we epidemiologists have.,In fact, I now have a graduate student here who is doing a study of met form and in relation to risk of breast cancer, ,because there was some thought that this might be a preventive agent for reducing the risk of certain kinds of breast cancer.,And this is being done at Kaiser Permanente in our division of research.,But it's looking like, and this is not the final result, but it's looking,like that's probably not going to turn up what was hoped for or what was expected.,And naturally, the researcher is very disappointed in that.,But, you know, I say, you know, this is important to know too, that there's a negative finding, so don't be discouraged if you have a negative finding.,It's important that that get published.,And I wish journals would be more interested in in publishing these.,And sometimes, you know, a negative finding, if you want to get it out there, it could be written in the form of a brief re which will take less journal space, it will get higher priority.,So I think that's, that is my main answer to your question.,I um. I also wish that there was greater ease in getting pure reviewers to review of paper sometimes.,Well, we have a list of the American Journal of Epidemiology, and I sent a particular paper out to people who said this was their specialty or special interest.,And out of ten people who we send it to, only one agreed to review, and we try to get two.,I was asked, can you make a decision on just the one review?,Because we can't keep trying to get review.,So as a scientist and an author, please accept the responsibility of being a reviewer as well as a as an author. And we've had some cases where, you know, we've published papers by a certain author, and this author consistently refused to review papers.,And naturally, they are not well regarded editorial staff.,So those, those would be my two concerns.,And the opportunity to review is a good way to learn.,Absolutely great. Is there any parting thoughts or tips that you want to offer to the class?,No, I think we covered your questions are so your questions are so good that you've covered everything that I might want to say.,Thank you so much for taking the time to speak with us.

非常欢迎，在下一个模块中，我将与加里·弗里德曼博士交谈。我很高兴他今天来到这里。在这门课程中我已经提过几次他的名字了。他提供了我与你分享的许多例子，他长期以来一直是医学文献中优秀写作的拥护者。所以他今天能来到这里真是太好了。他担任《美国流行病学杂志》编辑已有二十多年。并在北加州KaiserPermanente担任研究部主任近十年。他还是其他许多期刊的编辑委员会成员，目前是斯坦福大学的咨询教授。所以我真的很感激你今天来到这里，Gary。这是一种乐趣。所以我首先要问，显然我们需要做好科学研究，但是除了好的科学之外，期刊编辑在收到论文时还会寻找哪些关键要素？好吧，一个是新颖的。如果一篇论文只是众所周知的研究结果的重演，我们通常会拒绝该论文，甚至不将其发送给同行评审。我的意思是，如果你正在写第30篇关于酒精以及酒精与高血压的关系，或者肥胖与死亡率的关系的论文，不要指望人们会对此非常热情。因此，我们经常会立即拒绝论文。现在让我告诉你我们在《美国流行病学杂志》上所经历的过程。首先由总编辑查看，然后他将其分配给其他一位编辑，由他真正做出最终决定。我碰巧扮演的是流行病学总编辑的角色。还有其他更专业的编辑只研究癌症、心血管疾病或仅研究传染病，但我倾向于更笼统。因此，如果我们两个人认为这篇论文不够重要，无法被接受，即使它是一门好科学而且经过了良好的审查。那么，为了给作者一个忙，我们不会拖延对它的拒绝。除了新颖性外，我们要考虑的另一个标准是这本特定期刊的读者的兴趣。例如，有时候我们会得到一篇论文，它实际上与其说是一项流行病学研究，不如说是一种改善公共卫生的方法。我们将决定，这实际上更适合公共卫生期刊，而不是《美国流行病学杂志》。我们也在寻找好的写作。对于@@不讲英语的作者来说，这可能尤其是一个问题。通常，当论文来自国外时，英语通常非常糟糕。而且我们知道这将需要大量的工作。而且，如果我们认为这是一项不错的研究，我们经常会把它发回去，然后说，请一位母语为英语的人仔细阅读并编辑它。有时，当母语不是英语的外国人在美国机构工作并提交论文时，就会出现这种情况。通常这不是问题，但确实如此。另一个因素是，不要把纸张写得太长，也不要放太多不需要的多余材料。另一个重要的问题是我们所说的切萨拉米香肠。是的，是的，如果你能说一句话，那就太好了。如果你有一项同时涉及男性和女性的研究，并且想尝试从中获得两篇论文。比如说，这是这种危险因素对男性的影响，然后是另一篇论文，这是这种危险因素对女性的影响。这真的被期刊所拒绝。我自己的亲身经历是，作为一名作家，我必须处理这个问题。我和一位同事都写了一篇关于吸雪茄对健康的影响的论文。这是在KaiserPermanente。这是关于心血管疾病，我的是关于癌症。我把我的《流行病学年鉴》提交了，它被接受了。他向《新英格兰日报》提交了自己的文章，该报被接受了，但他们说，你对癌症有什么看法吗？所以他自然更年轻，比我更需要出版物。所以我有点自欺欺人，把我的论文从流行病学史册中撤出来，然后把它和他的论文结合起来，然后《新英格兰日报》把它拿走了。因此，作为作家，即使是我也面临着萨拉米香肠的问题，所以这些才是最主要的。是的，尽早解决这些问题可能会非常有帮助。而且，如果你必须指出一件事，那就是科学家在提交论文发表时犯的头号错误，你认为什么？我认为这是对他们的学习的重要性和出色程度过于自信。[LAUGH]你已经努力了-是的。而且你已经尽了最大努力把它写出来。这是一个对你来说非常重要的话题或问题，你想，天哪，这确实是一个重要的发现，但其他人可能不会那么重视它。因此，如果由于这样的因素而被拒绝，我会坚持下去。我认为重要的是要坚持下去，将其提交到其他地方，对其进行修复，然后将其提交到其他地方。是的，找到适合它的日记可能是关键，是的。对，因为你在这个项目上花了一两年时间，而且你认为它真的很重要，所以不要以为其他人会像你一样把它放在高度优先地位。是的，这是一个很好的观点。当然，我必须请你向作者提供一些关于写作风格的建议，因为你在《美国流行病学杂志》上写了许多关于写作的社论。那么在写作方面你有什么建议呢？好吧，我想清晰度和简洁是我所说的写作的最高优先级特征。避免重复。有时人们会在导言中说些什么，然后在讨论中重复一遍。避免这种情况，否则他们会在“方法”部分说些什么，结果中会重复。因此，避免重复，避免过多的措辞。而且我写过关于这个问题的社论，我想你已经提过了。我有，是的。并避免，有时候人们会在论文的介绍中写一篇相当长的讨论。而实际上，介绍应该简短。说出你为什么做这项研究，基本上说出你想要完成的任务。将所有讨论，即文献综述，留给讨论部分。不要试图在介绍中放太多。有些事情，当然你需要一些背景来说明你为什么要做这项研究，这可能涉及引用一些以前的文献，但不要详细介绍，那就在导言中。而且不要在文本中重复数字数据。你会有一个表格，里面有很好的数值数据，比如和比率等等，然后在结果中，表一显示了等等，等等，等等，赔率比就是这个和那个。因此，请避免重复。我们经常会要求作者只用文字描述表格的发现，读者就可以看到数字示例。很好，是的。所以这些是我的主要建议。这些都是不错的小贴士，是的。我认为，当我教这样的课程并且已经出现在这堂课上时，经常会出现的一个担忧是，很多时候他们会对我说，我一直在教他们用简单而简洁的语言写作。如果我简化得太多，他们会说得很好，我会把科学搞得一团糟，它就会失去精度。所以很多科学家都有这种恐惧，所以我希望你能对此发表评论[笑]。好吧，我认为你不一定会把这门科学搞得一团糟。当然，你确实想要精确度和清晰度，但我认为你应该避免使用行话和难以理解的东西。乔治·康斯托克（GeorgeComstock）已经不在世了，但他曾经是《美国流行病学杂志》的编辑兼主任，他曾经说过，受过良好大学教育的人或读过《科学美国人》的人应该可以理解论文。它不必充满只有你特定专业的同行才能理解的行话。是的。因此，我们欢迎可读性强、易于阅读的内容。我根本不会有那种恐惧。是的，就发表而言，比方说，当你收到两篇论文时，它们是同一门科学，一篇非常行话，听起来有点像。[笑]科学家们认为他们必须写作，而且你会有一篇写得很清楚。你能评论一下你的出版机会吗？[LAUGH]好吧，如果他们俩都经过同行评审并获得很高的评价，那么它们对编辑来说似乎很重要。是的。我们可能会问，请解释一下你所说的这个词或这句话是什么意思。是的，是的。所以，如果真的很难理解而且大多数读者不清楚，那就需要多走一步。是的。是的，要知道，你能专门为首次撰稿的作者提供什么建议？我想这门课程的许多学生都处于职业生涯的早期，还没有机会发表论文，也没有机会提交第一篇论文。最让我困扰的是，当我收到一篇论文时，它通常来自一所非常好的机构，而名单末尾的资深作者是知名人士，但很明显这是学生写的。[LAUGH]听起来像一篇论文，听起来像一篇博士论文或硕士论文。是的。其中，它包含了这项研究的所有可能的优势，所有可能的弱点。[LAUGH]因此，为了在撰写论文时证明他们在学校公共卫生或研究生课程中学到了他们应该学到的东西。所以，写得好像你是一位更成熟的资深科学家，知道其他科学家所理解的东西，而且你不必向所有事情解释什么。今天早上我碰巧看到了一篇论文，这是最新一期的《美国流行病学杂志》，它探讨了他们研究的优势和局限性。这是一项关于白人和非裔美国人死亡率的研究，与某个因素有关；它说我们研究的优势之一是，作为研究小组的一部分，我们有大量的非裔美国人口。好吧，这很明显，你不会-对，对。你不会写关于死亡的文章，所以我的意思是你不必这么说。有些显而易见的事情，不要说，只是说你学习的重要局限性，重要的优势。而且你不必将它们标记为优势和极限。现在有点行话，每篇学术论文你都必须找到字数限制。[LAUGH]是的。[LAUGH]只要说出它们是什么就行了。所以，我想只要避免让你的论文看起来像一篇论文就行了。是的，我在审阅论文时也遇到过这种情况。是的你可以看出有人写了一篇论文然后想把它变成一篇论文，但这是一种截然不同的产品。对。注意像论文或论文一样实际写这篇文章是个不错的建议让我们来谈谈重新提交的问题。因此，假设你获得了机会，论文被拒绝了，但你有机会重新提交，并附上审稿人的大量评论。你能为处于出版过程那个阶段的人提供什么样的提示？好吧，首先，尽管不能保证修订会被接受，信中也就是这么说的，但我认为你应该认为这是令人鼓舞的。它已经过了第一个审查阶段这一事实确实是一个好兆头，你应该努力改进这篇论文，这样它才能被接受。而且，首先，不管怎样，首先列出审稿人发表的每条评论并对此做出回应。作为编辑，它可以更轻松地看到作者考虑了每条评论。无论是审稿人还是参与其中的审稿人，编辑也经常会发表评论，列出这些评论并分别回复每篇评论。而且，不管评论怎么说，要么修复它，要么修复问题所在，要么解释为什么你认为这种批评不有效或不重要。解释一下为什么你不想修复它，并为此提供一个很好的论据。显示，并请向编辑展示你在手稿中进行修改的地方。如果有人说得好，我只是更改了方法部分来反映这一点，那我们很难找到你到底做了什么。因此，请在回复评论时列出更改。要么在手稿中突出显示它们，看看它们发生在哪里，要么突出显示它们，要么使用曲目更改。除了删除曲目变更的版本外，还要申请。还要提供包含跟踪更改的版本，以便编辑者可以准确地看到您做了什么。是的。或者有时论文会被发送给进一步的同行评审，有时候同行评审者会有非常强烈的担忧。作为编辑，我会把它发回给他们然后说作者真的满足了你对此的担忧吗？而且要有礼貌。[LAUGH][LAUGH]你知道，这个评论者很愚蠢，你知道。你说，他真的不明白，我们感谢审稿人的建设性批评，我敢肯定，这篇论文因此得到了改进，所以这不会有什么坏处。我认为，当你拿回评论时，起初要稍微防御一点，这是每个人的本能。所以你必须回过头来稍微调整一下语言以确保你保持礼貌，这是个不错的提示，是的。而且，对于那些可能已经提交了第一篇论文但实际上被彻底拒绝的年轻科学家，你能否给我们一些鼓励。有哪些鼓励词？[LAUGH]好吧，我只想说修复它，如果它被该期刊完全拒绝，他们就不会要求重新提交，而是要修复它，尝试回应审稿人认为合理的评论，然后将其提交到其他地方，然后坚持下去。作为一名作者，我不得不向多达四家期刊提交论文，直到最终被录取。所以我认为坚持很重要，不要把拒绝当作个人看待。很难不这样做，有时候我会这样做。但是你意识到，有些审稿人可能不是很称职，可能不太了解你在做什么。如果您提交流行病学论文，并且由不太了解流行病学原理的临床医生进行审查，则通常会发生这种情况。他们会觉得，如果你写一篇关于中风的论文，如果每个病例都没有经过神经科医生的审查，那么这不是一篇有效的论文。对，对。所以，或者也许他们很称职，但他们只是度过了糟糕的一天。[LAUGH][LAUGH]而且并没有真正注意你写的内容，也错过了一些真正能回答他们问题的段落。所以，只要意识到审稿人是人类，就像作者一样，系统就是这样运作的。是的，是的。它并不完美。然后稍微谈一下这个系统，你预计发布过程中会发生什么变化？现在，在线和开放访问发生了很多事情。对。稍微说一下将来会发生什么。好吧，我想你已经描述过了。[LAUGH][LAUGH]减少纸张，多用电子出版物。它会更快地出现，就像纸质版出现之前的EPUB一样，还会有更多的新期刊。我不断收到来自刚起步的期刊的电子邮件，它们会让人听起来像是你的领域。而且他们可能没有那么好的同行评审，他们想找一些知名的作者出版。但是我有一篇论文提交给了本应接受同行评审的期刊，大约五天后又被录取了。[LAUGH][LAUGH]所以我认为这不是经过同行评审的。当然，我有偏见，但我觉得这是一篇不错的论文。但我认为它没有像论文通常从好的期刊中获得的那种同行评审。由于在线期刊的激增，你认为同行评审将来会有所改变吗？再说一遍，对不起。你是否认为由于在线期刊的激增，同行评审过程本身会有所改变？好吧，不应该，但可能如此，我不确定怎么做。是的。是的，如果他们真的急于发布，他们可能会说，在一周内把你的评论拿回来，或者。是的。很多人就是做不到。他们做不了那么快，是的。我还有一点想说，现在美国国立卫生研究院有一项政策，即如果你的论文作为补助金或合同的一部分得到他们的支持，即使该期刊想收取下载论文的费用，一年后，美国国立卫生研究院也会将其作为完成的手稿放在PubMed上。这可能没有最终出现在期刊上的那种文案编辑，但这至少是你手稿的最终版本。因此，你将能够免费阅读已经出版了一年的论文，即使该期刊想为此收取费用。很高兴知道。而且，如果你能改变出版过程中的一件事，你会改变什么？好吧，当你之前问我这个问题时，我有两件事。[笑]Two没问题，[笑]。首先，我认为研究人员和期刊都应该提高对负面发现的估值。当你做研究时，你会有一个好主意，那就是你认为某件事是某种疾病的病因或可以预防某种疾病，然后你要做一项研究，但它不会成功。这是我们流行病学家最常见的经历。事实上，我现在有一位研究生正在研究二甲双胍与乳腺癌风险的关系，因为有人认为二甲双胍可能是降低某些乳腺癌风险的预防剂。KaiserPermanente的研究部门正在这样做。但看起来像，这不是最终的结果，但看来它可能不会达到预期或预期的结果。当然，研究人员对此感到非常失望，但知道有一个负面发现也很重要。因此，如果您有负面发现，请不要灰心，重要的是要将其公布。我希望期刊对发表这些文章更感兴趣，有时候负面发现，如果你想把它公之于众，可以用简短报告的形式写成，这将占用更少的期刊空间，它会得到更高的优先级。所以我认为这是我对你的问题的主要答案。我还希望能更轻松地让同行评审员审阅论文。有时候，我们在《美国流行病学杂志》上有一份清单，我会向那些说这是他们的专业或特殊兴趣的人发一篇特别的论文。在我们发送给的10个人中，只有一个人同意审阅，我们试图让两个，有人问我，你能不能只对一篇评论做出决定？因为我们不能继续努力吸引审稿人。因此，作为科学家和作者，请承担作为审稿人和作者的责任。在某些情况下，我们发表了某位作者的论文，而这位作者一直拒绝审阅论文，编辑人员自然不太重视这些论文。所以，这将是我的两个担忧。是的，这是一个很好的观点，一个很好的提示。而且，作为作家，有机会进行复习也是一种很好的学习方式。绝对可以。那么，太棒了，你想向全班提供任何离别想法或小贴士吗？不，我想我们已经介绍过了。太棒了，好吧。你的问题太棒了，你已经涵盖了我想说的所有内容。非常感谢您抽出宝贵时间与我们交谈。非常欢迎您。