PUBLISHING
PART 2

Zheng Shen

Jan. 24, 2018

*most of the materials are taken from slides by Brian D. Joseph, Joe Salmons, Keren Rice, Jeffrey Lidz, and Kai von Fintel from the workshop "The Publishing Process" at the 2015 LSA Summer Institute.

PREVIOUSLY FROM PUBLISHING...

BEFORE SUBMITTING…

➤ Term paper / MA Thesis / PhD Dissertation ≠ journal article

➤ Whether to submit?

  ➤ ask people

➤ Which journal to submit?

  ➤ paper type, content

  ➤ speed, selectivity

➤ Before submitting

  ➤ show your paper to advisors, faculty, colleagues

  ➤ proofread

  ➤ do not submit one paper to multiple journals

ON THE OTHER SIDE…

➤ Who handles the submission first?

   ➤ Editor, associate editors, an editorial team

➤ Avoid desk reject

➤ Check if reviewer guidelines are available to authors.

➤ Two to three reviewers are normally involved.

➤ Timeline (4-6 months for long articles, 2-3 for short ones)

   ➤ editors read the submission — assign the submission to reviewers — reviewing — editor making decisions based on reviews

➤ *Revise and resubmit* is positive.

➤ Reviews are advice, not decisions. You can discuss reviews with the editors

Q&A: ARE ALL JOURNALS CREATED EQUAL?

➤ No.

➤ The journals I mentioned in previous weeks <u>here</u> are internationally recognized peer-reviewed journals that focus on generative linguistics

➤ There are also national/regional peer-reviewed journals, which may be valued in different places (e.g. German journals may be valued higher in Germany than in the U.S.)

➤ Peer reviewed journals are valued higher than non-peer reviewed ones

➤ What about a paper in a German journal vs. a paper in the proceedings of NELS/WCCFL/SALT? I don't know.

➤ <u>SSCI</u>, <u>A&HCI</u>, <u>journal ranking</u>, <u>metrics</u>

➤ Peer review

  ➤ Review of submitted papers by people considered by the editor(s) to be experts in the field

  ➤ Evaluation of quality of scholarship, relevance, reliability, appropriateness for journal, readability

➤ How does it work

  ➤ After determining that the submission is appropriate for the journal (i.e. not desk reject), the editor identifies 2-3 people who would be appropriate reviewers in terms of research topics, languages, etc.

MORE ON PEER REVIEW

➤ Can I suggest reviewers?

  ➤ depends on the journal.

  ➤ but you should report **professional conflicts**, e.g. your advisors/ colleagues/significant others shouldn't be the reviewers of your papers.

➤ Blindness of reviews

  ➤ single blind review: the authors don't know who the reviewers are but the reviewers know who the authors are.

  ➤ double blind review: the authors and the reviewers are anonymous.

  ➤ Sometimes a reviewer will ask to be identified even if the general journal policy is double blind.

  ➤ The reviewers usually can guess/find out who the authors are based on previous presentations, paper archives, etc.

WHAT DOES THE EDITOR DO WITH THE REVIEWS?

➤ Editors read the paper again with all the reviews

➤ makes a judgement on the paper based on the reviews and their own evaluation

➤ The reviewers are advisory to the editorial team, but reviews are taken seriously even if the recommendation made by a reviewer or reviewers is not followed

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER YOU REVISED AND RESUBMITTED YOUR PAPER?

➤ The editors will read your new submission, evaluate it against the reviews, and make a decision to:

   ➤ 1. accept without sending it to the reviewers;

   ➤ 2. reject without sending it to the reviewers;

   ➤ 3. send it to the reviewers for the 2nd round of reviews (all or a subset of the original reviewers, but sometimes a set of new reviewers)

WHY PEER REVIEW?

➤ With good peer review, papers generally improve, even from very experienced authors.

➤ The peer review process attests to the quality of the paper in terms of content and presentation.

➤ Peer review is used by universities in decisions about hiring, tenure, and promotion.

YOU'VE SUBMITTED YOUR ARTICLE. NOW WHAT? – JEFF LIDZ

- Wait…

- and wait some more…

- and wait some more…

- You can ask the editor for updates if it seems like it's taking longer than expected

- (but be polite)

- and wait some more...

THE REVIEWS COME…

- 2-3 reviews

- Read them

- Get mad

- Wait…

- Read them again with a clear head

- Empathize

THE REVISION

- Assume your reviewers are mostly right

- Do what they say (with guidance from editor)

- If you don't know how to respond to specific comments, get advice from…

  colleagues, mentors, friends, the editor…

THE REVISION

- Assume your reviewers are mostly right

- If you disagree (in order of increasing risk)

  - say that you agree and do what they said

  - say that you agree and do something that shows that you were sensitive to their concern

  - say that you disagree (respectfully) and do something that shows you were sensitive to their concern

THE REVISION LETTER

- Thank the editor for their help

- Thank the reviewers for their deeply insightful comments that have improved the paper substantially (often, this is even true)

- State what the overall effects of the revision were and how they addressed the primary concerns of the editor & reviewers

THE REVISION LETTER

- Go through each comment of each reviewer and say

  - (a) what you did to address it and

  - (b) where they can find the change in the new manuscript

- Don't forget to thank them for their hard work, insightful comments and the care they took in helping you to improve the article

RESUMIT

- Make sure your revision addresses all concerns and that your cover letter is complete.

- Submit....

WAIT…

- and wait some more... and wait some more...

- You can ask the editor for updates if it seems like it's taking longer than expected

- (but be polite)
  and wait some more...

REPEAT?

- You may have to go through this more than once.

- Try to keep in mind that people are trying to help you, not to stand in your way

REJECTED?

- Try to figure out why

  - Wrong journal choice

  - Contribution not made clear

  - Real problems (logic, methods, etc)

- Then respond appropriately

  - Revise, then choose another journal

  - Make sure your contribution is clear

  - Start over and fix problems

DON'T GET DISCOURAGED

- Publishing is hard

  - not everyone shares your assumptions

  - some people are obstructionist

  - reviewer choice plays a huge role

  - learning to respond carefully takes time

- You will get better at it

SUMMARIZE: WORKFLOW FOR A JOURNAL SUBMISSION

1. you have a worked out idea or a term paper or a longer paper

2. you have a rough idea of submitting to a journal as a certain type of paper (e.g. squib, long paper)

3. meet with a couple of people about this (advisors, etc.)

4. write you paper according to the requirements of the journal

5. ask your advisors and colleagues to read it

6. revise it for a few times

7. ask someone to proofread it

8. revise it again

9. submit

SUMMARIZE: WORKFLOW FOR A JOURNAL SUBMISSION

10. wait for the reviews and the letter from the editors

11. 8 out of 10, it's revise and resubmit

12. congratulations, you are half way there

13. read through the reviews and editors' letter for several times

14. decide what to do to each point in the reviews (the points in the editors letter are the most important)

15. revise the paper

16. ask people to read it

17. proofread

18. for every review, write what you did regarding each point of the review, i.e. one letter to each individual reviewer

19. write a letter to the editor addressing their letter and the reviews

20. resubmit the paper, the letter to the editors, the letters to the reviewers