Writing great papers in high impact journals
An Introduction for Researchers
Central Roles of the Publisher

- Editorial & Author Services
- Marketing Dissemination Discoverability
- Registration/Validation
- Archiving
- Community Outreach
Why publish?

"Enforcing the publish or perish rule, Dean McWit?"
Motivation for publication

**Fame**
Recognition by your peers

**Fortune**
Promotions, grant applications, research funding

**Responsibility**
To society, taxpayer-funded research, contribution to progress
Probably the most common driver…. BECAUSE MY BOSS TOLD ME TO!
I'm going to write a journal article!
A step-by-step guide to journals publishing

1. Writing your paper
2. Submission and peer review
3. Production and Copyright
4. Becoming Famous
1. Writing your paper
Q: *What type of paper do I want to write?*

- **Full / Original article** (sometimes called a “transaction” or may even be “magazine article” in some areas): a substantial and significant completed piece of research.

- **Letters / Rapid Communications / Short communications**: quick and early communication of significant and original advances. Much shorter than full articles (check limitations).

- **Review papers / Perspectives**: summarize recent developments on a specific topic. Highlight important previously reported points. *Not the place to introduce new information.* Often invited.

- **Conference papers**: Excellent for disseminating early or in progress research findings. Typically 5-10 pages, 3 figures, 15 references.
1. Decide which type of paper you are going to write

2. The writing style depends on the community you are writing for: understand it better by reading lots of papers in the area

3. Remember your audience, it’s all about the readers, which includes editors and reviewers!

4. If in doubt: ask your supervisor and your colleagues for advice!
Paper structure and content

Each section has a clearly defined purpose; there are best practices to follow

- **TITLE** - a good title is important to attract readers and should include keywords

- **AUTHORS** - Make sure your author list is complete and ordered correctly

- **ABSTRACT** - needs to be well structured

- **MAIN BODY** - Write in a clear concise scientific style

- **REFERENCES (Bibliography)** – check carefully; use software
Some guidelines for good titles
This is your opportunity to attract a reader’s attention (including citations!)

• An explicit title can help attract citations because of the way in which scientists look for relevant literature to cite e.g. state a key finding, or frame a question…

• Keywords up front, and optimised for search engines: think of how your paper will be found, once published (N.B. Google)

• Short – typically up to 15 words

• Punctuation - split into main message/concept and qualifier
  • Cephalopod origin and evolution: A congruent picture emerging from fossils, development and molecules

• Consider a subtitle, if permitted (included in search engine output!)

• Try to think of the title before you start writing! Could help you orient yourself to the main topic

• [You can apply the same ideas to sub-titles and section titles throughout the paper]
Some guidelines for good abstracts

This is your opportunity to help Editors/reviewers (what’s this paper about?) AND search engines

• Most publishers make all abstracts free to access

• Put something important and new at the beginning.

• Put something important and new at the end.

• Don’t make the middle part longer than necessary as background information for your intended readership.

• As with the TITLE be as concise as possible

• 200 words maximum, some journals have a word limit
What makes a good abstract?

State why the research is important to a broader non-scientific audience

Introduce the procedure simply

Describe the experiment in detail

Offer a brief overview of the results

In early 2007 it was determined that the compound melamine, suspected of having been involved in the deaths of numerous pets, had been fed to hogs intended for human consumption. This report describes a method for the analysis of melamine in porcine muscle tissue using solid-phase extraction (SPE) and high-performance liquid chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry (HPLC/MS/MS). Melamine was extracted in 50% acetonitrile in water. Homogenates were centrifuged and supernatants were acidified and washed with methylene chloride. The aqueous extracts were cleaned up using mixed-mode C8/strong cation exchange SPE and then concentrated, fortified with a stable isotope-labeled analog of melamine, and analyzed by HPLC/MS/MS. Gradient HPLC separation was performed using an ether-linked phenyl column with ammonium acetate/acetic acid and acetonitrile as the mobile phase. Multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) mode of two precursor-product ion transitions for melamine and one for the internal standard was used. A five point calibration curve ranging from 50 to 2000 ng/mL of melamine in solvent was used to establish instrument response. The method was validated by analysis of seven replicate porcine muscle tissue samples fortified with 10 ng/g of melamine. The mean recovery for the seven replicates was 83% with 6.5% relative standard deviation and the calculated method detection limit was 1.7 ng/g. Copyright © 2007 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
Think “structured” abstract format

**RATIONALE:** Oxygen triple isotope compositions give key information for understanding physical processes during isotopic fractionation between the geo-, hydro-, bio-, and atmosphere. For detailed discussion of these topics, it is necessary to determine precise $^{17}$O-excess values of terrestrial silicate/oxide minerals with respect to Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water (VSMOW).

**METHODS:** Water was fluorinated in an electrically heated Ni-metal tube into which water and BrF$_5$ were loaded for the quantitative extraction of oxygen. Silicate/oxide minerals were fluorinated by heating with a CO$_2$ laser in an atmosphere of BrF$_5$. The extracted oxygen was purified and isotope ratios of the oxygen triple isotope compositions were determined using a Finnigan MAT253 isotope ratio mass spectrometer.

**RESULTS:** The oxygen triple isotope compositions of meteoric water and terrestrial silicate/oxide minerals fall on statistically distinguishable fractionation lines, defined as $[\ln(\delta^{17}O + 1) = \lambda \ln(\delta^{18}O + 1) + \Delta]$, where $\lambda$ and $\Delta$ correspond to the slope and intercept, respectively. The fractionation line for meteoric water has $\lambda = 0.5285 \pm 0.0005$ and $\Delta = 0.03 \pm 0.02\%$ and for terrestrial silicate/oxide minerals has $\lambda = 0.5270 \pm 0.0005$ and $\Delta = -0.070 \pm 0.005\%$, at the 95% confidence limit.

**CONCLUSIONS:** All the analyzed terrestrial silicate/oxide minerals including internationally accepted reference materials (NBS-28, UWG-2, and San Carlos olivine) have a negative $^{17}$O-excess with respect to VSMOW. We propose that it is necessary to specify if the determined $\delta^{17}$O values of terrestrial and extraterrestrial samples are expressed as the difference from VSMOW or the terrestrial silicate mineral-corrected value. Copyright © 2012 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
The chlorogenic acids of Gardeniae Fructus used traditionally as a Chinese herbal medicine (zhizi) have been investigated qualitatively by liquid chromatography/multi-stage mass spectrometry (LC/MS^n). Twenty-nine chlorogenic acids were detected and twenty-five characterised to regioisomer level on the basis of their fragmentation, twenty-four for the first time from this source. Assignment to the level of individual regioisomers was possible for three caffeoylquinic acids, three dicaffeoylquinic acids, three sinapoylquinic acids, four caffeoyl-sinapoylquinic acids, two feruloylsinapoylquinic acids, one p-coumaroyl-sinapoylquinic acid, three (3-hydroxy, 3-methyl)glutaroylquinic acids, two (3-hydroxy, 3-methyl)glutaroyl-feruloylquinic acids, one (3-hydroxy, 3-methyl)glutaroyl-dicaffeoylquinic acid, and one (3-hydroxy, 3-methyl)glutaroyl-caffeoyl-feruloylquinic acid. Six (3-hydroxy, 3-methyl)glutaroyl-caffeoylquinic acids were detected and two were tentatively assigned as 3-caffeoyl-4-(3-hydroxy, 3-methyl)glutaroylquinic acid and 3-caffeoyl-5-(3-hydroxy, 3-methyl)glutaroylquinic acid. The (3-hydroxy, 3-methyl)glutaroyl residue modifies the mass spectral fragmentation behavior and elution sequence compared with the chlorogenic acids that contain only a cinnamic acid residue(s). Fourteen of these twenty-nine chlorogenic acids have not previously been reported from any source. Copyright © 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
A little “Googleology”

- 200 variables in the Google algorithm: you can only hope to influence 4 or so...
- Use of words in body text (frequency, proximity, context...)
- Terms in:
  - Title
  - Subtitle
  - Section headings
Choose and place keywords wisely

Title: Core keywords/key-phrases

Abstract: Repeat core keywords/key-phrases 2–3 times, and add other field-related ones

Headings and body text: Consistent use of keywords

Make sure the terms you use are consistent:
e.g. which one: “dorsoventral”, “dorso-ventral”, “dorsal-ventral”? Which is more used in the literature?
Apply the principle of “chunking” throughout your manuscript.

This is hard to digest and remember...

Keep your lowest level sections below 600 words; better 300, if possible.

This is easier to digest and remember...
...in your body text, write in short sentences...

... and Use tables and information boxes to organise important details when possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>abc</th>
<th>abc</th>
<th>abc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xyz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xyz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xyz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xyz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 1

...
The times they are a-changin’...

Chaucer 49
(1343 – 1400)

Dickens 20
(1812 - 1870)

JK Rowling 12
(1965 - )

REFERENCES

More mistakes are found in the references than any other part of the manuscript

• It is one of the most annoying problems, and causes great headaches among editors

• Cite the main scientific publications on which your work is based

• Do not inflate the manuscript with too many references – it doesn’t make it a better manuscript!

• Avoid excessive self-citations

• Avoid excessive citations of publications from the same region
ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Use a spell checker. If English is not your first language then ask a native speaker or colleague to check your work or consider using a professional English Editing service:

There should be no barriers to getting your research published, yet we know that manuscripts are often returned for English language and formatting issues.

Let Wiley Editing Services provide you with expert help to ensure your manuscript is ready for submission.

- **English Language Editing**
  - Improve the chances of having your paper accepted; we give you direct access to native English speakers, experts in your area of research, who will provide extensive edits for language and style...
  - Read more

- **Translation Service**
  - Already have your manuscript in Portuguese, Spanish or Chinese? The Wiley Translation service will provide you an English language translation and a manuscript publication-ready...
  - Read more

- **Manuscript Formatting**
  - Save yourself valuable time formatting to a specific journal style. A skilled expert will check your manuscript to the specified journal style...
  - Read more

- **Figure Preparation**
  - Improve the visual presentation of your research. Using the Wiley Figure Preparation service allows you to generate publication-ready figures from your original files...
  - Read more
Show the readers you care about your research by taking care writing your paper

You need a **GOOD** manuscript to present your contributions to the scientific community!
2. Submission and Peer Review
Which journal to approach first?
Deciding Where to Publish

- Know your target audience
- Look at the journal requirements
- Look beyond impact factor
- Look at the literature

Where does your boss want you to publish?
Which audience do I want to reach?

- **Identify** the audience
- **Verify** their interest in the topic
- **Determine** the range of interest
  - Local vs. International?
You’ve chosen a journal, now you have to prepare your manuscript for submission…

Read the author instructions and format your article appropriately – all major journals will have online instructions…
Transactions on Emerging Telecommunications Technologies

Copyright © 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd

Edited By: Mischa Dohler
Impact Factor: 1.354
ISI Journal Citation Reports © Ranking: 2013: 31/78 (Telecomm
Online ISSN: 2161-3915

Recently Published Issues | See all

Current Issue: September 2014
Volume 25, Issue 9

Transactions on Emerging Telecommunications Technologies
formerly known as European Trans Telecommunications (ETT), has
aims:

- To attract cutting-edge publicat
leading researchers and research findin
around the world

- To become a highly cited sourc

Author Guidelines

Opportunist...
Only submit to **ONE** journal at a time
Online Submission

• Create an account in the journal’s online submission system

• Carefully follow the process through; make sure the author list you input is complete, it should match the names on the manuscript

• Journals usually have an editorial office that you can contact if you have any doubts in the first instance rather than going direct to the Editor
Online Submission

- Papers go through an initial checklist to make sure the author guidelines have been followed (format, length, language, figures etc.)
- Papers are also checked for plagiarism using special software...
Writing a good Cover Letter

• Your opportunity to speak to the Editor directly:
  • View it as a job application letter; you want to “sell” your work
  • WHY did you submit the manuscript to THIS journal?
    —Do not summarize your manuscript, or repeat the abstract
    —Instead, mention what would make your manuscript special to the journal
  • Mention special requirements, e.g., if you do not wish your manuscript to be reviewed by certain reviewers, and any conflicts of interest
  • Most editors will not reject a manuscript only because the cover letter is bad, but a good cover letter may accelerate the editorial process of your paper
Peer review process

1. Author submits article
2. Article assessed by editor
3. Sent to reviewers
4. Further review needed?
5. Reviews assessed by editor
6. Accepted
7. Revisions required
8. Rejected
9. Production
10. Publication

Author submits revised manuscript
Why Peer Review Is Important

- Improves the quality of papers published
- Helps assess the importance of findings
- Determines the originality of the paper
- Can potentially detect plagiarism and fraud
- A better system has not yet been identified

84% of researchers believe that without peer review there would be no control in scientific communication

90% of researchers feel that peer review improves the quality of their published paper
Peer Review
On what basis are peer reviewers chosen?

Journal’s reviewer database
Current and past authors / referees, bibliographic searches, keyword, interests, publication history.

Suggestions from authors
Very helpful!
Not just the biggest names please – others as well
Also list people with conflicts of interest who should not be asked to review

Suggestions from other reviewers
Can provide leads to further candidates

Suggestions from our Advisory Board Members
Especially in difficult cases, appeals or disputes

Editor’s own knowledge of the community
Contacts from conferences, prominent scientists, regular authors, etc.
Why be a peer reviewer?

Access to latest research before it is published

Duty

To keep the peer review mechanism buoyant

To enhance ones gravitas as an expert

To glean recognition by the editors

Pedagogical altruism – to encourage and help develop author’s ideas

Visa application (becoming more common)
EVOLVING REVIEWER RECOGNITION

Exploring new approaches to recognition and reward to motivate reviewers and improve science

Throughout 2015, we ran a pilot partnership with Publons using 11 journals (or 9,658 reviews). To date, 31% of reviews (from 1,568 unique reviewers) “opted in” to have data transferred to Publons. With 66% of these reviewers claiming their review(s) and receiving recognition from Publons. During our pilot, reviewer acceptance rates improved for all 11 journals.

Average claimed opt-in rate across all publisher and journal integrations with Publons is 18%. Our pilot’s rate is 17%.
## Typical Reviewer questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>See Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the problem significant and concisely stated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the experimental and/or theoretical methods described comprehensively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the summary (abstract) concise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the Literature citations adequate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the language acceptable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Manuscript Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Select...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of article is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tables are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of figures are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Decision

- Accept
- Minor Revision
- Major Revision
- Reject
Peer Review Outcomes

Acceptance
• Without changes (rare)

Rejection
• Use this as a learning experience and don’t just resubmit the manuscript to another journal – improve it based on feedback

Revision
• With minor changes or major changes – address these methodically and list clearly how you have addressed each point. If you feel a point is not correct you can challenge it…
How Does An Editor Use Peer Review?

Editors base their decisions on:

• The journal’s aims and audience
• The state of knowledge in the field
• The level of competition for acceptance and page space
• **Reviewer comments, but remember….. reviewers’ recommendations are not a vote**

The editor makes the final decision
Common Reasons for Rejection

✓ Paper **does not fit within a journal's scope**

✓ Findings **cannot be generalized**

✓ Results **do not clearly show practical, clinical, or theoretical implications**

✓ **Wrong methodology** was used

✓ Manuscript is **poorly written**, include spelling errors or jargon

✓ Figures, tables, and images are **not clearly labeled**

✓ High competition for page space
Tips to survive Peer Review

**Accept** feedback as a learning experience

Remember very few submissions are accepted **unconditionally**

Seek **help** with language and statistics if you need it

**Persistence** pays! Answer questions and address revisions quickly

Understand that editors and reviewers are trying to help **improve** your paper

**Celebrate** your accomplishment! You are one step closer to being published
The comments of the referees should be used to refine your work and improve the manuscript

Answer **Politely**

Answer **Completely**

Where you disagree, support your argument with evidence

http://exchanges.wiley.com/blog/2015/07/30/how-to-deal-with-reviewer-comments/

Remember, reviewers are readers too!
3. Production and Copyright Ethics
✓ Once your paper is accepted then you will be notified, via the online submission system, by the Editor of the good news…then the paper leaves for production.

✓ Your part in this process is to check the proofs when they are generated and the quicker this is done the sooner the paper can appear online!

✓ You will also need to sign a copyright transfer form to allow the Publisher to publish the work…
COPYRIGHT TRANSFER AGREEMENT

Date: ____________________  Contributor name: ____________________________________________

Contributor address: ________________________________________________________________

Manuscript number (if known): _______________________________________________________

Re: Manuscript entitled ______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________ (the “Contribution”)

for publication in ________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________ (the “Journal”)

published by ________________________________________________________________ (“Wiley-Blackwell”).

Dear Contributor(s):

Thank you for submitting your Contribution for publication. In order to expedite the editing and publishing process and enable Wiley-Blackwell to disseminate your Contribution to the fullest extent, we need to have this Copyright Transfer Agreement signed and returned as directed in the Journal’s instructions for authors as soon as possible. If the Contribution is not accepted for publication, or if the Contribution is subsequently rejected, this Agreement shall be null and void. **Publication cannot proceed without a signed copy of this Agreement.**
GOT ETHICS?
Academic Publishing Depends on Trust!

There are ethical responsibilities for all actors in the publication process:

Editors

Authors

Referees
Editor responsibilities

Ensure efficient, fair, and timely manuscript processing

Ensure confidentiality of submitted manuscripts

Make the final decision for accepting or rejecting

Not use work reported in a submitted manuscript for their own research

Ensure a fair selection of referees

Act upon allegations of scientific misconduct

Deal fairly with author appeals
Author responsibilities

- To gather and interpret data in an honest way
- To give due recognition to published work relating to their manuscript
- To give due acknowledgement to all contributors
- Notify the publisher of any errors
- To avoid undue fragmentation of work into multiple manuscripts (salami publishing)
- To ensure that a manuscript is submitted to only one journal at a time
Reviewer Responsibilities

Ensure confidentiality of manuscripts and respect privileged information

Not to withhold a referee report for personal advantage

Return to editor without review if there is a conflict of interest

Inform editor quickly if not qualified or unable to review

Judge manuscript objectively and in timely fashion

Explain and support recommendations with arguments and references where appropriate

Inform editor if plagiarized or falsified data is suspected
Ethical Misconduct

Examples of ethical misconduct that are not tolerated:

- Falsifying data
- Fabricating data
- Plagiarism
- Multiple concurrent/dual submissions
  - Image manipulation
  - Authorship misrepresentation
  - Duplicate publication

PENALTIES CAN BE SEVERE!
Raising the bar on ethical challenges in research publishing

In 2014, Wiley released a second edition of “Best Practice Guidelines on Publishing Ethics: A Publisher’s Perspective”, originally published in 2006. These multidisciplinary guidelines provide resources and practical advice on ethical concerns that arise in academic publishing for editors, authors, and researchers among other audiences.

Benefits

Support
Offers a centralized location for authors to find guidance and get advice from real people.

Reduction in misconduct
Helps authors avoid committing scientific misconduct and breach of publishing ethics.

Clarity
Provides understanding around ethical boundaries in a rapidly changing world of scientific research and publishing.

Wiley also has an internal Intellectual Property Group which provides guidance on escalated issues.
Ethics resources

publicationethics.org

http://exchanges.wiley.com/ethicsguidelines
Ethical Guidelines

✔ Articles should always be submitted to one journal at a time

✔ The same article should not be published in more than one place

✔ Several articles based on the same research must each make a unique contribution

✔ Acknowledge all those that have contributed to the work
4.
Becoming Famous
Manuscript published!

GAME
OVER?
Self-promotional author toolkit

Maximize the impact of your published research!

7 promotional tools to help ensure your work gets seen, read and cited.

SEO
- Are your title and abstract clear and searchable? Have you used the most relevant keywords?
- Have you looked at off-page SEO strategies, such as link building, to promote your article?

Conferences
- Think about simple messages to promote your article at your next conference – whether networking with colleagues, or presenting formally.

Publicity
- Is your latest research newsworthy? Have you shared it with your local press office?
- No permission is required from Wiley for any press release, but we ask that you wait until the article is published online, refer to the relevant journal in the opening paragraph, and link to the final published version of the paper on Wiley Online Library.

Social Media / Networking
- If you run a blog, post about your article.
- Share a link to your article on Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook or other social media platforms.
- Engage with any existing Society / College social media accounts.
- Join academic social networking sites such as ResearchGate and Academia.edu.

The Wider Web
- Update your faculty or professional website with an entry about your article.
- Register for your unique ORCID ID and add your article details to your profile.
- Find a Wikipedia page on a topic related to your article, and add a reference to your paper.

Multimedia
- Talk directly to potential readers and create a short video or podcast which conveys the essence of your paper. Ask your Wiley contact for more details.

Email
- Use Wiley Author Services to nominate up to 10 colleagues to receive free access to your article, or email a link to key colleagues.
- Sign up for journal content alerts, so you know when your article is officially published online.
- Add a link to your email signature.

97% of authors stated they are likely or very likely to use the toolkit.
How to measure impact

Get Read
Usage
Uses article views and downloads to track the reach of a paper online.

Get Shared
Altmetrics
Collects mentions in social media and web-based media to track online attention.

Get Cited
Citations
Captures references to a published source to track validation of one’s research by others.
ORCID

Connecting research and researchers to increase the discoverability of published work. Wiley is using ORCiD to create an improved author experience.

Showcases work
Clearly links professional activities back to individual authors

Helps with career progression
Funders, institutions and societies can easily identify individual author’s research

Spend more time conducting research
Minimize time spent entering repetitive data when reporting on past activities

wileyauthors.com/orchid
WILEY ADVISORS NETWORK
Connecting the next generation of researchers and professionals

- Up-and-coming researchers in diverse fields of study
- Twitter feed to connect with young researchers
- "A Day in the Life of an Early Career Researcher" blog
- Wiley webinars on a broad range of publishing topics
Open Access

What are my options?
Understanding Open Access
Wiley Video

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o2HMouOV-Lg
Open Access

Gold Open Access
Pay to Publish

Green Open Access
Self-Archiving

free, immediate, permanent online availability of published research, combined with the rights to share and use the content
Wiley offers three Open Access options

Pay-to-Publish Open Access

Wiley Open Access
Fully open access journals

OnlineOpen
Hybrid open access journals

Self-Archiving Open Access

Self-Archiving
Peer-reviewed versions on personal website

Fully Open Access Journals (launched 2011)
Program of fully open access journals. Every article is published open access

Open Access Option (launched 2004)
Hybrid model enables authors to make their article fully open in a subscription journal thus providing choice for authors to publish open access in the journal of their preference

Self-Archiving
Allows peer reviewed (but not final) versions of a paper to be hosted on a person website or an institutional website after an embargo period

Publishing Open Access with Wiley
Figure 1. Share of papers published by Spain in gold Open Access journals compared with the global share according to Web of Science during the 2005-2014 period.

Table 1. Total number and share of papers authored by Spanish institutions published in Open Access journals indexed in the Web of Science by scientific area during the 2005-2014 period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts &amp; Humanities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. OA documents</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>5,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OA documents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical, Pre-clinical &amp; Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. OA documents</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>19,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OA documents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering &amp; Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. OA documents</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>5,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OA documents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. OA documents</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>3,845</td>
<td>20,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OA documents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. OA documents</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>9,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OA documents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. OA documents</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>7,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OA documents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Whether publishing open access in a hybrid journal or in a fully open access journal, we provide several resources to help authors navigate open access publishing:

- **Understanding Open Access video**
- **and Funder Open Access policy finder**
- **Compliance Road Maps**
- **Publishing Decision Tree for RCUK funded authors**
Open Access Policy Finder

Helping authors to locate the open access policy and funding support they need

- Provides OA policies by funder and/or institution
- Browse OA policies by country
- Advises on availability of OA APC funding
- Highlights Wiley OA Accounts

wileyauthors.com/policyfinder
Author choice of Creative Commons Licenses

✓ Author retains copyright
✓ Encourages sharing and reuse
✓ Author chooses one of three license types

Open Access Licenses

- CC-BY
- CC-BY-NC
- CC-BY-NC-ND
Payments are covered by:

- **Authors**
  Out of grant funds
  APC waivers and discounts for certain countries

- **Funders**
  Provide dedicated funds for open access publishing

- **Institutions**
  Cover costs centrally with open access funds and/or arrangements with publishers

- **Societies**
  Some societies cover costs of journal APCs themselves
Self-archiving open access policy

**After an embargo period:**
- 12 months for STM journals
- 24 months for SSH journals

**Permits authors to self-archive on:**
- Personal website
- Institutional repository
- PubMed Central (PMC)

For more information on our self-archiving policy, visit [wileyauthors.com/selfarchiving](http://wileyauthors.com/selfarchiving)
Open access articles are 4x more likely to appear in Wiley’s top 1,000 articles on a rolling basis

High-quality and authoritative publishing standards

Retain copyright for the articles you publish under a Creative Commons License

Increase the potential audience for your article

Publish quickly and efficiently

Automatically comply with open access mandates
Open availability for digital outputs of research

Integrated sharing to ensure data is:

- **Accessible** – to everyone
- **Flexible** – both machine and human readable
- **Sharable** – under a Creative Commons license
- **Reproducible** – to enable open science
- **Without cost** – to authors or readers
Join the Open Access Conversation

www.wileyopenaccess.com
@wileyopenaccess
WileyOA
Questions?
"These cited references are authors’ acknowledgments of their debt to the published research findings of others"
Researchers, funders and institutions are increasingly interested in tracking the reach and effect of their work not just in scholarly circles, but across society as a whole. Through Altmetric, Wiley can showcase research impact to authors and readers in a new way.

Post-Publication Peer Review Sites
- e.g. PubMed Central, Scopus

Mainstream Media
- e.g. Newspapers, magazines

Online Reference Managers
- e.g. Mendeley, CiteULike

Social Media
- e.g. Twitter, Facebook, Google+

Government Policy Documents
- e.g. Climate change, public health

87% Of survey respondents indicated they would use altmetrics to gauge the popularity of an article

77% Of survey respondents indicated they would use altmetrics to network with other researchers

Wiley can monitor, search and measure all of the conversations across the journal portfolio, as well as those published by competitors.
Vitamin C for preventing and treating the common cold

Overview of attention for article published in Cochrane database of systematic reviews, January 2013

About this score

In the top 5% of all research outputs scored by Altmetric

424

The data shown below were collected from the profiles of 224 tweeters who shared this research output. Click here to find out more about how the information was compiled.
PROMOTIONAL TOOLS

• Creating impact upon publication

In 2015, Wiley also made Kudos available free of charge for all Wiley authors. Last year, almost 3,000 articles were “explained,” enriched and shared using Kudos tools.
How to publish a Book
An Introduction for Researchers
A step-by-step guide to book publishing

1. The proposal
2. Writing the book
3. Production
4. Becoming Famous
The Proposal

Author prepares and submits book proposal

Wiley arranges external review process, then shares feedback

Project is presented to the Wiley publications committee

If approved, a contract is offered and signed
Writing a proposal

- A good proposal takes **time and thought** to complete
- The information provided helps to carry out a **thorough market assessment** and project costing
- An invaluable process to **focus your ideas** and clarify your vision for the book
- Provides the **framework** for the entire book

Do you plan to write or edit this book?
Author and Title information

Tentative book title (and subtitle)

Author/editor details
• Contact details
• Brief biography
• Why are you the ideal person to write/edit this book?
• List your previous works

If you’re planning an edited book, it is not necessary to have signed up individual chapter authors at this stage
Subject Matter

Give a short summary of your vision for the book, including:

- A **detailed** description of the book you want to write including the topics it will cover and what makes it **unique**

- An explanation of **why** you feel the book should be published. How will it **benefit the reader**?

- Proposed contents list. If the book is edited, provide a tentative list of contributors and their affiliations
The Market

Identify the readership for your book

- Level
- Prerequisite knowledge
- Reader profile and how the book serves them?

**Primary Market** (those audiences you feel *need* this book)

**Secondary Market** (those audiences with an *occasional* need for this book)

**Competition:** list existing related books
Manuscript information

• How many (printed) pages would you expect the book to contain?
• How long do you estimate it will take for delivery of the completed manuscript?
• List any special physical features you would expect to include.
Reviews

Give an international list of at least six people qualified to give an opinion on your book proposal (include email address if known).
Textbooks:
• Give some information about the course the book is written for: level/student numbers/length of course

Revisions:

Please list up specific changes / differences between the old and new edition of your book and how these changes will enhance this edition
Writing the book

Manuscript preparation

Wiley Editors provide support and advice

Final manuscript is submitted to Wiley
Preparing your manuscript

- Writing for SEO
- Abstracts and keywords
- Chapter titles and headings
- Artwork
- Tables
- Equations
- Code
Publisher support

The commissioning editor is on hand through the process to provide support as necessary.

You also have a dedicated project editor to assist you with all practical issues relating to development of the manuscript. The Project Editor will be able to advise you on issues such as formatting, figure development etc., and will also provide feedback on sample material as you work on your manuscript.
Final submission

- The final version of all chapters
- The names of all main authors and co-authors with complete postal address
- Final version of each image file (see Artwork Guidelines).
- A full Table of Contents and any preliminary material
- A complete set of permission grants, labelled clearly (see Permissions Guidelines).
- Abstracts and keywords for each chapter for inclusion in the online version of your book (see Abstract and Keyword Guidelines).
Production

Wiley - copyediting, typesetting, and cover design

Author checks proofs, making corrections where necessary

Printing and publication
Electronic Formats

Online books

eBooks (and enhanced ebooks)

eMobi

ePub
Maximize the impact of your book

1. Online Booksellers
   Take advantage of the power of Amazon

2. SEO (Search Engine Optimization)
   Make your book more discoverable online

3. Social Media
   Share with your network and beyond

4. The Wider Web
   Increase your web outreach

5. Conferences
   Make the most of meeting your fellow professionals

6. Publicity
   Talk to the media through your local press office or the Wiley Newswire

7. Email
   Personally share links with or recommend your book to colleagues

8. Multimedia
   Record (and share) your views on the significance of your book
Book citation index

- Launched in 2011
- Citation of books and chapters
- E-feed licence

Selection Process
- Original research
- Single/multi-authored or edited
- Series/monograph

- Does not include undergraduate textbooks, encyclopedias or popular science