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You don’t publish data - you publish an argument. What problem do you address? Why is it relevant? Will anything change?
Audience

- Who is your audience? What do they know? What don’t they know?
- Different journals are read by different specialists.
First steps

- If you have data, try to create your figures early in the process. Make sure your charts are clear and readable - at least as good as they can be.
First steps

* Hone in on your argument. Why should people listen to you? How will your findings impact the field? Is there anyone in particular who will be affected?
What academic journal is most appropriate for your work? In what journals have similar studies/works been published?
Each journal has a different organization and a different format for citations. When you revise the paper, it will help if you do so with a specific journal (or journals) in mind.
Journal Selection

To find out: length, percentage of submissions published, audience reach, reputation, time to decision, time to publication, style guide requirements, submission policies.
You may by citing anywhere from 3 - 60 papers in your article (and occasionally more), depending on the discipline and the length of the article. You will need to have read much more than that to properly place your article.
The idea with a literature review is to present a context from which to interpret your findings. Whose work does yours resemble? Are you agreeing with anyone else’s findings? Are you disagreeing with them?
Many comments you will receive from peer reviewers will mention studies that you should have discussed. A more comprehensive search will improve your study’s chances of getting into a journal.
Are you communicating the same thing people are reading? Have a friend or GRC consultant read the paper and list the 4-5 main points. Are they the same as the 4-5 points you are trying to make?
Ethics

✱ Are there ethical considerations in publishing the work? Are there specific guidelines for the journal?
✱ Can individuals be identified?
✱ Has part of the research been published before?
✱ Is there a disclosure needed regarding funding?
✱ How do you state the use of commercial products?
What tables and figures are absolutely necessary to express your argument? Which ones are not necessary?
Different journals have different guidelines for citations. Follow your journal of choice’s guidelines to the letter.
General Format

* Abstract
* Introduction
* Methods
* Results
* Discussion
* Conclusion
In trying to express your ideas, there will undoubtedly be simpler phrases that if shortened will make your manuscript easier to understand.

- A GRC consultant or peer can help with this paring down process as needed.

- Simply put, write simply. (and clearly)
Many commas, are unnecessary
Two levels of structure

Is the broad outline of the paper structured, with a clear argument?

Are the mechanics of the paper ok? Is each sentence/paragraph flowing well?
Do you effectively craft your authorial voice to reflect that of an expert in the field, particular to the journal to which you are submitting?

Your audience is no longer your instructor but other contributors to your field. Make sure your authorial voice and positioning reflects this. What might this look or sound like exactly?
Surviving Peer Review

※ Identify weaknesses in your argument. Be your own enemy. But try to find one among your friends.
Try to start a proofreading circle among your friends. Offer to proofread your friend’s papers. Be critical, use lots of red ink. Make them mad. That way, they’ll be happy to return the favor.
Submitting the Manuscript

スタミミングスのマニュスクリプト

☆ Make sure all your figures are saved as high-resolution .tiff files.
☆ Follow detailed instructions - different journals have different publication pathways.
☆ Don’t rush, take your time and make sure everything goes right the first time.
Immediate Gratification

...isn’t going to happen. Publishing a paper is a long process. It could take up to a year or longer for your work to make it to the mailboxes of your colleagues.
“Accepted with Revisions”

Good news! It will see daylight. Take the comments from the peer reviewers and go over them very, very carefully. Address them all - even if you disagree.
“Revise and resubmit”

Yellow light. If you make the revisions as suggested and resubmit you *might* get published. This indicates that your argument is intriguing and perhaps useful to the journal but might need some further research or crafting. No guarantee that the article will get published, however.
“Rejected without Review”

Unfortunate. There may be critical errors in your writing or argument. Or, it is a decent article that simply isn’t a good fit for the journal.

Revise it for a different journal and submit again!
You always start on a blank slate with your next paper. Nobel Laureates have had papers rejected without review. Don’t give up! Consider and use the submission and review process as a way to develop your skills. Consistent practice and development will have positive results.
Please see our website at www.unm.edu/~grad (right side panel) for a link to our calendar of events and workshops.

Make an appointment with a GRC consultant to discuss your article by speaking to a CAPS receptionist at 277-7205 or on the third floor of Zimmerman library.