***Publishing a journal article***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Module 5 | Mentorship and the publication process |
| Sub-module B | Publishing a journal article |
| Length of sub-module | Approximately 1 hour and 10 minutes to 1 hour and 40 minutes |
| Sub-module summary | In this second sub-module, continuing to provide an overview of the publication process and how to guide mentees through this process, we will now address what happens once a paper is submitted to a journal. You are encouraged to draw on your own (mentoring-related) experiences and the lessons gained from them, during discussions. |
| Equipment, visual aids and handouts (on the day) | PowerPoint projector, screen and laptop  Internet connection  Flipchart paper, pens, sticky notes  Put the **exit cards** up on the wall from the previous day or module (if applicable)  **5B-publ\_publ journal.pptx**  **HO1 cases to distribute.doc** |
| Guidance to facilitating learning activities | **Morning review** (5-15 mins)  Start off with some banter about what you or the participants did the previous evening, for example. Don’t make it about yourself – get the participants talking!  Next stand beside the **exit cards** on the wall and make some overall comments on the frequent themes. Say that you won’t have time to respond to all the cards but you will be commenting on the key ones. Invite further comments from the participants.  Remind participants of the learning contract on **5B-publ\_publ journal.pptx*-*slide 2** (on animation fade setting) if necessary.  Throughout the sub-module, trainer/s should refer participants to the **four reflection questions** on the wall and at the back of their handbooks. Trainer/s should encourage participants to makes notes in response to these four questions, at regular intervals (not just at the end of the sub-module or day).  **Sub-module summary** (2-3 mins)  Display **slide 3**and verbally present the sub-module summary above to set the scene. It is important that these points are shared with participants from the outset.  The next three cases in this sub-module address various aspects of publishing an article in a journal. They are relatively simple so discussion time can be kept short and to the point, unless participants have a particular issue to discuss or an experience to share related to the topic.  First, trainer/s can select their preferred case discussion method/s for Cases 8, 9 and 10 from the ‘Guidance for trainer/s section’.  **Case 8: A shortcut or not?** (5-10 mins)  The trainer/s might want to simply invite participants individually to read Case 8 (in **HO1 cases to distribute.doc)**. Invite participants to volunteer suggestions on how Dr Sloan should proceed, there should be some discussion around avoiding ‘salami science’ as touched upon in the proceeding sub-module when discussing ethics.  Invite participants to make any notes from the discussion, under Case 8 before moving on to the presentation.  **Participatory presentation: Submitting the paper** (15-30 mins)  Using **slides 4-9**the trainer/s can present the key points and ask the questions on the slides to the full-group. The questions are in blue and can be asked first before revealing some suggested responses (on animation fade setting).  Refer participants to **Resource 14** in the participant handbook for more detail on producing cover letters (**slide 5**).  The trainer/s might want to note that the initial screening by the journal is done to determine whether the paper should be sent for peer review. If a journal decides not to send a paper for peer review (and thus not to consider it for publication), the author can proceed to submit the paper to another journal (**slide 7**).  The trainer/s might want to make the following points, when on the subject of peer review (**slide 8**):   * Some journals invite authors to suggest potential peer reviewers and let authors request that certain individuals not be considered as peer reviewers (for example, because they seem likely to be biased). * Mentees may well ask mentors for guidance in such regards. * Proposed reviewers should be individuals who are well qualified to review the research but who do not have conflicts of interest. For example, authors should not propose colleagues at their institution or close friends of theirs.   **Case 9: Too great a barrier?** (10-15 mins)  The trainer/s might want to invite participants in pairs to read and discuss Case 9 (in **HO1 cases to distribute.doc)**. Invite pairs to volunteer suggestions as to how Dr White should proceed.  Discussion of Case 9 should include at least the following two points:   * When journals accept papers, they normally request some revisions. Authors should not feel discouraged. * When authors find that a requested revision would introduce an inaccuracy or other major problem, they should propose an alternative revision or explain why the proposed revision is not suitable. Both the author and editor want the paper to be accurate and clear; they should work together to achieve this goal.   Invite participants to make any notes from the discussion, under Case 9 before moving on to the next mini-presentation.  **Mini presentation: Revising a paper and answering queries** (3-5 mins)  Using **slides 10-11**the trainer/s can present the key points and ask the questions on the slides to the full-group. The questions are highlighted in blue and can be asked first before revealing some suggested responses (on the animation fade setting).  **Case 10: An inconveniently timed absence** (10-15 mins)  The trainer/s might want to invite participants individually or in pairs to read and discuss Case 10 (in **HO1 cases to distribute.doc)**. Invite participants to volunteer suggestions as to how Dr Mills should proceed.  In discussing Case 10, it should be noted that Jill could:   * Ask the journal whether the deadline for reviewing the proofs could be extended. * If the deadline cannot be extended, arrange to have a co-author or other suitable person review the proof (in which case the journal should be informed of this arrangement).   Invite participants to make any notes from the discussion, under Case 10 before moving on to the next mini-presentation.  **Mini-participatory presentation: Reviewing proofs** (3-5 mins)  Using **slide 12**the trainer/s can present the key points and ask the questions on the slides to the full group. The questions are highlighted in blue and can be asked first before revealing some suggested responses (on animation fade setting).  After presenting the key points, the trainer/s might want to note that a final step is to celebrate the publication of a paper. Mentors should congratulate their mentees on publication of their papers and, if appropriate, to celebrate with them.  **End of day or sub-module reflection** (20-30 mins)  Trainer/s can share a summary of the day’s or sub-module’s activities and the highlights for them as trainer/s. Then invite participants to share their reflections on the day’s or sub-module’s work and impressions of the workshop.  Finish by asking participants to individually fill out exit cards. Display **slide 13** (on animation fade setting) with the instructions. Make sure the colours of the sticky notes or cards correspond with those named on the slide. They can be of any colour, as long as they are of three different colours, and preferably not white. |