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Today’s Presenters:

**Graduate Students**
- Zarina Giannone (PhD Student, University of British Columbia)
- Kyrsten Grimes (PhD Student, University of Toronto)
- Jean-Philippe Gagné (PhD Student, Concordia University)
- Georden Jones (PhD Student, University of Ottawa)

**Expert Guest Speaker**
- Kevin Kelloway (Professor/CRC, Saint Mary’s University)
Workshop Outline

1. Publishing Deconstructed
2. Preparing a Manuscript
3. Common Barriers
4. Tips and Tricks
5. Professional Editor’s Perspective
6. Student Editor’s Perspective
7. Q & A with Dr. Kelloway and Graduate Student Panel
Publishing is imperative to successful scholarship
  • Key metric for funding, research/post-graduate opportunities

Rejection is inevitable and it does NOT define you
  • Positive Uncertainty
Publication Stats

• Top journals receive far more submissions today than just 5 or 10 years ago
• Top journals reject the majority of submissions and expectations are increasing
  • e.g., enhanced study complexity
• High rejection rates
Hang in there!

Research is highly valued by us, within our research circles, and by the general public!
Preparing a manuscript
Journal selection

• Impact Factor
  • The number of times all items published were cited in a given year divided by the total number of “citable items” in that journal during the same year
  • Importance?

• Think about the audience you are trying to target

• Be realistic
  • Canadian journals are less competitive

• Read the publication guidelines!
Preparing to Publish

- Ensure adequate time for co-authors to review submission
- Author guidelines
- Reference style
- Number of references
- Word count
- Cover page
- Tables and figures
New Submission

Select Article Type
✓ Enter Title
✓ Add/Edit/Remove Authors
Funding Information
Submit Abstract
Select Classifications
Additional Information
Suggest Reviewers
Oppose Reviewers
Select Region of Origin
Attach Files

Please Add, Edit, or Remove Authors

Enter the names of all authors, whether it be an individual or group, by clicking the "Add Another Author" button. The Order of Authorship can be edited by the dragging an author's row into the correct order. Please ensure that all author names match the manuscript's title page, including initials and punctuation. When finished adding authors, click "Next".

Inclusion of this information indicates that these individuals have agreed to be listed as an author.

Please list each author's name as they appear on the title page (e.g., John R. Smith).

Current Author List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ Add Another Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrsten Marie Grimes [Corresponding Author] [First Author] [You]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Add Another Author

Previous Next
We sought to determine what cognitive mechanisms contribute to the development of positive symptomatology in schizophrenia. We hypothesized that the constellation of schizotypal traits would be a risk factor for the presentation of subsyndromal positive symptomatology. In order for subsyndromal positive symptomatology to be present, however, fantasy proneness and an externalizing bias must also be present and automatic thoughts must be externalized. A random sample of undergraduate students (N = 215) with at least a grade 4 reading level and deemed to exert adequate effort were included in the study. Participants completed self-report measures to assess schizotypal traits, externalizing bias, fantasy proneness, and automatic thoughts, with subsyndromal.
## New Submission

### Additional Information is Required for Submission
Please respond to the questions/statesments below.

#### Grant Funding

Use this submission funded by a grant from NIMH, Wallace Trust or Research Councils UK? If yes, please enter the specifics of your grant below.

**NOTE:** If you answer "None of the Above," please skip the following two questions (grant number, granting agency).

- **Answer Required:**
  - [ ] NIMH Funding
  - [ ] Wallace Trust Funding
  - [ ] Research Councils UK Funding
  - [ ] None of the Above

### Grant Number

**Character Count:** 0

**Limit 50 characters**

###Granting Agency

**Character Count:** 0

**Limit 200 characters**

**Was this manuscript prepared consistent with the APA Publication Manual (6th edition)?**

- **Answer Required:**
  - [ ] Please select a response
  - [ ] Yes

**Does your manuscript include measures of effect size, as recommended by the APA Publication Manual?**

- **Answer:**
  - [ ] Please select a response
Statistics

• Make sure your analyses are appropriate for the hypotheses and variables included in your study
• Make sure you present your results appropriately
• Df, statistic, $p$ value
• Consider including effect sizes and power if appropriate
• Make sure to report missing data
• Make sure you can explain your data cleaning process if needed
Statistics

• If you are unsure about your results/analyses

• Consider consulting with a statistician
  • Most universities have statistic consultants on staff
  • Possibility to include them as a co-author

• Very useful when needing to reply to tricky questions from reviewers
Collaboration

• Consider collaborating with:
  • Clinical researchers
  • Other professors
  • Other students
  • Colleagues met at conferences

• In order to:
  • Participate in different research projects - and publish them!
  • Gain their experience in editing manuscripts
  • Gain their clinical perspectives on the research
  • Gain their input on which journal to submit to
Common Barriers and Responding to Reviewers
Reviewers Decisions

1. Author submits manuscript
2. Journal editor screens manuscript
3. Manuscript is peer reviewed
4. Journal editor/editorial board decides whether to publish
5. Author is informed of decision

Some manuscripts are rejected before peer review
6-60% rejected here
Reviewers Decisions

- Accepted without any changes (acceptance)
  - Extremely rare

- Accepted with minor revisions (acceptance)
  - The best outcome you can hope for

- Accepted after major revisions (conditional acceptance)
  - Changes suggested by reviewers/editors (e.g., adding a study)

- Revise and resubmit (conditional rejection)
  - Will reconsider in the future (if major changes are made)

- Rejected (outright rejection)
  - Do not resubmit to the same journal
Rejection

- Extremely frequent
- Reviewers tend to write about the negative aspects and limitations
- Select a journal that may be a better fit
- **Incorporate reviewers’ comments before resubmitting**
- Reviewers read your manuscript as if a faculty member wrote it
- Fun fact: Peters and Ceci (1982) showed that 1 out of 12 already published manuscripts were rejected by the same journal they had been published in previously

- “Unfortunately, manuscripts reporting on [topic] are not a high priority for [journal] at the present time.”
Responding to Reviewers

• All responses combined may be as long (or longer!) than the manuscript in some cases
• You may not agree with reviewers → always be polite
• If you cannot make a change → explain why and include it in the discussion as a limitation
• You do not want to make a change → clearly defend your point
Addressing Revisions

• Reviewer: “Another variable to consider is illness of the participant [...] This would also be a potential variable that would contribute to health anxiety if there were a medically ill parent.”

• Response: “Thank you for this observation. Participants were asked to identify whether they had experienced certain health conditions such as asthma, diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis, and so on. Participants were not asked to provide details regarding their personal medical risks or contact with health care providers in association with such risks. As a result, we could not determine if "medical risk" was associated with increased health anxiety. To address the reviewer's concern, we added a statement on this matter to the discussion (p. XX).”
Addressing Revisions

• Response: “Reviewer #1 highlighted the importance of considering several studies characteristics (e.g., controlled studied, blinded studies, method for controlling drop outs) that may produce biased results. As this is a preliminary meta-analysis in an area with little research base, preserving as many studies for analysis as reasonably possible was of importance. However, we agree that the potential for bias is cause for concern. We have added a section (pp. XX-XX) that addresses this bias through an outlier analysis.”
Common Challenges

• Rejection
• Reviewers comments
• Edits
• Co-authors
• Balancing different priorities
Persistent you will be

- 8% of submissions in *Nature* get published
- Rejection is the norm
- Don’t give up
  - Resubmit to another journal
  - Rework your paper/analyses
  - Take the feedback the editor gives you
  - Rejection = feedback
Patience you will learn

- Responding to reviewers comments can be lengthy
- Take your time to respond to the comments
- Don’t overlook your responses even if you don’t agree with the reviewer
- Take breaks and take time to vent if necessary (so that your frustration does not show in your tone!)
Meticulous you will become

• Take your time to edit your paper accordingly to the comments
• Make sure your responses are clear and respond to the comment
• Rushing to resubmit won’t increase your chances of publication
• Ask for feedback from your co-authors
Interpersonal skills you will use

• Working with different co-authors may be difficult
• Organize meetings to discuss reviewer comments
• Decide on a plan
• Decide on a timeline
• Decide on tasks
• Decide on authorship at the beginning of the process
Busy you are

• Think about your priorities
  • Thesis, clinical work, publishing, course work
• Schedule time to work on your manuscript/revisions
• Find a study buddy
• Treat yourself when you are done
Student Editor’s Perspective

Mind Pad, Canada’s Student Psychology Journal

- What is it?
- Initial publication/peer-review opportunities
  - Authors
  - Reviewers
  - Editors
Student Editor’s Perspective