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Outline

In this session we will discuss:

- Authors: How to write a good paper.
- Referees: How to write a good report.
- Resubmission or How to argue.
- Rejection without Review
- Ethics
Review process in a nutshell

How to submit?
- Introduction, abstract, conclusion.
- A good cover letter.
- Proof read.
- Check with less involved colleagues.
- Proper literature search.
- Suggest referees.

How to report?
- Start by summarizing the result in the paper.
- Address our criteria of validity, importance, and broad interest (PRL) as well as accessibility, presentation...
- Back up claims of interest/disinterest, importance/unimportance – give examples.
- Be diplomatic.

This is an example of the fact that scientific progress usually proceeds incrementally, sometimes in unbearably small steps. We believe that our paper represents one of those steps.
This paper should be rejected for the following reasons
1. No one cares about this anymore
2. Anyone who could referee it is probably dead
3. All who read it will wish they were

... the revised version is greatly improved ... there are now only a large number of grammatical errors rather than a huge number.

I'd suggest that you send this paper to [...] or [...] or [...] for a review.
I've moved on to other things sufficiently that I can't be spending the time to plow through its 57 pages. I'd rather read War and Peace.

Good referee reports

Characteristics of a good report
- substantiated arguments (for or against)
- reasonable level of detail
- no personal, polemic, self-serving remarks
- timeliness

We grade reports!

The editors may
- edit a report for cause (happens often)
- withhold a report (happens but rarely)

An example of a good report

"I strongly recommend that this paper be published. It is a valuable contribution at the intersection of two fields of significant interest. The paper is very well written and clear, and with some work I was able to understand and learn from it on the first reading. It is a pleasure to recommend that a paper be published essentially as submitted."

Resubmission

- Answer all criticism.
- Be factual, and collegial.
- Make (helpful) notes for the editor.
- Be objective, no matter how you might feel.
We have revised our manuscript ONLY according to the comments of referee A. We have not taken into consideration the comments of referee B, who clearly completely missed the main points of our manuscript. It is unfortunate that referee C repeats this mistake.

- PRB raised editorial rejections from 2006.
- PRL raised their own rate from 2005, after a recommendation by the PRL review panel in 2004.
- Motivation: to save time of referees, editors, and also authors who may find better audiences elsewhere.
- Statistics show that this has been a successful initiative.
Ethics

• We rely on referees (and readers) to identify breaches of professional ethics.
• We coordinate efforts with other affected journals.
• We will investigate, although we have no real power beyond our journals.
• **No two Ethics cases are alike!**

For more information:

http://publish.aps.org
http://prb.aps.org
http://prl.aps.org

feedback@aps.org
help@aps.org

Not only is this paper wrong, but I did it first!