[recall] In science, research and literature are linked
And don’t forget the processes
Especially the editorial process
Write to be read … barriers?

- The **title**: short, attractive, representative of the text/research
- **Keywords**: thesaurus?
- **Abstract**: abstract structure?
- **Authors**, their affiliation
- **Language**: do you speak/write/read English?
- The **text**:
  - The quality of the scientific approach
  - The structure of the text: IMRaD,…
- The **quality of the writing**:
  - readability
  - clarity
  - precision
  - style
A paper:

Is:

- A problem and a solution;
- A new and original answer (compared to what we already know);
- Only one message.
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Description of the study: Wildflower strips are used to provide floral resources for bees in agroecosystems. There is a need to develop implementation processes that maintain the development of the area's flowering species.

Objectives: To determine the effects of autumn sowing and seedling growth during the first growing season on the development of the area's perennial species.

Methods: We surveyed species development during three years (2012–2014) and 21 plots in an experimental wildflower strip.

Results: Autumn sowing increased flowering species diversity during the first growing season, with 15 species observed, compared to 10 species observed in early spring sowing. This improvement resulted in a greater diversity of species, with 15 species observed, compared to 10 species observed in early spring sowing. This improvement resulted in a greater diversity of species, with a greater diversity of species, compared to early spring sowing. This improvement resulted in a greater diversity of species, compared to early spring sowing. This improvement resulted in a greater diversity of species, compared to early spring sowing. This improvement resulted in a greater diversity of species, compared to early spring sowing.

Conclusions: The implementation and management of these practices is of particular importance to improve the efficiency of wildflower strips. We recommend autumn sowing, which reduces costs, and using classical techniques to maintain the desired species.
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Introductory part
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- **structured abstract**;
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Elements:

- **Title** (+ current title & translated title);
- **author(s)** + affiliation (use institutional standardization);
- **structured abstract**;
- **Keywords**: use a thesaurus.

Special attention must be paid to the quality of these informations

- it is also the metadata of the paper
- each element is listed “as it” in most bibliographic databases
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The title

- Short (between 5 and 25 words);
- Clear (so unambiguous);
- Summary (= summary of the abstract);
- Must attract the reader;
- Informative or synthetic;
- In the form of a question or statement.
Abstract

**Description of the subject.** Wildflower strips are used to provide flower resources for insects in agroecosystems. There is a need to determine implementation processes that maximize the development of the sown flowering species.

**Objectives.** To determine the effect of i) sowing period (autumn and spring) and ii) early cutting of annuals during the first growing season on the development of the sown perennial species.

**Method.** We surveyed species development during three years (2012-2014) in 24 plots in an experimental wildflower strip. Plots were sown either in autumn or in spring, and received or not an early cutting management in 2012.

**Results.** Sown species were favored by autumn sowing. A few species did better after spring sowing. Two years later (2014), early cutting management enhanced sown flowering species abundance and diversity in case of spring sowing only.

**Conclusions.** Studying implementation and management protocols is of first importance to improve the efficiency of wildflower strips. We recommend autumn sowing as a first approach, and mowing aimed at controlling annuals in the first year after sowing.
Or graphical abstract

- Ionic liquids
  - Imidazolium
  - Choline
  - Pyridinium
  - Phosphonium
  - Ammonium

- Drug delivery systems
  - Metallic nanoparticles
  - Polymeric nanoparticles
  - Liposomes
  - Dendrimers
  - Carbon nanotubes
  - Micelles
  - Solid-lipid nanoparticles

Novel hybrid ILs-DDS conjugates

- Increased colloidal stability
- Increased drug solubility
- Enhanced drug delivery
- Enhanced thermodynamic stability
- Tunable shape and size
- Reduced aggregation

Synergistic activity
- Optimized therapeutic effect

- Possible environmental hazard
- Toxicity
- Regulatory gaps
- Need for industry adaptability
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Introduction
- What is the context for this project?
- How does it fit in with other research on the topic?
- What is the research question?

Methods
- What did the author(s) do to answer the research question?

Results
- What was the answer to the question?
- This is often shown in tables and figures.

Discussion/Conclusion

WHY?

HOW?
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The body of the text: IMRaD model/structure

- **Introduction**
  - What is the context for this project?
  - How does it fit in with other research on the topic?
  - *What is the research question?*

- **Methods**
  - What did the author(s) do to answer the research question?

- **Results**
  - What was the answer to the question?
  - This is often shown in tables and figures.

- **Discussion/Conclusion**
  - What is the significance of this project?
  - How does it fit in with what else is known about the topic?
The body of the text: Introduction

Must:

- indicate the problem (what exactly are we talking about?);
- refer to published literature (what we already know?);
- present the hypothesis(s) (what is asked?).
The body of the text: Introduction

Must:
- indicate the problem (what exactly are we talking about?);
- refer to published literature (what we already know?);
- present the hypothesis(s) (what is asked?).

Objectives:
- highlight the value of the work presented in the article;
- justify the choice of hypotheses and scientific approach.
**Description** (specify, unless already well described in the literature) of the experimental protocol.
**Description** (specify, unless already well described in the literature) of the experimental protocol.

**Objectives:**
- allow the evaluation of the result's quality;
- allow another researcher to:
  - reproduce the results obtained,
  - use the same method in further experimentation.
No interpretation, only results
No interpretation, only results

Illustrations
- not to be redundant (graphs, tables and text);
- readable independently of the text:
  - quality of the title (above for tables & below for graphics) and legends (always below),
  - multilingual;
- numbered and always called (Table x or Figure y) before in the text.
Figure 1: Total polyphenols contents of spices using different roasting temperatures (roasting time: 15 min) and different roasting times (roasting temperature: 140 °C), respectively — Teneurs en polyphénols totaux des épices respectivement à différentes températures de torréfaction (temps de torréfaction : 15 min) et à différents temps de torréfaction (température de torréfaction : 140 °C).
The body of the text: Discussion/conclusions

Must:

- relate the results to the starting hypothesis;
- recall the originality and interest of the article (and research);
- highlight the practical consequences of this research;
- no bibliographic references. It is the discussion of the author’s work, not that of other works;
- be critical, present the limits of the research conducted (without denigrating the work);
- possibly explain unexpected results or observations.
The body of the text: Discussion/conclusions

Must:

- relate the results to the starting hypothesis;
- recall the originality and interest of the article (and research);
- highlight the practical consequences of this research;
- no bibliographic references. It is the discussion of the author’s work, not that of other works;
- be critical, present the limits of the research conducted (without denigrating the work);
- possibly explain unexpected results or observations.

It is an essential part. Sentences can be cited in articles and books.
A review (or systematic review)

- For a review paper;
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- For a review paper;
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A review (or systematic review)

- For a review paper;
- For an application for research funding;
- For a research paper (part of the introduction);
- For a thesis.
A Review

Demonstrates the value of your work.

Show that you’re proficient in the topic.

Express your agreement and disagreement.
A review - can use another structure

Introduction:
- subject, limitations, and scope of the research;
- presentation of the structure of the “Literature” section;
- presentation of the methodology of the extended literature search.

Literature:
- discussion on the different sources selected;
- organization: evolution over time, points of view and schools, different aspects.

Conclusions (or “implications” and “future”):
- contributions of the literature (what is already known);
- areas of agreement and controversy (incl. Your voice);
- questions still awaiting answers (by You).
A review - can use another structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• subject, limitations, and scope of the research;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• presentation of the structure of the “Literature” section;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• presentation of the methodology of the extended literature search.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>• discussion on the different sources selected;</td>
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### Introduction:
- subject, limitations, and scope of the research;
- presentation of the structure of the “Literature” section;
- presentation of the methodology of the extended literature search.

### Literature:
- discussion on the different sources selected;
- organization: evolution over time, points of view and schools, different aspects.

### Conclusions (or “implications” and “future”):
- contributions of the literature (what is already known);
- areas of agreement and controversy (incl. Your voice);
- questions still awaiting answers (by You).
A revue - can also be structured as a research article

Introduction

- subject, limitations, and scope of the research.
A revue - can also be structured as a research article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>subject, limitations, and scope of the research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material &amp; methods</td>
<td>presentation of the methodology of the extended literature search.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A revue - can also be structured as a research article

Introduction
- subject, limitations, and scope of the research.

Material & methods
- presentation of the methodology of the extended literature search.

Results
- findings (structured presentation of the literature) by sources, area of knowledge, timeline, ...
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### Introduction
- subject, limitations, and scope of the research.

### Material & methods
- presentation of the methodology of the extended literature search.

### Results
- findings (structured presentation of the literature) by sources, area of knowledge, timeline, ...

### Discussion
- contributions of the literature (what is already known);
- areas of agreement and controversy (incl. Your voice);
- questions still awaiting answers (by You).
All documents used must be cited in the text, with reference to the bibliography.
All documents used must be cited in the text, with reference to the bibliography.

All documents in the bibliography must be cited at least once in the text.
The bibliography

References must be:
- recent
- exhaustive (but not redundant – a selection of the most representative)
- accessible (not « submitted » or « local document not published »)
- scientific (should this be specified?)
The bibliography

References must be:
- recent
- exhaustive (but not redundant – a selection of the most representative)
- accessible (not « submitted » or « local document not published »)
- scientific (should this be specified?)

And don’t forget the use of the right tool to manage documents and bibliography!
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some publishers accept appendices;
• it’s getting easier with electronic publishing;
• with open science, it’s called open data.
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Writing a paper: first steps

1. before all: **literature search**;
2. the **article type** (research, review, research note, method...);
3. the list of **authors** (!);
4. the choice of the **journal** (tools...);
5. define the **subject** of the article (one question - one answer);
6. **authorizations** (for illustrations).
A decision must be taken **before** starting the work (research and writing).
A decision must be taken **before** starting the work (research and writing).

### The author:
- plays a central role in determining hypothesis;
- contributes to obtaining, analyzing and interpreting results;
- participates in writing a significant part of the article;
- not to be confused with thanks.

The place of an author in the list is also important (first, last...)

**The authors**
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The journal choice (recall)

Before 1950
- researcher read/used two or three titles
- peer reviewing process was not yet used

After WW2
- increase of the number of publications (mainly in English)
- IF created to help librarians to choose titles
- the IF has been guide to authors to choose (prestigious) titles to read and where to publish … with all the biases that are now well identified
- evaluation systems of researchers and research have integrated IF in evaluation process
- DORA’s declaration on research evaluation is gradually changing the situation
Currently

With the multiplication of bibliographic databases and specialized search engines, the development of Open Access, We choose our readings:

- less on the basis of titles where they are published
- but on the basis of a bibliographic search
Currently

With the multiplication of bibliographic databases and specialized search engines, the development of Open Access, we choose our readings:
- less on the basis of titles where they are published
- but on the basis of a bibliographic search

Continue to choose titles with IF to publish is for:
- the ego of researchers (based on the notion of prestige, not quality)
- competition between research teams (and universities)
- respond to the “diktats” of some evaluation committees
The journal choice (recall)

It is necessary to:
- reappropriate the publishing process
- reduce the costs (in public money)

Open Access is a solution (green or golden way)
knowing that with the evolution of the models the quality of the evaluation and publishing processes have significantly increased

Points of attention:
- predatory journals (which have appeared since the invention of APCs) but especially “borderline” journals such as Frontiers in or MDPI
- the amount of APCs and the transforming models that will continue to link universities to big publishers who will make even more money (we refuse to sign these agreements)
- the intrinsic quality of journals: process, visibility, editing…
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The journal choice

- Open access! (or at least fair publisher):
  - avoid hybrid journals (“Open Choise”),
  - avoid predatory journals/publishers.
- International recognition;
- Databases and citations;
- Peer reviewing and validation process;
- Audience (generalist vs. specialist, language…);
- diffusion (eJournal, frequency, process duration);
- Edition (author’s guide).

OA = between 2 et 5 times more citations!
Enter your abstract here:

After a brief historical review, this article presents the current situation of the journal BASE, its objectives, its challenges, its functioning and its limitations. BASE is a journal that publishes articles in Open Access in the field of agronomic sciences in the broad sense and offers a free service to authors. The editorial board pays particular attention to the transparency of its validation and editing processes. The figures presented allow BASE to find its place alongside all international scientific journals. At the end of the article, after describing the difficulties encountered, several perspectives are described. These should address the possible disadvantages of the multidisciplinary nature of BASE.

Search

Your results...

Score : Title of Journal, ISSN

98.42 : Social Communication, 2299-5382
98.40 : Revista Română de Biblioteconomie şi Ştiinţa Informării, 2559-5490
98.35 : Journal of Research Practice, 1712-851X
98.30 : Management, 2299-193X
98.28 : Analele Universităţii "Eftimie Murgu" Resita: Fascicola II, Studii Economice, 2344-6498
Open Access Journal Finder powered by Enago

The Enago Open Access Journal Finder enables you to find quality open access journals that are pre vetted to protect you from predatory publishers. This free journal finder solves common issues on predatory journals, journal authenticity, and article processing fees by utilizing a validated journal index provided by the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). Enago's proprietary search algorithm helps you shortlist journals that are most relevant to your manuscript and research objectives, thus giving you the best chance of publication.

JOURNAL RESULTS

- Are keyword-targeted and most relevant to your manuscript's subject area
- Are validated and certified by DOAJ
- Include international high impact, peer-reviewed publications

Functioning and its limitations: BASE is a journal that publishes articles in open access in the field of agronomic sciences in the broad sense and offers a free service to authors. The editorial board pays particular attention to the transparency of its validation and editing processes. The figures presented allow BASE to find its place alongside all international scientific journals. At the end of the article, after describing the difficulties encountered, several perspectives are described. These should address the possible disadvantages of the multidisciplinary nature of BASE.

Enter your email address

SEARCH JOURNAL

Also available in your language

- Japanese
- Chinese
- Korean

DOAJ metadata is licensed under CC-BY-SA. The search algorithm incorporated in the tool is proprietary to Enago. If you are a publisher and would like to have a similar functionality on your website (for your journals), please contact us at academy@enago.com.
Think. Check. Submit. helps researchers identify trusted journals and publishers for their research. Through a range of tools and practical resources, this international, cross-sector initiative aims to educate researchers, promote integrity, and build trust in credible research and publications.

Sharing research results with the world is key to the progress of your discipline and career but with so many publications, how can you be sure you can trust a particular journal? Follow this checklist to make sure you choose trusted journals and publishers for your research.

Are you submitting your research to a trusted journal or publisher? Is it the right journal or book for your work?
Are you suspicious of a journal's authenticity? Is it a predatory journal?

These are legitimate questions if you're invited to submit a paper that:

- promises your rapid publication;
- has procedures and/or policies that look suspicious;
- is outside of your area(s) of expertise.

Compass to Publish helps you determine the degree of authenticity of open access journals requiring or hiding article processing charges (APCs) using a criteria-based evaluation. It is not designed for open access journals that explicitly state that they do not require article processing charges (APCs). It does not evaluate the quality of a journal, but its degree of authenticity. It does not pretend to offer an exhaustive list of criteria for the identification of predatory journals.
Authorizations

For:

- tables;
- graphics (including maps!);
- drawing or photograph.

You must have permission to reproduce (unless in open access, e.g. CC, or public domain). Contact with rights holders (editor, authors…) can take a long time…
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Authorizations

For:
- tables;
- graphics (including maps!);
- drawing or photograph.

You must have permission to reproduce (unless in open access, e.g. CC, or public domain)

contact with rights holders (editor, authors...) can take a long time...
The basic

- write to communicate, not to impress;
- keep your audience in mind;
- write in your own voice: express yourself;
- organize the information carefully;
- follow the instructions;
- set aside blocks of time for writing;
- write quickly and leave gaps if necessary;
- revise, revise, revise.
Your text

- write readable (words, sentences & paragraphs);
- be understandable and direct;
- remove jargon;
- use concrete words;
- add enough details (but not too much);
- credit sources adequately.
The right tools
- write without editing!
- use an editor (instead of a word processor) to write without distraction;
- use a mental map to structure your ideas.

Don’t try to get it right the first time and resist the temptation to edit as you go.
Writing

The right tools
- write without editing!
- use an editor (instead of a word processor) to write without distraction;
- use a mental map to structure your ideas.

Don’t try to get it right the first time and resist the temptation to edit as you go → You will tend to get stuck and waste time.
Take care of the readability of your text

Readability depends on:
- the length of the sentences
- the complexity of the words used

There should be only one idea per paragraph
Take care of the readability of your text

Readability depends on:

- the length of the sentences
- the complexity of the words used

There should be only one idea per paragraph

If a reader has to reread a sentence to understand it, it is probably poorly written
It is essential to avoid using the terms:

- few,
- many,
- a lot,
- some
- ...

Their meaning are subjective

You must give a quantity, a proportion, a percentage. Say how many!
Some simple tips to improve your writing (to write stronger sentence)

1. Avoid contractions

   - don’t → do not
   - can’t → cannot
   - shouldn’t → should not...
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Some simple tips to improve your writing (to write stronger sentence)

1. Avoid contractions
   don’t → do not
   can’t → cannot
   shouldn’t → should not...

2. Avoid “there is” or “there are”
   There are many issues that students face at university → Students face issues at university
Three simple tips to improve your writing (to write stronger sentences)

3. Avoid “really”, “very”, “a lot”, “so”

A lot of students think university is very hard → 50% of students find it hard to study at university
Some simple tips to improve your writing (to write stronger sentence)

3 Avoid “really”, “very”, “a lot”, “so”

A lot of students think university is very hard → 50% of students find it hard to study at university

4 Prefer the active voice

Healthcare reforms were implemented by Obama → Obama implemented healthcare reforms
Some simple tips to improve your writing (to write stronger sentence)

3. Avoid “really”, “very”, “a lot”, “so”

A lot of students think university is very hard → 50% of students find it hard to study at university

4. Prefer the active voice

Healthcare reforms were implemented by Obama → Obama implemented healthcare reforms

5. Use strong verbs

He made objection to nationalization → He objected to nationalization
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Peer reviewing process open / single blind / double blind; contacts (between the authors and reader are forbidden).
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Peer reviewing process
- open / single blind / double blind;
- contacts (between the authors and reader are forbidden).
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Fraud
- plagiarism and self-plagiarism;
- data production;
- data manipulation and falsification.

Conflict of interest
- financial and Commercial;
- contractual;
- patent.

Authorship
- who did what?
- ghost authors (rewriting company).
Ten advices to write an incredibly bad paper ... ;-)

1. Avoid Focus;
2. Avoid originality and personality;
3. Make the article really really long;
4. Do not indicate any potential implications;
5. Leave out illustrations (...too much effort to draw a sensible drawing);
6. Omit necessary steps of reasoning;
7. Use abbreviations and technical terms that only specialists in the field can understand;
8. Make it sound too serious with no significant discussion;
9. Focus only on statistics;
10. Support every statement with a reference.

Sand-Jenson in Oikos 2007, 116 723 (C&E News Sept 10, 2007)
Submit your paper

- via email or on a dedicated site;
- With a cover letter:
  - a brief description of the work, its purpose, and interest in the journal,
  - the originality of the manuscript,
  - the subject of the manuscript fit with the scope of the journal;
- declaration on the honor of lack of conflict of interest (funding, for example);
- declaration on honor that all co-authors authorize the submitting of the paper.
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The main reasons for rejection (or major revision) are as follows:

- There's plagiarism.
- The content is not original.
- There are too many mistakes (spelling, grammar, language...).
- Objectives (hypothesis[s]) are not defined.
- The interest is too local.
- The experimental design is too poor.
- There are inconsistencies in the data.
- The conclusions are hasty or erroneous.
- The results are too partial (“further study should…”).
- The bibliography is poor or too old and does not give a current vision of the problem.
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Thank you for your attention

1these slides were created with a Markdown file, Beamer and Pandoc