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• 4 issues per year
  • Original Articles
  • Brief Communication
  • Invited Reviews
  • LTE
  • Special Issues
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    • Methods in Behavioral and Social Research
    • Maryland Oral Health Summit
    • DPH Competencies
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Goals

• Improving the impact of journal
• Maintaining and increasing global reach
• Ensuring a sustainable financial future
• Keeping on top of changes in government regulation
• Growing, engaging and retaining AAPHD membership
• Improving access and services using technology
Journal of Public Health Dentistry
Impact Factor 1.38
## Journal of Public Health Dentistry

### Institutional Reach by Type of Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia &amp; NZ</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of World</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,357</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,895</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,929</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Journal of Public Health Dentistry

Global Readership

- Australia & NZ: 5%
- Canada: 7%
- China: 7%
- Europe: 25%
- Japan: 13%
- Rest of World: 9%
- USA: 1%
- UK: 33%
### Institutional Reach by Type of Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>All-Time Score</th>
<th>One-Year Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State policy environment and the dental safety...</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dentist shortage: an analysis of dentists, practices,...</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Effectiveness of Community Water Fluoridation...</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wealth Effect And Dental Care Utilization In...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Patterns of emergency department use for dental...</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here we include details of the top ten most downloaded articles. The average number of downloads per article published in JPHD in 2016 was 125.2. For all journals we publish in Dentistry the average number of downloads per article was 153.7.
TIPS ON GETTING PUBLISHED

Journal of Public Health Dentistry
Publishing tips

• Chose a good environment
  • Pick a good training program/advisor/colleagues
  • Look for a good publishing record

• Do good research
  • Well designed studies
  • Fills an important gap in our knowledge
  • Work with talented colleagues

• Send it to the right journal
  • Right readership
  • Right “tone”
  • Impact Factor

http://sciencecareers.sciencemag.org/career_development/previous_issues/articles/2007_04_06/caredit_a0700046/(parent)/68
Writing Scientific Papers…

• Is a skill that must be learned.
  • Work with experienced colleagues
  • Practice
  • As for critique from experienced colleagues
  • Volunteer to write the first draft.
Know when you have “enough” to publish

- Stop and write when the data are sufficient to tell a story that is complete and makes sense.
  - Use the AADR abstract as a guide.
  - Test your reasoning on colleagues by asking them whether you told a logical and convincing story after giving a talk from your assembled figures, for example.

http://sciencecareers.sciencemag.org/career_development/previous_issues/articles/2007_04_06/caredit_a0700046/(parent)/68
Pick the right journal

- Readership
- Stated goals
- You can save time and reduce your frustration if you send it to the appropriate journal first instead of waiting until it's rejected by a top journal.
Make the paper right the first time.

• In the eyes of the editor/reviewers the quality of the paper you send in directly reflects the quality of the science behind it.
  1. You can predispose them to be for or against you right from the start.
  2. No careless errors, especially in the data
  3. Check and recheck that all information is consistent
  4. Images and graphs represent what you say they represent.
  5. Figures are your best ally to convey your story, make them easy to understand.
  6. It is critical that the paper is:
     1. written clearly
     2. contains no spelling or grammatical errors,
     3. The logic crisp and clean.
  7. Make sure that all authors have seen and approved the submission!
Components of Manuscript

- Title
- Abstract
- Introduction
- Methods/Material
- Results
- Discussion/Conclusion
- References
Components of Manuscript: Introduction

Best practice

• State the problem
  • What we know about a topic
  • What we don’t know (the leading edge of the gap; the next logical step)
  • Why its important to fill this knowledge gap.
  • Why your study is the logical next step.
  • Tell the story and make it interesting.

Concerns

• Too long
• Too many unnecessary paragraphs (consider the readership)
• Inappropriate references
• Failure to provide strong rationale for study
• Failure to address the study as an hypothesis.
Pet Peeves……

• Cliché opening paragraphs
  • Caries is the most common disease of childhood, five times more common than asthma…
  • Caries is a preventable disease…..

• Irrelevant material or description of issues that are well understood by the readership.

• Failure to provide a strong rationale for why the study was done
  • No one has ever looked at this topic…. (maybe no one cares)

• No a priori hypotheses or theory
  • Data dredges of some database to look for p-values
## Components of Manuscript: Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best practice</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Describe the subjects or data source clearly (inclusion/exclusion)</td>
<td>• Convoluted explanations of approach – KISS (use hypotheses to organize methods).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe methods to level needed to understand relevance.</td>
<td>• Failure to test hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surveys/instruments (valid/reliable)</td>
<td>• P-hacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Statistics – make sure they are correct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples

Good

- Descriptive statistics are provided in Table 1.
- To address hypothesis 1, that maternal smoking increased the risk of DDE, we used logistic regression. The dependent variable was DDE, the independent variable was maternal smoking and we included variables to control for age, race, education, ....

Bad

- We explored the role of maternal smoking and DDE using descriptive statistics, t-tests, and linear and logistic regression....(we tortured the data until they confessed).
Fatal Flaws

- Poor or inappropriate research design
  - “Prevalence” studies that use convenience samples.
  - Therapy studies that don’t use RCTs
  - Use of instrumentation that is ad hoc or failure to report psychometrics.
- Inadequate knowledge of literature – not addressing an important (gap) issue or misrepresenting what is known.
- Lack of innovation
- Lack of strong rationale for study (specifics important)
- Failure to secure ethics review (IRB).
- Minor changes from a previous study.
- Scope too large
Not So Fatal Flaws

- Not following directions (instruction to authors)
- Poor writing
- Failure to address all reviewers concerns.
- Conclusions that are not supported by study results.
Components of Manuscript: Results

Best practice

- Short, sweet and don’t repeat.
  - If you say it in the table/figure – don’t repeat in text.
- Don’t interpret
- Use C.I. over p-value when possible.

Concerns

- Too much “Discussion” in “Results”
- Lots of irrelevant analyses that don’t address hypotheses or purpose.
  - Post-hoc subgroup analysis
  - P-hacking
  - Trivial findings – not “clinically” irrelevant
## Components of Manuscript: Discussion (Conclusions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best practice</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address the main points first</td>
<td>Unsupported conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say what evidence was created in support of hypotheses.</td>
<td>Scattered and poorly organized section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say what your findings mean – not what you want them to mean.</td>
<td>Failure to contrast or compare to what we already know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare/contrast with other research</td>
<td>Wimpy statements like – further work is necessary to fully address this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make clear why your work adds something important (clinical, conceptual, methodological)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to structure Discussion

- Brief recap of most important question (remind reader what the research question was and what your study said about it)
- Compare to other literature
- Discuss study limitations
- Make a conclusion that comports with the study
After all that

• Create your title. Short but provocative.
• Write abstract: VERY IMPORTANT – take time to do it well. Its hard to write a little that says a lot.
• References: all that are necessary and no more.
• Keywords: Use MeSH terms
• Set the manuscript aside for 1 week – then re-read. After you fix all the mistakes, then send it to collaborators for comment.
• Show your paper to your most critical colleagues and take their advice seriously.
What is Peer review?

- **Peer review** is a process of self-regulation by a profession or a process of evaluation involving qualified individuals within the relevant field. Peer review methods are employed to maintain standards, improve performance and provide credibility. In academia peer review is often used to determine an academic paper’s suitability for publication.

- Wikipedia 05.22.12
Why should you do Peer review?

- Because it pays well?
  - Future grant or paper submissions
- Because it is good for promotion?
- Because you are asked?
- Because it is the ethical thing to do?
  - Respect or disrespect
Does peer review work?

- Prevent dissemination of irrelevant or inaccurate findings
  - Fact versus view
  - Without peer review- regarded with suspicion
  - With peer review?
- Two heads are better than one?
- Role of editor or granting agency
- Anonymous peer review
  - Single or double blind
  - Open
Response to review

The journal wants your paper

- Accept – never happens on first try
- Minor revision – lucky if you get this. Address and resubmit
- Major revision – you probably can respond, but it may or may not be possible to fix all problems.
  - Design issues
  - Analysis issues
  - Writing issues

The journal does not want your paper

- Reject – use comments to fix and try another journal.
Response to review

Good reviews

• Reviewer gives you relevant and fair feedback that truly improves manuscript.
• Respond (quickly) by acknowledging and fixing
  • include a detailed, point-by-point explanation of how you have addressed each of the reviewers' and editor's comments..

Bad reviews

• Reviewer didn’t understand, or was not competent to review.
• If, after careful consideration, you think there has been a misunderstanding or error
  - Discuss with editor.
Final Thoughts

- Be careful with “review articles”
- Use high quality statistical consulting support BEFORE you begin the study.
- A priori hypotheses are better (and more honest) that post hoc.
AN AUTHOR’S RESPONSIBILITIES: PUBLICATION AND AUTHORSHIP
What is an “AUTHOR”

• “Authorship refers to the listing of names of participants in all communications, both oral and written, of experimental results and their interpretation to scientific colleagues.”

• Authorship is the fulfillment of the responsibility to communicate research results to the scientific community for external evaluation.”

• “Authorship is also the primary mechanism for determining the allocation of credit for scientific advances and thus the primary basis for assessing a scientist's contributions to developing new knowledge.”

• “As such, it potentially conveys great benefit, as well as responsibility.”*
Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Authorship and Contributorship

Authorship credit based on:
1) substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, OR analysis and interpretation of data; AND
2) drafting the article OR revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3) final approval of the version to be published.

Authors should meet conditions 1, 2, AND 3.
Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Authorship and Contributorship

Large, **multicenter** groups:
1) The group should identify the individuals who accept direct responsibility for the manuscript (3).
2) These individuals should fully meet criteria for authorship/contributorship.
3) The corresponding author should indicate the preferred citation:
   1) Identify individual authors as well as the group name.
   2) List other members of the group in the Acknowledgments.
Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Authorship and Contributorship

1) Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group alone does not constitute authorship.
2) All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship, and all those who qualify should be listed.
3) Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content.
Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Authorship and Contributorship

1) All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an acknowledgments section.
   1) E.g., a person who provided purely technical help, writing assistance, or a department chairperson who provided only general support.
2) Groups of persons who have contributed materially to the paper but whose contributions do not justify authorship, use headings as:
   • “clinical investigators” or “participating investigators,”
   • their function or contribution should be described—e.g., “served as scientific advisors,” “critically reviewed the study proposal,” “collected data,” or “provided and cared for study patients.”
3) Because readers may infer their endorsement of the data and conclusions, these persons must give written permission to be acknowledged.
AUTHORSHIP PROBLEMS
Authorship Problems: Types

- **Gift (Guest) author**: listed as author, but does not qualify
  - To make paper look “impressive”
  - Mutual CV enhancement.

Authorship Problems: Types

- **Ghost author**: Someone omitted from authorship who is qualified
- **Denial of authorship**

**CONCLUSIONS**: This case-study review of industry documents demonstrates that clinical trial manuscripts related to rofecoxib were authored by sponsor employees but often attributed first authorship to academically affiliated investigators who did not always disclose industry financial support. Review manuscripts were often prepared by unacknowledged authors and subsequently attributed authorship to academically affiliated investigators who often did not disclose industry financial support.
Authorship Problems: Types

- **Coercive authorship**: exertion of seniority or supervisory status over subordinates.

Authorship Problems: Types

- **Duplication authorship:** publishing the “same” work in multiple journals.

Authorship Problems: Types

• **Fraudulent authorship:**
  • John Darsee
  • Robert Slutsky

PREVENTING AUTHOR ABUSE
Authorship Order

• **First author**
  • carried out a majority of the experimental work described in the paper.
  • Wrote first draft

• **“Senior” author?** (Last author)
  • Not awarded due to seniority.
  • Directs, oversees, and guarantees authenticity of work
  • Implicitly takes responsibility for work’s scientific accuracy, valid methods, analysis, and conclusions.
Authorship Order

- **Corresponding Author**
  - Person charged with communicating with editor and readers
  - Often required to “ensure that all authors are aware of and approve the submission of the manuscript, its content, authorship, and order of authorship” (PLoS Genetics)
  - Often first or last author
Authorship Order

• **Middle or Contributing author**
  • Listed between first and senior author.
  • Ordered by relative contribution.
Should “technicians” be authors

- Yes, if they meet the same standard as other authors.
Authorship Problems:

- Encourage culture of ethical authorship
  - People do what they think is the “cultural norm”
  - Refer to policy (ICMJE and local policy)
- Should discuss authorship issues beforehand
  - Good: Before manuscript is prepared
  - Better: When study is being planned.
  - Best: When interviewing/considering collaboration or position.
- Written authorship agreement is ideal.
  - Special considerations for large multicenter studies.
Authorship Problems:

- **DISPUTE**: Does NOT contravene ICMJE guidelines
  - Issue: Define “substantial”?

- **MISCONDUCT**: Contravenes ICMJE guidelines
  - **Individual resolution**: explain the fact that the suggested author list contravenes editors’ recommendations, and could be considered scientific misconduct. Again, stick to the facts and avoid being emotional. Point out that an editor could well decline to publish if he or she finds out. As soon as the meeting is finished, make a note and file it.
  - **Appeal** decisions that fail to meet ethical standards.
Institutional Oversight

• Ethics training
• Formal mechanisms in place to resolve disputes.
  • Ombudsman
  • Authorship Conflict Resolution Committee:
    • Fact finding and advisory (not – non-binding).
    • Serious abuses (coercion authorship, denial) should be referred for scientific misconduct review.
Editor’s Perspective
The Editor’s Responsibility

• Have policy in place and publicly available (Web).
• Make clear documentation for authorship (required).
• Signed letter from all authors.
  • (1) information on prior or duplicate publication or submission elsewhere of any part of the work as defined in the Uniform Requirements;
  • (2) a statement of financial or other relationships that might lead to a conflict of interest;
  • (3) a statement that the manuscript has been read and approved by all the authors, that the requirements for authorship have been met, and that each author believes that the manuscript represents honest work; and
  • (4) the name, address, and telephone number of the corresponding author who is responsible for communicating with the other authors about revisions and final approval of the proofs.
• Do not accept manuscripts where authorship in dispute.
Note: This document combines the original COPE Guidelines from 1999, the Code of Conduct developed in 2003, and the Best Practice Guidelines developed in 2007. This revision was developed after wide consultation with COPE members and approved by the COPE Council on 7th March 2011.

Background/structure

The COPE Code of Conduct for Journal Editors is designed to provide a set of minimum standards to which all COPE members are expected to adhere. The Best Practice Guidelines are more aspirational and were developed in response to requests from editors for guidance about a wide range of increasingly complex ethical issues. While COPE expects all members to adhere to the Code of Conduct for Journal Editors (and will consider complaints against members who have not followed it), we realise that editors may not be able to implement all the Best Practice recommendations (which are therefore voluntary), but we hope that our suggestions will identify aspects of journal policy and practice that should be reviewed and discussed.

In this combined version of the documents, the mandatory Code of Conduct for Journal Editors standards are shown in regular script and with numbered clauses, and the more aspirational Best Practice recommendations are shown in italics.
Editor’s Code of Conduct

• Clear Instructions to Authors
  • Reference ICMJE (if applicable) and/or criteria for authorship
  • Guidance on ALL that is expected of them
• Mechanism for author’s appeals (editorial decision as well as disputes)
Editor’s Code of Conduct: Best Practices

• support initiatives designed to reduce research and publication misconduct
• support initiatives to educate researchers about publication ethics
• assess the effects of their journal policies on author and reviewer behavior and revising policies, as required, to encourage responsible behavior and discourage misconduct.
• adopt authorship or contributorship systems that promote good practice (i.e. so that listings accurately reflect who did the work) and discourage misconduct (e.g. ghost and guest authors).
• Bring serious concerns to parent institution.
Institutional v. Editorial Responsibility

**Institution**
- Have policies in place
- Investigate possible misconduct
- Have dispute mechanisms in place
- Discipline investigators as appropriate.
  - Ensure no further misconduct

**Editor**
- Be alert to possible misconduct.
  - Authorship
  - Scientific misconduct
- Alert parent institution
- Do NOT conduct investigation
  - Support parent institution investigation.
- Correct or retract erroneous information
What to do if you suspect ghost, guest or gift authorship
(see also flowcharts on Changes in authorship, as such requests may indicate the presence of a ghost or gift author)

Guidance for Editors

Reference

WWW.publicationethics.org
EXAMPLES
Case 1:

- PhD student (Jacobs) visits prestigious lab (Franks).
- Returns to home, write paper
- Franks adds authors she is not comfortable with.
  - Technician
  - 2 postdocs
  - 2 grad. Students
- Frank adds Jacobs to another paper from his lab
- Frank references ICJME and says all meet standard.
- Seabrook intimidated – and doesn’t want to “rock boat”.
Case 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Substantial contribution to design, acquisition OR Analysis/interpretation of data</th>
<th>Drafting article OR revising it critically for intellectual content</th>
<th>Final approval version to be published</th>
<th>Authorship order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Jacobs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Frank</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Seabrook</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(technician)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post docs)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(grad students)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case 1:

• Discuss authorship issues regarding lab policies prior to:
  1. Accepting position in lab?
  2. Starting project?
  3. Writing paper?

• Include who should be author and ordering of names.

• Discuss acknowledgements
Case 1: Some

- Does this work merit a publication?
- Who “owns” these data?
- How will future authorship issues be handled (with these data)?
Case 1:

- Some journals require authors to account for their role in the paper.
  - This can be published or not.
- **Guarantor/Author**: takes full responsibility for published work.
- **Contributor** (listed at end) is someone who participated in research to some degree, but not an author.
Case 1:

• Difficult choices.
  • Talk with person directly
  • Consult Ombudsman
    • a neutral, independent party who can help students and faculty work out disputes.
  • Consult research integrity officer.
  • File formal complaint – (dean/chair). Which institution?
  • Extricate yourself
Questions

• Do you know your (lab, department, research group) policy on authorship?
• Do you know Pitt’s policy on authorship
• Does Pitt have an Ombudsman? Research Integrity Officer?
Case 2:

- PD worked in AP’s lab but has moved on to another position at a new university.
- PD had paper accepted based on work.
- AP asks editor to withdraw paper.
  - Believes PD made some questionable decisions re: data.
  - AP’s university looked into matter – insufficient evidence for scientific misconduct claim.
  - AP unable to replicate findings.
- What is editor to do?
Case 2:

- Editor asked for documentation of case from university
  - Shown that unanimous conclusion that no misconduct had occurred.
- Ask AP for specifics of concern.
  - 2 out of 22 data points in question.
- Editor suggests AP re-do analysis without 2 points. If same conclusion – publish.
- This was done – no change in conclusion. Editor publishes paper.
Case 3:

- Student project (questionnaire study) submitted as part of course grade.
  - Study conducted and written up by the students.
- Issue: why faculty supervisor first (corresponding) author?
- Editor questions this and article is withdrawn.
- Then resubmitted (photocopy letter from all students) with no changes.
- Editor:
  - Try to contact students
  - Ask faculty (corresponding) for explanation.
  - Change journal policy (email, list contributions)
- Follow up – students claim coercion.
- Paper withdrawn.
- Additional papers from same university submitted with same problem (culture)