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Questions

1. Experiences publishing papers at different stages in careers (graduate student, postdoc, and now)?
   1. Publications are most impactful dissemination mechanism in our research
      1. Ability to reach a wide range of people internationally
      2. During job searches and funding agencies publication record is assessed
      3. Get a publication out of every project, sometimes challenging as a Project Scientist, have to put in own time though make it a priority
   2. Progress reports provide many of the essential components for publishing manuscripts
   3. Reviewing papers is helpful as well in lieu of experience writing progress reports and proposals
   4. Writing is hard and still difficulties at times
      1. Though it gets easier over time
      2. Review process never gets easier and rejections are a natural part of the process, some can be difficult
   5. Presentations and feedback/questions can help guide subsequent manuscript development
2. Literature review can be one of the biggest hurdles, how do you engage topic that you’re not familiar with (do you write results first and come back to literature)?
   1. Writing results first can be helpful, though back and forth between sections is inevitable as the literature guides how results should be presented
   2. Everyone is different, some preference is literature review first and having a few lines from most relevant/applicable papers
3. Responding to reviewers, how do you deal with negative reviews?
   1. It is difficult.
   2. First review, do not get upset, separate yourself from feeling personally attacked
      1. Explain each and everything in your responses as if you were explaining to someone not familiar with the work (e.g., 5th grader)
   3. Can receive some nasty/obnoxious reviews
   4. View reviewer comments as an opportunity to explain something better and more clearly in your work
   5. Have a thick skin
4. Who do you seek out to help you with negative reviews and avoid abandoning papers?
   1. Really important to have a community of people you can talk to
      1. Your paper is publishable, perhaps in a different journal
      2. Peers, friends, and mentors are important
   2. Varies with journals/disciplines as well
      1. Different cultures in different fields
   3. Reach out to the editor as well
      1. Candid conversation about resubmission or moving on
      2. Which reviewer comments are most worthwhile to address
   4. Disconnecting personally is number 1 step for review process
5. At what point do you contact editor regarding rude comments?
   1. Make it a point to highlight those to the editor, consider requesting removal of reviewer
      1. Keep in mind that editor may or may not accommodate request
   2. Also consider appealing editor decision as well
6. What do you prioritize when deciding where to submit? Do you prioritize editors, journal, prestige?
   1. Audience
   2. Focus on journal more than specific editors
7. How do you deal with editor who does not effectively communicate?
   1. Consider other staff members that can be copied
8. How do you identify key papers on a topic? Also, for literature review do you read all or just skim?
   1. Abstract, introduction/summary, and skim through figures
   2. Write down important messages
   3. Only use a review paper if written within the last 2 years as a starting point
      1. Then look for key referenced papers and subsequent citations
   4. Your abstract is extremely important in addition to figures
   5. Introductions can be worthwhile as well
9. Do you review papers outside your area of expertise? If so, how do you?
   1. Depends how far outside expertise and how much additional time would be required on your part
   2. As a reviewer, if you realize subsequently that this is beyond your expertise you can communicate this with editor
10. How do you deal with the lack of communication and lengthy publication process timeline?
    1. Occasionally you do get odd review processes
    2. Open access journals can be very difficult sometimes given demand load
    3. Open discussion peer review processes are interesting as well because it creates challenge to publish elsewhere since manuscript is made available
       1. May need to request that in-review paper is taken down
    4. Some journals simply take a long time and have lengthy review cycles
11. Is there a way to know when you have enough content for a publication?
    1. Presentations and conferences force you to turn your data and results into a story
    2. Sometimes use new figures in response to reviewers to show ongoing nature of the work as well
    3. Always have to have a cut-off and draw a line in the sand
    4. Research is ongoing, publications are only what we know at the current time
    5. Read draft of paper from reviewer perspective and assess what would you critique/reject within the manuscript
       1. Still challenging because you are very close to the work
12. How do you deal with conflict and disagreements among coauthors in original manuscript submission and/or addressing reviewer comments?
    1. Stick to the facts
    2. Little word changes can accommodate concerns sometimes
    3. People interpret facts differently
    4. Having confidence to say what you want
    5. Some may want to be removed from manuscript due to such disagreements
    6. Talk to coauthors as well (in-person or telephone), not an email exchange (impersonal)
    7. If there’s a disagreement, wait a couple of days to let frustration subside
    8. As lead author, support work you did, don’t just necessarily automatically bend to reviewer wishes
    9. Some of it may come down to personal preference
13. How do you navigate co-authorship (e.g., who should be on paper, what order)?
    1. Adding a name should not be a dealbreaker
    2. Based on contributions directly to the manuscript, but also the research as well
    3. Is it worth energy/time debating addition or removal
    4. Establish up front
    5. Know who your collaborators are, choose carefully if it can be helped
    6. Debate regarding “courtesy” authorship to PI who obtained funding but otherwise did not contribute directly to work or manuscript
       1. Sometimes the PI goes last (senior/advisor role)
    7. Dealing with different personalities, people management and interpersonal skills
    8. Difference in importance of order, also discipline specific, personal preference as well
    9. Long author lists sometimes defer to alphabetical order
    10. Some faculty institutions track first and last author
    11. Ask upfront and let people state preference
14. When do you speculate about results and implications of the paper?
    1. Personal preference
    2. Also based on editor/reviewer feedback
    3. At least have 2 really strong and defensible key points
       1. Perhaps 1 additional point of speculation
    4. Generally avoid speculation
       1. Exception would be with a small, ancillary case study to demonstrate
    5. Speculations within reason
       1. Put in context of limitations and caveats as well
       2. Don’t overstate results
15. How important is impact factor? How easy is it to publish in high impact?
    1. Personal preference how important impact factors are
       1. Focus more on audience, review process, and past experiences
    2. Higher impact factors result in high rejection rate
       1. Consider sending a pre-submission inquiry to editor (e.g., Nature and BAMS have a pre-submission process)
       2. Also consider submission to partner journals as well
       3. Some journals require you to cite papers within the journal to somewhat manipulate/artificially elevate impact factor as well
       4. University faculty and different nations impact factor may matter more
       5. Review criteria can be a barrier as well in higher impact journals
    3. Bibliometric ways of assessing work
       1. H-index (citation/publication)
       2. Impact factor
       3. Organization as a whole (UCAR/NCAR) does track as required by NSF
       4. [ncarref@ucar.edu](mailto:ncarref@ucar.edu)
16. How do you get yourself to write? When is the best time to write a paper?
    1. Varies by person
       1. Figure out what works best for you (time, location, etc.)
       2. Consider setting timers
       3. Consider outlines
    2. At least 1 paragraph a day or 1 hour a day, can spur more
    3. Dedicated time is helpful
    4. Writer’s block
    5. Accountability buddies/group
    6. Book “How to Write A Lot”
    7. Don’t be afraid to get things down and subsequently revise
    8. Methods are the easiest place to start writing
    9. Turn off internet, not checking email
17. What internal review processes exist?
    1. Internal Review Process (by lab or institution)
    2. RAL, ACOM, ASP