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UCLA (2012 AY)

Impact Factor: 1.420 (Ranked 14 out of 32 in Medical Laboratory Technology category)

Scope: The Journal of Laboratory Automation (JALA) is a multi-disciplinary, bimonthly international peer-reviewed journal devoted to the advancement of technology in the laboratory.

JALA highlights innovation at the intersection of academia, industry, and government research and is backed by an internationally-renowned Scientific Advisory Board and Editorial Board.
JALA Audience

JALA authors, readers, and reviewers are academic, commercial, and government researchers, scientists, and engineers who conduct research and develop new technologies to increase productivity, elevate data quality, reduce lab process cycle times, or enable experimentation that otherwise would be impossible.
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JALA Editorial Board
Internationally-Recognized Researchers and Business Leaders from 7 Countries
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JALA Editorial Highlights At-A-Glance

Editor’s Choice Collections
• Diagnostics and Detection
• Emerging Technologies in Medicine
• Laboratory Automation and Robotics
• Microfluidics
• Nanomedicine

Special Issues
• Advancements in Biomedical Micro/Nano Tools & Technology (Jan. 25)
• New Developments in Global Health Technologies (Mar. 15)
• Novel Drug Development and Delivery
• Robotics for Laboratory Automation
• Next Generation Microarrays
• Nanomaterials and Microfluidics for Automation
• Nanomedicine
• Biosecurity and Biosafety
• Food and Agriculture
• Bionanotechnology
JALA Market
Journal of Biomolecular Screening (JBS)

Editor-in-Chief:
Robert Campbell, Ph.D.
Senior Research Advisor
Eli Lilly & Company

Impact Factor: 2.049

Ranked:
32 out of 73 in Chemistry, Analytical
79 out of 157 in Biotechnology & Applied Microbiology
45 out of 72 in Biochemical Research Methods
Scope: Readers are encouraged to submit material in any relevant topic area, including: target identification/validation, assay design and development, assay technologies (novel applications, comparisons), automation/robotics, lead generation and/or lead optimization, high-content screening/imaging platforms, virtual screening and chemoinformatics, data/image analysis, statistics and information technologies/ methods, sample management (e.g., library design, compound logistics, chemical diversity), biological reagent production, characterization and management for drug discovery (cell lines, stem cells, surrogate tissues/species [e.g., xenopus, zebrafish, yeast]), genomic and proteomic screening biomarkers, high-throughput approaches to ADME/PK and predictive toxicology, and legal/ licensing issues insofar as they impact the field of screening and/or drug discovery. The Journal will also publish reviews, mini-reviews, and perspectives in these topic areas. Other features include: upcoming conferences and training seminars, product applications, employment opportunities, society and member news, and book reviews.
JBS Indexing

Biomolecular Interaction Network Database (BIND)
BIOSIS database
BIOSIS Previews
Biotechnology Citation Index
Chemical Abstracts
Current Contents: Life Sciences
Elsevier BIOBASE/Current Awareness in Biological Sciences
EMBASE/Excerpta Medica
EMBiology
Index Medicus
InfoTrac (full text)
MEDLINE
Prous Science Integrity®
Science Citation Index Expanded (Web of Science)
Scopus
JBS Editorial Board
Internationally-Recognized Researchers and Business Leaders from 6 Countries

Albert-Ludwigs-Universitat Freiburg
AstraZeneca
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Exelixis
GlaxoSmithKline
Johnson & Johnson
Lankenau Institute for Medical Research
Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center
U.S. National Institutes of Health

Noscira
Novartis Pharma
Pfizer
Promega
Sanofi Aventis
Tecan Italia
Threshold Pharmaceuticals
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Venenum Biodesign
Vertex Pharmaceuticals
JBS Editorial Highlights At-A-Glance

Editor’s Choice Collections
• ADME/Tox
• Assay Data Analysis, Statistics
• Compound Management
• Epigenetics
• Flow Cytometry (FACS)-Based Screening Methods
• HCS, Imaging, Data Analysis
• High-Throughput Screening Methods
• High-Throughput Screening Reviews
• NMR, Mass Spectrometry-Based Screening Methods

Special Issues
• Data Mining and Analysis (TBD Soon)
• Phenotypic Drug Discovery (Jan. 25)
• Stem Cells in Drug Discovery
• Epigenetic-Targeted Drug Discovery
• High Content Screening, Imaging and Data Analysis
• Compound Management
JBS Market
How to Get Published

Central Message
• What are the key take-away points of your paper?
• Summarize the messages of your paper in 3-5 sentences

Choosing the Right Journal
• Choose the right audience
• Be realistic about the impact/significance of your paper
• IF versus the best audience/category

Manuscript Composition – Enhance the Readability
• Title
• Abstract
• Introduction
• Results
• Discussion
• References/Citing
Manuscript Composition

Title

• What is the most important message of your paper?
• The message is more than just the data
• Capture the audience’s imagination
  • Cellular-Level Surgery Using Nano Robots (JALA, Dec 2012)

• Be Clear:
  • Bad Example: Treatment of Pediatric Melanoma Patients with Lasers
  • Better Example: Laser Treatment of Pediatric Melanoma Patients

• Follow journal rules for title length and format
Manuscript Composition

Abstract

• Establish the narrative of your paper
• Convince the editors, reviewers and audience to want to read your paper
• Should be able to stand on its own without reading the paper
• State the hypothesis, question or objective of the study
• Complete the story by answering the hypothesis, question or objective
• How does this work impact your field of research and the larger scientific/medical/commercial industry?

• Stay consistent with title and introduction in the use of keywords and concepts
• Follow the correct style and format
• Follow order of the manuscript (Intro-Methods-Results-Discussion)
• Stay within the allowed word count
• Do not include data that isn’t in the paper
• Do not suggest conclusions that can’t be supported by the data in the paper
• Limit abbreviations to a minimum
• No references and no figure or table citations
Manuscript Composition

Introduction

• Why was this study conducted?
• Sufficiently introduce the current state of research without becoming a review paper
• Recognize key works that came before yours
• Be clear how your work differentiates from previous publications.
  • What did you do differently?
  • What is novel?
  • Concisely reiterate/summarize the key talking points/data/ideas that you will demonstrate in the paper and emphasized in abstract

Methods

• Effectively describe how studies were performed.
• Explain techniques in sufficient detail that an expert in your field could effectively replicate your work.
• Be clear about the source of materials
• Describe statistics techniques employed
• If your studies involved living subjects, describe ethical and regulatory considerations of the study
Manuscript Composition

Results

• Order your Results and Figures in a clear and sensible manner that fits your narrative
• Provide enough data in Results to convince the audience of your conclusions
• Title your Results subsections in a concise and clear manner
• In each subsection, start by clearly stating why these experiments are important.
• State your results clearly and with no embellishments or overreaching conclusions
• Always begin and end with a bang (what are the most important experiments of the paper?)

Discussion

• Explain why your work is important. This is your narrative. What conclusions do you take from your Results that advance what is known in your field of research?
• Do not just summarize your results. Answer bigger questions.
• Do not be afraid to talk about the limitations of your work
• How does your current work indicate where future research should go?
Originality

Importance of Citations

- Ideas are the currency of Academia
- Failure to cite violates the rights of the person who originated the idea
- Academics need to trace the genealogy of ideas

Originality of Research

- How does your work differentiate from work that came before it?
- What novel insights or conclusions can you make from your work?

Evaluation of Originality by Peer Reviewers

- How does your work compare to the work cited in your paper?
- How does your work compare to work that you failed to cite (This can kill your paper)

Description of Originality in Manuscript

- Create and maintain a narrative that easily explains why and how your work is novel.
- Differentiate your work from properly cited work that came before yours. Show how your work extends beyond what is known.
The Importance of Citations

**Ideas are the Currency of Academia**
- Ideas enable the originator of the idea to receive credit for their work
- Citations are a key indicator of impact
- Giving credit to one who makes new discoveries is important for the field

**Failing to Cite Violates the Rights of the Person who Originated the Idea**
- It is important to keep track of sources
- During the course of describing new findings, it is important to formally describe how prior discoveries have served as a foundation for new ideas

*From: The Importance of Citation, Judy Hunter, Grinnell College*
The Importance of Citations

**Academics Need to Trace Genealogy of Ideas**

- Inspiration for new ideas should be acknowledged
- Mapping out the course of innovation is important for those within the field as those who are new to the field
- Mapping out the course of innovation makes how your work is novel easier to follow

*From: The Importance of Citation, Judy Hunter, Grinnell College*
The Importance of Citations – During Review Process

How are Citations Evaluated?
• Did the authors sufficiently acknowledge previous work?
• Do the citations sufficiently explain the genealogy of ideas leading up to this paper?

Reviewer Response to Citations
• Thorough referencing will make the review process easier
• Failure to cite key papers that your work clearly builds on will greatly harm your paper and the reviewer’s perception of your work

Citations in Reviewers’ Critiques
• If citations are not sufficient in paper, Reviewers will point it out
• If Reviewers are not specific about requests for greater citation – Don’t just add 1 or 2 token cites.
Authorship Issues

Authorship Order

- Which graduate student/postdoc/tech did the most work/led the project?
- Co-first author is fine
- Lead PI should go last
- Gamesmanship: Do you have collaborators that helped with your project that can add legitimacy to your work?

Corresponding Authorship

- The lead PI should generally be Corresponding Author. In cases of multi-disciplinary studies, can have two Corresponding Authors.
- Situation-specific cases for making postdoctoral fellow Corresponding Author

Authorship Permissions

- Does everyone on the authorship list know they are associated with your paper?
Peer Review Process

• The review process is confidential, and reviewers are obliged not to discuss papers or authors with anyone outside of the SLAS editorial staff.

• Manuscripts are typically evaluated in response to stated Peer Review Guidelines and initial feedback is usually provided to authors within four weeks after submission.

• Manuscripts can be accepted as written by reviewers, declined as inappropriate, or as is more often the case, reviewers will suggest revisions in the SLAS Spirit of Mentorship.

• Authors are then offered the opportunity to revise and re-submit their manuscripts, or provide explanations in response to reviewer questions or suggestions.

• Revisions and responses are re-reviewed by the editor-in-chief and/or peer reviewers before final publishing decisions are made.

• Invited reviewers are asked to decline their invitation if they have any perceived conflict of interest with the author, the author's affiliation and/or the topic of the paper.
Peer Review Guidelines (available at www.slas.org)

Four Primary Areas of Evaluation

• Content
• Presentation
• Ethics
• General
Content

1. Is the manuscript within the defined scope of the journal?

2. Is the subject of the paper of sufficient interest to the journal's readership?

3. Does the paper report a specific, identifiable, advance in knowledge?

4. Has the work reported in this paper been published before? (Suggestion: search MEDLINE and/or Google Scholar by author and keywords.)

5. Are the title and abstract truly descriptive of the content?

6. Are the procedures and methods complete and sufficiently clear that the work could be repeated by anyone knowledgeable in the field?

7. Are the conclusions justified, sound and logically consistent?

8. Are the references to prior work pertinent and complete?
Presentation

1. Is the paper as concise as it could be; consistent with clarity?

2. Are all figures and tables relevant and properly prepared?

3. Reviewers are not required to comment on grammar and punctuation. Instead, reviewers are encouraged to suggest changes that would remove ambiguity or clarify meaning.
Ethics

1. Papers under review are confidential and should not be discussed or shown to others without the express permission of the editor-in-chief.

2. The identity of reviewers is kept anonymous. A reviewer should reveal his or her identity to an author only with permission from the editor-in-chief.
General

1. Ensure the appropriate manuscript category is selected by the author. If you do not think the category selected by the author is the best fit for the manuscript, recommend a more appropriate category.

2. Ensure the author is following the journal's Instruction for Authors and American Chemistry Society (ACS) Style Guidelines.

3. Assessments should be returned on or before the specified deadline. Reviewers who may not be able to meet a deadline are urged to say so as soon as possible.

4. Please keep in mind that reviewer manuscript evaluations and comments will be relayed to authors as guides for revision. Be honest, but courteous. Offer constructive criticism to the authors so they can benefit from your expertise. Critique the manuscript, not the author.

5. Any comments for the editor's eyes only should be shared in a separate note.
Permission Guidelines

• Any text, tables, or figures reproduced from previously published work can only be reprinted with written permission from the copyright holder.

• Permissions must be submitted with the manuscript, and must include print and online publication.

• Acquiring permission is the sole responsibility of the author.

• The publication from which the material is taken must be listed in the references.
Copyright and Simultaneous Submissions

• Manuscripts are considered for publication with the understanding that if a paper is accepted, copyright is transferred to the Society for Laboratory Automation and Screening, and that no paper presenting the same information has been or will be published elsewhere.

• If part of a contribution has appeared or will appear elsewhere, the author must specify the details in the comments portion of his or her submission. Simultaneous submissions of manuscripts to multiple journals at the same time is not acceptable — please do not submit manuscripts that may be under consideration by another publication or electronic medium.

• Published manuscripts may be published elsewhere only with the written permission of SLAS.

• Authors whose research was funded by an NIH grant may submit the final, accepted version of the manuscript for deposit in PubMedCentral. JALA requires such authors to specify a release date of 11 months following the date of print publication of the manuscript.
Ethics of Publishing

Definition of Plagiarism
• From Merriam-Webster Dictionary: to steal and pass off (the ideas or words of another) as one's own: use (another's production) without crediting the source

Typical Responses to Plagiarism
• Author will be given an opportunity to explain themselves
• During review process – failure to be accepted
• After publication – Retraction

Conflict of Interests
• All prospective authors must recognize and disclose any conflict of interest, or potential conflict of interest, that may bias their work, or could be perceived to bias their work, and acknowledge all financial support and any other personal connections.
• JALA follows the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, especially as they relate to conflicts of interest.
Ethics of Publishing

Scientific Misconduct
In accordance with the Council of Science Editors, SLAS recognizes that as a general guide, the term "research misconduct" applies to any action that involves purposeful manipulation of the scientific record such that it no longer reflects observed truth, or mistreatment of research subjects. The concepts of negligence and deceit are central to the definition of research misconduct. Research misconduct generally falls into one of four areas: fabrication of data, falsification of data, plagiarism, and unethical treatment of research subjects.

If SLAS suspects misconduct by authors, reviewers, editorial staff, or other editors, it will take action. This duty extends to both published and unpublished papers. SLAS will first seek a response from those accused. If SLAS is not satisfied with the response, SLAS will ask the employers of the authors, reviewers, or editors, or some other appropriate body (perhaps a regulatory body) to investigate. In the case of its own editorial staff, SLAS will conduct the investigation itself. SLAS will make all reasonable efforts to ensure that a proper investigation is conducted. If this is not possible, or does not happen for whatever reason, SLAS will make all reasonable attempts to persist in obtaining a resolution to the problem and a correction of the record if it is needed.
Tips and Resources

Go to www.SLAS.org

Click on “Scientific Journals” button (on right side of page) or go directly to www.slas.org/publications/journals.cfm

Scroll down to “Tips for Authors” box for links to:
• This presentation
• Clinical Chemistry Guide to Scientific Writing
• Advice for Published Journal Authors
• Help Readers Find Your Article
• Promote Your Article
• Increase Use and Citations of Your Article

Other Recommended Reading:
• How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper (by Day and Gastel)
• ACS Style Guide