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Mission of Scientific Journals

To publish original, high quality, and important findings in a specific scientific area with peer-review

The purpose of Journal of Food Science is to publish important findings in food science and technology.

Therefore, the contents of a manuscript should be within this scope and be relevant to the readership of the Journal of Food Science.
Why Do You Publish?

- Make contributions to society
- Be recognized professionally by peers
- Advance in the profession

Criteria for Acceptance

Originality

- Novel or creative research methodology
- New and important research findings
Criteria for Acceptance

Scientific Quality
• Appropriate experimental design and methodology
  – Data presentation and interpretation
  – Appropriate statistical analysis
  – Depth of the investigation
  – Substance of the results
  – Thorough and logical discussion of results

Criteria for Acceptance

Clarity of Presentation
  – Organization of presentation
  – Readability, clarity of writing, and grammar
  – Paper is much more likely to be rejected based on inadequate analysis than lack of originality

Importance to the Scientific Field and the Readership
  – Usefulness of findings to food scientists
Why Was My Manuscript Rejected?

Immediate Rejection Criteria

- The subject matter is of insufficient interest to the readership to a specific journal
  - Lack of new information
- The results are trivial, predictable, or duplicative of others
  - Insufficient international importance or interest
- Scientific quality is substandard due to poor experimental design and methodology
  - Improper conclusion
- Suspected misconduct - fabrication and plagiarism
Suggestion

Neatness counts in scientific research publications!

Personal Pet Peeves

• Response Surface Methodology
• Explanation of mechanism
Rejection Rate of New Manuscripts for JFS

**Excluding CR/H Section Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New Manuscripts</th>
<th>Rejected New Manuscripts</th>
<th>Rejection Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Factor
Origin of Impact Factor

“Eugene Garfield, a Philadelphia researcher who described himself as a "documentation consultant," spent his free time thinking about scientific literature and how to mine information from it.” …

“…compares his brainchild to nuclear energy: a force that can help society but can unleash mayhem when it is misused.”

Chronicle of Higher Education October 14, 2005

Definition of Impact Factor

For 2011 IF:

Citations in 2009+2010 Papers
Papers published in 2009+2010

• So, IF of 1.0 means an average of 1 citation per paper published in the previous 2 years
• Nature has IF of 32.182, 9th highest of all journals
• In Nature, 25% of papers had 89% of the citations!
  • >half have IF <1.0
Application of Impact Factor

27 million citations

5968 science journals

1712 social science journals

Use of Impact Factor

Evaluation tool for
• Research impact/funding
• Faculty Evaluation/Salary-Promotion
  • Hiring Decisions
  • Library Subscriptions
• Decision on where to publish
• Gage progress relative to competition
Inadvertent Consequences of IF

- Affect kind of research funded
- Hiring-Promotion decisions
- Submitting papers down the IF chain
- Authors dancing to editor’s requests
- Papers are rejected because they may not attract attention

Mechanisms to Enhance IF

- Publish more review articles
- Publish methodology papers
- Citations to editorials, news articles, book reviews, and abstracts count but not as papers
  - Advertise the journal’s papers e.g. news releases
- Use editorials like a paper citing the journal’s own papers
  - Ask authors to cite the journal’s papers
# JFS Impact Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
<th>No. Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>21/94</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>31/94</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21/92</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32/94</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>33/94</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>33/96</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>42/96</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>37/103</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>34/107</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>34/118</td>
<td>1.601</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>35/126</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plagiarism:

The Disease of Current Publishing
In China, academic cheating is rampant

Some say practice harmful to nation

By Gillian Wong
Associated Press / April 11, 2010

‘My opinion is that writing papers for someone else is not wrong,’ said former schoolteacher Lu Keqian.

---

Plagiarism Defined

- Plagiarism means to copy another person's ideas, words or work and pretend they are your own. In: S. Wehmeier, Editor, Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English (6th ed.), Oxford University Press, Oxford (2000).

- Present as new or original an idea or product derived from an existing source. In Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary
**Why the problem now??**

Science is moving so fast.

Access to sources of information has exploded!

Time is at a premium.

Inability to check for copying materials.

Loss of ethical standards.

Cultural differences toward the use of others’ original works

---

**Fair-Use Doctrine**

The "fair use" doctrine, which is clearly delineated by statute, states as follows: "the fair use of a copyrighted work … for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research, is not an infringement of copyright. In determining whether the use made of a work in any particular case is a fair use the factors to be considered shall include—
(1) the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes;
(2) the nature of the copyrighted work;
(3) the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole;
(4) the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work"  
Less than a decade ago:


Important Questions

- Should screening for plagiarism be routine practice?
- Should editors screen all submissions, or just the ones they want to publish?
- Is plagiarizing data and images a greater offense than plagiarizing text?
- What should the threshold be for contacting institutions about plagiarized work?
- Can software detect the “most insidious” form of plagiarism: the piracy of ideas?
CrossCheck

- CrossCheck is used in the detection of plagiarism.
  - Launched in the summer of 2008
- CrossCheck uses a software called iThenticate and databases of content against which submitted manuscripts can be compared.
- CrossCheck looks for both identical and similar text in documents that are chosen.

iThenticate

The system finds instances of self-plagiarism, and duplicate publication more often than actual plagiarism, It does not actually detect plagiarism; it detects overlap or “similarity”. Therefore, an editor must evaluate the report.
iThenticate continued

- widely adopted in American/Western journals right now
  - endorsed by major publishing companies,
  - offered as an integration in the online peer review process on ScholarOne Manuscripts since 2009.

- There are some things that the software cannot yet do,
  - screening figures and tables, and
  - detecting duplicate submissions to two different journals simultaneously
The Pomegranate and Its Many Functional Components

By: Amanda Fergusson
As of Jun 29, 2010 10:32:26 PM BST
15,000 words - 400 matches - 202 sources

Example of iThenticate Output

- 1 672 words / 4% - Internet from Nov 1, 2009 rejuvitality.com
- 2 563 words / 4% - Internet from Apr 22, 2009 www.articlearchives.com
- 3 289 words / 2% - CrossCheck
- 4 214 words / 1% - Internet from May 2, 2010 www.biotivia.com
- 5 206 words / 1% - Internet from Jun 4, 2010 www.aseanfood.info
- 6 185 words / 1% - CrossCheck
- 7 173 words / 1% - Internet from Oct 20, 2008

© 2010 Institute of Food Technologists
Experience of Plagiarism for IFT Peer-Reviewed Journals

1. Anonymous source reported extensive copying of published papers

2. iThenticate detected copying without attribution
Anonymous source reported extensive copying of published papers

1. Publish an erratum in the next issue of the Journal of Food Science. This erratum stated the following:

The paper entitled “…” was found to contain significant portions of text that had appeared in previously published articles. This text was not attributed to its original source and credit had not been given to the authors of the original articles.

The authors of this paper have taken full responsibility for this error and wish to express their deepest apologies to the authors of the following papers:

2. Insert a link within the electronic version of the offending paper that will take readers directly to the erratum as stated in the previous slide.

3. The five co-authors were banned (identified by a flag) from submitting manuscripts to JFS for 5 years.

4. Notified the administration of the authors of the transgression
Flagged Authors

- ScholarOne has capacity to allow flagging an author.

- A red colored flag indicates to the SE that the author has a restriction in submitting a manuscript to IFT peer-reviewed journals.

- This has been applied to a group of authors whose manuscript was identified as containing significant portions of unattributed materials.

iThenticate detected copying without attribution

- Manuscript was in a second revision and about to be accepted when iThenticate was applied

- Authors used several sentences in the manuscript without proper attribution

- Authors were allowed to withdraw the manuscript

- Topic could be addressed by the authors in a new manuscript
Policy on Plagiarism

When an act of plagiarism in one of IFT peer-reviewed, copyrighted papers is suspected or brought to the editor's attention after the paper has been published:

1. We will attempt to identify all published papers that were incorrectly used in the publication.

2. We will notify the authors of the papers that were incorrectly used and the authors of the transgressing publication that we are going to publish a statement in an issue of the journal recognizing that sections of the paper were cited without proper attribution.

3. We will provide an opportunity for the authors to provide some explanation for the incident.

4. If satisfactory explanation is not forthcoming, we will publish an erratum in a future issue of the journal.

5. As a general rule, if plagiarism has occurred, we will ban the authors from submitting manuscripts to IFT journals for 5 years.
Author’s Promise

The Institute of Food Technologists and the Editors make every effort to ensure the integrity of the articles published in the Journal of Food Science. Ultimately, however, it is the responsibility of the author to adhere to the terms of publication. These terms are very clearly set forth in the copyright assignment form that must accompany each published article. By signing this form, corresponding authors warrant that:

1. Their article is an original work, has not been published before and is not being considered for publication elsewhere;
2. They have obtained permission from the copyright holder to reproduce in the article material not owned by them, and that they have acknowledged the source;
3. Their article contains no violation of any existing copyright or other third party right or any material of an obscene, indecent, libelous or otherwise unlawful nature and that to the best of their knowledge, the article does not infringe the rights of others;
4. In the case of a multi-authored article, they have obtained, in writing, authorization to make these warranties on their behalf and that all co-authors have read and agreed the terms of this Agreement.

Resources for Authors

1) Wiley-Blackwell has Best Practice Guidelines on Publication Ethics. This document includes flowcharts from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) that propose possible actions in response to ethical problems (Section 9).
   http://www.wiley.com/bw/publicationethics/

2) Committee on Publication Ethics Guidelines.
   http://publicationethics.org/guidelines

   http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/editorial_policies/white_paper.cfm

Take Home Message

IFT takes the issue of plagiarism very seriously.

We are professionals adhering to an ethical code of conduct.

The issue of plagiarism must be taught in our curriculum.

So, please consider IFT’s journals for your manuscripts

Journal of Food Science

Journal of Food Science Education

Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety
Sections of JFS

Concise Reviews/Hypothesis
Food Chemistry
Toxicology and Chemical Food Safety
Food Engineering/Physical Properties
Nanoscale Food Science, Engineering, and Technology
Food Microbiology and Safety
Sensory and Food Quality
Health, Nutrition, and Food

Thank you!