



NOAA FISHERIES

Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series

13-01

Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series Guide for Manuscript Submission, Review, and Publication

Michael J. Asaro
Jennifer Goebel

Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series | NOAA Fisheries | Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office
55 Great Republic Drive | Gloucester, MA 01930

KEYWORDS

Publication guide; Editors; Reviewers; Style manual

© 2013 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

The Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series is a secondary publication series based in the NOAA Fisheries Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office in Gloucester, MA. Publications in this series include works intended for a general public audience in the topic of marine policy and marine policy analysis.

Please visit www.nero.noaa.gov/policyseries for more information.

This document may be cited as:

Asaro, MJ, Goebel, J. 2013. Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series Guide for Manuscript Submission, Review, and Publication. *Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series 13-01*. NOAA Fisheries Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office. 13p.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	<i>ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION SERIES</i>	<i>1</i>
1.1	Audience and Scope.....	1
1.2	Mission.....	1
1.3	Open Access Policy.....	1
1.4	Publication Process.....	1
1.5	Publication Ethics.....	2
2.	<i>GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS</i>	<i>2</i>
2.1	Determination of Scope	2
2.1.1	General Guidance	2
2.1.2	Submission Checklist	3
2.2	Procedures for Submission	4
2.2.1	Analytical Works	5
2.2.2	Workshop Proceedings	5
2.2.3	Posters	6
2.2.4	Abstracts	6
2.3.1	Style Guidelines.....	6
2.3.1	Authorship.....	6
	Qualification for Authorship	6
	First Authorship	7
	Employee Rights and Procedures.....	7
	Acknowledgments	7
2.3.2	Content.....	8
2.3.3	References.....	8
2.4	Ethics Agreement	8
	Authorship	8
	Content of a Work	9
	Submission of Works to Journals.....	9
3.	<i>GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS</i>	<i>9</i>
3.1	Reviewer Responsibilities.....	9
3.2	Policy for Reviewer Selection	9
3.3	Reviewer Ethics Agreement.....	9
4.	<i>GUIDELINES FOR EDITORIAL TEAM</i>	<i>10</i>
4.1	Editorial Roles	10
4.2	Editorial Procedures	10
4.3	Editorial Ethics	11
5.	<i>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</i>	<i>11</i>
6.	<i>REFERENCES</i>	<i>12</i>

1. ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION SERIES

1.1 Audience and Scope

The Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series is a secondary publication series based in the NOAA Fisheries Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office in Gloucester, Massachusetts. Publications in this series include works intended for a general public audience in the topic of marine policy and marine policy analysis.

1.2 Mission

In the normal course of their work, NOAA Fisheries Greater Atlantic Region policy analysts and fishery management specialists produce numerous documents, including policy analyses, white papers, case studies, workshop proceedings, posters, and position papers, to support their stewardship and management activities.

The mission of the Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series is to provide centralized, public access to NOAA Fisheries policy documents beyond those required by statute.

This series complements existing NOAA Fisheries scientific publications currently available to the public through the NOAA Fisheries Scientific Publication Office and regional Science Centers.

1.3 Open Access Policy

As a repository of public information produced by employees of the United States Government, the Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series adheres to an open access policy for publications. All issues in this publication series are accessed freely via www.nero.noaa.gov/policyseries and are free to view and distribute.

The Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series use Open Journal Systems (OJS) open-source journal administration software. This program was created and is freely distributed by the Public Knowledge Project (<http://pkp.sfu.ca>), a non-profit partnership of Simon Fraser University, the School of Education at Stanford University, the University of British Columbia, the University of Pittsburgh, the Ontario Council of University Libraries, and the California Digital Library. The mission of the Public Knowledge Project is to expand access to published scholarly material.

1.4 Publication Process

Publications in this series are accessible through www.nero.noaa.gov/policyseries. Manuscripts are submitted through the publication website software and undergo an internal peer review. Reviewers are employees of NOAA Fisheries and are selected by the Editorial Team, which facilitates the review process from submission to publication. The Editorial Team is primarily comprised of staff from the Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office Communication Team,

with assistance from other supporting staff. Issues in this publication series consist of single works and are published on a rolling timeline as submissions are submitted and reviewed.

1.5 Publication Ethics

The Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series adheres to a strict code of publication ethics. All authors, editors, and reviewers must adhere to the applicable ethics statements in this document (see sections 2.4, 3.3, and 4.3). Ethics agreements serve to ensure the quality of manuscript submission, protect the original works of authors, facilitate a competent review, and establish a fair editorial process.

2. GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

As an author, your tasks include submitting a draft copy, submitting a revised copy, copyediting, and proofreading your work.

To submit your work, you must have a user account and be enrolled as an author. User accounts are provided upon request to the Editorial Team. Please see www.nero.noaa.gov/policyseries for contact information.

2.1 Determination of Scope

The Greater Atlantic Region Policy Series journal offers NOAA Fisheries researchers, analysts, and policymakers the opportunity to publish manuscripts, workshop proceedings, posters, and abstracts that result from their work. The Editorial Team invites contributions on policies and issues relating to living resources in the marine environment

2.1.1 General Guidance

Every prospective author must prepare his/her works in accordance with the federal Data Quality Act. NOAA has issued guidelines and NOAA Fisheries has issued procedures to ensure that all NOAA and NOAA Fisheries staff members prepare their works accordingly. Every NOAA Fisheries staff member (employee, contractor, etc.) is required to read, understand, and hold him/herself accountable to these guidelines and procedures. All requirements apply to all authors and co-authors, regardless of the order of authorship.

There are a number of readily available references for preparing manuscripts. These include Day's *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper* (Philadelphia: ISI Press; 1979). For writing style and usage, please see Strunk and White's *Elements of Style* (New York: MacMillan; 1979) and the Federal Plain Language Guidelines available at plainlanguage.gov.

For handling capitalization, punctuation, numbers, formulae, tables, scientific notation, bibliographic elements, and other matters of copy editing, refer to (in order of their listing):

- 1) *CBE Style Manual*, 5th & 6th eds. (Bethesda, MD: Council of Biology Editors; 1983 & 1994);
- 2) *A Manual of Style*, 16th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2010); or 3) *United States*

Government Printing Office Style Manual, 30th ed. (Washington, DC: U.S Government Printing Office; 2008).

For spelling of scientific and common names of fishes, mollusks, and decapod crustaceans from the United States and Canada, use *Special Publications* No. 20 (fishes), 26 (mollusks), and No. 17 (decapod crustaceans) of the American Fisheries Society (Bethesda, MD). For spelling of scientific and common names of marine mammals of the world, use *Special Publication* No. 4 of the Society for Marine Mammalogy (Lawrence, KS). For spelling in general, use the most recent edition of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam).

For statistical terms, you should generally follow the *ISO* [International Standardization Organization] *Standards Handbook 3: Statistical Methods*, 2nd ed. (Geneva, Switzerland: ISO: 1981).

For abbreviating serial titles (for use in lists of cited works), use the most recent issue of *BIOSIS Serial Sources* (Philadelphia: Biosciences Information Service).

For preparing the list of keywords associated with the work, be sure to follow the guidelines for word choice and spelling developed by the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) online thesaurus.

Excerpts from this section were taken from Gibson *et al.* 2003.

2.1.2 *Submission Checklist*

Before submitting your manuscript, please be sure you have met all the following criteria:

- Receive approval from the your supervisor for submission to the Journal
- Agree to NOAA ethics statement
- Adhere to relevant Data Quality Act standards
- Prepare manuscript using styles described in “General Guidance”
- Agree to the “Release of Copyright” if author is a not a NOAA Fisheries employee
- Indicate that submission is ready to be considered by checking the following boxes under Step 1: Starting the Submission/Submission Checklist:
 - Approval has been received from your supervisor to submit this work
 - The submission has not been previously published nor is it before another journal for consideration (or an explanation has been provided in Comments to the Editor)
 - The submission file is a Microsoft Word document
 - Adheres to bibliographic requirements outlined in Section 2.1.1
 - Adheres to Style Guidelines outlined in Section 2.3.1
 - Agree to Copyright Notice using online form
- Upload documents using “Procedures for Submission”

2.2 Procedures for Submission

1. Obtain a user account from the Editorial Team and log in to the journal website. Please see www.nero.noaa.gov/policyseries for Editorial Team contact info.
2. From the User Home page, choose “Author,” which will bring you to your “Active Submissions” page.
3. Start a new submission.
4. Upload your documents as Word files, including any tables and figures. Please do not submit PDFs.
5. Each of your submissions will appear on your Author Home Page, and you can follow the progress of your submission through this page.
6. Once your submission is complete, it will fall into one of these categories:
 - a. Awaiting Assignment: The Editorial Team will review the submission for appropriateness and approval
 - b. Queued for Review: the Editorial Team will review the submission and assign Reviewers
 - c. Queued for Editing: the submission has been reviewed and is ready to go through the copyediting, layout editing, and proofreading processes
7. As the author, you can click on the hyperlinked title of any listed submission. This will bring you to your submission’s Summary page. You can review any changes made to your submission here, and upload revisions of your own.
8. Your Archive page will list all your submissions and where to find them in the Journal. It will also list any declined submissions.
9. When you make a submission, you will be provided with information on the Journal’s privacy statement and copyright notice. There are no submission fees.
10. You may submit any comments about your submission to the Editorial Team in the box provided.
11. The instructions for uploading files are online and self-explanatory, but if you have any trouble using the system, please contact the Editorial Team.
12. Once you have uploaded your submissions, you will be asked to fill in information about the authors of the submission. If there are multiple authors, use the “add author” button at the bottom of the online form. You can re-order the list of authors, make one of them the principal contact with the Editorial Team, or delete any authors added in error. The form will ask you biographical information and indexing information, including a title, abstract or summary, and terms for indexing.
13. A list of references should be included at the end of the manuscript.
14. If you have any supplementary files, you can upload them next. These may include data sets or research instrument specs, etc.
15. Finally, confirm your submission by clicking “Finish Submission.”
16. Once your submission is complete, you can return to the site and check on your submission’s progress by selecting “Submission Summary” and checking “Status.”
17. The Editor will review your submission and make a decision:
 - a. Accepted as is
 - b. Revisions Required (will require some minor revisions)
 - c. Resubmit for Review (requires significant re-working)
 - d. Rejected

18. You'll be notified by the system of the decision, and you may use the system to track your submission's progress through the editorial process.
19. Once your submission is "In Editing," you may be asked to review corrections and/or rewrite parts of the submission. Upload your corrected version to the site.
20. After copyediting is complete, layout editing will begin. You will be asked to review your submission as an HTML and/or PDF version. Review the file and make any comments using the Layouts Comments icon.
21. Finally, you will be asked to proofread the final version. A member of the Editorial Team will also proofread the final version. Once you approve the final version, the submission will be published and available at www.nero.noaa.gov/policyseries.

2.2.1 *Analytical Works*

All analytical works must have an abstract, table of contents, list of acronyms and, if applicable, lists of tables and figures. While traditional scientific manuscript organization— Introduction, Study Area, Methods and Materials, Results, Discussion/Conclusion, References Cited— may be appropriate in some cases, not all submissions need to follow this organization.

The length of analytical works may vary. In general, article-length works should be between 4000 and 8000 words, and include figures and tables in the body of the manuscript, where appropriate.

2.2.2 *Workshop Proceedings*

Where contributions from various authors are to be published in Workshop or Conference Proceedings, the written submissions should be no more than 6000 words for plenary talks and 250-500 words for parallel session talks, in abstract form. Written submissions should be solicited before or at the time of the workshop

Workshop Proceedings should include:

1. Title, date, location
2. Recommended Citation
3. Editors/Compilers
4. Organizing Committee, Chairs, Key Organizers
5. Sponsors and Contributors
6. Table of Contents
7. Information about the Workshop
8. Presentations
9. Acknowledgments
10. Keynote Address

2.2.3 Posters

Poster displays are an increasingly important means for NOAA Fisheries staff to convey their work to colleagues. A good description and explanation of how to design and lay out the components of a poster display appeared in an article called *The Scientific Poster: Guidelines for Effective Visual Communication*, which was published in the Third Quarter 1990 issue of *Technical Communication*.

2.2.4 Abstracts

An abstract typically serves as a literature-searching tool when it accompanies a journal article, and as a synoptic permanent record when it accompanies an oral presentation or poster display. The basic abstract is the one accompanying journal articles; those abstracts associated with oral presentations and poster displays are a variation on the theme. The rest of this section is an excerpted and modified portion of the fifth chapter in the *Council of Biology Editors Style Manual*, 3rd ed. (Washington, DC: American Institute of Biological Sciences; 1972), which provides guidance for preparing an abstract associated with a journal article.

Excerpts from this section were taken from Gibson *et al.* 2003.

2.3.1 Style Guidelines

When submitting analytical works, workshop proceedings, or abstracts, the following style must be followed:

- One-inch margins
- Double-spaced text
- A single, clear, 12-point typeface (prefer Times New Roman or other serif font)
- Use italics rather than underlining (except for URLs or links)
- No extra space between paragraphs
- An indented first line for each paragraph
- Information identifying the author and title of the manuscript on every page
- Page numbers
- All tables, figures, and illustrations appear within in the body of the submission, not at the end

Posters need not follow these guidelines, but should be submitted as Microsoft Word or Microsoft PowerPoint files whenever possible.

2.3.1 Authorship

Decisions about authorship are important to all contributors and an occasional source of disagreement. Although it is difficult to achieve unanimity of opinion when authorship is in dispute, these guidelines attempt to standardize the process of making authorship decisions.

Qualification for Authorship

Anyone who provides substantial original data and ideas on the interpretation of the data that are important to the work should be considered as a co-author. Authors should include those who played a major role in the analysis of the data and the writing of the work.

At the discretion of the author(s) and in consultation with the contributor(s), others who contributed, but to a lesser extent, should be recognized with acknowledgments only.

It is the responsibility of potential authors of, or contributors to, a work to attempt to clarify their roles before writing begins, and preferably even before research begins. It is most important to consider the contributions and sequences of authors prior to drafting the work, so that authors are not added as drafting progresses, and so that all have a clear understanding of the extent of their participation from the outset.

No person should be included as an author without his/her permission.

All authors should be familiar with the concept(s) on which the work is based, the implications to the scientific field, the design of the experiment or approach to a question, the data, and the analysis and interpretation of the results. Any co-author should be competent to summarize the content of the work.

It should be unusual for more than five authors to contribute to any single work.

If technician contributions are significant enough to qualify as authorship, the principal investigator may include a technician as an author. Student assistance is generally recognized with acknowledgments only.

First Authorship

The person who contributed the most in terms of original perception and definition of the problem, design and conception of the analysis required, detailed description of analytical protocols, analysis and interpretation of data, formulation of conclusions, and drafting the work should emerge as the first author. Factors to be considered include conceptual input, data acquisition, data analysis, time invested, preparation of first draft, and final editing.

The first author should lead in concept development, but also participate in the research, analysis, and writing.

Employee Rights and Procedures

If an employee feels that he/she is being excluded from authorship or included as an author inappropriately, the matter should be discussed with his/her supervisor. If the matter cannot be resolved through discussion, that discussion should be documented in a memo for the record, and the division/staff/office chief asked to review the situation and suggest a resolution. If the employee feels that he/she is being excluded from authorship because of prohibited discrimination practices, then an EEO counselor may also be consulted.

Acknowledgments

Contributions to works are acknowledged at the discretion of the author(s). Although this is a subjective decision by the author, he/she should acknowledge an employee's competent, thorough job in performing his/her duties with regard to the study and/or publishing process. It is the author's responsibility to review the contributions of technicians, students, typists, illustrators, editors, librarians, and others to the overall project, and to ensure that their

contributions are properly recognized. The acknowledgment should be limited to the work at hand.

Frequently, the concept for a research project originates with a researcher who may or may not be a NOAA Fisheries employee. This individual certainly deserves some recognition. Furthermore, it is sometimes the forcefulness and drive of a supervisor that motivates or allows staff to complete and publish a work. This individual should also be acknowledged, provided he/she plays a positive role in getting the work out and published.

The author or supervisor may also consider recognizing an employee's exceptional contributions to a work with an appropriate award, as well as acknowledgment in the work itself.

Excerpts from this section were taken from Gibson *et al.* 2003.

2.3.2 *Content*

All submissions should address an important issue and contribute to the body of knowledge about marine living resources and policies applicable thereto. Submissions should effectively and informatively communicate their contribution to a general marine policy audience, and be written in such a way as to be accessible to the general public.

2.3.3 *References*

For in-text citations, use the name-date system without commas: (Author 2013). The list of cited works should contain all the bibliographic information, and follow the guidance set out by the International Standards Organization to abbreviate serial titles (available online at <http://www.public.iastate.edu/~CYBERSTACKS/JAS.htm>)

2.4 **Ethics Agreement**

Authorship

Authorship should be decided, if possible, before the work is written, even if the decision is only tentative. This decision should come from the author who has been most engaged in designing and executing the research. Any conflicts on authorship or content of the work should be resolved among the co-workers. The basic requirement for authorship is that an author should be able to take public responsibility for the work. An author should be able to indicate why and how the observations were made, and how the conclusions follow from the observations. An author should be able to defend criticisms of the work, as, for example, in a letter-to-the-editor responding to published criticisms. These abilities should come from having participated in design of the study, in observing and interpreting the reported findings, and in writing the work.

Claims to authorship may come from persons who have had little to do with the intellectual content of the work, but who have provided financial support, routine technical assistance, or research space and equipment. Such contributions need not be rewarded with authorship but can be acknowledged in the appropriate section of the work.

Content of a Work

Authors have ethical responsibilities in presenting their works. A work must report only observations objectively made by one or more of its authors and must not fail to report evidence conflicting with the conclusions reached. Authors must relate their study/analysis to previously published relevant work and unpublished observations of others. A work must indicate how the research/analysis was conducted in relation to generally held ethical standards.

Honest and full reporting is the first responsibility of the author(s). It calls for accurately and completely representing the observations made and/or data collected. Unpublished data drawn from other sources should be identified as such and appropriately credited, with indication that such acknowledgment is with the consent of the person being credited.

Submission of Works to Journals

Editors, responsible to both readers and authors, expect authors to meet the ethical standards discussed above for the preparation and the content of works submitted to their journals. They also expect full, honest disclosure of other facts that may bear on acceptance or rejection of a work.

Excerpts from this section were taken from Gibson *et al.* 2003.

3. GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

3.1 Reviewer Responsibilities

Reviewers will be provided a user name and can log in to the journal website to retrieve the manuscript once it has been assigned by the Editorial Team. The Editorial Team will request that the manuscript review be completed and submitted by a specified date. The reviewer will assess the quality of the subject matter, methods and/or analyses, and conclusions presented in the manuscript. Upon completion of the review, the reviewer will return the manuscript, with comments and/or suggested edits, to the editor by logging into the journal website. All reviews will be archived within the journal management software.

3.2 Policy for Reviewer Selection

Reviewers are selected by the Editorial Team based on subject matter expertise. Each manuscript will require the selection of most likely two reviewers. One reviewer will be selected from a pool of employees within the NOAA Fisheries Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office with subject matter expertise. The second individual requested to serve as a reviewer by the Editorial Team will be the lead author's immediate supervisor. The selection of additional reviewers will be done at the discretion of the Editorial Team.

3.3 Reviewer Ethics Agreement

To ensure a thorough and productive review, reviewers will serve only within their area of subject matter expertise. Reviews must be free of both positive and negative bias. Reviewers must adhere to the confidentiality of the work being reviewed and must respect private, original

work of the author(s) during the review process. Details of the manuscript, communications with Editorial Team and contents of the review must all maintain confidentiality. If the reviewer feels unable to satisfactorily complete the review due to subject matter or other reasons, he or she must contact the Editorial Team, not the author(s), with any concerns.

4. GUIDELINES FOR EDITORIAL TEAM

The Editorial Team oversees the content and production of the journal. The Editorial Team works to produce the journal and to establish policies and procedures for manuscript submission and review.

4.1 Editorial Roles

The following roles are performed by one or more people as part of the Editorial Team:

Managing Editor: Manages journal content and staffs editorial roles; oversees editorial and review process; undertakes scheduling of content and publishing of journal

Editor: Reviews submissions and makes final content decisions

Copyeditor: Works with submissions to improve grammar and clarity, poses questions to author on possible errors, and ensure strict adherence to journal's bibliographic and textual style

Layout Editor: Transforms copyedited submission into the proper format for electronic publishing

Proofreader: Reads galleys for typographic and formatting errors

4.2 Editorial Procedures

After the submitted work has been approved by a member of the Editorial Team, the work goes to editorial and review process to determine a timeline for review and editing and to set a publication date for the work

Once review have been completed, as outlined in Section 3, the a member of the Editorial Team will return the work to the author, with notes from the reviewers, and determine whether the author needs to rewrite the work, or whether the work is ready for editorial review

When the work is ready for editorial review, the a member of the Editorial Team will assign the work for copyediting to identify issues of spelling, grammar, plain language, and readability, and work with the author to correct any deficiencies and make improvements within the timeline agreed to by the authors.

Upon completion of the final draft, the work will go to a member of the Editorial Team performing the role of the Layout Editor, who will transform the copyedited submission into the

proper format for electronic publishing. A final version will go to proofreading to review the document for typographic and formatting errors prior to online publication.

4.3 Editorial Ethics

The responsibility of the Editorial Team in scientific and policy communication is broad, affecting not only authors but reviewers and readers as well. Therefore, editors must be especially sensitive to ethical conduct of their duties.

The Editorial Team is obliged to authors to prevent an inappropriate judgment by a reviewer resulting in rejection of a valid and important work. The Editorial Team is also obliged to readers to publish only valid and important works. Both of these obligations require that the Editorial Team select reviewers with careful attention to their competence in the subject of the work, an absence of bias, and honesty. If the author recommends reviewers, the Editorial Team may or may not follow the recommendation. If the author asks that certain reviewers not be used, because of unfavorable bias, that request must be honored unless the Editorial Team has reason to believe the request is intended to eliminate all competent reviewers from examining the work.

When the judgments of two reviewers on a work differ significantly, the Editorial Team must take responsibility for deciding which judgment is probably the more reliable or for seeking additional reviews. Should the latter course result in excessive delay in the review process, the Editorial Team should offer the author the option of withdrawing the work.

Excessive delays in the review process are a disservice to both authors and readers. Reputations and professional advancement of authors depend, in part, on prompt publication of their works.

Excerpts from this section were taken from Gibson *et al.* 2003.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Teri Frady and colleagues at the Northeast Fisheries Science Center for guidance on the establishment of this publication series. We also thank partners of the Public Knowledge Project for facilitating the creation of this series through the distribution of Open Journal Systems publication software.

6. REFERENCES

Gibson J.A., T.L. Frady, E.L. Kleindinst, and L.S. Garner. 2003. Manuscript/abstract/webpage preparation, review, and dissemination: NEFSC author's guide to policy, process, and procedure. Northeast Fish Sci Cent Ref Doc 03-01; 38 p.

