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Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge. Our mission is to **unlock people’s potential with the best learning and research solutions.** Our vision is **a world of learning and research inspired by Cambridge.**
The early days

King Henry VIII’s *Letters Patent*, 1534
Cambridge University Press

- World’s oldest publisher, founded in 1534
- Integral part of the University of Cambridge
- Our first book was published in 1584 (around the same time as the *Pen-tsao Kang-mu* 本草纲目)
- Offices over 50 countries with 2000+ people
- Academic and professional books and journals, print and online
- English language teaching and education products
What we do

Unlock people's potential with the best learning and research solutions

Academic

English

Education

Bibles
Our Mission

• A not-for-profit organisation – all surplus reinvested in the University and in our future publishing
• Support research and learning
• Global– we want to work with the best scholars and the best universities around the world!
Dr. John King Fairbank
Cambridge History of China

费正清博士
剑桥中国史
JFM Symposia China: Shenzhen, Hangzhou, Beijing
From Fundamentals to Applied Fluid Mechanics
UK publisher spreading its wings to new Beijing base

By CHENG YINGQi in Beijing

Cambridge University Press in the United Kingdom. It is the first international publishing house to move its Asian academic headquarters to Beijing. The past 10 years have seen strong growth in the number and quality of academic papers in China. (Photo provide to China Daily Asia Weekly)
Our strengths in.. Humanities and Social Science
Our strengths in...
Psychology
Our strengths in...
Psychology
Our strengths in...
Science, Technology and Maths
Why Publish?

There are many ways to be honored in life. For us, being elected a Fellow is certainly one, but in my humble opinion, to leave a legacy, here at the Wren after we are gone, is the greatest!

—— G. H. Hardy

“The man who knows infinity”
Why publish?

• A core part of an academic’s job

• Essential for career progression

“To get to know, to discover, to publish - this is the destiny of a scientist.”

François Arago
The academic publishing landscape

- Over 20,000 journals (more than 25% biomed)
- More than 2 million articles per year
- More than 120,000 new academic books each year
- STM: $14 billion, Hums/Soc Sci: $2.4 billion (annually)
- Many publishers (some small, some large)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Number of journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Springer (exc. NPG)</td>
<td>2987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>2388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis</td>
<td>2105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolters Kluwer (inc. Medknow)</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindawi</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUP</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The STM Report, 4th Edition
“There is no form of prose more difficult to understand and more tedious to read than the average scientific paper.”

Francis Crick
An article should be:

- Fit for purpose
- Understandable, and written in good English
- Well organized
- Discoverable
- Stable and citable
Selecting a journal

- What is the hierarchy of journals in your field?
- How significant are your findings? (The more significant, the higher you can aim.)
- Are your results of interest to a narrow group?
- Is your paper within the scope of the journal?
- Is your paper related to others in a journal?
Selecting a journal

- What is the journal’s impact factor?
- Is your paper original research or a review article?
- Does the journal publish special issues?
- Is the journal flourishing; is it always late/under budget?
- Who is on the editorial board?
- Are you looking for traditional or Open Access?
- What is the Open Access policy of the journal?
Selecting a journal – Predatory journals

What are they?
- Rise in ‘predatory journals’: illegitimate journals that exist primarily to extract fees from authors
- Often appear to be legitimate – for example, choosing names confusingly similar to reputable titles, and claiming to have eminent academics on their editorial boards
- Claim to be open access in order to charge fake APCs

How to avoid them
- Check whether a journal is indexed in reputable citation databases such as Scopus or the Web of Science
- Consult Thinkchecksubmit.org for a useful decision-making checklist, e.g.:
  - Do you or your colleagues know the journal?
  - Is it clear what fees will be charged and what you will receive in return?
  - Do you recognise the editorial board?
  - Is the publisher a member of any recognised industry initiatives, e.g. Committee on Publication Ethics?
Impact factor

- Journal X’s *impact factor* is the average number of citations in journals indexed by ISI received for papers published in Journal X during the two preceding years
  - IF = Citations in the preceding two years/number of papers in same two years
  - 5 year IF = Citations in the preceding five years/number of papers in same five years

- IF varies by field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JINS</th>
<th>Behavioral and Brain Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.098</td>
<td>17.194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to avoid immediate rejection

• Write a good paper - mistakes include:
  – Poor English
  – No conclusions
  – Insufficient originality or importance – avoid ‘salami science’!
  – Obvious scientific or logical flaws
  – Absence of a message that the paper is important to the target audience

• **Write a clear, informative abstract**

• Don’t choose an inappropriate journal! Be within the scope.
• Obey the rules in the journal’s *Instructions to Contributors* (format, double blind etc)
• One corresponding author; but approval from *all* authors
• One journal at a time
Dear XXXXXX:

I am writing to you with regard to manuscript ******** entitled “xxxxxxxxxxx" which you submitted to the Journal of ZZZZZZZZZZZZZ.

I have read your paper, and I consider the paper out of scope. For an explanation of the journal's theme, please see http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displaySpecialPage?pageId=860. This web page also explains the formatting rules for submissions.

Thank you for considering the Journal of ZZZZZZZZZZ for the publication of your research. I hope the outcome of this specific submission will not discourage you from the submission of future manuscripts.
Dear XXXXXXX:

I am writing to you in regards to manuscript ******** entitled “xxxxxxxxxxxxx”.

As the Editor in Chief, I have read your paper twice over the last two days. While I am somewhat familiar with the area (especially the first three references, plus a bit of the fourth one), I will admit that I could barely follow the flow of ideas in your paper. Unlike regular submissions, your paper jumps right into the middle of a topic, using difficult to understand notation, and giving only the barest of context. I expect that an EiC with my background should be able to follow a paper in this area with much less effort; a pearl should be immediately accessible to an even wider audience (somewhat lacking in background).

Instead of assigning your paper to a Managing Editor, I am therefore taking the liberty to reject your submission immediately. I urge you to read some of the recent theoretical publications in Journal and to compare/contrast with your own submission.

Sincerely,

Editor in Chief
Getting to the peer review stage

- Title: clear, concise, accurate, informative
- Abstract: make people **want** to read your paper
- Key words (use taxonomy supplied by the journal, or international standards)
- Introduction
- Conclusion
- References: not too many self-citations; relevant; recent; check them carefully
- Meaningful figures, labelled carefully
- Concise, comprehensible writing
Figures and illustrations

‘Charts and graphs overload. Charts are supposed to be used judiciously to elucidate rather than obfuscate. Often, having too many charts detracts from the central point or argument and dilutes the power of graphic illustration.’

*From an actual reviewer’s report*
The impact of figures...

The Areas of the blue, red, & black wedges are each measured from the centre as the common vertex.

The blue wedges measured from the centre of the circle represent area for area the deaths from Preventible or Mitigable Zymotic diseases, the red wedges measured from the centre the deaths from wounds, & the black wedges measured from the centre the deaths from all other causes.

The black line across the red triangle in Nov. 1854 marks the boundary of the deaths from all other causes during the month.

In October 1854, & April 1855, the black area coincides with the red; in January & February 1856, the blue coincides with the black.

The entire areas may be compared by following the blue, the red & the black lines enclosing them.
Deciding on a title

- The title should clearly and simply reflect the content of the paper (key words/phrases in first 50-60 characters)

- Begin review article title with ‘A Review of…’ (to help with database searches)

Example:

- Original: "Structural right ventricle changes in first episode heart attack - a longitudinal study"
- Revised: "No progressive right ventricle changes during a one-year follow-up of patients with first episode heart attack"
"I appreciate the reviewers’ comments and suggestions. They are very helpful. Let me respond point by point to the issues they raise.

Referee A:
Page 1. Para 3. I can see that this statement is indeed a little ambiguous. I have now made the point more clearly.
Page 2. Para 2. I have referred to the work mentioned by the reviewers and added a reference."

...
Effective writing

• You can always improve on a first draft

• Avoid the ‘passive voice’
  – A novel diode laser was fabricated by the research team. (Passive)
  – We fabricated a novel diode laser. (Active)

• Remove unnecessary words
Writing your manuscript

ABC of effective writing:

**Accuracy**
- Immaculate presentation
  - Article should only be submitted when fully complete
  - Obey the rules in the manuscript submission guidelines
  - Check your references, check your data is correct
  - Focus on correct use of grammar and spelling
  - If non-native speaker of English, ask an articulate peer to read through work or consider language editing services

**Brevity**
- Be concise and get to the point!
  - A longer manuscript is not necessarily a better one
  - Typical paragraph: First sentence states the main point, other sentences in paragraph support this.
  - Simple writing – easier to communicate to the audience

**Clarity**
- Well organised with clear message
  - Structure the manuscript correctly
  - Suggested structure for scientific papers:
    - Introduction: identifies the knowledge gap addressed by the article, specifies the novelty, objectives and scope of the work
    - Applied research methodology
    - Obtained results
    - Discussion/conclusion
Post-acceptance

A good publisher adds value to the accepted manuscript with:

- Copy-editing
- Production at the highest industry standards
- State-of-the-art online delivery
- Usage statistics available at journal and paper level
- Discoverability; COUNTER compliance; CrossRef; Bibliographic databases; World of Science; PubMed; allowing Google to index;
- Open access options meeting all funding bodies’ requirements
More than 54% of online traffic to your article will come from search engines. So, what can you do to make your article more discoverable?

- Optimize title, abstract, keywords
- Scholarly research networks (eg ResearchGate, Academia.edu – but check policies)
- Blogs
- Social media, eg Twitter, LinkedIn, etc
- ORCiD identifier to link all your work
- Article link in e-mail signature
Cambridge Core Share 是一种帮助作者和读者轻松生成期刊文章在线只读共享链接的全新工具。该链接可以在互联网上免费共享，从而提高研究的影响力和可发现性。

目前适用于 Cambridge Core 平台上 150+ 期刊。

点击文章页面上的“Shareable Link”即可生成共享链接，该链接可在任何地方发布，永久有效且没有阅读次数限制。

cambridge.org/coreshare
Open Access (OA) Publishing

- **Gold OA** – author (more typically a funding body) pays for publication via an article processing charge (APC)

- **Green OA** – author publishes in a traditional journal but is allowed to post the article on their own site or repository (typically with an embargo period for accepted version)

- **Hybrid OA** – an OA option in a subscription-based journal
# Open access

Open access (OA) – important way to make research findings freely available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gold Open Access</th>
<th>Green Open Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>• Free public access to published article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Immediate access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free public access to a version of your article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some publishers require embargo period (time delay). Check your journal guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td>• Is determined by type of user licence, e.g. CC-BY-NC-ND. Check with your journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Authors have the right to use articles for range of purposes. Open versions of article should have user licence attached, e.g. CC-BY-NC-ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee</strong></td>
<td>• Article processing charge (APC) paid by author, or on their behalf (for example by institution or funding body)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How can I publish OA?</strong></td>
<td>• Publish in hybrid OA journal (subscription journal in which some articles OA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publish in OA journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Check your journal guidelines. Typically publish and then self-archive in a repository</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Access Journals

• Different approaches to peer review (e.g., PLoS ONE – technically sound)
• Speed of uptake depends upon funding bodies’ policies
• Funding bodies’ policies listed at Sherpa/Juliet and publishers’ archiving policies listed at Sherpa/Romeo
  [http://www.sherpa.ac.uk](http://www.sherpa.ac.uk)
• OA articles receive 18% more citations than average (Piwowar, et al. (2018))
• Beware!
### Open Access Publishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STM Journals total (2017)</th>
<th>$9.9 billion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OA Journals (2017)</td>
<td>$570 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(OA revenue growing at 6 times journal growth rate of 1.3%)
2017 OA articles, by revenue model

Source: Piwowar and Priem et al, February 2018
Pearls of wisdom...

I would tell the students that how they come on stage, i.e., their very first papers and presentations, makes a lasting impression on senior colleagues. It is just like in theater performances or conducting.

Second, I would tell them, while at the beginning of one’s career it is certainly important to publish more, they should not let themselves be overwhelmed by the pressure to publish. My students publish very little and all those that wanted to go into academia got a an academic job.
Pearls of wisdom…

Third, they should know that they will be remembered only for their gold nuggets, i.e., the best of their best papers.

Fourth, the quality of exposition is front and center. Papers that are not carefully crafted have an impact only if they are absolutely earth-shattering and the author is lucky enough to find somebody who writes their results up nicely and explains them to the community. Poor exposition, in my view, shows a lack of respect for the results and hence reflects poorly on the results per se.
Pearls of wisdom…

Assuming you have some good results to begin with, the most important part of a paper is the introduction: this should provide motivation (why the work is important) and place it in context (novelty with respect to other work).

Most importantly this is where you can state what the work should be compared against. You want to be as thorough as possible: it is better to tell reviewers/readers that some loosely related work is not really related, rather than have a reviewer give a negative comment because that work was not cited and the reviewer thinks it might be relevant.
Pearls of wisdom…

Emphasize clarity. Place yourself in the position of someone who knows very little about the topic, which is not so easy when you are an expert. When in doubt, it's better to err on the side of stating something simple if it helps the not-so-expert reader understand the paper.

This is especially relevant for junior researchers: for work to have impact it has to be accessible, easy for others to understand and use, and that often requires extra effort, when the concepts themselves are complex. One strategy for this is to use toy examples to illustrate the basic ideas.
Pearls of wisdom... in summary

- Quality
- Clarity
- Context
If you are asked to review an article

Typically, you will not know the identity of the authors. You are part of the global academic community so try to be:

- Objective and fair
- Constructive and helpful
- Polite
- On schedule
# Publishing ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical issue</th>
<th>Author responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>× Duplicate submission</td>
<td>✓ Confirm work in the submitted manuscript has not been submitted elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Plagiarism or inadequate citing</td>
<td>✓ Ensure that all work in a submitted manuscript is original and that you acknowledge content reproduced from other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Non-disclosure of conflicts of interest</td>
<td>✓ To declare any potential conflicts of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Significant errors in publication</td>
<td>✓ Notify the publisher if a significant error in publication is identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Not conforming to national, local and intuitional laws and requirements</td>
<td>✓ Studies involving human or animal subjects should conform to national, local and institutional laws and requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Copyright issue</td>
<td>✓ Obtain permission to reproduce content such as images, maps, figures, musical examples etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Publishing ethics

Cambridge University Press is a member of Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Verdict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author requests permission to publish review comments received</td>
<td>Denied: reviewers were told the process was confidential at time of carrying out review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author of rejected paper publicly names and criticises peer reviewer</td>
<td>Classified as a mistake by author (who apologised publicly to the reviewer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author requests certain experts not to be included in editorial process</td>
<td>Ongoing! Options: honour request, open peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of a manuscript on an external website after acceptance but prior to journal publication</td>
<td>Classified as a mistake by author, who removed the manuscript from the external website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author sends gift to editor of journal while manuscript being reviewed</td>
<td>Editor, worried about conflict of interest, returns the gift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Publishing a book

Why?

• The subject needs it
• Students need a textbook
• Colleagues need a guide
• Career progression
• Hardly ever for money!
The types of book we publish

• Textbooks for students
• Cutting-edge books for individual researchers and graduate students
• Specialized research monographs
• Technical books for practitioners/clinicians
• Multi-volume reference works
• ‘Trade’ books
A note on edited volumes

• Appropriate for multidisciplinary or emerging fields; common in medicine
• Normal for large reference books
• Not usually appropriate for textbooks
• Very difficult to ensure coherence, consistency in notation, style and level of treatment
• Typically have less long-term influence
Dissertations

• Thorough review of previous scholarship

• Mastery of a specific topic

• Typically too narrow for book-length treatment

• Sometimes possible to split into articles
Turning a dissertation into a book

• Are those review chapters all necessary?
• Add topics that were beyond the scope of a thesis
• Is additional explanation necessary?
• Does the framework need to be changed to give a strong narrative argument?
• Eliminate the sense of writing ‘through gritted teeth’
• Consider these points before approaching a publisher
How to decide which publisher?

- Editorial and production support
- Prestige
- Market Reach
- E-books/Digital Offering
- Global reach
- Relevant list
- Personal contact
- Pricing
Preparing a book proposal

• Names and affiliations of authors
• Title – clear, accurate
• Background to the field
• Brief description of the book – jargon-free!
• Reasons and qualifications for writing
• Target readership
• Competition – how your book differs
• Table of contents
• Estimate of length and schedule
• Sample material
The assessment process

• Generation of a book proposal
• In-house review by editor
• Revision of proposal, if necessary
• External single-blind peer review
• Further revision, if necessary
• Approval of strategy and business model
• Contract offer
Summary of assessment process

Proposal

Editorial assessment

Peer review

Revision/response

Syndicate Meeting

Internal editorial, sales & marketing review

Contract with author

Process takes 1 -12 months
Approval by the Press Syndicate

- Governing body of Cambridge University Press
- 18 members - ‘Syndics’
- All new publications (books and journals) must be approved by the Press Syndicate
The assessment process

Noam Chomsky
MIT

Mary Beard
Cambridge

Stephen Hawking
Cambridge

Terrence Tao
UCLA

Steven Weinberg
University of Texas

The same process for everyone
The book contract

• Confirms details of title, word (or page) count and delivery schedule and proposed publishing format
• If contract offered on basis of a prospectus, may have a clause requiring a ‘clearance reading’ before final acceptance
• Confirms who owns copyright
• Confirms the obligations of the publisher
• Confirms financial terms
New publishing models: beyond books and journals

• Short books – something between a book and a review/survey article
• Open Access books
• Interactive e.g. iPython, Cloud, Wolfram
• New ways of accessing information
A new format … introducing Cambridge Elements

• Combining best of both books and journals
• Edited by leading scholars
• Strong quality control
• 20-30k words (45-70 pages)
• Rapid publication
• Main format is digital, allowing superior functionality
About Elements

Welcome to Cambridge Elements, our new concept in academic publishing.

Cambridge Elements are a new concept in academic publishing and scholarly communication, combining the best features of books and journals. They consist of original, concise, authoritative, and peer-reviewed scholarly and scientific research, organised into focused series edited by leading scholars, and provide comprehensive coverage of the key topics in disciplines spanning the arts and sciences.

Conceived from the start for a digital environment, and with the ability to be regularly updated, they provide a dynamic reference resource for graduate students, researchers, and practitioners.
Elements – published across the academic spectrum
Author Hub is the dedicated, online platform for Cambridge University Press book authors. Log in to your personal account for practical advice to support you on your publishing journey, and for access to sales and royalty information, exclusive author discounts, news and more.

If you are a prospective author, you can use Author Hub to find out all you need to know about publishing with us.
Very useful resources

Gustavii

Day and Gastel

Luey
Questions?

“What is written without effort is in general read without pleasure.”

Samuel Johnson

“You know that I write slowly. This is chiefly because I am never satisfied until I have said as much as possible in a few words, and writing briefly takes far more time than writing at length.”

Carl Friedrich Gauss

Contact: John Linglei Meng, jmeng@cambridge.org
Thanks!

John Linglei Meng, jmeng@cambridge.org
What does the publisher do?

Commissioning & Pre-Contract Peer Review

Development
- Advice on style, structure
- Class-testing, reviews
- Figures

Design
- Internal layout
- Cover design

Distribution
- Print (or PoD)
- Online
- Archiving

Copy-editing Proof-reading

Global Marketing

Rights & Royalties
- Licensing
- Co-publication
- Translations

Commerce
- Library supply
- Retail & internet
- Wholesalers
- Direct

Intellectual Property Protection

Design
- Internal layout
- Cover design

Copy-editing Proof-reading

Global Marketing

Rights & Royalties
- Licensing
- Co-publication
- Translations

Commerce
- Library supply
- Retail & internet
- Wholesalers
- Direct

Intellectual Property Protection
Assessment workflow
Production workflow

Production Editor (receives and logs accepted paper) → Copy Editor → Typesetter

Typesetter (incorporates corrections) → Production Editor → Author [& EiC] (checks proofs and answers queries)

Production Editor (checks final proofs) → Typesetter (sends final files) → Cambridge Content Services (uploads article)