



## From Submission to Publication: How We Work with Your Manuscript

Surely, we, Editors, Authors, Referees and Readers, are looking for the same goal: a strong Journal of the Brazilian Chemical Society with high impact and sound contributions to the development of chemical sciences. Last year, we reached an impact factor of 1.43 and of course we do want to move ahead. However, we may sometimes have conflicting interests and we want to point out some details about our publication process and goals just to remind you of some ideas.

We have clear guidelines for authors (please, see <http://jbcs.sbq.org.br/conteudo.asp?page=14>) and, as stated, we focus on publication of Articles, Communications, Short Reports, Reviews, Accounts and Letters encompassing new aspects of chemistry and with original and significant contributions to an innovative chemical knowledge. This is a major goal and, occasionally, manuscripts are rejected by Editors without external peer review because they do not reach this target. Science develops by adding bricks to a collective wall and by changing paradigms. We should consider where our contributions are leading to.

Of course, manuscripts should follow specific format and authors should be careful in their writing for avoiding delays during the submission process and (re)sending manuscript corrected versions when working with our office staff. By the way, our publishing office works hard to attend you and us, but certainly we may help their work just by following the format guidelines for text, figures, references etc.

Additionally, nowadays we should take advantage of the possibilities brought by digital media and a visually attractive Graphical Abstract is an excellent way to get attention of prospective readers. The use of Supplementary Information (SI) for adding details about experiments (why not adding a movie with special experimental strategies?) and instrumental data also brings important contribution to editors, reviewers, and readers. SI is now a must for articles describing the synthesis of new compounds, and

should be extended to other areas too. We do suggest you consider these points when preparing your coming manuscripts.

After being approved by our publishing office, the submitted manuscript is sent to a specific editor based on her/his main area of expertise. Editors start their work by reading abstract, cover letter and all text for understanding its particular aspects, results and contributions. Particular attention is now devoted to checking whether this manuscript reports novel results, especially if the authors have reported similar studies in previous publications (we do not want to add to salami publishing!). Editors want to serve the chemical community, but they also need to act as gatekeepers to set the standards of the journal. All editors struggle to equilibrate both roles and, again, Editors, Authors, Referees and Readers, certainly have the same goal. It is a hard feeling when editors have to reject the submitted manuscript without external review and we strive to avoid this, but of course we are restricted by the search for novelties to develop our chemical knowledge. It helps a lot when authors send a cover letter with clear indications highlighting the outstanding points of the manuscript and how it brings new horizons to the studied topic. Unfortunately it is not so usual to receive good cover letters and frequently these are bureaucratic letters without any special appeal. We urge all authors to rethink about this aspect.

Then, it comes to the indication of reviewers. Together with editors, reviewers are essential for a critical evaluation of each manuscript and its special features. At this point, authors should think carefully about the suggested reviewers and occasional ethical implications. Indication of good reviewers shows that you know the research area. By the way, your manuscripts' references also give an indication of the compatibility between your work and the JBCS. Reviewers have a critical role and we summarized their action in a recent editorial named "Refreshing Guidelines for Peer Reviewers".<sup>1</sup> Good reviews

are extremely helpful for editorial decision and we celebrate when we receive them. On the other hand, it makes our work harder when a reviewer does not reply an invitation (are you available?) or accept the invitation but does not provide his/her comments according to the deadline proposed. This affects a lot our publication time and authors are frequently upset about this. Please, reviewers, do your best and help us to meet authors' expectations.

No need to remember that we play different roles at different times and we know how we would like to be treated. Our current average publication time (from submission to web publication) is under 5.5 months and we have been able to keep it despite the increase of the number of submissions. As recently mentioned in the first editorial of this year, in 2012, the JBCS received about 700 submitted manuscripts and 280 articles were published in 12 issues.<sup>2</sup>

After receiving reviewers' feedbacks, Editors decide about the submitted manuscript and the publishing office sends their decision to the authors. Patience and modesty are great fellows. Do not take anything as personal. Your piece of work was evaluated, but this does not reach you personally. Calm down and think on how all authors may contribute to do corrections and to reply reviewers' and editor's comments. A reply letter with itemized responses will be a must for further editorial decision. Eventually the editor may consult the reviewers again. Time is always a critical resource. Authors should stay patient and reviewers should act as fast as possible. Sometimes it is just too much for a busy schedule, but we must do our best to meet expectations without delays.

Fortunately we get to the point to accept the manuscript and after receiving the so expected letter, authors should work with the publishing office for having the article published.

At this point, Editors will read again the galley proof and authors should check it carefully and without any delay. Authors always complain about the time involved in the publication process, but please do not forget to review the manuscript and return its proof as soon as possible.

Nowadays, the JBCS is assigning the digital object identification, the DOI number, in ahead-of-print articles. Soon the JBCS will start a new platform for manuscripts processing, the ScholarOne provided by Scielo. It will be another major step in the internationalization of the JBCS and it will open new routes of evolution.

We are looking forward to receiving your manuscripts and working together for continuous development of the JBCS. Our joint efforts may lead us "to the infinity and beyond". Let us enjoy our journey!

**Joaquim A. Nóbrega**  
*JBCS Editor*

**Watson Loh**  
*JBCS Editor*

## References

1. Nóbrega, J. A.; Loh, W.; *J. Braz. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *24*, 525.
2. Nóbrega, J.A.; Hatje, V.; *J. Braz. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *24*, 1.