Wiley Researcher Academy is collaborating with the following institutions all over.

1. University of North Carolina at Greensboro
2. Duke University Medical Center
3. Georgetown University Medical Center
4. **Narayana Medical College and Hospital. India**
5. Manipal Academy of Higher Education. India
6. Jet Propulsion Laboratories
7. CSIRO
8. The Rockefeller University
9. Arizona State University LMI Young Scientist Programme

Benefits of learning with Wiley Researcher Academy

- Developing the skills of scientific researchers
- Facilitating networking and collaboration
- Supporting success in research publishing

This Program is intended to equip all the challenges a researcher has to face before, during and after writing the research article. The topics/ courses covered will help in successful publishing in high quality journals.

- Learn from experienced Editors
- Collaborate with other researchers
- Receive a certificate upon course completion

Courses offered:

1. Qualities of a successful scientific researcher
2. Research and Publication: the essential link
3. Funding the research project
4. Selecting an appropriate journal
5. Best practices in writing scientific articles
6. Key components of a research article
7. Manuscript submission
8. Peer Review
9. Open Access to scientific literature
10. Managing Research Data
11. Ethical considerations in research and publishing
12. Roles of the Publisher and Journal editors
13. Post Publication Activities and driving visibility
14. Becoming a peer reviewer

Dr Andrew Moore, Editor-in-Chief BioEssays and Editor-in-Chief Wiley Researcher Academy, Frankfurt Am Main Area, Germany visited Narayana Medical College, Nellore on 23.01.2019. He addressed the faculty, post graduate students, and guided them in how to write a research proposal for funding. Dr S P Rao, Dean, Narayana Medical College informally welcomed the chief guest by offering a floral bouquet. Dr Rao narrated the developments at Narayana Medical College and described the existing facilities for advanced bio-medical research. He also briefed the various motivational schemes initiated by the Narayana Medical College to promote research among the faculty members and students. He also explained the pitfalls in writing a manuscript for publication.

Dr Andew Moore addressed the faculty and narrated his experience as chief editor for the scientific journal. He pointed out the areas concerning "**From getting money to getting published".** Taking an example from ICMR, he narrated the requirements for funding. He explained pointwise the format for research project proposal and advised on the important aspects. Discussing the General principles and process of grant application, he pointed out that the budget preparation is pivotal. The budget shall be neither an under estimate nor an over estimate. It should be optimal and consist of equipment cost, personnel cost and other research relevant travel cost.

While addressing the general rules for funding, Dr Andew said that the researcher should

be prepared in time and content. The total budget for the research project should include research equipment costs, research relevant travel cost and personnel cost. Dr Andew advised that researcher should not wait for the call, instead they should call the waiter. In other words, researcher always should keep an active eye out for grants, rather than waiting to be informed. He suggested that if the researcher is on lookout for funding in broad generic areas, they should consider a search portal. eg. http://info.researchprofessional.com; https://pivot.cos.com/; https://terravivagrants.org;

Dr Andew marked a road map for funding in the following way

First Year: The researcher should think about the potential areas of research likely to be in broad areas of risk estimation/ innovation. They must select topics of their interest and estimate the concree outcomes and benefits of research. Researcher must spend time in excavating the current literature in support of funding. They must discuss the topic with their collegues to receive feedback. Finally, they should complete and write up current work on which the application rests. Think of all the things that could stop the researcher project in its tracks. Is there a particular part that isn't yet demonstrated at the level of proof of concept? Perhaps researcher should get a small grant to research that bit before going for the big one! Researcher devote a small amount of time every day to working on their draft application. They should obtain feedback from their colleagues. Colleagues are their most useful source of feedback: use them. They will almost always regard this as a service to the community. They don't want researcher or funders to waste valuable time with a bad proposal… C.f. peer review of manuscripts! What goes around comes around!

Researcher should make sure and thought of all ethical aspects (human research / animal research) in time, and apply for approval of the planned procedures/experiments/data collection from the relevant ethical review board. They should check that the proposal fits well in detail to the grant description. At this stage, adjustments should be minor, but still important, e.g. using the right words to describe the area of intended research and outcomes: which words to the funders use in their information package? But don't overdo it! At this stage the researcher should know who will assess the proposal and how? That's crucial to know so that researcher can write it in a way that they will appreciate as important and worth funding.

Researchers must write up the application as intend it to look in its final form. Request a colleague to review it again. Reading material on paper is an absolute MUST: paper is very unforgiving, and reveals many more mistakes than a computer screen. Assessor panels will, even today, invariably read applications on paper. Take care of technicalities and

make sure you have the ethical approval in signed form. Always use recorded delivery to send a grant application: it's been known for an application to lay undelivered at the reception of a funding council. If that happens to the researcher, he/she will have the right to file for consideration never the less, because they will have proof of the date of delivery. If the researcher is not enthusiastic about their research, neither can the assessors. Express the excitement (without overdoing it), avoid long sentences and structure in writing for easy digestibility and memory effect!!!

And most importantly, think about the audience.

The second part of his talk is devoted towards publication. The main reasons for manuscript rejection for publication are that **the manuscript does not fall within the aims and scope of the journal; the paper contains too much bad writing and** are particularly common amongst young researchers. The reason **Methodology/materials are not described thoroughly enough** and is of crucial importance to a problem that is growing in perception amongst research funders and policy makers: inability to reproduce a piece of work – sometimes called the "reproducibility crisis". The other reasons for rejection are as follows:

- **The manuscript fails the technical screening.**
- **The research topic is of little significance.**
- **The manuscript presents an incomplete piece of research.**
- **There is a lack of a clear hypothesis or research aim.**

- **The goal of the research is over-ambitious.**
- **There are flaws in the procedures and/or analysis of the data.**
- **The conclusions are exaggerated and/or cannot be justified on the basis of the rest of the paper.**

Reasons for rejection can be categorized into two broad groups, depending on when they occur: you must understand this distinction and its consequences.

A. **Before Peer Review:**
   a. The manuscript fails the technical screening.
   b. The manuscript does not fall within the aims and scope of the journal.
   c. The research topic is of little significance.
   d. The paper contains too much bad writing.

B. **After Peer Review:**
   a. The manuscript presents an incomplete piece of research.
   b. There is a lack of a clear hypothesis or research aim.
   c. The goal of the research is over-ambitious.
   d. Methodology/materials are not described thoroughly enough.
   e. There are flaws in the procedures and/or analysis of the data.
   f. The conclusions are exaggerated and/or cannot be justified on the basis of the rest of the paper.

Hence, researcher should Choosing the "right" journal…and avoiding the "wrong" ones…The researcher should decide what to publish. The Original and significant results or methods or Reviews or summaries of a particular subject, particularly synthetic reviews or basically, work that advances the knowledge and understanding in a certain scientific field, or provides a valuable resource can be chosen for publication. They should also be aware of what should not be published. The following should avoid publication in journals

- **Out-of-date work**
- **Duplications of existing work**
- **Insignificant work**
- **Conclusions that are not supported by the results**

However, there are certain grey areas such as Preliminary results (are they useful, or are they too inconclusive?); Replication of results but in a different system; and "Negative results". In such cases, one should think of where best the results could be published? The editorial team of a scientific journal basically need a "good story", which - in more scientific terms – is scientifically sound, significant results that also represent a significant contribution (to the literature) in an area of research, and that would be of substantial interest and relevance to a large proportion of the journal's readership. They also need a scientific narrative that structures and binds the results together into an integrative picture that presents something new, be it an empirical observation, a proof, or an explicit hypothesis/model of predictive value.

The Structured Approach to writing a Scientific Article.

Discussion	Results and Materials & Methods	Introduction	Bibliography	Abstract and title
The conceptual architecture of your "thesis."	Tells people what you did, how, and what happened.	Tells people , in context, why you've done the present research.	Links to the peer-reviewed past of your field.	The "first impression" your article will make.

Lastly, Dr Andews cautioned about predatory journals and narrated some of the features of predatory journals.

- The editorial staff and editorial board are not identified, but if so, no academic qualifications or affiliations are given.

- There is a lack of transparency in publishing operations; policies on digital preservation; publication fees.
- Publisher prevents search engines crawling content.
- The journal's name doesn't fit its mission or origin (e.g. "Swiss journal of biomedical education")
- Claims of community standing, impact factors issued by respected organizations, or organizations that sound like respected ones, and of indexing in respected services.
- Spam Emails requesting authors or reviewers, containing crass spelling or grammar errors.
- The publisher makes **little, or no, effort to make the content discoverable**.
- The journal looks like a reputable journal, or even steals its name and web contents…

Dr Rao thanked Dr Andews for his illustrative talk and Dr Jitendra, Vice Principal, Narayana Medical College proposed vote of thanks.