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• AAC has an international and multidisciplinary readership.
• It’s published quarterly (March, June, September, and December) by Taylor & Francis
• The journal is included in the Thomson Reuters Social Sciences Citation Index.
  • Its impact factor is calculated annually and 2022’s impact factor is 2.0
• ISSN Print 0743-4618; ISSN Online 1477-3848.
AAC Content

• AAC publishes scientific articles that are related to the field of augmentative and alternative communication that
  • report research concerning the assessment, treatment, rehabilitation, and education of people who use or have the potential to use AAC systems
  • discuss theory, technology, and systems development relevant to AAC
  • includes a broad range of topics that reflect the development of this field internationally.

• AAC publishes manuscripts in the following categories:
  • Research articles including intervention and technical notes
  • Systematic reviews and meta-analyses
  • Tutorials
  • Forum papers
  • Case studies
Why publish in AAC?

• To share your research studies with our interdisciplinary audience
  • Including through Open Access opportunities
• To contribute to the knowledge base of the field
• To archive your scholarly contributions for the field
Journal Metrics

- Journal metrics are useful for helping you decide where to submit your manuscript.

- Each metric has its own limitations.

- It is best to look at multiple metrics.

- Impact Factor is the most well-known journal metric, but isn’t necessarily the best.
Open Access
AAC and Hybrid Open Access

• Open Access offers greater visibility, transparency and impact.
  • Making content **freely available** online to read. Your manuscript can be read by anyone, anywhere.
  • Making content **reusable** by third parties with little or no restrictions.

• Articles published as Open Access with Taylor & Francis typically receive 32% more citations and over 6 times as many downloads.

• Your funder or institution may encourage, or mandate Open Access and funds might be available to cover charges
  • Taylor & Francis covers 100% of the cost for authors from low-income countries and 50% of the cost for authors from middle-income countries
The Manuscript Preparation Process
Writing your manuscript

• Write first, edit later
• Keep it simple, complicated ideas expressed plainly
• The paper structure (IMRaD)
  • Introduction
    • Theory
    • Question/problem
    • Thesis/hypothesis/argument
    • Roadmap
  • Method
  • Results
  • Discussion
  • Conclusion
• You are telling a story - make sure it is consistent and easy to follow
What makes a good title?

• Simple advice: keep it short and to the point.
• Avoid redundant or cliché words/phrases.
• Highlight your findings, not your process.
• Make sure it stands out creatively or in terms of clarity.
• Make sure to include specific keywords that capture the subject of your article.
Writing an abstract

• Write the paper first- the abstract is a review or map of the entire paper
• Check the IFAs for the journal you are submitting to-there will likely be requirements.
• Who is your intended audience-frame it for them
• About those words....keywords/phrases, naturally
• ‘This paper’...focus on the essential information. Word counts!
• Revise every time you revise the paper.
• Language-difficult to read?
Introduction

• Provides rationale for why the study is important
• Considers theories where appropriate
• Provides literature review
• Leads the reader to your research questions
• Ends with the questions
Method

• Study design
• Ethical approval
• Selection and Description of Participants/Sample Size
• Masking -- anonymous
• Randomization (if applicable)
• Interventions (where applicable)
• Outcome measures
• Data analyses and statistics
Results & Discussion

**Results**
- Present results in a logical sequence, using figures and/or tables to supplement your description where needed
- Provide data on all outcomes stated in the Method section
- Provide numeric results as both absolute numbers and derivatives such as percentages

**Discussion**
- Summarize the main findings of your study and explore explanations for them
- Emphasize the new and important aspects of your study and put these in context
- Discuss study limitations
- Include implications and future research directions
- Link conclusions with the aims of the study
Documentation of Ethical approval and reporting guidelines

• Before starting the study, ethical approval must be obtained for all protocols from the local institutional review board or other appropriate ethics committee.

• We recommend authors use study-design specific consensus-based reporting guidelines as guidance where possible.

• Some examples of these guidelines are:
  • PRISMA: systematic reviews and meta-analyses
  • CONSORT: clinical trials
  • ARRIVE: Animal Research Reporting *In vivo* Experiments
  • STROBE: observational studies in epidemiology

https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/
Data sharing

What are data?
- Spreadsheets, results
- Images, photographs, video, music, survey responses, annotations, etc

The Objective of Data Sharing
- Increases the transparency and reproducibility of research
- Helps enable open research alongside open-access publications
- Data Sharing aims to be, if not already, one of the main pillars of open research

Data Sharing can
- Increase the speed of discoveries and advancements
- Create a more open and ethical field

“The recorded information (regardless of the form or the media in which it may exist) necessary to support or validate a research project’s observations, findings or outputs, or which is required for legal, (funder), or regulatory compliance.”
The University of Oxford Policy on the Management of Data Supporting Research Outputs
Data Sharing considerations

- All Datasets on which the conclusions of the paper rely, should be made available to the editorial team (for some journals this is mandatory for readers too)
- Data should be deposited in suitable repositories (persistent identifiers, version control etc.)
- **Sensitive data** should be made available via a *managed access* route

What are ‘**sensitive**’ data?

Any dataset which contains detailed information about something that is expected to be kept confidential. Such datasets need to be anonymised and appropriately codified before they can be shared more widely. Examples of sensitive data:

- Where the data include personally identifiable information, e.g. names, medical ID numbers, social security numbers, telephone numbers, photographs, biometrics information
- If the dataset contains information on confidential locations which can lead to harm if made public;
- Restricted information (e.g. financial or proprietary information)

https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/publishing-ethics-for-editors/publishing-ethics-faqs
Publication ethics - issues that can arise

- Authorship
- Competing interests
- Data or image fabrication/falsification
- Plagiarism/ text recycling
- Duplicate submissions
- Peer review manipulation
- Breaches of copyright

www.icmje.org/
www.publicationethics.org
Authorship

What are the issues?

**Ghost, Guest and authorship for sale**

Who qualifies as an author?

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Any listed author is a representative of the published paper and should have in-depth knowledge about all aspects of the study as published (i.e. rationale, methodology, analysis and interpretation).
Duplicate submission

Submit to one journal at a time!!!

Authors make a declaration upon submission that the content is original and has not been submitted elsewhere

Multiple pre-submission queries are okay

When is it ok?

- Article was published in another language (at Editors’ discretion. Must be made clear which version is a translation)
- Data presented at conferences (posters, short abstracts)
- Posted in a repository/pre-print server
Before you submit

- Look at papers published in AAC
- Review the journal Aims & Scope
- Email the Editorial Assistant to obtain a copy of the requirements at submission (rbutus@telus.net)
- Read ALL of the requirements and format your article accordingly
- Consider English ‘polishing’
- AAC is an English-language journal
AAC Submission Requirements

• Journal-specific requirements are available from the editorial office
  • Review them before submitting and make sure your manuscript follows them

• The journal follows the APA 7\textsuperscript{th} edition publication manual
  • Purchase a copy of the manual as a resource
  • Make sure your manuscript follows all APA7 guidelines
Preparing your manuscript

Think like an Editor!

“...I think authors need to think ‘what is it like to be an editor of a journal? How many papers is the Editor receiving per day, per week? What is going to actually make the journal pay attention to my paper?’"

Monica Taylor, former Editor of the Journal of Moral Education
Submission Portal
Submit, track and manage your work

Access the Submission Portal
Email
Password

Forgot password?

LOG IN

Create a Taylor & Francis account

Or

Log in with ORCID

Don't have an ORCID ID yet? Create one now

Continue a submission
Complete or manage an existing submission

Track progress
Find out where your submission is in the review process

Revise and transfer
If eligible, you could save time with a transfer
The Review Process
Types of peer review

Single-anonymous
- Reviewers know the identity of the authors
- Authors do not know the identity of the reviewers
- Most common model of peer review in STM

Double-anonymous
- Reviewers do not know the identity of the authors
- Authors do not know the identity of the reviewers
- Most common in HSS
- *AAC follows this review process*

Open peer review
- Reviewers know the identity of the authors
- Authors know the identity of the reviewers
- Reviewer reports may be published with reviewer names if article accepted
Who is involved?

Editor

• Assesses the article at submission
• Assigns **Associate Editor**
  • Usually selects suitable reviewers
  • Summarizes and integrates reviews; makes recommendation to Editor
• Makes decision on publication

Reviewers

• Assesses the details
• Give advice and expertise to the Associate Editor and Editor

Journal staff

Check format and journal requirements at submission and before acceptance
Manage communications
Production processes once the article accepted
Maintain journal systems and websites
Co-Editors Rose A. Sevcik and MaryAnn Romski, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

• Current Associate Editors: December 2023

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Barton-Hulsey</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Blackstone</td>
<td>The Bridge School</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Boster</td>
<td>Nationwide Children’s Hospital</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Clarke</td>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Clendon</td>
<td>Massey University</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakila Dada</td>
<td>University of Pretoria</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stijn Deckers</td>
<td>Radboud University</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee Dietz</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Drager</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Fried-Oken</td>
<td>Oregon Health and Science University</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mats Granlund</td>
<td>Jonkoping University</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McCarthy</td>
<td>Ohio University, Athens</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Murray</td>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India Ochs</td>
<td>US Government</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Rackensperger</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elana Radici</td>
<td>University of Milan-Bicocca</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Reichle (Single Subject Design Consultant)</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Robinson (Statistical Consultant)</td>
<td>Centers for Disease Control</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Sigafoos</td>
<td>Victoria University of Wellington</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Soto</td>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Sutherland</td>
<td>University of Canterbury</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerstin Tonsing</td>
<td>University of Pretoria</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Trembath</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>AUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Wilkinson</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
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THE AAC REVIEW PROCESS

• Manuscript received by Editorial Office

• Manuscript reviewed for appropriate content and journal style/APA 7 style

• Associate Editor (AE) selected; receives the manuscript

• Reviewers selected; receives the manuscript

• Reviews returned to AE

• AE synthesizes reviews and makes a recommendation (Accept, Revise, Resubmit, Reject) to the Editor

• Editor makes the final decision
What are reviewers looking for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluations</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Significance of manuscript</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriateness for AAC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appropriateness of design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appropriateness of statistical analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General quality of research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Appropriate references to literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality of writing, organization clarity, and style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manuscript Originality

Plagiarism
• The appropriation of another person’s or group’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit
• Includes content from books and websites (blogs)

Text recycling/self-plagiarism
• The excessive repeated use of own work (text, figures, data, ideas, etc)
• Leads to redundant publication
• Distorts the scientific record

AAC uses Ithenticate a software program that assesses originality
Responding to Reviewers’ Comments

1. Don’t become disheartened. Most papers undergo revision.

2. Carefully read the decision letter.

3. Consult your co-authors.

4. Break down the comments by category—create a list or table.

5. If the peer reviewer has misunderstood something, revise your explanation.
Make it easy for the editor

Address every comment
  - Where you amended (page number, new material)
  - Why you didn’t amend (be specific)

Review the response twice to make sure it is clear and devoid of any frustration

Be professional and respectful of the reviewers and editor

Remember: the reviewers are trying to help you publish your best work
Factors Affecting Review Decisions

• Choosing the wrong journal
• Manuscript lacks structure/organization and is difficult to follow
• No contribution to the field
• Not properly contextualized
• Libellous, unethical, rude, or lacks objectivity
• Not following the journal's author guidelines with regard to formatting
• Poor style, grammar, punctuation or English, clarity of the writing
• Adequacy of the rationale
• Accuracy and scope of the literature review
• Appropriateness of research design, data analysis, and interpretation of results
Some Current Issues and Priorities for AAC

• Recruiting reviewers
• Encouraging global submissions by authors from LMICs
• Encouraging submissions across content areas concerning culturally and linguistically diverse participant populations
• Special issues on emerging and important topics in the field
• Addressing emerging terminology issues -
  https://communicationfirst.org/the-words-we-use/
Want to be a Reviewer?

- A strong pool of reviewers is critical to a successful review process
- We appreciate the volunteer efforts of our reviewers
- New reviewers are sought by the Co-Editors
- Expertise in relevant areas
- Previous experience in the publication process is desirable
  - But T&F has resources to assist new reviewers
- Contact Co-Editors if you are interested and submit CV to Co-Editors
Guidance, news and ideas for authors

authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com
Thank you!

QUESTIONS???????????