

Gender Equity Project Colloquia and Workshops

Successful Publishing and Handling Rejection Activities and Discussion

Read: Dealing with the rejected article (Guillou & Earnshaw, 2000)
Writing for professional journals (Henson, 1999)
Tips for writing proposals (Rice 2005)
How to read and respond to a journal rejection letter (Siegel & Werb, 2002)
Grant writing tips (Valian et al. 2006)

One characteristic of very successful people is their ability to respond to adversity, whether it is a rejection of a paper or grant or lack of initial support for a new idea. For every scientist there are setbacks, and this workshop is designed to help you learn how to handle setbacks quickly and effectively that may include knowing when to drop one thing to move forward on another.

Pre-Workshop Activity: Look at a recent article or grant proposal that has either been rejected or given a revise and resubmit. Look at the comments made by the reviewers and separate them into the following categories:

1. Minor, easy-to-fix – Mistakes that take the least amount of time to correct, such as providing more detail about methods or highlighting key points
2. Major –The substance of your paper (theory, method, etc.) which may take longer to modify.

Presentation: Professors Revenson and Francesconi will share some of their knowledge about publishing successfully and dealing with less-than-favorable reviews.

Discussion: Recall the most recent paper or grant proposal that was rejected or received a revise-and-resubmit decision; then consider the following:

1. Were the comments made by the reviewers constructive? If so, what made them constructive?
2. Were any of the comments made by the reviewers particularly unhelpful? If so, what made the comments unhelpful?

3. In the materials that you read for the workshop, which suggestions were particularly useful?
4. Imagine that a respected colleague received the rejection or reviews that you did. What suggestions would you give him or her?

References

- Guillou, P. J. & Earnshaw, J. J. (2000). Dealing with the rejected article. *British Journal of Surgery*, 87 (12), 1603-1604.
- Henson, K. T. (1999). Writing for professional journals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(10), 780-783.
- Montgomery, M. (2003,). Thank you for advertising, but your needs don't meet my interests [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50 (2), B15.
- Rice, P. M. (2005). *Tips on Writing Proposals*. Retrieved August 2, 2006, from University of Southern Illinois Carbondale, Office of Research Development and Administration Web site: www.siu.edu/orda/general/proposal_tips.pdf.
- Siegel, V. & Werb, Z. (2002, August). How to read and respond to a journal rejection letter [Electronic version]. *Women in Cell Biology*, 25(8), 5-7. Retrieved January 4, 2005, from <http://www.ascb.org/index.cfm?navid=112&id=1605&tcode=nws3&search=1>.
- Uchiyama, K. & Simone, G. (1999). Criteria for judging manuscripts. *Publishing educational research: Guidelines and tips*. Retrieved 14 March 2005 from <http://35.8.171.42/era/epubs/howtopub/criteria.htm>.
- Valian, V.V., Barr, G., Berenbaum, S., Griffin, Z., Gerken, L., & Rajaram, S (2006). Grant writing tips. Unpublished manuscript, for Gender Equity Project, Sponsorship program.