

## AAEM writing and publishing workshops 2009 – 2011

### Bibliography

Aalbers MB. Creative destruction through the Anglo-American hegemony: a non-Anglo-American view on publications, referees and language. *Area* 2004; 36(3): 319-322

Albanese A. AAAS Says *Science* Will Remain in JSTOR. *Library Journal*. January 7, 2008. Available at <http://www.libraryjournal.com/index.asp?layout=article&articleid=CA6517215> . Accessed 22 October 2008

*Library Journal*. Academic Newswire. January 3, 2008. Available at <http://www.libraryjournal.com/info/CA6516694.html> . Accessed 22 October 2008

Anonymous. Linguistic Imperialism. Wikipedia. Available at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linguistic\\_imperialism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linguistic_imperialism) . Accessed 20 October 2008

Anonymous. JSTOR. The Archives. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/archives/index.jsp> . Accessed 22 October 2008

Anonymous. ‘Science’ will end link to JSTOR. *Inside Higher Ed*. 26 July 2007. Available at <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/07/26/jstor> . Accessed 22 October 2008

Anonymous. What do editors at specialty journals look for in manuscripts? *The Write Stuff* 2008; 17(2): 86

Armstrong JS, Wright M. The ombudsman: Verification of citations: Faulty towers of knowledge? *Interfaces* 2008; 38(2): 125-139

Belcher DD. Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 2007; 16: 1-22

Bourne PE. Ten simple rules for getting published. *PLoS Computational Biology* 2005; 1(5): e57. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.0010057.

Available at <http://www.ploscompbiol.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pcbi.0010057> . Accessed 24 September 2008

Burrough-Boenisch J. The return of the native: A British perspective. *The Write Stuff* 2008; 17(2): 63-64

Charkin R. Macmillan newsletter 2004. Available at [www.macmillandistribution.co.uk/pdf%20files/Review%20of%202004.pdf](http://www.macmillandistribution.co.uk/pdf%20files/Review%20of%202004.pdf) . Accessed 22 October 2008

Chew M, Villanueva EV, Van Der Weyden MB. Life and times of the impact factor: retrospective analysis of trends for seven medical journals (1994–2005) and their Editors' views. *J Royal Soc Med* 2008; 100: 142-160

Cooper L. Better writing and more space needed online (Correspondence). *Nature* 2008; 455: 26

Coppin G. Site licensing and personal subscriptions—competitive or complementary? PowerPoint presentation. Association of Subscription Agents and Intermediaries Conference, “New forms of information supply.” 28 February to 1 March, 2005, London. <http://subscription-agents.org/conference/200502/> . Available at [www.subscription-agents.org/conference/200502/Coppin.pps](http://www.subscription-agents.org/conference/200502/Coppin.pps) . Accessed 22 October 2008

Emily KN. The return of the native: An American perspective. *The Write Stuff* 2008; 17(2): 65-66

Esposito JJ. Open access 2.0: Access to scholarly publications moves to a new phase. *J Electron Pub* 2008; Spring. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0011.203>. Available at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=jep;view=text;rgn=main;idno=3336451.0011.203> . Accessed 8 July 2008

Fox R: Is broken English bad for us? WAME listserv posting, October 19, 1999.

Gadagkar R. Open-access more harm than good in developing world (Correspondence). *Nature* 2008; 453: 450

Gale E. What does an editor look for? Available at <http://www.diabetologia-journal.org/eicadvice.html> . Accessed 21 October 2008

Gastel B. Approaching a writing project. PowerPoint presentation. Available at <http://www.authoraid.info/resource-library/ApproachingWriting.ppt/view>. Accessed 22 May 2008.

Guyatt GH, Haynes RB. Preparing reports for publication and responding to reviewers' comments. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006; 59: 900-906

Habibzadeh F. Journal impact factor: uses and misuses. *Arch Iran Med* 2008; 11(4): 453-454

Hannay T. The web opportunity. *STM News* 2007; June. Nature Nascent blog. <http://blogs.nature.com/wp/nascent/2007/06/post.html> . Accessed 18 March 2009

Jawaid SA, Jafary MH, Aslam M (eds). Proceedings National Conference on Medical Editing. April 23-25, 2007, Rawalpindi, Pakistan. Karachi: Mubarak Ali on behalf of the Pakistan Medical Journalists' Association, 2007

Jefferson T, Rudin M, Brodney Folse S, Davidoff F. Editorial peer review for improving the quality of reports of biomedical studies. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2006; Issue 2. Available at [www.cochrane.org/reviews/en/mr000016.html](http://www.cochrane.org/reviews/en/mr000016.html). Accessed 10 July 2006

Kozak M, Cooter M, and various authors. A call from a non-native English speaker: Don't look at my affiliation (Viewpoint). *European Science Editing* 2008; 34(4): 100-104

Langdon-Neuner E. Hangings at the *bmj*: What editors discuss when deciding to accept or reject research papers. *The Write Stuff* 2008; 17(2): 84-85

Lillis T, Curry MJ. Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars. *Written Communication*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 3-35 (2006). DOI: 10.1177/0741088305283754  
Marusic M (editor). *Principles of research in medicine*. Zagreb: Medicinska Naklada, 2008

Sadana R, Paraje G. International gaps in science publications. *Response (Letters)*. *Science* 2005; 309: 1325-1326

Shashok K. Author's editors—facilitators of science information transfer. *Learned Publishing* 2001; 14(2): 113-121. DOI: 10.1087/095315101300059495

Shashok K. Standardization versus diversity: how can we push peer review research forward? *Medscape General Medicine* 2005; 7 (1), Posted 02/17/2005. Available at <http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/498238>

Shashok K. Content and communication—How can peer review provide useful feedback about the writing? *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2008 8(3). DOI: 10.1186/1471-2288-8-3 (31 Jan 2008). Available at <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2288/8/3> .

Steele C. Rigour mortis? Are evaluative measures and scholarly research compatible? *Australasian Conference on Information Systems 2007*, 5-7 December 2007, University of Southern Queensland. Toowoomba, Queensland, Australia. Available at [www.acis2007.usq.edu.au/assets/slides/Colin\\_Steele\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.acis2007.usq.edu.au/assets/slides/Colin_Steele_FINAL.pdf) . Accessed 9 October 2008

Taraborelli D. Soft peer review: Social software and distributed scientific evaluation. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on the Design of Cooperative Systems (COOP '08)*, Carry-Le-Rouet, France, 20-23 May 2008. Available at <http://www.academicproductivity.com/2007/soft-peer-review-social-software-and-distributed-scientific-evaluation/> . Accessed 28 May 2008

Ware M. *Peer review: benefits, perceptions and alternatives*. London: Publishing Research Consortium, 2008

Wright M, Armstrong JS. The ombudsman: Verification of citations: Fawlty Towers of knowledge? *Interfaces* 2008; 38(2): 125-139

World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) listserv discussion. Value of technical editing. 2-8 March 2005. Available at <http://www.wame.org/resources/wame-listserve-discussions/value-of-technical-editing/> . Accessed 5 August 2008