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**DIABETES**

- ADA’s flagship journal
- Peer-reviewed research on the physiology and pathophysiology of diabetes and its complications
- A journal devoted **exclusively to diabetes** research
- Acceptance rate in 2016: 12–18%; ~350 articles and 4000+ pages published per year; research published online before print

ADA, American Diabetes Association.
DIABETES IMPACT FACTOR IF 216: 8.8
IMPORTANCE OF IMPACT FACTOR

Does the impact factor of a journal matter?

• Do you base your submission of a manuscript on the impact factor of the journal?

• Do you choose a journal to read based on its impact factor?

• Do you think that, scientifically, the best work is published in the journals with the highest impact factor?
HOW IMPORTANT IS IMPACT FACTOR? – BASED ON CITATIONS PER PAPER

The smaller the number of papers accepted, the higher the impact
Review Papers in general have higher impact

Immediate vs sustained citations

IP vs impact on discovering new drugs, improving human health and getting the Nobel Prize

IP, impact factor.
ASSESSMENT OF ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS IN DIABETES

• Both animal and human studies
• Mechanistic studies
• Novel observations in humans with potentially high impact
• In vitro studies only when they are part of in vivo experiments unless reporting major advances in science
• Observational studies only if additional mechanistic information is included
• Genetic studies showing significant association
• Proteomic, genomic, metabolomics and microbiome studies reporting novel pathways and biomarkers
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Authors

Final acceptance 12–22% of submissions

Editorial Office Screening (format, ethics)

Editor-in-Chief

Associate Editors (n=14)

−15%

−35%

Ethics Committee

Reviewers
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High-priority manuscripts

• Novelty
• New mechanistic insights
• Highly relevant to diabetes/metabolism
• Well-designed and carefully performed experiments
• Clear, accurate and objective interpretation
• Changes treatment paradigms/practices; novel drug targets
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High-priority manuscripts

• Innovative and move the field forward
• Offer better understanding of the disease process and complications
• Study unambiguously challenges an existing paradigm
• Thorough analysis using both *in vitro* and *in vivo* experiments
• Clearly written, logical, well-organised and high-quality figures
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Title page
Title – concise (< characters and space) and succinct, conveying the theme of the manuscript. For example: Impact of pre-meal administration of insulin on food intake in type 2 diabetic individuals

Authors
Authorship is a privilege and implies:
• Substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data
• Preparation and revision of manuscript – intellectual contribution rather than simply editing
• Final approval of the manuscript
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Introduction

• Define the problem
• Provide the essential background information
• Provide the rationale for the hypothesis or questions addressed in the study
• Specify the specific aim or hypothesis tested
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Research design and methods

• Precise and concise description of the study design
• Relevant information on study participants
• Description of methods used
• If published methodology is used, refer to the publication and provide only a very brief outline
• Indicate any innovations or modifications made
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Statistical analysis

• Power calculation – specifically in large human studies
• Description of statistical/bioinformatics approach
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Results

• Statement of observations and not interpretation
• Critically important results in tables and figures
• Concise and pertinent legends
• Supplementary data that are helpful to the reader
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Discussion

- Recommend the 1st paragraph to provide a concise summary of salient observations/results
- Following paragraphs should be devoted to interpreting the results
- Avoid repetition of literature review that is already given in the introduction
- Always summarise and integrate the interpretation of results
- Definitive conclusion based on the results and interpretation
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Acknowledgements

• Acknowledge people’s contributions
• Acknowledge the funding agency
• Specify the role played by each of the authors
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Plagiarism

- Manuscripts submitted to *Diabetes* will be uploaded to CrossCheck/iThenticate, plagiarism detection software, to scan the document for plagiarised text. Plagiarism is scientific misconduct and will be addressed as such.
Digital image manipulation

All digital images in manuscripts accepted for publication will be scanned using image forensics software for any indication of improper manipulation

- Falsification of data
- Improprieties for authorship
- Misappropriation of the ideas of others
- Violation of generally accepted research practices
- Material failure to comply with legislative and regulatory requirements affecting research
- Inappropriate behaviour in relation to misconduct
- Deliberate misrepresentation
PLANNING A STUDY

• Choose a topic which has potential high impact
• Thorough reading of published research
• Novel hypothesis is always exciting provided it is supported by logical reasons
• Define your question(s) clearly
PLANNING A STUDY

• Design the study well – proper controls, well-defined population or animal models, etc.
• Statistical advice whenever needed
• Always use the state-of-the-art methodologies
• Analyse the results objectively
• Interpret results objectively
• Disproving your hypothesis should not dishearten you – your aim is to find out the truth