So You Want to Publish in . . . ?

How to Avoid Some Potholes and Pitfalls and Make It Into Print

THE EDITORS OF THE *JOURNAL OF AMERICAN COLLEGE HEALTH*

ABSTRACT. Many college health professionals are intimidated at the thought of submitting an article to the *Journal of American College Health.* In this article, the editors provide details about the scope of the journal, describe types of articles it publishes, warn about common errors authors sometimes make in writing and submitting manuscripts for publication, and outline the steps in the review process.

Key words: academic writing, getting published, writing for publication

NOTE: The following is an adaptation of an article that first appeared in the March 1996 issue of the *Journal of American College Health* (*JACH*) and was reprinted in volume 48 of the *Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama, and Sociometry.* Parts of the original article have been deleted because they are relevant only to *JACH.* The article contains information and suggestions that anyone preparing a manuscript for publication will find helpful. Most of the comments by the *JACH* editors apply to the preparation of submissions to all scholarly journals. Our readers, however, will note some stylistic differences because *JACH* does not follow the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.), which is used by *The International Journal of Action Methods.* That minor point does not diminish the value of the article to those preparing manuscripts.

THE JOURNAL OF AMERICAN COLLEGE HEALTH (*JACH*) is a remarkable publication—it represents not one discipline but all of the disciplines in the broad field of college health. It functions as a scientific journal, presenting the latest research advances in the field, but it is also a trade journal in which we professionals in college health tell each other what we are doing, what is new, and how our colleagues approach the day-to-day problems associated with improving students' health, curing their ills, and teaching young adults to practice the healthy behaviors that we hope they will follow throughout their lives.

As the journal has evolved over the years since 1952, when it was first published as *Student Medicine,* there has often been tension between some professionals in college health who desire a sophisticated medical research publication and those who want a practical trade journal. We executive editors attempt to assure that each issue represents a good balance between these points of view and offers something of interest to all of our "customers"-the members of the American College Health Association (ACHA) and others interested in the health of college and university students.

In nearly every issue of the journal, one page is devoted to an outline of the scope of the journal and detailed information for authors on how to submit articles. The following pages offer an expanded description of the kinds of articles that appear in *JACH* and suggest how authors can turn their ideas into published articles.

Major articles are scientific. They present new data, new insights, or new analyses; they are rigorous, are often quantitative, and include detailed statistical analyses; they report on original research or offer an in-depth study of topics of interest. References to the current literature are an integral part of the work. These articles demand the most precision on the part of authors and reviewers and frequently require extensive revisions. The major article category sometimes includes state-of-the-art reviews that summarize other scholars' data and publications in the literature, putting these in perspective for the college health professional.

We are looking for major articles that describe new contributions to knowledge or provide new perspectives on older knowledge, rather than studies that simply confirm previous observations. For example, we have received and published many articles dealing with knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to AIDS. As a wise and thoughtful author, you will review past years' issues of *JACH* before preparing one more piece that repeats what has already been said, and you will consider what insights your article can offer our readers.

Major articles are usually from 10 to 16 double-spaced, typed pages (5 to 8 printed pages in the published issue), but this is not a hard and fast rule. In addition, they include an abstract of about I5O words that states the purpose of the article, the main findings (but does not include probabilities or use acronyms), principal conclusions, and an indication of the importance of the work. Choosing three to five key words is helpful for abstracting services and databases.

Clinical and Program Notes are different. They are the trade aspect of our journal, describing interesting things you saw or outlining different things that you did, often with step-by-step instructions about how to carry out on-campus projects.

Clinical notes do not need the same kind of scientific rigor as major articles because they describe a particular program on a particular campus. As an author, you may outline a new program or describe an innovative idea about an exciting program, or you may present data on or an evaluation of a unique program at a single institution or a small number of institutions. In effect, you are saying, "Hey folks, look at what I am doing. It worked for us and you might get some ideas from it."

The topic could also be an interesting clinical case with details of unusual interest to your fellow health professionals. Although clinical and program notes are usually seven or fewer double-spaced typed pages in manuscript form, they must include an abstract, key words, a short review of previous articles on the same topic, and complete references. Figures and tables are used only occasionally.

Viewpoints are purely personal statements about particular processes, programs, or issues. Sometimes they deal with economic, financial, or ethical matters; sometimes with educational philosophies or aspects of national policies that affect college health.

Viewpoints give you an opportunity to inform, . . . convince, or enlighten . . . readers about your perspectives on an issue. Sometimes viewpoint articles introduce an element of controversy into the pages of the journal. . . .

Most viewpoints are relatively short—usually three to five page. They do not require abstracts or key words, and almost never include tables or figures.

Editorial, . . . Book Reviews, Brief Reports . . . appear from time to time. Nearly every year we develop a theme issue. . . . We sometimes assemble a theme issue or a cluster of articles on a common topic from manuscripts on hand. . . .

Every article that we publish is edited so that it conforms to the highest standards for clarity, good usage, . . . [and] style.

Writing the Article

Once you have completed your literature review and research, . . . you are ready to start writing. If you are working with a collaborator (working together often creates great enthusiasm for the project and keeps you from becoming bogged down in the tedium of revisions), you will want to decide whether one of you is going to do the first draft or whether you will discuss the work at every stage as you go along.

Keep your audience in mind as you write. Often we receive manuscripts from authors who do not make it clear why their material is suitable for *JACH* readers. We want to say "So what?" to the author. What are the implications

of the research being described? . . . Is it research that can be replicated? If it is a how-to article, what materials are necessary to carry it out, what size group is it meant for, how much time did it take, how did you measure whether it was effective?

For beginning authors, clinical notes or viewpoints are often the best kind of article to start with. Whatever type of article you decide on, make a detailed outline that starts by telling why you did the research, how you went about it, what you found, and why it is worth reporting.

Major articles begin with an introduction that includes the literature review and sets forth the hypotheses being tested; you need not use the heading Introduction because the reader knows that is the purpose of the opening paragraphs. The remainder of the article should be divided into separate sections labeled Method (how you went about it), Results (what you found), and Discussion (why it was worth reporting). A similar listing of the parts of an article is suitable for preparing a clinical note or a brief report. In the Method section, you must include clear statements about the number of participants in the study, how they were chosen, the materials used, and whether the study was approved by the campus human subjects committee. Results should be statistically analyzed, if appropriate, and described in sufficient detail to allow readers to verify the conclusions from the original data.

In the Discussion section, emphasize any new information learned from the study and tell what conclusions can be drawn from it. Be sure that the conclusions discussed are related to the original purpose of the article, as stated in the introductory paragraphs, and are warranted by the data you have collected. A few words of caution: try not to keep too many ideas going at the same time; focus your thoughts.

Too many authors include material in the results section that should be in the discussion section, insert facts in the discussion section that should be included under methods or materials, or repeat the first or last paragraph or an identical paragraph from the text as the abstract. Do not worry about a title or an abstract at this point.

Using Statistics

Ever since computers arrived on the scene about 25 years ago, people have been able to do amazing things with numbers. In fact, computers have made possible the routine use of a wide range of data analyses (e.g., factor analysis and multiple regression analysis) that were very rarely undertaken before 1970 simply because the time and effort needed to do them were so enormous. Now, anyone who can type, even if only moderately well, can undertake these and other powerful—if mysteries—analytic procedures. All you need to do is type your data into the computer and—using a mouse to point and click or a

few additional keystrokes—initiate the analyses. Thanks to the computer, out come more numbers, lots of them!

For you, the authors, the good news is that generating and analyzing your data is just that simple. The bad news is that you can set this process in motion without having an adequate understanding of what you have got to start with or what you may get to the end with. For example, you can generate Student's *t* test, Fisher's *F* test, cannonical correlations, discriminant functions, and so forth. Like magic, you have a statistically significant finding. That is, you have a statistically significant finding if, as you scan the printout, you can tell which numbers are the eigen values for the factor analysis you requested and which is the probability of Wilks's lambda.

To stat with, the news may be bad because the computers do not ask some very basic questions: Is this number nothing more than a name (as is Group 3, etc.), nothing more than a rank (as in first = 1, second = 2, etc.), or nothing more than a count or frequency of discreet items (as in five completed suicides)? When the answers to such questions and the analyses that have been employed do not match, the results of the analysis are not valid. What went in may not have been garbage, but what came out certainly is.

The articles by Steenbarger, Manchester, and Schwartz (*JACH*, March 1996, pp. 194–218) can be very useful guides to understanding statistics and their role in doing and reporting research. In addition, you will find people with expertise in the language of numbers and statistics in several departments in your college or university—psychology, sociology, political science, economics, and mathematics are among those departments.

You would be wise to consult a statistically knowledgeable colleague or an appropriate resource from one of the above-mentioned departments for guidance in the numerical and statistical dimension of your research and data analyses. Ideally, you would do this as you are planning the study; a bit less optimally, prior to initiating the study; if at all possible, before analyzing your data; and, without question, before you begin writing up the study. If you do not have a sound grasp of the character of the data you have collected, or if you do not fully understand the analyses you have employed, then you will be disappointed when your manuscript is reviewed. In these circumstances, you cannot write clearly, accurately, and meaningfully about the findings of your study.

The First Draft

Armed with your outline, sit down with a sharpened pencil and clean paper or fire up your word processor and simply begin. It has been said that "a job begun is half done," and that is surely true when it comes to writing. Write it all down, even if you think you may be rambling. Recognize that you will revise and revise and revise before you have a finished manuscript to submit

to the journal. Another warning: please do not begin your article with the words "The purpose of this research was. . . ." You can tell what it is about without using a trite phrase.

If you are working from a speech that you delivered in person, you should realize that an oral presentation about your research does not make a publishable article, even though your associates may have urged you to submit your talk to the journal because they found it so interesting. An effective speech and an interesting article are two different things. Before an audience, you may repeat words for emphasis, insert informal and humorous asides, tell what you are going to say, say it and then summarize. You will have to do a lot of rewriting and careful editing before you turn that great presentation into a publishable article. This rewriting is also necessary for small research papers, theses, or dissertations, which must be translated in to a style suitable for journal readers.

Shun stilted prose; write as you speak, using the first person and active voice: "I (or we) surveyed" rather than "a survey was conducted," or "in analyzing the data, we found that" rather than" it was found that." At one time, authors thought that the anonymity of the passive voice was more scholarly, but in today's world, it is customary to accept responsibility for what you publish. Remember that the data do not find anything. Rather, from the findings in the study, the authors reach the conclusions drawn from their analysis of the data.

Please do not use contractions (don't, won't, it's), even if that is the way we all speak, unless you are quoting someone directly. Keep all sentences and paragraphs generally short and clear, but strive for variety in style. All acronyms should be defined at first use, and used sparingly—a sentence consisting of a string of CADs, HRs, SBPs, DBPs, MMPIs, and DSMs, not to mention more obscure initials for home-grown measures, is hard for readers to decipher. Your job as an author is to make it as easy as possible for the reader to understand what you have to say.

Do not attempt to pack too many ideas into a sentence or paragraph. Above all, have a single theme for the article. Always use your best English, watching out for dangling participles; dangling modifiers; split infinitives; run-on, incomplete, or convoluted sentences; and starting sentences with there is/are or it was.

Avoid sexist language. Traditionally, authors have used "he" as an indefinite pronoun, but changing a sentence to the plural can avoid the implication that all participants in a study are men. All first-year students are not freshmen, nor are all students heterosexual; all nurses are not "she," and doctors are not always "he." We do not use the he/she or s/he locution, and we do not use their with a singular subject (never "each student handed in their questionnaires") even though this is increasingly common in the popular press.

Remember, too, that all students are not 18 to 22 years old; at many universities, the ages of students can range from 16 to 70 or more years.

Tables and Figures

Tables and figures (used sparingly) should be submitted on separate sheets, and camera-ready copy for figures is desirable. You can often provide detailed findings from a research study in a simple table. Both tables and figures should be self-explanatory and easy to read; the reader should not have to refer back to the text to figure out what is being said. That means that captions should be clear and complete; acronyms, if used in the table or caption, should be explained in a note.

The text of the article should briefly summarize the data in the table (or tables) rather than duplicating it. Reading every finding of a research project in the text of an article is tedious and usually results in a request that the author use a table and highlight only major findings in the text. An additional note: better two or more tables than one that has so many details that the reader cannot easily decipher it.

Please resist the temptation in tables and figures, as well as in text, to use elaborate graphic features—48-point, bold capital letters, different type faces, excessive italics, and fancy borders and boxes. These features, such fun to do on your home computer, do not brighten the days of editors and compositors. They must be stripped out before we can proceed with production. Simply type your table in neat columns and leave it to us to do the boxing as needed.

If you use tables or figures adapted from other sources, you must obtain permission in writing from the copyright holder (usually either the original author or publisher) and submit it with your article. The same is true of cartoons, poetry (rarely used), or extended quotations of material protected by copyright laws.

References

References should be . . . relevant, and comprehensive. The references indicate that you have done a thorough literature search, but your reference list should include only pertinent articles. If you use a direct quotation from another source, the page on which it appears should be indicated. Short excerpts from journal articles or scientific books do not require permission from the original author.

In the reference list itself, be sure you have included all of the pertinent details: correct title, source (journal or book), year of publication, volume, and page numbers. We do not use op dt, loc cit, or ibid. Be sure references are correctly punctuated, authors' names correctly spelled; a sloppy reference list makes us question how thoroughly you have done your work. . . .

Rewriting the First Draft

When you have finished the first draft, put your manuscript aside and stay away from it for a day or two. You will be astonished at what you have written-sometimes because it is great, often because you want to write it all in another way to emphasize the basic ideas that were lost in the verbiage. Read the manuscript aloud; if you run out of breath on a sentence, it is too long! Be your own editor. If you discover that you have too many ideas in the article, prune it; promise yourself that you will develop a second piece based on the part you took out as you polished the initial effort.

Revise the article carefully, then take the revised draft to a colleague; consult someone in the English composition or journalism department, although *JACH* editors are wary of a style that is too journalistic. We believe that *JACH* is a scholarly publication, and the casual style appropriate to the morning paper, a popular magazine, or a television commentator is all wrong for us. You might also want to have a colleague who has published widely look over what you have done. Do not forget to show the draft to a statistician again if your work has computations. Double-check all addition; if your percentages don't add up to 100, explain that the total of 97% or 101% is the result of rounding.

Do these associates think your manuscript is written clearly? Can they tell what you are saying and come up with what you thought you meant to say? Encourage them to be strict in their judgments. Do not be afraid of honest criticism, even though it may make you uncomfortable, and listen carefully to suggestions for reworking. A good evaluation at this point will save you from the disappointment of a rejection later.

Now is the time to rewrite, reorganize, move paragraphs and sentences, delete clichés (*first and foremost*) and overused and unnecessary words and phrases (*input, impact, therefore,* and *thus* are particular offenders, as is *because of the fact that*). Sometimes you will discover you have used an expression, such as "from time to time," so often that it has become a jarring motif in an article. If you suspect you have overused a word or phrase, your computer's search-and-find command will serve you well and keep you from the frustration of searching for the proverbial needle in a haystack. Beware of the jargon of your field (*use* is better than *utilize, method* better than *methodology*). In other words, refine your creation. It is easy to do with a computer, and a clean copy without all those arrows and strikeovers will lift your spirits. This is also a time to relax a bit, give yourself time to do a good first, second, or third revision. At this point, you can at last prepare your abstract and give the article a short, specific title.

Last-Minute Checks

Before you send the article to us for editorial review, proofread it carefully. Spell checks are great, but they miss homonyms, such as *there* and *their; here*

and *hear;* furthermore, the word processor has no way of knowing that you typed *the* when you meant *then* or *there.* When we editors read an article with egregious misspellings and sloppy mistakes, we tend to feel the authors did not think much of either the journal to which the piece was being submitted or the article itself. Proofread your cover letter as well; we have received cover letters in which an assistant misspelled the signer's name or the title of the article being submitted. At last you are almost ready to send the article off for the editors' evaluation.

Submitting the Manuscript

Avoiding some of the pitfalls en route to publication will save you the grief of early rejection. We will usually send back without review submissions that are single spaced or are printed on both sides of the paper. If manuscripts are not submitted in duplicate, we will get in touch with you and ask for a second copy before sending the manuscript out for review. If you use the wrong reference style and do not include abstracts or key words (if required), you will have to remedy the situation at the time of revision.

Because articles are blind reviewed (the reviewer does not know who the author is and the author generally is unaware of the identity of the first reviewer), your submission package should include a separate sheet listing the names of all authors and their affiliations as well as their fax, e-mail, and telephone numbers. This sheet will be kept in the managing editor's office at Heldref Publications when the manuscript is sent out for review. The name of the corresponding author should be clearly indicated, and if that individual is at a different address during vacations, he or she should provide an alternative means of being reached. Authors' names should not appear on pages within the submission or at the end of the paper.

An accompanying letter should indicate that the article is not being simultaneously submitted to any other publisher and has not been published elsewhere. Presentations of research findings at a conference or a poster session at [an] annual meeting are not considered simultaneous publication. In fact, some of our finest articles are careful reworkings of such material.

If your research involves human-subject participation in experiments or reports of surveys that ask personal questions, you should indicate, usually in the text of the article, that the project has been approved by your university's Institutional Review Board. Case histories that might reveal the identity of the individuals must be cleared with the persons described, who may ask you to modify the text to protect their privacy. If your project received funding through a grant, the source should be indicated and will be included in a note at the end of the article. You may also wish to acknowledge the assistance of

an individual or individuals, such as a graduate assistant who ran statistical analyses or students who made on-site observations.

Check the submission package before you drop it in the mail. Are the pages numbered? Is the manuscript double-spaced throughout, including the abstract, references, notes, tables, and figures? Have you enclosed all of the tables and figures on separate pages rather than in the text of the article? Have you indicated the corresponding author in cases of multiple authorship? Are addresses, telephone, e-mail, and fax numbers given in the cover letter? Have all identifying marks been deleted from the manuscript itself?

Peer Review

When you send in your manuscript for peer review by the editors, you are not subjecting your carefully nurtured article to a legal procedure in which you must defend your work before stern and unyielding judges. We believe that authors have creative, imaginative, and useful ideas. We look upon the review process as professional mentoring in which we bring our experience and point of view to help you produce an article that is important and relevant for a larger audience—journal readers—who may not have even thought about the topic before.

Peer review actually started when you surveyed the literature to learn what other people had written about the topic you were investigating. As you checked professional journals and databases and talked with colleagues on campus, you were discovering what aspects of the subject had never been analyzed and would be worth pursuing. Many journal editors, who themselves have experienced the publishing routines of acceptance and rejection, are willing to discuss proposed projects with would-be authors.

At a later stage, we hope the comments we offer can help you develop a sound and worthwhile article. We seek to encourage; to stimulate; to suggest new approaches; to point to the insights that you, as the author, may have overlooked in preparing your research (or clinical note or viewpoint) for publication. If you find that the editors' comments and instructions are confusing, you can sometimes communicate directly with an executive or consulting editor by asking the managing editor to talk with the concerned editor and determine whether a telephone call or letter would be useful.

From Submission to Publication, One Step at a Time

When the two hard copies (no need for a disk at this stage) of your manuscript arrive at Heldref Publications, the managing editor sends you a numbered acknowledgment card (e.g., 41-96-103); 41 indicates *JACH*, 96 is the year received, and 103 shows where, chronologically, the manuscript is

among those received in that calendar year. This number is useful for managing editors in identifying the manuscript if you call or write with questions about it and for editors, who must sometimes check to find out whether the submission is moving through the review process.

The managing editor assigns reviewers at this time: one consulting editor, to whom it is sent first, and an executive editor, who is charged with making a decision on disposition. The managing editor has no say about action on manuscripts and assigns reviewers on the basis of identified areas of expertise that editors. . . provide and update regularly. . . .

Roles of Consulting and Executive Editors

The consulting editor evaluates the manuscript, fills out a general checklist regarding looked-for qualities. . . , and writes comments to be sent to the authors exactly as written. In addition, the consulting editor prepares separate, confidential comments for the executive editor and suggests which of the categories (major article, clinical note, nurses, brief report, or viewpoint) would be appropriate. Sometimes the reviewer suggests that a manuscript the author proposes as a clinical note should be expanded into a major article or converted into a viewpoint or that what was submitted as a major article should be cut by 45% and published as a program note.

The executive editor then reads the article and the first reviewer's comments, makes his or her own decision on disposition (accept, request revision, ask for statistical review, or reject), and returns the packet to the managing editor, who then sends all of the material (except the confidential remarks) to the author. The process usually takes from 6 weeks to 4 months, but it is slower during holiday seasons and summer or when the mail service is erratic.

Immediate acceptances are rare (only one or two a year), and rejections run to about 60% on all submissions. Requests for revision may be encouraging, indicating only minor changes are necessary, or less encouraging, calling for substantial rewriting before the submission can be seriously considered for publication. Authors receive copies (usually photocopied) of the comments exactly as consulting and executive editors wrote them, as well as the original manuscript, often with marginal suggestions from the reviewers.

Rejected manuscripts are rarely reconsidered, but may be reviewed as new submissions if they have been entirely recast as a result of editorial suggestions.

Responding to Reviewer Comments

Read comments and requests for revision with great care when you receive the marked manuscript and a request for revisions. Respond to the comments when you rewrite. Reviewers do not always agree in their evaluations, but the

final decision is always up to the executive editor, and his or her comments and suggestions merit particular attention. If for some reason you cannot respond to an editor's request for changes, you should indicate why (larger sample not available, changed conditions, etc.) either in a covering letter or, preferably, in the manuscript itself as an acknowledged limitation of the study.

Sometimes we ask authors to clarify the hypothesis that guided their research, rerun statistical analyses, provide more details on the nature of a sample, clean up sloppy grammar, or rewrite and reorganize the entire article. Often, the revision request asks for cutting (sometimes by half) to eliminate verbosity and jargon and delete material that is not germane to the hypothesis.

Although the Heldref revision letter asks for a 3-week turnaround, the editors would prefer that authors take the time to do the job well (but a year's delay is too much and the manuscript may be relegated to the dead file). Some authors, even those who receive encouragement to resubmit, choose not to make the required revisions or find they cannot provide responses to editors' queries. In that case, we would appreciate it if you would notify the managing editor that a revision will not be sent or that the manuscript is being submitted elsewhere. . . .

If you are sending in a revision, you should always return the editors' comments and the original marked manuscript along with it, showing where changes have been made. Please put the date of your resubmission on the title page and send two copies of the revision, just as you did with the original. Revised, resubmitted manuscripts go through the same review procedure as they did on the initial round, usually with the same reviewers. Sometimes, however, the executive editor may think a different consulting editor would be more appropriate. Occasionally, a near-perfect first submission is marked for a quick review by the executive editor only, but that is rare.

Multiple Revisions

Two revisions or even three are not uncommon, and we urge you to think carefully before sending in a casually done reworking of your manuscript. Resubmitting a revised manuscript does not guarantee publication. Occasionally, we find that an author's revisions reveal new weaknesses that lead to a regretful rejection. Authors who fail to heed the editors' requests almost always get an unfriendly evaluation and a rejection from the editors. On the other hand, we find that many published authors write to tell us that the revision and cutting we suggested have led to an improved article and one that they are proud of.

This description of the review process should tell you that becoming a published author takes time. We often get pleas from authors for a quick turnaround because they need to cite this publication in their tenure folders. We

are sympathetic, but we cannot speed up the review process or guarantee a rapid review, acceptance, and publication of your article. All of our editors and reviewers are volunteers; they are not paid for their work; they have administrative, clinical, and teaching duties just as you do; and they are often carrying out their own research and are writing for publication.

The only quick answer we can give to an author who is impatient for a response is to reject the submission without completing the review. We do not want to do that. If you are likely to need evidence of a published or in-press article for promotion or tenure, it is best to start working several years ahead of the deadline, because we cannot promise acceptance and you may need to do several revisions before your article is ready to appear in the journal.

The Published Article

When at last you have surmounted all the hurdles, you can tell friends and family that you have received your acceptance letter. We will ask for a disk when we accept your article, tell you what software we want, and send a form that transfers the copyright to Heldref Publications. If you are the first author of an article with several authors, you are responsible for getting the other authors' signatures. Now all you have to do is await calls from the managing editor, checking on details. . . and finally, the pleasure of seeing your article in print.

Accepted manuscripts are usually published within 6 months. . . . This is the amount of time required for putting a journal together–final editing, composing, . . . proofreading, correcting, and incorporating the article in an issue of the journal.

If we are planning a theme issue related to the topic of your article, it may be held for use later or rushed ahead of the queue. Limited space in the journal may also result in our holding the article until a later issue. The journal is usually 48 pages plus separate covers, so if a particular article would increase the issue to 51 pages, we must wait to publish it in a subsequent issue.

Whether yours was a solo work or had half a dozen collaborators, each author receives two complimentary copies of the journal in which the article is published. You can also obtain additional copies of the issue with your article at half price; reprints (in lots of 100) can be ordered from the Heldref reprint division after the article appears.

A Final Word

As you go through this lengthy description of how to write for. . . [a journal], remember that we editors are here to assist you. A lot of comments on your submission are an indication that we recognize that your manuscript con-

tains something potentially publishable, although it may call for a lot of work on your part and ours to carry it from initial submission to appearance in print. We want the results of sound research and successful experiences in the field of college health to be available for readers in the clearest and most understandable form.

Writing is an enormous and adventurous journey. Happy writing, bon voyage, and see you in print!

NOTE

This article is based on panel discussions featuring *Journal of American College Health* executive editors MARY-KATE HEFFERN, MSN, RN, CS; RICHARD P. KEELING, MD; CLIFFORD B. REIFLER, MD, MPH; and PAULA SWINFORD, MS, CHES; ALLAN J. SCHWARTZ, statistical editor; former executive editor JOHN DORMAN, MD; and managing editor MARTHA H. WEDEMAN, AB, that were presented at recent annual meetings of the American College Health Association.