



## The Pre-Submission Checklist for *Hypothesis* Authors

Margaret A. Hoogland\*, MLS, AHIP; She, Her, Hers;<sup>a</sup>,

<sup>a</sup>Associate Professor and Clinical Medical Librarian, University Libraries, The University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9932-3605>,  
[margaret.hoogland@utoledo.edu](mailto:margaret.hoogland@utoledo.edu)

**Cite as:** Hoogland MA. The pre-submission checklist for *Hypothesis* authors. *Hypothesis*. 2024; 36(1). doi:10.18060/27712

 Hoogland. All works in *Hypothesis* are licensed under a [CC BY-NC 4.0 DEED Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). Authors own copyright of their articles appearing in *Hypothesis*. Readers may copy articles without permission of the copyright owner(s), as long as the author(s) are acknowledged in the copy, and the copy is used for educational, not-for-profit purposes. For any other use of articles, please contact the copyright owner(s).

This editorial provides a list of five things author(s) should consider before submitting to *Hypothesis*:

1. *Avoid plagiarism and copyright infringement.*

The [Instructions to Authors](#) outline what *Hypothesis* expects of submissions, which include non-original image(s) in a manuscript. If an author requires clarification or would benefit from additional information, it is best to touch base with authors who have experience with the journal or to email the Editor.

When considering plagiarism, the Editor consults with Associate Editors, expert colleagues, and members of the Editorial Team. *Hypothesis* values the input of all Editorial Team members, Peer Reviewers, and fellow information professionals. Ultimately, the journal Editor sets the policy, takes responsibility for the final decision, and shares the determination with the author.

2. *Include the appropriate number of relevant references.*

The Editor expects to see a minimum of three references for each non-[Brief Report](#) submission and anticipates seeing the article which inspired the project, or the original article for historical submissions. Articles on a new or emerging field (e.g., artificial intelligence, new use of mobile devices) should cite the most current literature. If the topic is new or emerging in the field of library and information science, then an author might need to consult published articles outside of the library and information science field. Providing context for how the topic relates to the field of library and information science could also be useful for colleagues.

3. *Endeavor to place citations in your manuscript so as not to distract the reader.*

Although the citation requirements and styles strive to be straightforward, it takes familiarity with the content and lots of practice to seamlessly include citations in the manuscript. For this Editor, this entails planning to write multiple drafts (1-3 minimum – including this editorial!), asking for internal feedback from readers with multiple perspectives and experiences, and carving out sufficient time for the entire process.

4. *Finalize authors and author order as you prepare to submit the manuscript.*

Determining authorship and author order continues to be a challenge. Partway through a project, author(s) might need an extended break; they suddenly have limited time to work on the project; or they might completely step off a project. For these reasons, authors should consider waiting to determine authorship and order of authors as they prepare to submit a manuscript.

In 2009 and 2010, the *Hypothesis* Research Mentor columns outlined criteria for authorship and acknowledgement according to the International Committee for Medical Journal Editors (ICJME)<sup>1-2</sup>. The CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy)<sup>3</sup> statement outlines ways to identify contributions of team members on multi-authored submissions. *Hypothesis* asks authors to complete the CRediT statement, because it encourages author teams to assess what they did

on a project and this could contribute to determining author order.

This Editor only questions authorship and author order if a submission contains an incomplete or confusing CRediT statement or if an author submits a complaint.

*5. The Timeline from Submission-to-Notification varies!*

The publication process includes multiple stages. As a first-time author or when submitting to a new journal, the delay in processing time can be frustrating and sometimes a cause for concern. Outlined below is a draft submission timeline for *Hypothesis* submissions:

**Stage 1:**Submission - Completed by the Editor, *Duration: 7-14 Days*

- The Editor reviews the submission and either asks the author(s) to make some corrections (e.g., figure files are indicated in text but not uploaded into the system or references are missing), rejects the submission if it does not meet the aims and scope of the journal, or moves the submission to the next stage.

**Stage 2:**Review - Completed by the Peer Reviewers, Associate Editors, Editor - *Duration: 28-70 Days*

- The Editor assigns three peer reviewers, who have two-to-four weeks (depending on the submission date and category) to review and provide feedback.
- Upon reviewing the comments from peer reviewers, the Editor checks with the Associate Editor, who might choose to add comments or review a copy of the revised submission, and then notifies the author(s).
- The Editor could suggest a date for uploading revisions and the response(s) to reviewers, if the author(s) hope to include the article in a specific issue, or leave the turnaround time up to the discretion of the author(s). The Editor tries to give author(s) 4-6 weeks for completing the revisions and response to reviewers.
- Upon reviewing the revised manuscript and response to reviewers, the Editor and Associate Editor either confer and request additional revisions from the author or the submission moves to the next stage.

**Stage 3:** Copy Editing - Completed by the Copy Editing Team, *Duration: 28 Days*

- The Editor assigns two Copy Editors to review each submission and to ensure it flows smoothly from one paragraph to the next, citations conform to the *Hypothesis* requirements, and make comments about punctuation as needed. Copy Editors get 4-6 weeks for each submission.
- The author(s) get up to 2 weeks to review and to respond to the copy edited version.

- Once both groups are satisfied, the Copy Editors upload the revised version onto the journal website and the submission moves to the final stage.

**Stage 4:** Production - Completed by Production Editor or Editor, *Duration: 14 Days.*

- Take the approved copy edited version, figures, images, etc., and create the galley proof in the *Hypothesis* LaTeX template.
- Authors have up to 1 week to review and to request the Production Editor make minor edits (e.g., punctuation is missing; correct this typo; please create appendixes instead of having the table be in-text).
- After completing the minor edits, the Production Editor uploads a PDF file of the “galley.”
- The Production Editor assigns the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) for the article.

**Stage 5** Publication Day - Completed by Production Editor or Editor, *Duration: 3-6 Hours*

On publication day, the Production Editor creates the issue by:

- Creating an entry for the new volume and issue number in the system.
- Scheduling each article for publication in the upcoming issue.
- The Production Editor publishes the issue but does not notify any member of the Editorial Team.
- the Production Editor confirms that each article DOI is active and working.
- The Production Editor tells the Editor that the issue is ready.

**Stage 6:** Marketing the Issue - Completed by the Marketing Team and the Editor, *Duration: 1 Hour*

- Editor performs a final check to ensure each article DOI is working.
- Editor shares the news with the Editorial Team.
- The Marketing Team and the Editor share the news via listservs and on social media.

The *Hypothesis* Editorial Team wishes you a Happy Spring and hopes you enjoy the March issue.

## Acknowledgements

I thank Wade Lee-Smith, Julia Stumpff, Andrea L. Ball, and Jill Turner for providing thoughtful and candid feedback.

## References

1. Eldredge J. Authorship part one: Defining the article author. *Hypothesis: The Journal of the Research Section of MLA*. 2009; 21(3):11–4. Available from: <https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/hypothesis/issue/view/1618>
2. Eldredge J. Authorship part two: Order of Authors. *Hypothesis: The Journal of the Research Section of MLA*. 2010; 22(1):8–11. Available from: <https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/hypothesis/issue/view/1619/605>
3. Brand A, Allen L, Altman M, Hlava M, Scott J. Beyond authorship: attribution, contribution, collaboration, and credit. *Learn Pub*. 2015 Apr 1; 28(2):151–5. doi:[10.1087/20150211](https://doi.org/10.1087/20150211)