

Interview with Journal Editors

Organizer

Wen-Han Hwang

Institute of Statistics, National Tsing Hua University

Chair

Chun-Houh Chen

Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica

Speakers

Matthew Schofield^{1,2} and Su-Yun Huang^{3,4}

¹Co-Editor of Biometrics

²Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Otago

³Co-Editor of Statistica Sinica

⁴Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica

Discussants

Hsin-Cheng Huang⁵ and Yi-Ting Hwang⁶

⁵Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica

⁶Department of Statistics, National Taipei University

Note Taker

Sheng-Mao Chang[†]

Department of Statistics, National Taipei University

[†]Corresponding to: Sheng-Mao Chang
E-mail: smchang110@gm.ntpu.edu.tw

1. Introduction

On July 24, 2023, Professor Chun-houh Chen, former director of the Institute of Statistical Science (ISS), Academia Sinica, hosted and chaired a seminar titled "Perspectives on Academic Publishing in Statistics: Insights from Editors' Experience." The seminar was organized by Professor Wen-Han Hwang from National Tsing Hua University. Esteemed editors, Professor Matthew Schofield from the University of Otago, Co-Editor of Biometrics, and Professor Su-Yun Huang from Academia Sinica, Co-Editor of *Statistica Sinica*, were invited to share their valuable insights. The seminar also featured Professor Yi-Ting Hwang, a distinguished professor from National Taipei University and editor of the *Journal of Chinese Statistical Association* (JCSA), and Professor Hsin-Cheng Huang from Academia Sinica as discussants.

To disseminate the wisdom shared during the seminar, JCSA has summarized the content for wider accessibility. If you find this article beneficial, you are encouraged to participate in future seminars with esteemed journal editors. Please stay updated by visiting the ISS website for the latest information. Leveraging advanced technology, the presentations and discussions were recorded using a cellphone, and the sound was translated into text using an app. The text was then edited with the assistance of ChatGPT.

The rest of this article is arranged as follows. In Sections 2 and 3, two editors provide separate introductions to their respective journals. Following that, in Section 4, we present guidelines for writing good papers, thoughtfully shared by Professor Hsin-Cheng Huang, drawing from his experience serving on various editorial boards. Section 5 is dedicated to the insights shared by two editors, as guided by Professor Yi-Ting Hwang. They discuss the role of editors, the review process, guidance for authors, and the future of academic publishing in statistics. Section 6 features select discussions that are particularly beneficial for young scholars. In Section 7, we summarize the discourse surrounding the issue of reproducibility, a topic that deserves the attention of all participants. Lastly, we have edited and reorganized the speakers' words to make this article more concise and accessible.

2. Biometrics: Professor Matthew Schofield

2.1 About the Journal

Biometrics is the flagship journal of the International Biometric Society (IBS), a worldwide organization dedicated to statistical and mathematical applications in biosciences. The journal covers diverse scientific areas, including agriculture, biomedical science, public health, ecology, environmental sciences, forestry, and related disciplines. Its focus aligns closely with the society's objectives, emphasizing high-quality research.

The IBS is organized into geographically defined regions, with variation in research interests among its members.

The IBS hosts bi-annual conferences known as IBC, with the next one scheduled for the end of the following year. Additionally, regional conferences are held during the off years, such as the upcoming "Biometrics in the Bay of Islands" event from the Australasian region. Founded in 1947, the IBS held its first conference in Massachusetts, with the esteemed RA Fisher serving as its inaugural President. Over the years, the society has been led by renowned figures like William Cochran, Gertrude Cox, CR Rao, John Nelder, Norman Breslow, and Elizabeth Thompson. The IBS is associated with two journals - the flagship journal "Biometrics," aligned with the society's mission, and the collaborative publication with the American Statistical Association (ASA) - "The Journal of Agriculture, Biological, and Environmental Statistics" (JABES).

The photo (<https://www.biometricsociety.org/about/our-history>) presented shows the first IBS meeting in Woods Hole, MA, and shows a lack of diversity in terms of women and non-white attendees. Over the years, the society has evolved significantly since its establishment in 1947. The current editorial team comprises four members, with Geert Molenberghs serving as the executive editor, and William Rosenberger, Katja Ickstadt, and Matthew Schofield as co-editors. Co-editors are appointed based on geographic regions, representing North America, Europe, and the rest of the world, respectively. The co-editors hold three-year terms, with one being replaced annually at the end of each calendar year to maintain continuity. Erica Moodie will succeed William Rosenberger in January 2024, and a replacement for Prof. Ickstadt will be determined during 2024. This model ensures that there are always at least two experienced co-editors overseeing the editorial process.

Biometrics currently has over 100 associate editors, with most serving multiple terms. Professor Schofield had served four consecutive terms. Submissions are first reviewed by editorial assistants for formatting and rule adherence before the Executive Editor assigns them to one of the three Co-Editors. Co-editors perform preliminary reviews and may reject papers that don't fit the journal. Otherwise, they assign an associate editor (AE) for a more thorough review, and the AE may invite external reviewers. The AE is expected to participate in the review process alongside the external reviewers actively. Reviewers make recommendations to the AE, who, in turn, recommends to the co-editor. Ultimately, the co-editor makes the final decision on acceptance or rejection. This multi-tiered process ensures a comprehensive and informed evaluation of submissions.

2.2 From Editor

Biometrics receives four main types of submissions: Biometric Methodology, which forms the majority of submitted papers, and Biometrics Practice, the other significant category. The other two types are the reader's reactions and letters to the editor, which

are less common. Over the last three years, there has been one letter to the editor and less than 10 reader's reactions per year. The journal also includes a section for book reviews overseen by a separate editor, currently Chuhsing Kate Hsiao, with a different process for facilitating reviews rather than submissions.

Biometrics Methodology focuses on developing new methods and biological science results. The papers aim to be accessible to subject-matter scientists through an introductory section and the inclusion of real data to motivate the research. Papers that lack substantial data support often face rejection.

The second section of Biometrics is Biometrics Practice, and it can be confusing for authors, referees, associate editors, and co-editors. This type of paper need not include new theoretical developments, but its success hinges on offering substantial new insights that surpass existing literature. The goal is to present information that an expert in the field would find significantly eye-opening.

1. They demonstrate innovative applications of existing methods to areas in which such a method has not been previously employed. Consequently, substantial new insights or findings are provided.
2. They creatively illustrate the proper use of different methods under various explicit/implicit assumptions. Consequently, clearer guidance and understanding of the use of different methods are offered.
3. They propose innovative and practical data analysis strategies, based on a combination of experience, intuition, and methodological arguments.
4. They re-examine from a new perspective statistical practices that are widely used in biometric applications, providing useful alternatives to the current standard.

The journal receives approximately 600 to 700 submissions annually, with each co-editor handling around 200 to 250 papers per year, averaging one paper per workday. The majority of submissions come from North America (about 55%), Europe (about 15%), and around a quarter from Asia, with Taiwanese authors making up a small percentage (1-2%). Contributions from other regions like Africa, South America, and Oceania collectively amount to approximately 5% of the submissions. The journal's acceptance rate stands at approximately 20%, and the review process usually takes about three months. The current impact factor is around 1.9, and it has been between 1.7 and 2.6 in recent years. Biometrics maintains a positive reputation in the statistics community.

One of the most significant mistakes authors make is not thoroughly reading the information for all sections of the website, resulting in inappropriate submissions that do not align with Biometrics' scope. It's essential to recognize that not every statistics paper is well-suited for the journal. For instance, highly theoretical papers with minimal practical application tend not to be suitable and may be desk rejected. Another

common mistake is directly submitting a paper written for another journal, which was previously rejected. For example, a paper originally intended for *Biometrika*, a more theoretical journal than *Biometrics*, is unlikely to be suitable for *Biometrics* without modification. These mistakes emphasize the importance of understanding the specific requirements for a successful paper in *Biometrics*.

Another related point is the misconception that well-developed theory guarantees acceptance. However, authors need to recognize that *Biometrics* is an applied journal, where having an application that motivates the theory is an important part of a successful paper.

A common reviewing mistake is attempting to portray expertise in areas where one lacks knowledge. Some of the best reviews the speaker has received, both as an associate and co-editor, were from individuals who openly admitted aspects of the paper they couldn't comprehend.

A second reviewing mistake occurs when a reviewer is not decisive (either positively or negatively) when they believe it is warranted. In such cases, it is important to remember that the ultimate decision lies with the co-editor. Additionally, most journals have a box for confidential comments, and while not compulsory, providing additional context can significantly enhance the review and help the co-editor consider the reviewer's thoughts more effectively.

When reviewing, it is important not to be rude or condescending. Similarly, if you receive a paper to review from someone you have a conflict of interest with, such as having worked with them or discussed their research, make sure the conflict is declared to the appropriate person.

3. *Statistica Sinica*: Professor Su-Yun Huang

3.1 About the Journal

Statistica Sinica, established in 1991 with Professor George Tiao as the founding editor, is sponsored by the Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica, and the International Chinese Statistical Association. Initially publishing two issues per year, it expanded to four issues in 1996, released in January, April, July, and October. Special issues were traditionally printed, but in recent years, they have shifted to online-only publication to save space and reduce the backlog. The current term of the three co-editors, Rong Chen, Su-Yun Huang and Xiaotong Shen, is coming to an end, and new co-editors, Yi-Hau Chen, John Stufken, and Huixia Wang, will take over shortly.

Statistica Sinica serves as a prestigious platform for statisticians and data scientists to publish exceptional and innovative papers, fostering the advancement of statistical theory and the development of relevant statistical methods and applications in society, science, and technology. The journal encourages collaborative interdisciplinary work

and has earned recognition by being indexed and abstracted in Scopus, Science Citation Index Expanded, and Current Index to Statistics. Additionally, it is included in JSTOR and EBSCO databases, further enhancing its accessibility and impact. *Statistica Sinica* holds a commendable SCImago journal ranking of 42, placing it in the Q1 category. In terms of the JCR ranking, our journal's impact factor is around 1.4, and the ranking falls between 60-70.

In the previous year, our journal received roughly 400 submissions, slightly lower than the figures from previous years. The majority of our submissions come from the USA and China, with Taiwan ranked sixth. We have observed a steady increase in submissions from the Statistics community in Taiwan. The average time for the first review report was 55 days. The acceptance rate for the same year was 26%, slightly higher than in recent years. On average, the time from acceptance to publication was 379 days, which is a little over one year. The backlog is a significant concern for our journal, with 167 papers currently awaiting publication. To mitigate the impact of this backlog, all accepted papers are promptly posted online. However, we recently discovered that even though the papers are available online, Google Scholar and Google Search cannot locate these publications. This means that while your paper will be accessible online upon acceptance, it might not appear in Google Search results. We are actively working to address this issue and find a resolution.

Over the past three years, we have implemented a policy of publishing online-only special issues. One of these special issues is dedicated to honoring Professor Tzu-Leung Li, while another special issue features "Sliced-inverse regression after 30 years", in recognition of Professor Ker-Chau Li. Additionally, we have published two special issues focusing on Causal inference and High dimensional statistics. Looking ahead, we have three forthcoming special issues on Sequential Monte Carlo, Data privacy and Network data analysis, scheduled to be published next year.

3.2 From Editor

Regarding the review process at *Statistica Sinica*, it typically involves a quick screening by the co-editors. Approximately 40-50% of submitted papers are filtered out by either the co-editors or the screening associate editors, with the majority done by the co-editors for reasons such as poor fit, subpar writing quality, or organization issues. The AEs then conduct an additional screening to determine if the paper deserves further review. Qualified scholars are invited to evaluate the manuscript. As the journal aims for an efficient, high-quality review process, we usually request AEs to complete a review within two to three months for initial submissions and within two months for revisions.

I would like to share some personal viewpoints on manuscript preparation. It is important to note that these are my own views, which may not necessarily align with the incoming editors' perspectives. Nonetheless, I hope these suggestions will be valuable

to young scholars. Here are some tips from my personal viewpoint on how to ensure a smooth and efficient review process:

1. Choose the right journal: With numerous journal options available, ensure that your paper's topic aligns well with the journal's scope. For *Statistica Sinica*, it focuses on general statistical methods, theory, and applications, and it may not be the best fit for highly specialized papers.
2. Careful manuscript preparation: Take the time to meticulously prepare your manuscript and craft a compelling introduction. The introduction should clearly outline the major research problem and objectives to help reviewers understand your work better.
3. Clarity in research objective: Ensure that your research objective is clearly defined in the introduction. If reviewers cannot grasp the major research problem, it might indicate a lack of clarity in the writing.
4. Emphasize your contribution: In the abstract and throughout the paper, highlight your key contributions and position your research within the relevant literature. Providing a comprehensive literature review will demonstrate the significance of your work.
5. Give careful consideration to the abstract: A well-prepared manuscript is particularly crucial, especially when it comes to the abstract, as it sets the tone for the paper and helps reviewers assess its potential impact and contribution to the field.

The key aspect relevant to publishing in *Statistica Sinica* is originality, which is of utmost importance. Additionally, it is crucial to present your research results competently, clearly, and coherently. Rigorous methodology and theory are also significant factors, ensuring that your research methodology is sound and well-founded.

4. Guidelines for Preparing Scientific Papers

Professor Hsin-Cheng Huang generously shares his insights on reviewing papers based on his extensive experiences as an editor, associate editor, and reviewer. He assesses the reviewability of papers based on two aspects: the quality of results and the quality of presentation. Here are his valuable suggestions:

Quality of Results

1. Clear purpose and conclusions
2. Novel statistically (significant advance/significant adaptation from elsewhere/new model etc.)

3. Addresses a worthwhile problem (problem is interesting and worth tackling)
4. Appears to be technically correct (statistical and mathematical reasoning are sound)
5. Adequate demonstration of validity (claimed properties or advantages justified sufficiently, sufficient detail that the reader can reproduce results)
6. Adequate references to literature (cites recent work, key papers in the area, etc.)
7. Appropriate example or real-world application (if an example or application is needed, what's provided is suitable)

Quality of Presentation

1. Well organized
2. Clear exposition (assumptions and model specifications clearly identified)
3. Readable
4. Well-summarized (title, abstract, keywords are suitably descriptive)
5. Software fit for purpose (if software is provided, it is adequately documented, works as stated, acceptably easy to use)
6. Good graphics and tables
7. Good English (good spelling and grammar)

5. Questions and Answers

We extend our gratitude to Professor Yi-Ting Hwang for leading the seminar's discussion. During the seminar, four major topics were addressed, with insights from two esteemed editors, Professor Schofield for Biometrics and Professor Su-Yun Huang for Statistica Sinica. Below, we present a concise summary of their discussions to save space, but we acknowledge that some important information may have been omitted inadvertently. We invite readers to participate in our upcoming discussions with journal editors to avoid any potential loss of valuable insights.

5.1 On the role of editors

Hwang: Could you elaborate on the roles of the Executive Editor and the Co-Editors of Biometrics in the publication process?

Schofield: As a co-editor, my focus is on the scientific aspects of the papers, quickly reviewing them before passing them on to AEs. The executive editor handles various administrative tasks, such as managing the publishing process, compiling yearly reports, and preparing reports for the boards from IBS. The Executive Editor, along with the Co-Editors, are involved in hiring new Co-Editors and Associate Editors. The executive editor plays a crucial role in allocating papers to co-editors and ensuring a balanced workload. They skillfully manage the distribution of papers, even adjusting it during times like vacations to maintain a fair share of responsibilities among co-editors.

Hwang: What qualities do you believe are essential for someone to serve as an (executive) editor for a prestigious journal like *Biometrics* or *Statistica Sinica*?

Schofield: The role of an executive editor requires exceptional communication and organizational skills. The workload is substantial and constant, and without proper organization, the tasks could quickly accumulate, leading to potential challenges in managing the entire process effectively.

Huang: *Statistica Sinica* does not have an executive editor, but a qualified editor would benefit from a strong foundation in general knowledge and effective communication skills with AEs. Additionally, possessing good leadership skills would be advantageous for the role.

5.2 Regarding the review process

Hwang: How do you handle situations where reviewers' reports are not helpful or contradictory? What steps do you take to ensure that the feedback provided to authors is constructive and fair?

Huang: In most cases, the AEs provide constructive and helpful suggestions for revisions, along with clear recommendations. However, there can be instances where the reviewers' reports are not as useful or conflicting with the AE's report, leading to confusion. In such situations, seeking another AE's opinion for a quick assessment and discussing the matter with the other co-editors helps in making decisions. Throughout the past three years, I have only encountered this situation once.

Schofield: As a co-editor, I have not encountered such a situation yet. However, during my time as an associate editor, I did face conflicting reports from reviewers. In that case, I believed seeking a third review was the right decision, even though it extended the review process. This approach ultimately led to a more thorough and fair evaluation. If faced with a similar situation as a co-editor, I would follow a similar policy to ensure a rigorous and comprehensive review process.

Hwang: What steps are taken when an AE's report is not informative or does not adequately address the paper's strengths and weaknesses?

Huang: If the referee reports are already very informative and the AE provides only a short report or one line of comment, that's acceptable. However, if all the reports, including the AE's, lack sufficient information, a second opinion would be sought to ensure a comprehensive evaluation.

Schofield: To ensure feedback is constructive and fair, our fantastic editorial staff at Biometrics implements a thorough process. If certain comments or sentences are deemed unhelpful, they are removed by editorial staff before the report is sent back to the authors. We encourage reviewers not to include recommendations in their reports, as the final decision lies with the co-editors, not the reviewers. The editorial staff addresses flagged issues to maintain fairness and transparency in the review process.

Hwang: How do you balance the need for a thorough review with the need to provide timely feedback to authors? What steps are taken to ensure that reviewers complete their assessments promptly?

Huang: The submission system includes an automatic reminder letter, but if a reviewer or AE is exceptionally slow in responding, we may proceed with a decision based on the existing feedback or seek an alternative reviewer. On some occasions, I requested an AE to act as a reviewer, and they provided a timely report.

Schofield: The editorial staff plays a crucial role in monitoring the progress of submissions and following up with reviewers, AE, and co-editors to keep the process on track. In cases where unforeseen circumstances arise, like an unresponsive AE, efforts are made to ensure the reviewing process continues smoothly by reassigning the paper and ensuring the well-being of the involved parties. Overall, the priority is to strike a balance between timely responses and conducting rigorous, high-quality scientific reviews.

Hwang: How do you handle ethical issues, such as plagiarism or data fabrication, when they arise?

Huang: The submission system includes a similarity check to detect potential plagiarism, which is relatively straightforward to implement. However, when it comes to preventing data fabrication, we currently lack specific measures. In the event of plagiarism or data fabrication being detected in an accepted paper, it should undoubtedly lead to the retraction of the paper.

Schofield: I completely agree, and this is where I expect that the Biometrics executive editor would take the lead and, in discussion with the co-editors, consider the best possible action, which could include the retraction of the article. Fortunately, I haven't had to deal with this yet, and hopefully, it is something that's rare.

5.3 Guidance for authors

Hwang: Which core elements do editors prioritize when determining the suitability of a statistics paper for publication?

Schofield: When conducting pre-screening for submissions, it is crucial to ensure a clear and compelling story. If the abstract and introduction fail to communicate the research questions and their significance coherently, the paper may not progress further. Additionally, for Biometrics, it is essential to identify strong motivating examples and data that support the research story. Aligning with the journal's values and core mission is also a key consideration during the pre-screening process.

Huang: I agree that a compelling story and some novel statistical methods are essential.

Hwang: Can you share some of the most common mistakes authors make when submitting their work to statistics journals? Can you share some good examples you've observed from authors during the submission process to statistics journals?

Schofield: The biggest mistake is sending your work to a journal where it is not a good fit. The best examples I have seen are where the authors have clearly read the information for authors, and also read the journal itself. It was clear that they had a good understanding of what a Biometrics paper should look like.

Huang: For good examples, I would like to emphasize the importance of clarity and being well-organized for your paper writing.

5.4 Future of Academic publishing in statistics

Hwang: Given the rise of data science and artificial intelligence (AI), how do you see these trends influencing the future of academic publishing in statistics?

Huang: In discussions about artificial intelligence, I'd like to envision a future where we have an AI-powered peer review system. While some aspects, such as plagiarism checks and verifying related references, would likely be easily handled by AI, delving deeper into evaluating the quality of methodology or checking the correctness of proofs would present significant challenges for an AI system. As technology continues to advance,

it will be fascinating to see how AI can further assist in the peer review process, but certain intricate evaluations may still require human expertise.

Schofield: AI has the potential to play a crucial role in aiding authors for whom English is not their native language. As a native English speaker, I acknowledge the privilege of writing academic articles in my own language and recognize the challenges that non-native English speakers face. AI could substantially assist in ensuring clarity and coherence in writing, offering substantial help throughout the writing process. Provided it is monitored carefully and thoughtfully, the integration of AI in the peer review process could bring valuable advancements to the field and support authors from diverse linguistic backgrounds in contributing to the scientific community.

Hwang: So, do you think AI will replace the initial screen of publishing?

Huang: I agree that for initial screening, AI can be beneficial in checking clarity, organization, and basic grammar errors. It is capable of performing similar checks effectively. However, going deeper into more complex aspects may not be feasible at this stage of AI development.

Hwang: Do you expect to see more submissions about applications and/or methodologies of machine learning, big data, and deep learning in statistical journals?

Huang: We are certainly open to considering research related to machine learning, deep learning, and big data, as these are relevant and emerging areas. In *Statistica Sinica*, we have organized three special issues focusing on Data privacy, Network data analysis, and Sequential Monte Carlo, which align with recent trends. Additionally, we have received some submissions on big data research, suggesting the possibility of exploring new and exciting types of research for consideration.

Schofield: Regrettably, my crystal ball lacks precision and reliability. Currently, *Biometrics* receives numerous paper submissions that involve machine learning that were uncommon a decade ago, and I believe this trend will persist in the near future. I cannot predict what will replace these emerging themes in the future.

Hwang: The last two questions are also related to data science and artificial intelligence. How can journals adapt to these changes and continue providing valuable statistical research outlets? What challenges and opportunities do these trends present for academic publishing in statistics?

Huang: Regarding opportunities, incorporating timely trend topics into the agenda

could lead to increased impact and a broader knowledge scope. However, the challenge lies in addressing both traditional statistics and artificial intelligence-based methods. Finding individuals well-versed in both domains might not be easy, making it particularly challenging to find suitable reviewers.

Schofield: I agree that the challenges are mainly logistical in nature. If we start receiving a significant number of machine learning papers, it could strain the current editorial board and associate editors, who may have limited expertise in this area. They might become overworked, and we would need to find associate editors with the necessary expertise. Nevertheless, there are still plenty of opportunities to explore and overcome these challenges.

5.5 Role of AI Tools in Academic Publishing

Hwang: With the advent of AI tools like ChatGPT, how do you see these technologies influencing academic publishing?

Schofield: We should not ignore the existence of technologies like ChatGPT. The fast-paced evolution of this technology necessitates close monitoring and it raises ethical concerns. Currently, I would not use it for the initial screening of submissions, but I am hesitant to predict how AI tools may or may not be used in the future. The rapid advancement of ChatGPT has surprised many, including myself, as it achieved remarkable capabilities much sooner than expected. It will undoubtedly have an impact; however, the exact extent of its influence remains uncertain.

Huang: At the moment, I wouldn't utilize ChatGPT for editorial tasks like screening. However, I have personally found it useful for paper writing. I input the abstract or parts of the text, and ChatGPT helped me with editing. This is particularly beneficial for non-English speakers. While it's helpful for writing, it has limitations. I can only input short paragraphs, not the entire paper. Additionally, it may not organize the paper, but it can assist with checking grammar, spelling, sentence correctness, and similar aspects.

Hwang: Would it change the reviewing process?

Huang: I don't think so. To this point, AI can only do the similarity check. Our submission system already has that kind of service for the similarity check. Anyway, I would not use that for the editorial tasks at this time.

6. To Young Researchers

Schofield: Although not all associate editors of *Biometrics* end up as co-editors, I believe my tenure as an associate editor and the relationships I built during that time were important in securing the position of Co-Editor. I also had several years of experience as an associate editor for *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* (MEE). I want to address the more senior academics in the room and express my gratitude for the opportunities I received. Both my appointments as an associate editor were made possible by senior colleagues who recommended me to the respective journals. For instance, Prof. Shinichi Nakagawa kindly endorsed me for an associate editor position at MEE, leading to my invitation to join the editorial board. Similarly, David Fletcher recommended that I replace him as an associate editor of *Biometrics*. I believe that for junior colleagues, having a supportive network of senior academics who can advocate for them is crucial in obtaining editorial board positions and gaining valuable experience. So, as senior members of the academic community, being aware of this and helping our junior colleagues get such opportunities can make a significant difference in their careers.

Hwang: What is your advice to give to early career researchers for publishing their first paper in statistic journals?

Schofield: That's an excellent question, especially for PhD students. First and foremost, listen to your advisor's guidance. Additionally, the checklists listed in Section 4 given by Professor Hsin-Cheng Huang are excellent resources for assessing what makes a successful paper. If you are part of an institute with experienced individuals who have editorial expertise, seek their feedback on your paper. One crucial skill you must develop quickly is being receptive to negative feedback. I remember my first submitted paper being rejected with negative reviewer comments. I also remember my Ph.D. advisor emphasizing the importance of addressing the reviewer's comments to enhance the paper for future submissions. It was challenging to accept, but a vital lesson in using feedback constructively.

Huang: I completely agree with Matthew, and I'd like to add one more thing. Rejection is a common occurrence in academia, and it happens to everyone. Whether you're young or senior, the key is not to get discouraged by rejection. Each rejection provides an opportunity to learn and improve. Even as a senior researcher, I still face rejections quite often, and that's perfectly normal. The important thing is to persevere and keep learning from each experience.

7. Reproducibility Issue

During the seminar, there was an extensive discussion about the issue of reproducibility. Here is a summary of the key points raised by the chair, speakers, and attendees.

The question of reproducibility is indeed challenging. No editor can guarantee that all published results are fully reproducible. However, making data and code accessible for review can be a helpful step toward achieving reproducibility. It involves providing resources that allow others to confirm and replicate the findings presented in the papers.

Currently, the implementation of reproducibility measures is not optimal. Some journals typically require authors to put their code on the journal website, and this may not align with how most researchers work, using platforms like GitHub and other repositories. There is room for improvement to streamline this process and make it more efficient. Most journals place the burden of checking reproducibility on the reviewers, which can be time-consuming for them. Several journals hired someone to investigate the reproducibility of articles submitted. However, the process has proven to be quite labor-intensive, leading them to adjust their policy and focus on reproducibility during the resubmission stage rather than the initial submission.

While we may not have fully achieved this level of reproducibility yet, it is crucial to recognize its importance, and we should aim to improve in this area. The goal is to create a more robust and transparent research environment for the benefit of the scientific community.