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SCIENTIFIC WRITING, OR HOW I LEARNED TO LOVE BEING AN EDITOR

Give the rationale for your work
Don’t ignore that of others

Organic Process R&D editorial (C&ENews, Feb 24, 2003, p. 31): Authors deliberately don’t cite competitor’s work
Hope reviewers don’t find out is competition

May also neglect to mention own work.
Only one reason: the work is similar to a previous publication.

This is self-plagiarism!
I've read through the paper twice and find the method a familiar one, and similar to some work I've done here with undergraduates. I'll make a few comments, but leave the question of publish/not publish alone.
Don’t repeat your own work
Comments on manuscript “8-hydroxyquinoline anchored to silica gel via new moderate size linker: synthesis and application…..(S02355)” by

General comments:

Preconcentration is subject of many researches in analytical chemistry and 8-hydroxyquinoline is frequently used in analytical chemistry either for liquid-liquid or solid-phase extraction. This manuscript described a new synthetic pathway and characterized 8-hydroxyquinoline immobilized silica gel with $^{13}$CPMAS NMR and DRIFT spectroscopy. In addition, the optimum operating conditions for preconcentration of trace metals in river water were examined in somewhat detail. The manuscript should be published in TALANTA. However, the manuscript should be shortened and a major revision is needed. In addition, the authors published a quite similar paper in xxxx, 374, 554-560. So the significance of this manuscript is weak.
_X__ Reject
The submitted paper focuses on the detection of catechol derivatives using a laccase modified electrode. The work is similar to several other papers from this group. The appears to be hastily put together both from the perspective of how it is written and from the depth of the science. Therefore, because of the lack of novelty and the difficulty the reader has in understanding the manuscript, this referee cannot recommend publication at this time. Some specific comments are:
The manuscript describes a speciation study of Gd(III) based on a computer simulation. The authors first use an artificial neural network to obtain a stability constant for a Gd(III) complex needed for the computer simulation program. This value is then used with other binding constants for other Gd(III) complexes to simulate the species present. Essentially, the authors have repeated their work in reference 11 for Gd where in reference 11, speciation was performed for Ca, Zn, and Pr. Because of the nature of the study, it does not seem appropriate for the Talanta and another journal such as noted in reference 11 would be better suited.
Extractive spectrophotometric determination of tungsten(VI) as its 6-chloro-3-hydroxy-2-(2'-thienyl)-4-oxo-4H-1-benzopyran complex

NOT REFERENCED:
A sensitive and selective extractive spectrophotometric determination of tungsten(VI) using 6-chloro-3-hydroxy-2-(4'-methoxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-1-benzopyran

3-Hydroxy-2-(4'-methoxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-1-benzopyran as an analytical reagent for the spectrophotometric determination of tungsten(VI)
...the experimental designs seem to have been largely taken from a paper that is not cited (Garris et al., 2004, J Neurosci Methods, 140:103-114). *Even worse, it appears that entire text was simply lifted from the published work, e.g.,:*

"*Although too large for attaching to a rat, the size of the remote unit expedited circuit construction, modification and testing*"  (Garris) 
"*As the unit was too large for attaching to a rat, the size of the remote unit expedited circuit construction, modification and testing*"  (submitted manuscript)

"*A 14.7456MHz crystal enables an ADC rate of 100 KS/s and 460 Kbaud serial communication with the third component of the remote unit, telemetry.*"  (Garris) 
"*14.7456 MHz crystal enables an ADC rate of 100 KS/s and 460 Kbaud serial communications with the third component of the moving unit, telemetry*"  (submitted manuscript)
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Fig. 4—Derivative cyclic voltammograms: 1.0×10^{-6} mol/L aniline; 0.0010 mol/L HCl; 0.0030 mol/L NaNO₃; 0.0025 mol/L Na₂SO₄; 0.0060% HCHO; 0.0060% Triton X-100; scan rate of 100 mV/s; (a) First scan; (b) Second and repetitive scans.

Fig. 5. Derivative cyclic voltammograms: pH 5.7; 1.0×10^{-6} M formaldehyde; 2.0×10^{-3} M DNP; 0.010 M NaCl; 0.0010% Tween-80; scan rate of 100 mV/s; (a) First scan; (b) Second and repetitive scans.
A novel potentiometric diphtheria immunosensor modified colloidal Ag and polyvinyl butyral as matrixes
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Preparation and application on a kind of immobilization method of anti-diphtheria for potentiometric immunosensor modified colloidal Au and polyvinyl butyral as matrixes

Dianping Tang, Ruo Yuan, Yaqin Chai, Linyan Zhang, Xia Zhong, Yan Liu and Jianyuan Dai

Chong Qing Key Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Southwest China Normal University, Chongqing 400715, China.

Fig. 7. The reproducibility (a) and life time (b) of the immunosensor to 40 ng/mL⁻¹ diphtheria antigen.

Fig. 9. The reproducibility (a) and life time (b) of the immunosensor to 48.6 ng/mL⁻¹ diphtheria antigen.
Talanta paper

S&AB paper
Fig. 2. The electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) of the different electrodes: (a) bare platinum electrode, (b) Ag-modified platinum electrode, (c) Ag-PVB-modified platinum electrode, and (d) anti-Diph-Ag-PVB-modified platinum electrode. Supporting electrolyte, 10 mM PBS (pH 7.0) + 0.1 M KCl + 2.5 mM Fe(CN)₆⁴⁻/Fe(CN)₆³⁻ solution. Z vs. Z' at 220 mV vs. SCE.

Fig. 4. The electrochemical impedance spectroscopy of the different electrodes: (a) bare platinum electrode, (b) Au-modified platinum electrode, (c) anti-Diph-Au-PVB-modified platinum electrode, and (d) Au-PVB-modified platinum electrode. Supporting electrolyte, 10 mM PBS (pH 7.0) + 0.1 M KCl + 2.5 mM Fe(CN)₆⁴⁻/⁻ solution. Z vs. Z' at 220 mV vs. SCE.
I think there is no originality in this work. My opinion is that the authors often change journals to increase the number of their papers. I compare this report to some papers found in Science Direct: ........

...........There are many similarities with this manuscript. The titles and keywords are mixed to have the same objective. Different paragraphs are not original.....
“Kinetic - Photometric Determination of Silver (I) based on its Catalytic Effect on Ligand Exchange Reaction between Potassium Ferrocyanide and 2-hydroxy-4-Methoxybenzophenone thiosemicarbazone”

“Kinetic Photometric Determination of Silver(I) Based on its Catalytic Effect on Reaction Between Potassium Ferrocyanide and 2-Hydroxy-4-Methoxybenzophenone Thiosemicarbazone”
Don’t fabricate
Dear Editors,

As the author É C. L. has published already in your Journal, and might well try to publish again, I would like to inform you in advance that I came to the conclusion that this author is producing his data predominantly in a "virtual laboratory", i.e. on his computer, and not with an analytical instrument. I have been suspicious already for quite some time, but when I recently received one of his manuscripts for review, I went into details, and the report about this investigation (the referee's report) is attached. I do have additional confidential information about that subject (which I do not want to make public at this point in time) that makes me 100% sure that this author is cheating. I know what this information means, and I would not have sent it to you if I would not be fully convinced about this fraud.

1. ...The curves about tube lifetime presented in this work (Fig. 2) are so similar, and the stability of the absorbance over lifetime so perfect that they cannot be real. This referee has many years of practical experience with ETAAS, and he has never seen anything so perfect in his life.

2. ...This means that the author and his students must have occupied the instrument described in this manuscript for the whole year of 2002 plus the first quarter of 2003. This, however, is not possible, as the author does not have an instrument of his own. He is rather sharing this instrument with several other professors (and their students) at the Institute, who are using it regularly. Hence, the author simply did not have the time at the instrument necessary to carry out these experiments — hence the data cannot be real.

3. ...the author, although he pretends that he was working for more than one year with this instrument, is not familiar with the instrumental conditions, he was just using "copy and paste" of the conditions of the PerkinElmer instrument he has been using during his PhD work.
Don’t send the same work to two different journals!!
Dear Paul,

I feel I have to ask you for advice in regard to the paper you recently sent me to referee it.

Recently I received by chance two paper for refereeing which are from the same authors and on a similar topic:

A miniaturised fluorescence detector using a light emitting diode as excitation source and a windowless flow cell  
by Bingcheng Yang and Yafeng Guan

and

MS. No. S02221, submitted to Talanta:  
Light-emitting-diode-induced fluorescence detector for capillary electrophoresis using optical fibre with spherical end  
by Bingcheng Yang and Yafeng Guan

...If I refereed each paper separately WITHOUT the knowledge of the other, my recommendations would be most likely for a minor and a major change respectively.
Additional Editor’s comments:

I have received one review on this paper which recommends rejection (review attached). Whilst awaiting the second review I noticed a paper by the same authors which had recently been published:

Determination of trace lead, cadmium and mercury by on-line column enrichment followed by RP-HPLC as metal-tetra-(4-bromophenyl)-porphyrin chelates. Q. Hu, G. Yang, J. Yin, Y. Yao Talanta 57 (2002) 751 - 756

I have compared the Talanta paper with the manuscript submitted to Analytica Chimica Acta and I was astounded to see that they are virtually identical. It therefore appears that the authors have submitted the same work to two journals and were prepared to see it published in both. If true, this is an outrageous and totally unacceptable action.
Dear Professor Gong,

We have been alerted by the Editors of *Talanta* and *Analytica Chimica Acta* to a serious infringement of accepted standards in reporting scientific research. It concerns your submission to these two journals of virtually identical articles describing the same results. The articles concerned are “*Synthesis of polyacrylaminoimidazole chelating fiber and properties of concentration and separation of trace Au, Hg and Pd from samples*” (submitted to *Talanta* on 2 July 2001; accepted on 3 December 2001 and published in *Vol. 57, pp.89-95*) and “*Inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometric determination of traces of gold, mercury and palladium ions preconcentrated and separated on a new polyacrylaminoimidazole fiber*” (submitted to *Analytica Chimica Acta* on 31 May 2001; accepted on 12 March 2002). In view of the obvious similarities between the articles, all action on the latter article has immediately been stopped and it has been withdrawn from publication.
Dear Prof. Fresenius:

Enclosed is my initial review of the paper by Huang et al. entitled

"The Determination of Trace Tetracycline by Spectrofluorimetry of Eu-Tetracycline-Acetylacetone-Cetyltrimethyl Ammonium Bromide"

My assessment is that improvement in sensitivity over conventional methods is achieved as a result of adding the surfactant, but some details are lacking.

However, at the time I received the manuscript for review, I received a very similar manuscript from the same authors, submitted for publication in Talanta, entitled

"The Determination of Trace Tetracycline by Fluorescence Spectrophotometry of Eu-Tetracycline-Cetyltrimethyl Ammonium Bromide"

A copy is enclosed for your information. The only change in the one submitted to you is the addition of the reagent acetylacetone. The figures are virtually identical, with only an incremental increase in the sensitivity; most of the increase is due to the CTAB surfactant. The authors obviously conducted these studies in parallel with the idea of generating two papers. They should have presented only the completed study with the acetylacetone.

Because of the manner in which they have presented these two manuscripts, I am recommending that neither be published. While we were about to submit the Talanta manuscript for review, I decided not to proceed after receiving the Fresenius' Z. Anal. Chem. manuscript for review, and am returning it to the authors. I will be interested in learning of your disposition of the manuscript.

Please let me know if I can assist any further in this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gary D. Christian
Professor

Encl: Manuscript and author letter
Dear Sir,

We regret to have to return in the enclosure your above manuscript. As you may see from the enclosed statement of one of the referees, it has not been proposed for acceptance.

The second referee is of a quite similar opinion. However, the main reason for rejection is the fact that you sent at about the same time a quite similar paper to Talanta. The only change was the addition of acetylacetone, resulting in a slight increase in sensitivity. You should only have submitted the completed paper. The suspicion arises that you deliberately intended to publish two almost identical papers. This is in clear contradiction to the international rules for publishing scientific papers. In our letter of acceptance it is clearly said that a paper of the same contents must not be published elsewhere.

Yours sincerely,

W. Fresenius
Don’t plagiarize
homogeneous medium)? If this is the case, does it suppose an increase in the dynamic range?

The authors stated that the gradient observed in FIA is not always needed and the turbomixer is one way to eliminate it. We would like to see evidence to support their claim of no gradient. Is there a difference of the signal profile obtained with the turbomixer or with conventional FIA (a figure could be included)?

I noticed two disagreements between the text and figure/table. On page 5, line 2 it is stated that "complete mixing is accomplished within 3 centimeters of the turbomixer", in figure 1 however, the unit of distance is given in mm. Which is correct? The detection limit of chlorite ion for the turbomixer stopped flow is given as 0.008 mg/l in the text and 0.004 mg/l in Table 1. Again, which is the accurate value?

There is no summary included in this paper.
Coated graphite-epoxy ion-selective electrode for the determination of chromium(III) in oxalate medium
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Coated graphite-epoxy ion-selective electrode for the determination of iron(III) in oxalic medium
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Talanta

Abstract

A coated graphite-epoxy chromium(III) ion-selective electrode, based on the ion-pair between \([\text{Cr}^{3+}]\) and tricaprylmyethylammonium cation (Aliquat 336) in a poly(vinyl chloride) (PVC) matrix is constructed. A thin membrane film of this ion-pair, dibutylphthalate (DBP) in PVC was deposited directly onto a Perspex® tube containing a graphite-epoxy conductor substrate attached to the end of a glass tube. The effect of membrane composition (ion-pair, DBP and PVC), oxalate concentration, pH and some cations and anions upon the electrode response is investigated. The electrode shows a linear anionic response to E vs. \(\log [\text{Cr}^{3+}]\) in the chromium(III) concentration range from \(2.9 \times 10^{-6}\) to \(10^{-2}\) mol l\(^{-1}\), and a slope of \(-18.7 \pm 0.5\) mV dec\(^{-1}\), at pH working range of 2–8 and 0.3 mol l\(^{-1}\) oxalate concentration. Variation in the potential of about ±2 mV was observed during a working range of 7–8 h. The response time was less than 5 s and the life time of this electrode was superior to 1 year (over 1500 determinations by each polymeric membrane), with a practical detection limit of \(2.1 \times 10^{-6}\) mol l\(^{-1}\). Application of this electrode for chromium(III) determination in some food materials and various types of plants is described.

© 2003 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Chromium(III) ion-selective electrode; Coated graphite-epoxy conductor electrode; Potentiometry; PVC

Analytical Letters

ABSTRACT

A coated graphite-epoxy iron(III) ion-selective electrode, based on the ion-pair between \([\text{Fe}^{3+}]\) and tricaprylmyethylammonium cation (Aliquat 336) in a poly(vinyl chloride) (PVC) matrix is constructed. A thin membrane film of this ion-pair, dibutylphthalate (DBPh) in PVC was deposited directly onto a Perspex® tube containing a graphite-epoxy conductor substrate attached to the end of a glass tube. The effect of membrane composition (ion pair, DBPh and PVC), oxalate concentration, pH and some cations and anions upon the electrode response is investigated. The electrode shows a linear anionic response to E vs. \(\log [\text{Fe}^{3+}]\) in
Talanta

1. Introduction

Since the development by Ross [1] of the first liquid membrane electrode sensitive to the calcium cation, much progress has been made. Moody et al. [2, 3] replaced the thick layer of liquid exchanger material supported by a dialysis membrane (cellulose acetate) by a thin polymeric film of poly(vinyl chloride) (PVC), thus significantly decreasing the high resistance and relatively long response of that electrode. Several electrodes were constructed for various cations, anions and organic compounds.

Analytical Letters

INTRODUCTION

Since the development by Ross [1] of the first liquid membrane electrode sensitive to the calcium cation, much progress has been made. Moody and Thomas [2, 3] replaced the thick layer of liquid exchanger material supported by a dialysis membrane (cellulose acetate) by a thin polymeric film of poly(vinyl chloride) (PVC), thus significantly decreasing the high resistance and relatively long response of that electrode. Several electrodes were constructed for various cations, anions and organic compounds.
Fig. 1. Effect of pH on the response of the chromium(III) ion-selective electrode for chromium(III) concentration of: (O) $1 \times 10^{-3}$ and (□) $1 \times 10^{-5}$ mol L$^{-1}$ in 0.3 mol L$^{-1}$ oxalate, at 25.0 °C.

Figure 1: Effect of pH on the response of the iron (III) ion-selective electrode for iron (III) concentration of: ○○○: $1 \times 10^{-3}$ and □□□: $1 \times 10^{-5}$ mol L$^{-1}$ in 0.3 mol L$^{-1}$ oxalate, at 25.0 °C.
Fig. 2: Effect of oxalate concentration on the calibration curves of the chromium(III) ion selective electrode. (△) 0.08, (△) 0.1, and (□) 0.3 mol L⁻¹, at pH 6.0 and 25°C.

Figure 2: Effect of oxalate concentration on the calibration curves of the iron(III) ion selective electrode: △△△△ 0.08, •••• 0.1 mol L⁻¹ and □□□□ 0.3 mol L⁻¹, at pH 6.0 and 25°C.
Table 1. Determination of chromium in some food materials using chromium(III) electrode compared with atomic absorption spectrophotometric method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Chromium (μg ml⁻¹)</th>
<th>Relative errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Proposed sensor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black pepper</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa powder</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turmeric powder</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^2$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = \frac{S^2_B}{S^2_A} = 1.9/0.1 = 19$, $F_{0.01/3,3} = 29.5$ (critical value).

Table 1. Determination of iron in biotônico (Brazilian tonic formula) using iron(III) electrode compared with atomic absorption spectrophotometric method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replicates</th>
<th>μg/ml of iron</th>
<th>Relative Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spectrophotometry</td>
<td>potentiometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^2$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = \frac{S^2_B}{S^2_A} = 1.9/0.1 = 19$
$F_{0.01/3,3} = 29.5$ (critical value)
Reviewer 1:
The more I tried to read and understand this article, the more I see that the authors either did a very poor job or a fake job.

Figure 2 almost confirmed my suspicion when I found "total Cr analysis" in the description of the figure. This is supposed to be an arsenic paper, and not a chromium paper.

The authors copied more than 95% of the work of Matsuoka et al which was published in December 2006 as a "hot" paper in Analytical Sciences. (Volume 22, pages 1519-1524). Simply changed chromium to arsenic. The chromium reagent will not react with arsenic.
I received the next day from a reader of *Talanta*:

Sir, ….we found one related paper to our research,…

“Spectrophotometric determination of Fenitrothion…..


(Submitted September 5, 2006)

…The proposed reaction scheme is scientifically and experimentally not possible.

…author did not reply.
“…spectrophotometric determination of fenitrothion…”

J. Hazardous Materials, in press

Submitted October 8, 2006
Only minor change in purported reagent.

Abstract and all text identical to
“Spectrophotometric determination of fenitrothion…

Tables and figures identical,
only slight changes in numbers in tables.
Papers submitted to Talanta, 2006:
9 submitted, 7 rejected (3 without review)
2 accepted

Papers submitted to Chemosphere:
6 submitted, 1 accepted 2005
5 rejected without review 2006
10 papers published, Env. Monit. Assess.

Papers accepted by J. Hazardous Mater.
5 published, 8 in press.
Editor received complaint of too many duplicated manuscripts, and wrote to author in Dec. 2006 he is pushing the limit of accepted scientific conduct.
70 papers published in three years.

25 different journals

27 coauthors in 15 papers
University allows only 6 students
*Equipment not available!*
If you resubmit to another journal, at least pay attention to reviewers from the first journal. It will improve the paper. Very often the reviewers will be the same.
Dear Gary,

As I indicated in an earlier mail - I have seen this paper before. I therefore enclose my report (Analyst) together with the new one in an attachment to this mail.

**Not so much has been changed in this paper.** Maybe the language has improved a bit (revision probably still needed - English is not my mother tongue so I should be careful here). Still there is no explanation how the determinands migrate, what kind of charge they have, etc., why, why? It would be so simple to include. Did they not understand my previous report???

**I cannot follow the logic behind this paper.** The problem seems to be an artificial one - the real samples, on the other hand, offer a separation and quantification problem that would be possible to solve thereby making the paper more valuable.
Dear Dr. Murray,

I submit the following manuscript to Talanta....
Dear Professor Christian,

I submit the enclosed manuscript to *Analytica Chimica Acta*...
Dear Gary,

I received the attached review on manuscript PH901 for Anal Chim Acta. The reviewer comments about seeing something very similar for Talanta. Are you able to check into this to see if there is duplication of the Talanta manuscript?

Bets regards,

Paul

Dear Paul,

Yes, we have seen this paper, and rejected it, so the author is recycling it. Attached is the review we received.

Best regards,

Gary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Revise</th>
<th>In review</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>%acc,revise</th>
<th>%reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>363</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent:</strong></td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>No Review</td>
<td>Total ms.</td>
<td>% No Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of 363 manuscripts: 16.0