

**NEFSC**  
**Manuscript Review**  
**and Scientific Publishing**

*Author's Guide to Policy, Process, and Procedure*

by

**T. L. Frady and J. A. Gibson**

**NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service**  
**Northeast Fisheries Science Center**  
**Program Support Staff**  
**Woods Hole, MA 02543-1097**

June 1993

The Northeast Fisheries Science Center reference documents are a series of informal reports produced by the Center for timely transmission of results obtained through work at the various NEFSC labs. The documents are reviewed internally before publication, but are not considered formal literature. The National Marine Fisheries Service does not endorse any proprietary material, process, or product mentioned in these reports.

## Table of Contents

Policy .....	1
Summary of Review Process .....	1
Appendix 1: Procedures .....	3
Appendix 2: Where to Publish .....	7
Appendix 3: Manuscript Preparation .....	11
Appendix 4: Forms .....	15

## Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge the NEFSC staff members who have contributed over the years to developing a Center manuscript policy: Linda I. Despres-Patanjo for her work on the original guidelines for authorship, Carl J. Sindermann for his work on the 1985 manuscript policy, Allen E. Peterson for his final policy guidance, and the Center executive staff for their constructive criticism.

*This document replaces in full the Northeast Fisheries Science Center's (NEFSC's) 1985 "Manuscript Editorial/Review Policy."*

## POLICY

The NEFSC is responsible for the content of all publications authored by Center staff. "Publications" include papers, oral presentations, and posters produced and distributed/displayed as part of a staff member's official duties, and which are intended for circulation or presentation outside of an author's immediate working group. The NEFSC review policy applies to all such publications, hereafter referred to as "manuscripts," even those for which a Center author is not the senior/first author. It does not apply to reports developed or given for administrative purposes, except those intended for a Center publication series.

All manuscripts intended for publication, including abstracts or outlines of oral presentations and posters, must be approved by the author's division/staff chief and by the Science and Research Director **before** submission to prospective publishers, presentation, or display. This procedure is outlined in Appendix 1: Procedures. It is also summarized on the manuscript submission form found in Appendix 4: Forms.

At this time, the single exception to this policy is documents generated through the Stock Assessment Workshop (SAW) process. Technical review for these documents is completed through the Stock Assessment Review Committee and subsequent SAW meeting, and the signature of the current chief of the Conservation and Utilization Division and/or the SAW scientific coordinator is sufficient for publication of SAW documents in a Center series. Papers of the SAW will meet standards of the series editors for style, usage, and format. As SAW operations and documentation needs change, this exception may be discarded as inappropriate or unnecessary.

It is the policy of the NEFSC that review of manuscripts is an important part of official duties and that serious attempts should be made to complete reviews within the deadline of three weeks from receipt.

Any NEFSC employee who intends to publish as a private citizen (*i.e.*, not as a federal employee as part of his/her official duties) is potentially vulnerable to conflict of interest and/or other ethical charges, especially if payment for writing is involved. At this time, litigation is pending concerning the conditions under which federal employees may accept payment of any kind for writing, regardless of the subject matter. Before any employee engages in "outside" writing, he/she should contact the Information Services Unit (ISU) or the appropriate agency officials for advice on these matters.

## SUMMARY OF REVIEW PROCESS

The author is responsible for initially selecting the publication outlet, and for carefully preparing the manuscript to conform with guidelines provided by the prospective publisher. The Information Services Unit (ISU) chief and technical editor are available to advise authors on grammar, usage, and style. For general information on NMFS technical publications and on guidelines for preferred outlets, including NMFS technical publications, see Appendix 2: Where to Publish. For general information on preparing a manuscript, see Appendix 3: Manuscript Preparation. All forms referred to in this author's guide are found in Appendix 4: Forms.

The Center review process has two stages: peer review for scientific/technical content and administrative review for statements or findings with implications for Center or agency policy. The first stage is the responsibility of the senior or first Center author's division/staff chief. The second is the responsibility of the Center directorate. In general, each major review step should take no more than three weeks.

The ISU serves as support staff for the review process. In general, ISU is responsible for:

- tracking manuscripts through the process
- attempting to keep the review within deadlines by anticipating scheduling conflicts

among reviewers and sending reminders

- informing the author of the manuscript's progress
- keeping a publication file for each manuscript, recording progress from initial receipt by ISU through final publication
- producing an annual summary of publication activity

Both technical and policy review are four-point cycles: review, revision, approval/rejection, and submission. The division/staff chief reviews manuscripts singlehandedly or designates reviewers. The author works directly with the division/staff chief or his/her designates until their concerns are adequately addressed and the manuscript is approved or retired from

the process. Rejections are appealed in writing to the directorate.

The same cycle is used for policy review, although the directorate will probably not designate reviewers. The author works directly with the directorate until the manuscript is approved or retired. Manuscripts that fail to get approval after negotiation with the directorate will be retired from the process. Such manuscripts can be resubmitted as new manuscripts with revisions that meet directorate approval.

A procedural key to the review process is found in Appendix 1: Procedures; the process is also summarized on the submission form found in Appendix 4. This form replaces the various approval coversheets used for manuscript review throughout the Center. In general, each time the manuscript passes a step in the process, it is returned to ISU which updates the record and sends the manuscript to the next step. ISU will act on manuscripts within two working days of receipt unless the author is otherwise notified.

**APPENDIX 1**  
**PROCEDURES**

## INTRODUCTION

The review process is broadly divided into technical review and policy review. Division/staff chiefs certify the technical content of manuscripts. The Science & Research Director certifies the policy content. The ISU administers the process. Deadlines for major steps are generally three weeks from receipt. ISU processes each step within two working days, unless the author is otherwise notified. To make a correction in a manuscript that's out for review, or to withdraw a manuscript from consideration, contact the ISU chief or technical editor.

Manuscripts with multiple authorship are submitted to ISU by the senior Center author.

## WHAT AND HOW TO SUBMIT

When preparing the manuscript for review, please use the following specifications:

- Include an abstract or summary, a table of contents (if applicable), and lists of tables and figures.
- Make sure that the bibliography of cited works contains complete bibliographic data and conforms to the style preferred by the target publication.
- If intended for a Center series, see Appendix 3 for specific guidance.
- Include only paper **copies** of figures.
- Print review copies on 8-1/2" x 11" paper, with text double-spaced, and tabular data single-spaced.

Send **three** paper copies of the full manuscript (including tables and figures) for papers, or one copy of the abstract or outline for other presentations, and an author-completed manuscript submission form (Appendix 4) to:

Teri L. Frady, Chief  
Information Services Unit  
Northeast Fisheries Science Center  
166 Water St.  
Woods Hole, MA 02543-1097

Information Services staff will contact you at various steps in the review process regarding the status of your manuscript, beginning with confir-

mation that the manuscript has been received, and with inquiries (if any) with regard to missing or extraneous items. The ISU will send the manuscript and submission form to the sole/senior author's division/staff chief. Copies of the abstract and submission form are also sent to those in the chain of command for all Center authors of the manuscript.

## REVIEW/REVISION KEY

The process is described using a decision key. Begin with step 1, select the appropriate lettered alternative, and follow the instructions. The "S&RD" is the Science and Research Director. The "Chief" is the division/staff chief. The S&RD and chiefs may choose a staff member to act on their behalf for review purposes.

1. Chief initiates technical review.
  - a. Reviews manuscript him/herself without additional reviewers. Fills out "Technical Review Initiated" section of submission form. Go to 2.
  - b. Assigns reviewers from his/her staff, and/or nominates them from other divisions/staffs or even outside of Center. (To avoid delay during policy review, chief should consider asking S&RD to act as technical reviewer if manuscript is in area of S&RD's expertise.) Fills out "Technical Review Initiated" section of submission form, and returns package to ISU. Go to 9.
  - c. Decides review is not required. Fills out "Technical Review Initiated" and "Technical Review Completed" sections of submission form. Go to 3.
2. Chief completes review and checks appropriate box in "Technical Review Completed" section.
  - a. "Not Suitable," "Suitable as Is," or "Suitable with Corrections": Go to 3.
  - b. "Suitable with Rewrite": Go to 4.
3. Chief returns manuscript and submission form to ISU.
  - a. "Not Suitable": Manuscript has been rejected in technical review. Go to 6.
  - b. "Suitable as Is": Technical review complete. Manuscript is ready for policy review. Go to 14.
  - c. "Suitable with Corrections": ISU forwards manuscript to author for minor



- corrections. Technical review complete. Go to 5.
4. Chief works directly with author until revision is approved or an impasse results in rejection.
    - a. Approval: Chief checks "Rewrite Approved" and sends package to ISU. Go to 14.
    - b. Rejection: Chief checks "Rewrite Not Approved," attaches explanation of rejection, and sends package to ISU. Go to 6.
  5. Author returns revised manuscript to ISU for policy review. Go to 14.
  6. ISU sends rejected manuscript and submission form with attached explanation of rejection to author. Author can appeal rejection.
    - a. Appeal: Go to 7.
    - b. No appeal: Go to 8.
  7. Author sends manuscript, submission form with attached explanation of rejection, all written reviews, and his/her written rebuttal to ISU. ISU sends package to S&RD.
    - a. Rejection overturned: S&RD informs ISU which informs author. S&RD keeps package for policy review. Go to 14.
    - b. Rejection sustained: S&RD completes submission form, listing reasons for rejection under "Comments" section, and returns package to ISU. ISU sends package to author. Go to 8.
  8. Author either abandons manuscript or significantly revises it and submits it as a new manuscript.
    - a. Abandon: No further action required.
    - b. Revise: Go to 1.
  9. ISU prepares manuscript package for additional review and contacts reviewer(s).
    - a. Reviewer(s) can make comments within deadline. Go to 10.
    - b. Reviewer(s) has (have) schedule conflict. Go to 11.
  10. Reviewer(s) complete(s) review within deadline and return(s) review package to ISU. Go to 12.
  11. ISU informs chief that reviewer(s) is (are) unable to consider manuscript within deadline.
    - a. Chief assigns or nominates new reviewer(s). Go to 9.
    - b. Chief approves extended deadline to meet demands of reviewer(s) schedule. Go to 10.
  12. ISU sends completed review package to author who revises manuscript and returns package to ISU. Go to 13.
  13. ISU sends revised manuscript, submission form, and reviewer's(s') comments to chief. Go to 2.
  14. If S&RD doesn't already have it, then ISU submits manuscript and submission form to S&RD. S&RD completes policy review and checks appropriate box in "Policy Review" section, providing and/or attaching comments if necessary.
    - a. "Not Suitable," "Suitable as Is," or "Suitable with Corrections": Go to 15.
    - b. "Suitable with Rewrite": Go to 16.
  15. S&RD returns manuscript and submission form to ISU.
    - a. "Not Suitable": Manuscript has been rejected in policy review. Go to 17.
    - b. Suitable as Is": Policy review complete. Go to 18.
    - c. "Suitable with Corrections": ISU sends manuscript and submission form to author. Policy review complete. Go to 18.
  16. S&RD works directly with author until revision is approved or an impasse results in rejection.
    - a. Approval: S&RD checks "Rewrite Approved" and then sends package to ISU. Go to 18.
    - b. Rejection: S&RD notes final rejection in "Comments" section and sends package to ISU. Go to 17.
  17. ISU sends rejected manuscript, comments, and submission form to author, and copies author's chief on submission form.
    - a. Appeal: Only through chief. Go to 16.
    - b. No appeal: No further action required.
  18. ISU sends manuscript and copy of completed submission form to author. Author submits final draft to publisher.
    - a. For manuscripts printed by publishers other than NEFSC, authors must provide ISU with copy of final manuscript and 12 reprints when they arrive.
    - b. For manuscripts printed in NEFSC series, see Appendix 3.



**APPENDIX 2**  
**WHERE TO PUBLISH**

## INTRODUCTION

The NEFSC encourages its authors to publish their manuscripts in the formal literature whenever possible. This means either in anonymously peer-reviewed scientific and technical serials, scholarly books, or contributions to such books.

There are hundreds of serials that NEFSC authors may consider for publishing their manuscripts. The author's supervisor is generally the best source of information and guidance for selecting a publication outlet. In special cases (e.g., the need to publish oversized color charts), the author and his/her chain of command may be unsure of the best outlet. In those cases, the ISU is available to advise the author.

NEFSC authors frequently publish in, or contribute to, outlets produced by publishers other than NOAA, NMFS, and NEFSC. All manuscripts intended for these other outlets must enter the review process so that a record is kept of them, and the Science & Research Director is aware of them. For multiple-author manuscripts for which the senior author is outside the NEFSC, the review may be more for information purposes, since the NEFSC has little control over disposition of the published product.

When an NEFSC author publishes in a non-federal outlet, the publisher usually asks the author to sign a form transferring copyright to the publisher. Since the federal government waives all copyright *ab initio* (from the beginning), the federal author has no copyright to transfer. Most copyright-transfer forms used by non-federal publishers now recognize this situation, and have a special signature line/block for federal authors. If an NEFSC author encounters a copyright-transfer form without a special signature line/block, then he/she should still sign the form, but add in writing: "While my/our work may be copyrighted as part of a larger work, the government retains its rights in my/our work by itself."

The following sections describe the fisheries series produced by NOAA, NMFS, and the NEFSC.

## NOAA JOURNALS

NOAA produces two professional fisheries journals which are published by the NMFS Scientific Publications Office in Seattle, Washington: the *Fishery Bulletin* and *Marine Fisheries Review*. The *Fishery Bulletin* is "the U.S. counterpart to highly regarded federal publications produced by

most nations (e.g., *ICES Journal du Conseil*, *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*) that undertake significant marine research. Original research or authoritative review and interpretation in all scientific fields that bear on marine fisheries are published in the *Fishery Bulletin*."

The *Marine Fisheries Review* "publishes original articles, original research reports, significant progress reports, technical notes, and news articles on fisheries science, engineering and economics, commercial and recreational fisheries, marine mammal studies, aquaculture, and U.S. foreign fisheries development. Emphasis, however, is on in-depth review articles and practical or applied aspects of marine fisheries rather than pure research."

## NOAA FORMAL TECHNICAL REPORTS

NOAA produces one professional fisheries report series which is also published by the NMFS Scientific Publications Office in Seattle: *NOAA Technical Report NMFS*. It includes information "of a more limited conceptual or integrative content than *Fishery Bulletin*....The emphasis is on high technical quality and immediate usefulness of the information."

Typical issues cover: long-term, continuing scientific investigations; intensive, but scope-restricted scientific investigations; applied fisheries problems; general conservation and management matters; reviews, in considerable detail and at a high technical level, of certain broad areas of research; economic-related investigations; and management-related investigations.

## NEFSC INFORMAL TECHNICAL REPORTS

### TECHNICAL MEMORANDA

The NMFS central office, all five regional operations offices, and all five fisheries science centers are authorized by NOAA to publish their own subseries of the *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS* series. The distinction between manuscripts acceptable in this series and in the *NOAA Technical Report NMFS* series is not clear, except that some manuscripts sent to the NMFS Scientific Editor for consideration in the latter series are sometimes rejected for their content being too

regional, too transient, or not in a format accepted by the series (for example, annotated bibliographies are not currently considered for this series.)

Issues of the NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/NEC are characterized by small press runs (usually 200 to 400 copies), specialized audiences, and their usefulness for documenting results quickly. They are citable, available in major depositories, and abstracted in some major online data bases. They are not, however, considered formal literature.

Authors should not use this series as a holding tank for material they intend to submit to a formal outlet later, unless the material will be considerably revised with new conclusions or interpretations.

## REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

The Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document series is the "grayest" of scientific and technical literature produced by the NEFSC. This series is used to document findings to be passed on to other agencies, to provide a convenient way to deal with frequently asked questions, to document interim results, and to archive NEFSC administrative studies.

Issues of this series are characterized by their photocopied/plastic-comb-bound production, very limited distribution, and the short shelf-life of their information.

Authors should not use this series for draft materials or information that cannot be cited.

## NEFSC PUBLIC INFORMATION SERIES

The NEFSC has a number of newsletter-type series that help distribute timely information about current research activities and findings either to staff, constituents, or interested public. Those series produced primarily for distributing general information outside the NEFSC are *Research Highlights*, *End-of-Year Report*, and *News Release*, all produced by the ISU. NEFSC staff contribute ideas and write-ups for these series. All of these series are sent through the review process.

Those series produced primarily for distributing specialized information outside the NEFSC are: *The Shark Tagger*, a semiannual progress report on the NMFS Cooperative Shark Tagging Program, produced by the Apex Predators Investigation; and *Fishermen's Report*, a regular data report on each NEFSC bottom trawl, sea scallop, and Atlantic surfclam - ocean quahog survey, produced by the Resource Surveys Investigation. Both of these series are sent through the review process.

Those series produced primarily for distributing specialized information inside the NEFSC are: *Linkages*, a monthly activities report on, and produced by, the Research Coordination Unit; and *Pier Review*, a weekly activities report on, and produced by, the Fisheries Statistics Investigation. These series have been approved for distribution as a series, but do not require review of each issue.



**APPENDIX 3**  
**MANUSCRIPT PREPARATION**

## INTRODUCTION

Ideally, decisions on authorship should be made even before research begins, but that ideal is sometimes difficult to achieve. Under virtually all circumstances, though, such decisions should be made before any writing begins. Consequently, what follows is first a discussion of guidelines on authorship, then a discussion of guidelines on writing.

## GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORSHIP OF MANUSCRIPTS

Decisions about authorship of manuscripts are important to all contributors and an occasional source of disagreement. Although it is difficult to achieve unanimity of opinion when authorship is in dispute, these guidelines attempt to standardize the process of making authorship decisions.

## DETERMINING AUTHORSHIP

Anyone who provides substantial original data and ideas on the interpretation of the data that are important to the manuscript should be considered as a co-author. Because of the different kinds of manuscripts prepared at the NEFSC, the following procedures are recommended:

1. **Experimental Studies:** Authors should include those who actively contributed to the overall design and execution of the experiment, and to the analysis and interpretation of the data. Authors should be listed in order of their importance to the experiment.
2. **Routine Reports** (e.g., data reports, survey reports): Authors should include those who played a major role in the design, collection, and/or processing of field samples or data, and in the analysis of the data.
3. **Analytical Studies:** Authors should include those who played a major role in the analysis of the data and in the writing of the manuscript.

In each case, others who contributed, but to a lesser extent, should be recognized in the acknowledgments.

It is the responsibility of potential authors of, or contributors to, a manuscript to attempt to

clarify their roles before work on the manuscript begins, and preferably before research begins. It is most important to consider the contributions and sequences of authors prior to drafting a manuscript, so that authors are not added as the manuscript progresses, and so that all have a clear understanding of the extent of their participation from the outset.

No person should be included as an author without his/her permission.

All authors should be familiar with the concept(s) on which the manuscript is based, the implications to the scientific field, the design of the experiment or approach to a question, the data, and the analysis and interpretation of the results. Any co-author should be competent to summarize the content of the publication.

It should be unusual for more than five authors to contribute to any single manuscript.

If technician contributions are significant enough to qualify as authorship, the principal investigator may include a technician as an author. Student assistance is generally recognized in the acknowledgments.

## FIRST AUTHORSHIP

The person who contributed the most in terms of original perception and definition of the problem, design and conception of the research required, detailed description of research protocols, analysis and interpretation of the data, formulation of conclusions, and drafting the manuscript should emerge as first author. Factors to be considered include conceptual input, data acquisition, data analysis, time invested, preparation of first draft, and final editing.

The first author should lead in concept development, but also participate in the research, analysis, and writing.

The primacy of first authorship should be fully appreciated, since all co-authors of papers with multiple authors often disappear in text citations as "et al."

## EMPLOYEE RIGHTS AND PROCEDURES

Sometimes employees are asked to collect, collate, archive, or retrieve data, process samples, type manuscripts, or otherwise complete tasks that contribute in some way to a report or publication. If such an employee is not sure how the results of his/her efforts will be used, he/she should discuss the matter with the supervisor



involved. The supervisor should ensure that the workforce appraisal plan describes the report preparation and publication responsibilities of the employee accurately.

If an employee feels he/she is being excluded from authorship or included as an author inappropriately, the matter should be discussed with his/her supervisor. If the matter cannot be resolved through discussion, that discussion should be documented in a memo for the record, and the division/staff chief asked to review the situation and suggest a resolution. If the employee feels he/she is being excluded from authorship because of discrimination, an EEO counselor may also be consulted.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Contributions to publications and reports are acknowledged at the discretion of the author(s). Although this is a subjective decision by the author, he/she should acknowledge an employee's competent, thorough job in performing his/her duties with regard to the study and/or publishing process. It is the author's responsibility to review the contributions of technicians, students, typists, illustrators, editors, and others to the overall project, and to ensure that their contributions are properly recognized. The acknowledgment should be limited to the manuscript at hand.

Frequently, the concept for a research project originates with a researcher who may or may not be an NEFSC employee. This individual certainly deserves some recognition. Furthermore, it is sometimes the forcefulness and drive of a supervisor that motivates or allows staff to complete and publish a manuscript. This individual should also be acknowledged, provided he/she plays a positive role in getting the manuscript out and published.

The author or supervisor may also consider recognizing an employee's exceptional contributions to a manuscript with an appropriate award, as well as acknowledgment in the publication.

Acknowledgments are expected, but can be meager rewards for any substantial contributions to a manuscript.

## SPECIAL CASES

Division/staff chiefs should act as final arbiters in disputes over authorship, and should review authorship of all manuscripts emanating from their division/staff.

In instances where data sets have accumulated, but the investigator is unwilling to publish, it may be ethical to assign another scientist to draft the manuscript. The person who developed the data should appear as co-author, and should be involved in the preparation of the draft. The decision about whether he/she should be first author is subjective, and best left to the authors.

The requirement that all authors should be familiar with all aspects of the manuscript may be modified in special cases. For example, if the paper deals with a new technique or piece of sampling hardware, one author may do the engineering and another the scientific verification. Another exception might be in reports of multidisciplinary studies involving several specialists.

## GUIDELINES FOR WRITING THE MANUSCRIPT

There are two types of guidance for writing manuscripts: (1) specific guidance which is associated with the particular publication chosen as the intended outlet (such as instructions to authors provided by journals) and (2) general guidance which deals with all matters of format and style not covered by a particular publication's specific guidance.

## GENERAL GUIDANCE

There are a number of readily available, good references for preparing manuscripts. In particular, Day's *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper* (Philadelphia: ISI Press; 1979) is recommended. For writing style and usage, Strunk and White's *Elements of Style* (New York: Macmillan; 1979) is recommended.

For handling capitalization, punctuation, numbers, formulae, tables, scientific notation, bibliographic elements, and other matters of copy editing, refer to (in order of their listing): (1) *CBE Style Manual*, 5th ed. (Bethesda, MD: Council of Biology Editors; 1983); (2) *A Manual of Style*, 13th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1982); or (3) *United States Government Printing Office Style Manual*, 13th ed. (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office; 1984).

For spelling of scientific and common names of fishes, mollusks, and decapod crustaceans from the United States and Canada, use *Special Publications* No. 20 (fishes), 16 (mollusks), and 17 (decapod crustaceans) of the American Fisheries

Society (Bethesda, MD). For spelling in general, use the most recent edition of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam).

For abbreviating serial titles (for use in lists of cited works), use the most recent issue of *Serial Sources for the BIOSIS Previews Database* (Philadelphia: Biosciences Information Service).

The ethics of scientific research and scientific publishing are a serious matter. All manuscripts submitted are expected to adhere -- at a minimum -- to the ethical guidelines contained in Chapter 1 ("Ethical Conduct in Authorship and Publication") of the *CBE Style Manual*.

## SPECIFIC GUIDANCE

Format and style for submitting manuscripts vary with the publisher. Authors should obtain the "Instructions for Authors" from the publisher before preparing the final draft. NEFSC librarians can help authors find instructions for most serials.

Instructions for NOAA's fisheries journals and formal technical report series are found on the inside back cover of every issue. Instructions for the NEFSC's technical memoranda and reference documents are as follows:

1. **Clearances:** All manuscripts submitted for publication as technical memoranda or reference documents must be accompanied by a completely signed-off "Manuscript Submission Form" (see Appendix 4). If any author is not a federal employee, he/she will be required to sign a "Release of Copyright" form (see Appendix 4).
2. **Organization:** Manuscripts must have an abstract and -- if applicable -- a table of contents and lists of figures and tables. As much as possible, use the traditional scientific manuscript organization for sections: "Introduction," "Study Area," "Methods & Materials," "Results," "Discussion" and/or "Conclusions," "Acknowledgments," and "Literature/References Cited."

3. **Style:** All NEFSC publication and report series are obligated to conform with the style contained in the *United States Government Printing Office Style Manual*. That style manual is silent on many aspects of scientific manuscripts. NEFSC publication and report series rely more on the *CBE Style Manual*. Manuscripts should be prepared to conform with these style manuals.

As suggested in the "General Guidance" section, these series also use the American Fisheries Society's guides to names of fishes, mollusks, and decapod crustaceans, and use the Biosciences Information Service's guide to serial title abbreviations.

For in-text citations, use the name-date system. A special effort should be made to ensure that all necessary bibliographic information is included in the list of cited works. Personal communications must include date, full name, and full mailing address of the contact.

4. **Typing text, tables, and figure captions:** Text, including tables and figure captions, must be converted to WordPerfect 4.2, 5.0, or 5.1. In general, keep text simple (for example, don't switch fonts, don't indent except for paragraphs). Especially, don't use WordPerfect graphics for embedding tables and figures in text. If the automatic footnoting function is used, also save a list of footnotes as a separate WordPerfect file. When the final draft is ready for review, save the text, tables, figure captions, table labels, footnotes, and front matter as separate document files.

**Tables** should be prepared using tabs to separate columnar data. If you have to use spaces to separate columns, use them exclusively. Do not use a combination of the two.

**Figures** submitted with the final draft must be original and on paper. Except under extraordinary circumstances, color will not be used in illustration.

**Text** should be submitted both in hard copy and on a 5.5 in. or 3.24 in. diskette.

## **APPENDIX 4**

### **FORMS**

## NEFSC Manuscript Submission Form

### MANUSCRIPT DESCRIPTION

*(to be filled out by senior NEFSC author and submitted with manuscript to ISU)*

Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Author(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Author's(s) Affiliation(s) (complete mailing address if outside NEFSC):  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Intended Outlet: \_\_\_\_\_

Submission Deadline/Presentation Date (attach documentation): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Senior NEFSC author's signature)

(Date signed)

### TECHNICAL REVIEW INITIATED

*(to be filled out by Division or Staff Chief)*

No additional review needed

Additional review needed:

1. Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing address (if outside NEFSC): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing address (if outside NEFSC): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Division/Staff Chief signature)

(Date signed)

**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMPLETED**

*(to be filled out by Division/Staff Chief)*

- Manuscript not suitable for publication/presentation (attach explanation)
- Manuscript suitable for publication/presentation:
  - as is;
  - with corrections as indicated (does not need my further review); or
  - with rewrite as indicated (does need my further review)
    - Rewrite approved
    - Rewrite not approved (attach explanation)

---

(Division/Staff Chief signature)

(Date signed)

**POLICY REVIEW**

*(to be filled out by Science & Research Director)*

- Manuscript not suitable for publication/presentation (explain in "Comments" below)
- Manuscript suitable for publication/presentation:
  - as is;
  - with corrections as indicated (does not need my further review); or
  - with rewrite as indicated (does need my further review)
    - Rewrite approved
    - Rewrite not approved (explain in "Comments")

---

(Science & Research Director signature)

(Date signed)

**Comments:**

## RELEASE OF COPYRIGHT

The U.S. copyright law requires the release of copyright -- in writing -- from all non-federal authors seeking to publish in federal journals and report series. It is therefore necessary that you execute the release of copyright at the bottom of this sheet and return the sheet promptly to: Jon A. Gibson, Technical Editor, Information Services Unit, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, 166 Water St., Woods Hole, MA 02543-1097, USA.

If you are employed and you prepared your manuscript as part of your job, the rights to your manuscript rest initially with your employer. In that case, when you sign this release of copyright, we assume you are authorized to do so by your employer and that your employer has consented to all the terms and conditions of this form. If not, it should be signed by someone so authorized. Company or other forms may not be substituted for this form.

Manuscript Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Author(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Publication Outlet: \_\_\_\_\_

The undersigned, desiring to publish the above-named manuscript in the above-named outlet, hereby releases his/her copyright in the above-named manuscript to the Northeast Fisheries Science Center. In turn, since all copyright is waived by the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, the above-named author(s), and the employers for whom the work was performed:

1. Can reuse all or portions of the above-named manuscript in other works.
2. Can reproduce, or have reproduced, the above-named manuscript for the author's(s) personal use or for company use, provided that the copies are not used in a way that implies federal government endorsement of a product or service.
3. Distribute all or portions of the above-named manuscript prior to publication.
4. Retain all proprietary rights other than copyright, such as patent rights.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Organizational Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Employer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## NEFSC Manuscript Reviewer's Checklist

---

This is a list of questions that reflect the kind of advice we seek from you with regard to the enclosed paper. We do not expect you to answer all the questions. This is simply a tool that may prove useful in organizing your thoughts.

---

1. Does this manuscript present findings or data that need to be published and that are not available elsewhere?
2. Is the manuscript aimed at the most appropriate outlet to reach potential users?
3. Does the manuscript contain sufficient data and information to document its statements?
4. Are the cited communications and literature adequate and to the point?
5. Are all figures and tables essential to the text?
6. Do the tables and figures adequately display data and/or relationships?
7. Are base data, methods of analysis, and tests adequately portrayed?
8. Are the methods and interpretive concepts up-to-date and accurate? Has the author accounted for important developments in the field?
9. Are base data and statistical tests appropriate? Are the author's interpretations in line with test results?
10. Is the author's logic sound? Are statements adequately documented?
11. Has the author clearly presented the ideas? Is the reader able to follow the author's reasoning? Is information contained in the tables and figures discussed or merely repeated in the text?
12. Are the sections well organized?
13. Is the text concise?
14. Are objectives and conclusions clearly presented?
15. Has the author accounted for principal limitations of the methods, hypotheses, and results?