

**Workshop evaluation report**

**AIDS2010 Publish or Perish for Junior Authors: Writing and Publishing  
Scientific Manuscripts on HIV/AIDS and Related Topics**

**Wednesday 21 July 2010, 16.30-18.00, Mini Room 3 (120 pax), Reed Messe  
Vienna**

Out of approximately 120 participants we received 72 evaluation sheets for this workshop from respondents. The evaluation is based on the correct responses by the respondents, incorrect responses were disregarded.

**Participants:**

Out of 67 respondents 34% indicated as their main occupation being a researcher, with another 28% identifying themselves as health care workers and 15% as students.

The workshop attracted a range of authors, from experienced to junior authors; 35% (out of 71 respondents) noted having already written and submitted more than one manuscript, 24% indicated that they had never written and submitted a manuscript, 25% indicated that they were currently in the process of writing and submitting a manuscript and 15% indicated that they had written and submitted one manuscript to date.

Respondents were highly motivated to attend the workshop based on its 'title and description' (59% of respondents), as well as to 'further develop and strengthen skills' (83% of respondents). In addition, 9% of respondents indicated that the workshop was recommended to them.

**Content:**

On average nearly 90% of participants rated the workshop modules as either 'very useful' or 'useful'. Overall, the individual modules were rated very similarly: 'pre-submission advice' receiving the highest score (93% of participants chose 'very

useful’ or ‘useful’). The module ‘scientific writing’ was rated by 84% of respondents as ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’ and the module ‘editors panel’ received a ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’ score by 89% of respondents.

**Comments:**

In total we received 34 comments from participants out of which seven dealt with time-related issues. In particular participants called for more time to allow for questions and a longer session in general, maybe even developing the modules into individual workshops. Other comments dealt with a requirement for more comprehensive hand-outs including the slides and to utilize more demonstrative examples in the presentations as well as a sample manuscript to work from. It was also not apparent to the audience, judging from two comments, that the editors were from four different journals. Suggestions were made to include specifically an author in the panel as well as to include other journal editors.

**Audience questions:**

- What do editors want from a manuscript and what are the most common reasons for rejecting manuscripts?
- What charges are involved for authors and what about authors from low and middle income countries?
- Can work be published in journals after the data have been presented as conference abstracts?
- How do editors reach a decision when reviewers disagree in their recommendations? How are reviewers selected and how do editors handle reviewer suggestions and exclusions by authors?
- Can authors contact editors to inquire about the status of their manuscript and what do editors do to move along the peer-review process?
- What can editors do to help when governments won’t allow results to be published?