

Chemical Society Reviews

Instructions for Authors – January 2004

Also see www.rsc.org/illustrations and www.rsc.org/electronicfiles

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Policy and Aims
- 2.0 Tutorial Reviews
- 3.0 Critical Reviews
- 4.0 General Requirements (Tutorial and Critical Reviews)
- 5.0 Submission of Articles
- 6.0 Solicitation of Articles
- 7.0 Editorial Office

1.0 Policy and Aims

Chemical Society Reviews publishes accessible, succinct and reader-friendly articles on topics of current interest in the chemical sciences. The promotion of international and multidisciplinary awareness and co-operation is particularly encouraged. *Chemical Society Reviews* publishes two article types: **Tutorial Reviews** and **Critical Reviews**.

2.0 Tutorial Reviews

Tutorial reviews should be written to be of relevance both to the general research chemist who is new to the field, as well as the expert, and must be accessible to advanced undergraduates and beyond. They should provide an essential introduction to the field, serving as a springboard to further reading, and should have particular appeal to younger researchers seeking new fields to explore. Authors are required to write succinctly and select references carefully in order to give an enticing flavour of the topic rather than a comprehensive treatise. The implications of recent developments for the wider scientific community should be emphasised.

Tutorial reviews must be:

- *Short*: 8–10 000 word equivalents: the entire manuscript (double-spaced text and artwork) should not exceed 30 pages of A4 or American Quarto (8–10 journal pages)
- *Lightly referenced*: A maximum of 35 citations is strongly recommended. Multiple referencing (the use of a, b, etc.) is strongly discouraged. It is recommended that 7–10 citations be used to show the development of the field, whilst a further 10

be used to explain the basics; the rest should lead the reader to the latest developments

- *Jargon free*: All specialist terms and symbols should be defined. Authors should not presume knowledge beyond undergraduate level. Fundamental ideas should be simply explained

For most articles a broad outlook is required: authors should credit the major contributors within the citation limit. The ‘and references therein’ tag may be useful to direct the reader to further reading without having to list whole series of papers from one research group.

Note that excessive length or use of references would provide sufficient reason for non-acceptance of a manuscript and such manuscripts may be returned to the author for shortening prior to peer review.

Tables frequently eat up citations and their use is discouraged. Other forms of data representation are preferred.

When reaction schemes are given, only the significant reagents are necessary. Solvents can be omitted as can, in most cases, temperature. The reader can always refer to the original text should they require more experimental information.

3.0 Critical Reviews

Critical reviews should provide a deeper understanding of the topic in hand, yet retain their accessibility through an introduction written for the general reader. They should give a critical discussion of the existing state of knowledge of the subject matter, and while not exhaustive in coverage give a balanced assessment of the current primary literature, normally concentrating on the previous 5–10 years. The implications of recent developments for the wider scientific community should be emphasised and authors should aim to stimulate progress in the field.

Critical reviews must be:

- *Carefully referenced*: 100–150 citations are recommended. References should be selected to give a balanced view of the field but do not need to be exhaustive. Multiple referencing (the use of a, b, etc.) is strongly discouraged
- *Jargon free*: All specialist terms and symbols should be defined. Fundamental ideas should be simply explained

Articles should be of a suitable length to give an in depth discussion of the field but concise writing is encouraged and

manuscripts should normally be between 15 and 25 journal pages in length (18–28000 word equivalents, no more than 75 A4/American quarto pages in length (double-spaced text and artwork)).

A good introduction is of prime importance and should include a historical perspective and set the topic for discussion in the context of current chemical research. The introduction must be accessible to the general chemist. The body of the review should provide an in-depth, critical (yet fair) discussion of the current field and aim to stimulate further research. A section of concluding remarks should include comment on applications or future prospects for the field.

4.0 General Requirements (Tutorial and Critical Reviews)

The style for *Chemical Society Reviews* broadly follows that of RSC primary journals. More detailed guidelines than those below for the submission of final manuscripts can be found in the Instructions for Authors of *Dalton Transactions* or *PCCP* or *OBC*.

Authors must note that review articles must cite material that has already been independently peer reviewed and easily available to the readership from the published literature. **Reviews are not the proper vehicles for publishing new results.** Authors are requested to submit copies of any articles cited that are 'in press' or 'submitted' with the review manuscript.

The author's own work in the field should not be given special emphasis; all significant players in the field should be given equal attention.

Templates are available. The formats of these templates resemble journal layout and are designed to give authors a clearer idea of the length and layout of their final article. Please note that use of the templates is **optional** and not a requirement.

Title and graphical contents entry

Care should be taken to grab the attention of the general reader through the title. Authors are required to supply a black and white graphical contents entry along with a snappy description (30–40 words) of the review. The maximum size for the graphic is 40 × 80 mm. Please see Issue 1, 2004, for examples (www.rsc.org/isis/journals/current/chsocreview/CS042001.pdf).

Abstract

An abstract of 80–100 words should be supplied with the text. Authors should endeavour to write the abstract in such a way as to hold the attention of the general researcher as well as giving sufficient detail for the expert. The communities of scientists to whom the review is applicable should be described. Upon acceptance of the manuscript the Editorial Office may work with the author to refine the abstract.

Artwork

All diagrams should be clear and consistent with the text. Titles should be kept as brief as possible. To facilitate rapid processing of your work and to avoid omissions please ensure that submitted manuscripts clearly indicate the desired location of unnumbered graphics in the text, e.g. <structures 1 to 3 here>.

Colour reproduction is normally provided free of charge if there is a scientifically compelling case for the use of colour. The provision of free colour reproduction is determined by consideration of whether or not the scientific information can be assimilated without the use of colour. If colour is not scientifically justified, then black and white should be used. If there is no scientifically compelling case for the use of colour, but the author prefers colour, then the author will be charged £350/page (+VAT), this being a partial contribution to the additional production costs.

Reproduction of artwork

It is the author's responsibility to obtain permission from other publishers for the reproduction of artwork from other journals and to pay any required fees. This proof of permission must be submitted with the manuscript to ensure that the proper acknowledgement to the original source is given in the published article. Standard permission request forms to aid the author with this are available online.

Tables

The desired style of article and citation limits for tutorial reviews militates against the use of tables. Authors should consider providing the information in diagrammatic form or as a discussion of the important trends in the text. Judicious use of tables in critical reviews is permitted although authors are encouraged to convey the information in alternative formats. **Verbatim repetition of tabular information from already published material is not encouraged.**

If a table is unavoidable, for example to compare and contrast work from different sources, then careful attention should be paid to the format. The information should be easily digestible. The total reference count includes those within tables.

Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI)

Authors are invited to submit supplementary information to the RSC's ESI service. This information will be made freely available.

Cover artwork

One author per issue will be invited to supply full page cover artwork. Authors are welcome to submit suggestions of attractive, chemically relevant and colourful graphics to the Editor with the revised manuscript. Please note that submission of cover artwork does not guarantee that it will be used.

Reviews web site

Authors are encouraged to check our Reviews web site to ensure that they have cited relevant recent reviews: www.rsc.org/reviews

5.0 Submission of Articles

Authors are encouraged to send submissions to the Journal in electronic form using the RSC e-submission service. Articles submitted in this way will be sent for online refereeing whenever possible.

All manuscripts will be fully peer reviewed in line with the journal's aims and the high quality of scientific reporting required by the Royal Society of Chemistry.

Any amendments suggested by the referees or the Editorial Office should be responded to within two weeks of notification. All changes to the original and refutation of referees suggestions/comments should be clearly noted and explained in a covering letter with the revised manuscript.

Online submission of electronic files

Ideally, reviews should be converted from their native word processor format to a single PDF file for e-submission. Submission of a full review in PDF format facilitates online refereeing and allows manuscripts to be handled more accurately and efficiently by the Editorial Office. Further details and guidance are available online

The RSC e-submission service allows any number of files to be uploaded. The following files should be included on submission of review articles.

1. A PDF version of the manuscript as a single file (containing text (including abstract) and figures)
2. Data for deposition with the ESI service (if appropriate, see Section 4)
3. Details of any relevant in press submission (please give reference or include PDF file)
4. Names of potential referees
5. A black and white photograph of each author (or a group shot) supplied as a.tiff file at a resolution of greater than 300 dpi
6. A brief (approx. 50 words) biography of each author
7. Completed permission request forms (if necessary, see section 4)

As part of the submission procedure you will be asked to agree to a License to Publish. Alternatively a form may be forwarded to the Editor by fax or post (www.rsc.org/is/journals/current/copic.htm)

After e-submission your file will be acknowledged by the Editorial Office as soon as possible. Authors should contact the Editorial Office if they have not received an acknowledgement within 4 working days. Authors should not forward more than one version of their manuscript to avoid errors in manuscript handling by the Editorial Office.

For manuscripts submitted online a printed copy of the manuscript will **not** be required. Review articles commissioned following acceptance of a synopsis should be submitted as electronic files using the manuscript reference number and password assigned to the synopsis and NOT as a new article. Please contact the Editorial Office if you do not have your manuscript number and password.

Requirements for revised articles and material for proof preparation

Electronic submission of revised manuscripts is strongly preferred. Revised manuscripts sent by post can be accepted on 3.5 inch disk, ZIP disk or CD-ROM and should be accompanied by a printed copy of the manuscript. Please ensure that the electronic version is identical to the hardcopy. At this stage the native file types should be submitted, along with a PDF if possible.

If an article is accepted for publication, a MS Word (or similar native format) version of the manuscript and separate copies of the artwork in TIFF, EPS or Chemdraw (.cdx) formats will be required at that time for proof preparation. Unfortunately PDF files and MS Word files containing encapsulated figures are **not** suitable for proof preparation.

Further advice on submission of revised manuscripts and files for proof preparation is available online.

6.0 Solicitation of Articles

The majority of reviews will be solicited by members of the Editorial Board in accordance with the policy of the Editorial Board. However, the Editorial Office welcomes suggestions for reviews that would be suitable for the journal.

To aid the Editorial Board judge the suitability of a proposed review for the journal, all authors should submit a synopsis. The aim is not to provide an extra burden for the author, but to ensure the article will appeal to the journal's intended readership and to reduce the overall time and work needed in the preparation of the final manuscript. **Acceptance of the synopsis by the Editorial Board does not guarantee publication of the final manuscript.**

Submission of synopses

A synopsis pro-forma is available from the Editorial Office via csr@rsc.org

The synopsis should include:

- A paragraph explaining the current importance of the field, its implications for the wider scientific community, and the communities of readers who will find the article of interest
 - A structured synopsis of the review, giving section headings and expanding on each of these
 - A few (8–10) sample references to indicate its breadth and timeliness
 - A brief *curriculum vitae* of the leading author
- Synopses should be returned to the Editorial Office in electronic form as a MS Word file (or a similar native format).

7.0 Editorial Office

Dr Clare Bostock-Smith
 Managing Editor,
 Chemical Society Reviews,
 Royal Society of Chemistry,
 Thomas Graham House,
 Science Park, Milton Road,
 Cambridge, UK CB4 0WF

Tel: +44 (0)1223 420066
 Fax: +44 (0)1223 420247
csr@rsc.org