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**Abstract-** Abstracts should be up to 300 words long and provide a succinct summary of the article. Although the abstract should explain why the article might be interesting, the importance of the work should not be over-emphasized. Citations should not be used in the abstract. Abbreviations, if needed, should be spelled out. For original research, we suggest that (if applicable) abstracts are structured into **Background, Methods, Results,** and **Conclusions.**

**Keywords:** Authors should supply up to eight relevant keywords that describe the subject of their article. These will improve the visibility of your article.

# Introduction

The format of the main body of the article is flexible: it should be concise, making it easy to read and review, and presented in a format that is appropriate for the type of study presented. A Research Article should be no more than 20,000 words.

For most Research Articles, the following standard format will be the most appropriate:

* Introduction
* Methods
* Results
* Conclusions/Discussion

## *Sections*

Use section and subsection commands to organize your document. handles all the formatting and numbering automatically. Use ref and label commands for cross- references.

## *Tables*

Use the table and table data commands for basic tables — see Table 1, for example.

**Table 1. An example of a simple table with caption.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| First name | Last Name | Grade |
| John | Doe | 7.5 |
| Richard | Miles | 2 |

**Figures**

You can upload a figure (JPEG, PNG or PDF) using the files menu. To include it in your document, use the include graphics command (see the example below in the source code).

Please give figures appropriate filenames eg: figure1.pdf, figure2.png.

Figure legends should briefly describe the key messages of the figure such that the figure can stand alone from the main text. However, all figures should also be discussed in the article text. Each legend should have a concise title of no more than 15 words. The legend itself should be succinct, while still explaining all symbols and abbreviations. Avoid lengthy descriptions of methods.

For any figures reproduced from another publication (as long as appropriate permission has been obtained from the copyright holder — see under the heading ’Submission’), please include a line in the legend to state that: ’This figure has been reproduced with kind permission from [include original publication citation]’.



**Figure 1. Your figure legend goes here; it should be succinct, while still explaining all symbols and abbreviations.**

**Lists**

You can make lists with automatic numbering . . .

• For bulleted lists

(1) For numbered lists

**Methods**

Methods should include a brief discussion of allowances made (if any) for controlling bias or unwanted sources of variability, and the limitations of the datasets.

**Results**

This section is not essential for Web Tool papers.

**Discussion**

The discussion should include the implications of the article results in view of prior work in this field.

**Conclusions**

Please state what you think are the main conclusions that can be realistically drawn from the findings in the paper, taking care not to make claims that cannot be supported.

**Data (and Software) Availability (Mandatory for Scopus Q1 Publications)**

All articles must include a Data Availability statement, even where there is no data associated with the article

If you have deposited your datasets or used data that are already available in a repository, please include the name of the repository, the DOI or accession number, and license. This should be done in the style of, for example:

Repository: Confounding factors considered by studies of vaping as a possible gateway to smoking.

https://doi.org/10.5256/repository.4591.d34639.

This project contains the following underlying data:

* Data file 1. (Description of data.)
* Data file 2. (Description of data.)

Data are available under the terms of the Creative Commons Zero "No rights reserved" data waiver (CC0 1.0 Public domain dedication).

Use the website for Data Availability: (1) <https://datadryad.org/stash> (Excel Sheet)

(2) <https://figshare.com/> (Charts, Word, Figures)

For articles which have no associated data, the statement should read:

* “No data are associated with this article.”
* For articles where all associated data are presented in the article itself, please include the statement:
* “All data underlying the results are available as part of the article and no additional source data are required.”
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All studies involving humans (individuals, human data or material) must have been conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki. Approval must have been obtained for all protocols from the authors’ institutional or other relevant ethics committee (Institutional Review Board, IRB) to ensure that they meet national and international guidelines. Details of this approval must be provided when submitting an article, including the institution, review board name, and permit number(s).

Ethics approval must be obtained before the research is conducted; retrospective approval can usually not be obtained and it may not be possible to publish the study.

**Author contributions**

In order to give appropriate credit to each author of an article, the individual contributions of each author to the Manuscript should be detailed in this section. We recommend using author initials and then stating briefly how they contributed.

**Competing interests**

All financial, personal, or professional competing interests for any of the authors that could be construed to unduly influence the content of the article must be disclosed and will be displayed alongside the article.

**Grant information**

Please state who funded the work discussed in this article, whether it is your employer, a grant funder etc. Please do not list funding that you have that is not relevant to this specific piece of research. For each funder, please state the funder’s name, the grant number where applicable, and the individual to whom the grant was assigned. If your work was not funded by any grants, please include the line: ‘The author(s) declared that no grants were involved in supporting this work.’

**Acknowledgements**

This section should acknowledge anyone who contributed to the research or the article but who does not qualify as an author based on the criteria provided earlier (e.g. someone or an organisation that provided writing assistance). Please state how they contributed; authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements section.

Please do not list grant funding in this section.

**References**

1. J. M. Smith and A. B. Jones. Book Title. Publisher, 7th edition,2012.
2. A. B. Jones and J. M. Smith. Article Title. JOURNAL title, 13 (52):123–456, March2013.

References can be listed in any standard referencing style that uses a numbering system (i.e. not Harvard referencing style), and should be consistent between references within a given article.

**For Scopus Q1 (Open Review)**

**We ask our authors to provide reviewer suggestions because we believe that they are best placed to identify the most appropriate expert reviewers, within the appropriate field of research. Hints and Tips for Finding Reviewers**

To help you identify suitable reviewers, we’ve compiled a list of methods:

* To assist authors in identifying suitable reviewers, we provide a Reviewer Finder Tool. Our algorithm analyses the submission and provides a ranked list of reviewer candidates based on leading authors of related published studies. Authors can access this tool via the 'Suggest Reviewers' link next to submitted and published articles in the Submissions section in My Research. As this is an automatically generated list of potential reviewers, authors must use their own judgement to determine if the suggested reviewers have the appropriate expertise to review the article.
* Searching abstracting and indexing databases such as Google Scholar, PubMed, Web of Science and Scopus (or other subject-specific literature databases) for recent articles with specific keywords can help you to identify authors currently working in the same field as yourself, and who may be suitable to review your article.
* As an expert in your area of research, you will likely be aware of prominent laboratories whose staff may be suitable to review your articles - try searching their website for potential reviewers. You can also search for specific experts with whom you have no recent collaborations, as they or their postdocs may be suitable to review.
* Journal/Author Name Estimator and other similar tools can help to identify authors who have published related articles. (Link: <https://jane.biosemantics.org/>)