

Publishing Without Perishing: A Handbook for Graduate and Professional Students on Publishing in Bioethics and the Medical Humanities

Third edition edited by
Stephen R. Latham and Alison Jost
American Society for Bioethics and Humanities
Copyright (c) 2009 American Society for Bioethics and Humanities

Second edition edited by
Carolyn Ells and Tatjana Hugle
Student Interest Group
Society for Health and Human Values
Copyright © 1997 Society for Health and Human Values

First edition edited by
Rachel Ankeny Majeske and Susan McIntosh
Student Interest Group
Society for Health and Human Values
Copyright © 1994 Society for Health and Human Values

All rights reserved, including the right to reproduce this book or portions thereof; for written permission, contact the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, 4700 W. Lake, Glenview, IL 60025-1485; Phone: 847/375-4745; Fax: 847/375-6482; Email: info@asbh.org

Contents

Preface to the 3rd Edition

Preface to the 2nd Edition

Preface to the 1st Edition

Advice on Getting Published

- I. Introduction: Writing and Career *by Stephen R. Latham*
- II. Choosing a Journal *by Howard Brody*
- III. The Process of Editorial Review *by Robert F. Weir*
- IV. Writing Ethics Articles for Nursing Journals: Helpful Hints *by Judith A. Erlen*
- V. When You Get That Rejection Letter *by Thomas H. Murray*
- VI. Writing a Medical Ethics Case *by Albert R. Jonsen*
- VII. Bioethics Writing as a Shared Cooperative Activity: Some Notes on Its Joys and Terrors *by Hilde Lindemann and James Nelson*
- VIII. Writing an Unsolicited Book Review *by Ronald A. Carson*
- IX. Writing for Law Reviews *by Stephen Latham*
- X. Pitching a Book Idea *by Hilde Lindemann*

Journal Listings

Individual Journal Listings

Student-edited Health Law Journals

Index to Journals

Bibliography of Resources

Preface to the 3rd Edition

One year after the Society for Health and Human Values (SHHV) produced the 2nd Edition of this *Handbook*, the SHHV merged with the American Association of Bioethics (AAB) and the Society for Bioethics Consultation (SBC) to form the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities (ASBH). In the decade that has followed, the basics of academic publication have not actually changed too much; very little of the advice in the 2nd Edition's chapters has "dated." What has changed, and drastically, is that journals now have homes, accept manuscripts, exchange correspondence, and in many cases publish, on the Web.

The updating for this edition is of three main sorts: First, a few new chapters have been added—one on book proposals, one on law-review publication, and one (the crass introduction) on writing for career-advancement. Second, already-existing chapters were updated in minor ways to reflect such things as the formation of ASBH, the changed roles and titles of the contributing authors, and the move from snail- to e-mail. Third and most importantly, the extremely useful material on the characteristics of different bioethics and medical humanities journals has been updated to reflect the foundation of many new journals across many fields, and re-formatted to suit the Internet age. Happily, too, the *Handbook* has been given a home on the ASBH website, where it can be maintained and updated more easily than in "hard copy." If any journal has been left out, mischaracterized, or otherwise treated unjustly, we urge you to contact us with correct information so that we can make the necessary amendments and edits.

Stephen Latham would like to thank Sarah Peterson, JD, for her early assistance in the updating process.

Stephen R. Latham and Alison Jost, C-editors

Preface to the 2nd Edition

This *Handbook* is a project of the Student Interest Group (SIG) of the Society for Health and Human Values (SHHV). The first edition of this *Handbook* (1994) proved itself to be a useful resource for graduate and professional students interested in publishing in bioethics and medical humanities journals. As journals frequently revise their editorial addresses, statements of purpose, and review procedures, and new resources for writing and publishing frequently become available, the need was recognized for a second edition of the *Handbook*.

We have retained the original format of the *Handbook*. However, each of the three sections has been revised and updated. In the first section, some of the essays offering advice on writing and getting published are revised by their authors. We are pleased to include one new article by Hilde Lindemann Nelson and James Lindemann Nelson on collaborative writing. In the second section, 28 journal listings are revised and 6 journal listings are included for the first time. We dropped *Philosophical Books* from the journal listings because it publishes only invited book reviews. In the third section, the bibliography of resources is revised and updated and some Internet sources are added. Information obtained about individual journals for the first edition of the *Handbook* was collected in August and September of 1994 by survey to journal editors and information published in recent issues of the journals. Information obtained for this second edition of the *Handbook* was collected in May through July 1997 by survey to journal editors. In the section on individual journal listings, we indicate both new and revised journal listings. Where surveys were not returned, we reprinted the information obtained in 1994. While the individual journal listings are not exhaustive of potential publication opportunities, we attempt to include all relevant journals focusing on some aspect of bioethics and medical humanities. Some relevant journal listings are omitted because surveys were not returned by editors. Inevitably, some relevant journals have been overlooked. There are also many journals of broader focus (for example *JAMA*, in clinical medicine, and *Isis*, in history) that regularly publish articles on bioethics or medical humanities which are not included due to limited space.

We wish to thank SHHV and its SIG for their commitment to graduate and professional students in bioethics and medical humanities. Significantly, we wish to thank the Executive Council of the SHHV for providing a grant which fully supported the publication of the second edition of the *Handbook*. Others to whom we are grateful for their assistance with this project are those who contributed original articles, those editors who responded to our survey, and Rachel Ankeny Majeske and Tim Callahan for their encouragement and suggestions.

Carolyn Ells and Tatjana Hogle, Coeditors

Preface to the 1st Edition

The purpose of this *Handbook* is to provide helpful information in a consolidated form for individuals interested in publishing in bioethics and the medical humanities. It was prepared in response to suggestions that arose in discussion at the Student Interest Group (SIG) section at the 1993 meeting of the Society for Health and Human Values (SHHV). Many students expressed the desire to receive more guidance in a number of areas, including how to begin submitting articles for publication in journals. Bioethics and medical humanities are particularly tricky fields in this regard; although students in some programs of study receive input on these topics from their faculty advisors, many students with interests in these fields either are isolated in departments where the primary program focus is not directly related to bioethics or medical humanities (for example, students with an interest in clinical medical ethics who are enrolled in philosophy departments) or are in professional programs where opportunities to present and publish papers may be limited (for example, medical or nursing schools). Therefore, this *Handbook* is targeted primarily at students, although it may also be of use to junior faculty members; our hope is that it will support current student members as they pursue careers in these fields.

It must be remembered that there is no magical formula for getting a paper published. Not surprisingly, the advice and information contained in this *Handbook* is sometimes contradictory or may not be helpful to you in your particular situation; accordingly, use your own judgment (along with advice from a mentor) to pick and choose what seems most useful.

The *Handbook* has three sections: (1) short, original articles written by SHHV members from around the country on various aspects of getting published; (2) results of a survey of journals that publish in bioethics or medical humanities; and (3) a selectively annotated bibliography of resource materials that may prove helpful when you begin to write for publication. Although much of the information in sections two and three is publicly available, this *Handbook* has attempted to collect and organize it, particularly since bioethics and medical humanities are highly interdisciplinary fields and the information is thus very scattered.

Note also that publishing in journals is not the only means of having your work read or your name recognized, although journal articles typically form an important part of many hiring decisions and most tenure requirements. Take advantage of opportunities to present papers, such as departmental colloquia and professional meetings, particularly those with a student interest group. Submit your work to a paper prize competition (such as SHHV), a call for papers, or a graduate student publication. Volunteer to assist faculty members in writing book chapters or refereeing articles, or make it known that you are willing to write book reviews. The “Index to Journals” in this *Handbook* focuses specifically on journals that accept submissions other than regular articles, such as book reviews, critical reviews, and case studies; these types of writing are alternative ways to get experience with the publishing process.

We owe a debt of gratitude for assistance with this publication to a number of people, but especially: the Executive Council of SHHV for providing a grant which supported publication of the *Handbook*, and in particular Joel Frader and Tom Murray for their frequent advice and moral support; Cheryl Kilday and Jackie Kenney of Degnon Associates; Beth Ann Pischke of the Center for Medical Ethics, University of Pittsburgh; the contributors of the original articles; the journal editors who responded to our survey; and all of the SHHV members who simply communicated their support of our pursuit of this project. Please contact SHHV for more information on joining the organization and the SIG. We also welcome comments on any aspect of the *Handbook* and hope that it allows you to “publish without perishing”!

Rachel Ankeny Majeske, Coeditor

Stephen R. Latham, J.D., Ph.D. is Deputy Director of the Interdisciplinary Center on Bioethics at Yale University.

Introduction: Writing and Career

Stephen R. Latham

This *Handbook* is centrally designed to be of use to people who are just beginning a career in bioethics or medical humanities, or who are just finishing an education designed to set them up for such a career. This focus means that it only talks about a certain kind of writing—the kind of writing that “counts,” in the eyes of outside reviewers such as senior faculty, hospital administrators, and foundation staff, as c.v.-enhancing. There are poets and fiction-writers in bioethics and medical humanities, and there may even be a few lucky people for whom published poetry and fiction “count” in the sense mentioned above—but this *Handbook* isn’t for them. Nor does it deal with blogging, op-ed writing, or writing for institutional newsletters. Of course, career bioethicists and medical humanists—including straightforward academics and clinical consultants—blog and write op-eds and contribute to their institutional newsletters all the time. These are worthwhile activities. They can give the writer fame and real-world influence. They can earn the writer “points” for good institutional citizenship. But they aren’t the main ratchet for career. The main ratchet is “serious” publication—of book reviews, of case studies, and above all of original full-length articles—in peer-reviewed journals, law-reviews, and books. That’s what this *Handbook* is about.

Bioethics and medical humanities live in the interstices of several disciplines, and it’s astonishing how disparate the publication expectations in those different disciplines can be. Philosophy departments are suspicious of multiple authorship, medical schools of solo efforts. The tenure case for a philosopher-ethicist may consist of a half-dozen well-placed articles; a physician-ethicist may need dozens. Law schools and medical schools commonly don’t expect a tenured professor to have written a book; humanities departments often do. An academic medical

center may value medical-venue publications far more than publications in elite humanities journals. Medicine, sciences and some social sciences have been eager to adopt quantified proxies for publication quality: the “impact factors” of the journals in which you’ve published, the number of times your writings have been cited by others, the number of times your articles have been downloaded from web-based working-paper sites like the Social Science Research Network. At least some law schools seem also to be moving in that direction. But humanities departments have been more skeptical about such quantifications, and remain more apt to rely on customary disciplinary ideas about journal quality. And apart from these disciplinary variations, there are also wide variations among colleges, universities and health systems, in terms of the expectations they have for publication and for balance among research, service, patient-care and educational activities.

If, therefore, there is one cardinal rule for career-advancing publication in bioethics and medical humanities, it is: “Know your audience.” Find out, as early as you can, what the expectations are for the career, in the field, in the institution, where you want to work. How much publication is expected of you, and in what sorts of venues? Some of these judgments you can make on your own. If you want to be hired as a hospital ethics consultant, for example, it might not be the best strategic choice to publish primarily in history and philosophy, as opposed to medical or nursing, journals. But there’s no substitute for asking the actual people who will exercise judgment over the progress of your career. If you’re a junior law professor, you’ll want to find out whether your senior colleagues value medical journals, or whether they regard them as trivially short and poorly-sourced. And the only way to find out is to ask.

This is particularly true in cases where a bioethics program or department sits in one sort of environment (typically a medical center), but is full of scholars from another sort (philosophers, lawyers, medical historians, MA-trained clinical consultants). You need to ask the right people—that is, the people who will actually be judges in your case—what the relevant standards are.

When you ask, you may find out that there is not a solid answer—or that there are as many different solid answers as you have senior colleagues! This is an intolerable situation; you can't manage your career properly if the standards for your evaluation haven't been set. In such a situation, you need to find a mentor—a senior colleague or department administrator—to work on your behalf to establish clarity of expectations.

All of this may make your task sound threatening or unpleasant. But it's not. There are few people more privileged than those who get to establish a career, in part, by working with and writing about ideas; and the ideas in interdisciplinary fields like bioethics and medical humanities can be particularly exciting. Bioethics and medical humanities also offer more opportunity than even other interdisciplinary fields to mix reflection with practice, and to allow them to inform one another. No, the point of the admonition to get yourself and your colleagues straight about the standards by which you'll be judged is not to induce depression, but to encourage realism and action. Thereafter, with the help of this *Handbook*, you'll know where you're going, and you'll be on your way.

Howard Brody, M.D., Ph.D., is Director of the Institute for Medical Humanities and Professor of Family Medicine in the John P. McGovern Centennial Chair at University of Texas Medical Branch.

Choosing a Journal

Howard Brody

The ideal circumstance for a student preparing an article for publication is to be working closely with an experienced mentor who might also participate as a coauthor or senior author of the paper; a mentor will generally be able to offer the best advice on submitting a manuscript to the proper journal. Absent such a relationship with a mentor, the following observations may be valuable guidelines.

Identify the Audience

Most authors begin by thinking of a journal in which they would like their paper to appear based on considerations such as prestige, speed of publication, and so on. The editor of a journal looks at the manuscript very differently, and first asks: will this paper be of interest to our journal's audience? The casual reader of a journal may have little idea exactly of whom the audience consists, and so will have difficulty knowing where to send a manuscript. Often, brief editorial statements of a journal's purpose and instructions for authors give little advice on this score, although one should always check these sources.

Papers of interest to members of the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities (ASBH) and others in the fields of bioethics and medical humanities will generally be published in journals that can be classified under four general categories:

(1) Journals aimed at clinical practitioners in medicine, nursing, dentistry, and the various health professions will periodically run articles on ethics and humanities topics. Virtually all of these journals aim at one single discipline, and often at one particular subspecialty within that discipline; doctors generally do not read nursing journals, nor do oncology nurses read journals focused on maternal-child nursing.

(2) Some journals appeal specifically to educators of health professionals, and again are often specific to a discipline, although this type of journal is less likely to aim only at one subspecialty. Articles on teaching ethics and humanities often appear in these journals.

(3) Disciplinary journals in the humanities are aimed at teachers and scholars in those respective disciplines. These journals will occasionally print papers about the medical or health care aspects and applications of that discipline.

(4) Finally, some journals specifically will address the medical and health care humanities. These are the journals that will be read most regularly by members of organizations like ASBH, but they will be read much less often by either health care practitioners or scholars in the relevant humanities discipline.

As the above survey shows, sending an article to a journal of any one of these types will assure that there are a number of readers who will not see the article. A careful assessment of who you want to read the article, and who will be much less interested, is necessary to assure a good match with a journal. An article may, by its nature, have a natural audience, which will in turn suggest a small number of journals that might wish to print it. Alternatively, an article in the draft stage might be open to any of a number of “slants” or “spins” so as to make it more suitable for a particular target audience of the author’s choice. For instance, a paper on informed consent might, with fairly minor rewriting, be made applicable to an audience of emergency physicians, an audience of gastroenterologists, or an audience of hospital nurses.

If an article is rejected by one journal, you may wish to submit it as it stands to another journal; however, it will almost always be worth your while to carefully assess how the audience of journal A is different from that of journal B, and introduce some editorial changes to reflect the change in audience, even if they are only minor adjustments of wording.

Which References Are Cited?

If you are in doubt as to where to submit a paper, it is often helpful to review your list of references. If a substantial number come from a particular journal, it might be the journal that

would logically publish the piece. Be aware of the “conversation” on a particular topic that has been occurring in the pages of a particular journal, and think of how your paper might constitute an ongoing part of that conversation.

This advice is hardly infallible. Sometimes editors come to think that they have had enough papers on a particular topic, and start rejecting new manuscripts on that topic, even if they are of high quality, lest their readers get tired of that subject. Under such circumstances, it is better to pick a journal for which your topic will be novel; however, you will seldom, if ever, know about such decisions until your paper is rejected.

Obviously, you can make these judgments much more readily if you have been a regular reader of the journal in question. If you have not, it never hurts to scan one to two years’ worth of the journal’s tables of contents.

What Is the Journal’s Acceptance Rate?

As a relatively new author with less of a publication track record, you will have to assume that your paper might not be fully competitive in the very top journals. An attractive journal for you might be one that is known to accept a relatively higher percentage of articles that are submitted. Unfortunately, for obvious reasons, journals are unlikely to openly disclose this information. Such matters are usually transmitted around a field by word of mouth, and an experienced mentor again comes in handy in this regard. Attending a meeting of a professional organization such as ASBH is a valuable opportunity to become part of the field’s grapevine and to learn such information, which is also why so much of the valuable learning at such meetings occurs in the corridors and around the coffee pot, and not in the sessions proper. It is especially useful to talk with other student members and find out where they have successfully published. A journal’s prestige is usually inversely proportional to its acceptance rate, which is not a problem for the average student-author. When you are just starting in the field, it looks very good if you have been published anywhere. No one expects that you will break immediately into the top journals. Nonetheless, it is important to bear in mind that student papers have been published

in excellent journals, so you should not underestimate the value of your own work if you have reason to believe that it is truly top caliber.

Let the Editor Know

It is probably not politic to start a cover letter or an e-mail accompanying your manuscript by saying, “I am sending my paper to your journal because I have heard that you will print anything.” But other than avoiding such straightforward statements, there is no reason to be shy when communicating to a journal editor when you have done your homework about the journal. Include as part of your letter the reasons why you think your paper will interest the journal’s audience and how the paper further develops themes that have been previously discussed in the journal’s pages.

Getting Critical Feedback

Some journals get a reputation for quickly reviewing manuscripts and giving very detailed critical comments to the author. These journals, not surprisingly, tend to get a lot of submissions. Authors reason that even if they have little chance of acceptance by that journal, they will not be put very much behind schedule and also will get some very useful advice on revising the paper for another journal.

Since journal editors are not dumb, they are very much alert to how they can be “used” by authors, and they especially resent any indication that a rough draft rather than a polished manuscript is being submitted or that a paper is being submitted with anything short of serious intent. For an author just starting a career, the critical feedback received from an unsuccessful journal submission can be an extremely valuable learning experience, even if not exactly ego-boosting. But in fairness to editors, and especially to the unpaid referees who spend much of their own time reviewing manuscripts, be sure that you have pursued other, local channels for getting critical feedback first, and that the paper which you submit is truly the best version that you can produce.

Conclusion

Although there is no foolproof method for assuring that your submission will get published, picking an appropriate journal is an important initial step. In order to choose an appropriate journal, consider your paper's audience and referenced literature, and do your homework concerning the requirements of any journal that you are considering. Make sure you get as much local critical feedback as possible before submission, and write a personalized letter to the editor to accompany your submission to clarify why you think your manuscript is appropriate for the journal. Following all of these suggestions can help to increase your chances of publication success.

Robert F. Weir, Ph.D., is Professor Emeritus in the Departments of Pediatrics and Religious Studies at the Program in Biomedical Ethics and Medical Humanities of the University of Iowa's Carver College of Medicine.

The Process of Editorial Review

Robert F. Weir

Given the interdisciplinary nature of biomedical ethics and medical humanities, professionals in those fields publish in a variety of journals. Some of the publishing is, of course, in mainstream bioethics and medical humanities journals such as the *Hastings Center Report*, the *American Journal of Bioethics*, the *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, *Literature and Medicine*, *The Journal of Clinical Ethics*, the *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, the *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, *Bioethics*, *Medical Humanities*, the *Journal of Medical Humanities*, the *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, and so on. Other publications by persons in the field appear in leading medical journals (especially the *New England Journal of Medicine* and *JAMA*), specialized medical series (for example, the various *Clinics* series), law journals, philosophy journals, nursing journals, history journals, science journals, journals in the behavioral and social sciences, journals in religious studies, and journals of literature.

Invited Papers

Many of these publications occasionally solicit papers from individual authors on a particular topic. An invited paper is sometimes the only paper on a particular topic which is published in the journal. At other times, an invited paper is one of several papers devoted to a selected topic in a thematic issue of the journal. Either way, an invited paper usually does not go through a regular peer review process: it will be reviewed by at least one person who was involved in selecting the theme, and it will be revised according to the recommendations of a copy editor, but often it will not be sent to outside reviewers for their assessment of its quality and contributions to the field.

Initial Review Process

By contrast, most of the publications in the field of biomedical ethics and humanities go through a review process similar to the review process of publications in other fields. (Law reviews are the notable exception; see the chapter on publishing in law reviews, below.) The review process typically has several steps or levels of review. An initial review is done “in house” to screen out manuscripts that are clearly unacceptable to the editors of the journal. Unsolicited manuscripts may be judged unacceptable for a variety of reasons:

1. the obviously poor quality of the paper;
2. the topic of the paper (for example, a paper that addresses a topic that clearly lies outside the journal’s agenda or mission or on a topic that is judged not to be of sufficient interest to the journal’s readers);
3. the length of the paper (medical journals, in particular, often have inflexible standards for length);
4. the idiosyncratic nature of the paper’s content or style; or
5. the author’s failure to include statements required by the journal (for example, author responsibility, financial disclosure, or assignment of copyright).

Outside Reviewing

For a paper that passes the initial screening decision, the next step in the review process usually involves assigning the paper to a section editor. The section editor, in turn, sends the paper to two or three readers who are selected because of some combination of the following factors:

1. they are on the journal’s editorial board;
2. they have previously agreed to be reviewers for the section;
3. they have recognized special interests in and knowledge of the topic that the paper addresses;
4. they are recognized as authorities in the field; and/or
5. they are professional friends of the section editor.

Depending on the practices of particular journals, the readers may be contacted in advance to see if they have the time and interest to do the review, or they may simply get an unexpected manuscript in the in-box to review by a given deadline.

The reviewers of a paper submitted for publication are usually asked to address specific questions or topics in their review, with the particular questions or topics differing somewhat from journal to journal. Rather than giving only a general assessment of the paper as a professor might do with a student's term paper, the reviewers are asked to assess the manuscript according to the journal's assessment criteria. The criteria vary from journal to journal, but a fairly typical assortment includes the following:

1. the importance of the topic being addressed in the paper;
2. the originality of the paper;
3. the timeliness of the topic;
4. the quality of the paper's content;
5. the quality of the writing;
6. the accuracy of any tables or charts;
7. the validity of the paper's conclusion; and
8. the appropriateness of the paper for the journal considering its publication.

Some journals provide review templates with open-ended questions along these lines. Perhaps more commonly, journals ask reviewers to quantify their assessments of the paper on the basis of given criteria. Thus a reviewer may not simply be asked if the paper has originality, but *how original* it is (perhaps on a scale of one to five); not merely if the topic the paper addresses is important, but *how important* the topic is judged to be.

The reviewers of a manuscript are also asked for other assessments regarding the manuscript. For example, a reviewer may be asked to give a numerical assessment of the paper in terms of the chosen criteria, and also may be asked for an overall assessment of the paper, with the options usually ranging from (1) accept; (2) accept after satisfactory revision; (3) reconsider

after satisfactory revision; and (4) reject. Fortunately, reviewers are not given the option of “trash and burn the paper”!

Reviewers’ Comments

Upon completing this assessment of the paper, reviewers are frequently expected to do two more things. First, they are asked to make confidential statements (in one or more paragraphs) to the journal’s editors regarding their assessment of the paper, their specific criticisms of the paper, and their suggestions for improvement, especially if they have indicated that the paper should be reconsidered or accepted after satisfactory revision. These comments are, of course, not passed on to the paper’s author. Second, the reviewers are asked to make criticisms and suggestions that *will* be passed on to the author when the author is later informed of the paper’s “fate” in correspondence from one of the journal’s editors. The purpose of these anonymous criticisms and suggestions is for the author to use these comments to revise and improve the paper, either for resubmission to the same journal or for increasing the chances that the paper may be accepted for publication by another journal.

Depending on the practices of a given journal, the review comments from two or three “peers” of the paper’s author will either be returned to the section editor or to another editor at the journal. If the section editor receives the assessments, he or she is usually expected to add a general or “consensus” assessment of the paper based on the reviewers’ comments and his or her own reading of the paper. All of the review comments are then collected by a journal editor who either makes an independent judgment regarding the acceptance or rejection of the paper or presents the consensus assessment of the paper’s quality and importance to the full editorial staff. Depending on the operations of the editorial staff, the editor who has responsibility for the paper may still have the “make the case” for the paper’s inclusion in a forthcoming issue of the journal.

Additional Factors to Consider

Two additional variables in the review process are worth mentioning. One variable pertains to money. Although most mainstream journals neither pay authors for their papers nor

require payment from authors for publication, a few reputable journals do. For example, a small number of bioethics journals sometimes provide modest payments to authors for papers, and on the other hand, some scientific journals require payments from authors based on the number of journal pages that will be used to publish the paper. The second variable has to do with anonymity and confidentiality. Most, but surely not all, journals take steps to protect the identity of the authors and reviewers. The result is that the authors of papers submitted for editorial review are virtually never told the names of the persons who reviewed the manuscript. By contrast, some journals also go to great lengths to protect the identity of the authors from the reviewers so that the assessments of the paper are masked, while other journals do not attempt to conceal the identities of authors from reviewers at all.

Author Notification

The final part of the review process is the notification sent from an editor at the journal to the author of the paper. If it is a rejection, some editors do a commendable job of making comments specific to the paper that has been submitted. Other editors, for reasons of time or convenience, simply send out e-mails that tell an author that the paper has not been accepted by the journal. For whatever consolation it may be, my guess is that virtually all of the established persons in the field of biomedical ethics have received one or more rejections of both types. The question then becomes: what do you do after receiving such a letter? Revise the paper and resubmit it to another journal-or give up? Such a decision must be made in light of the reviewers' specific comments and preferably in consultation with a mentor or someone else with experience in the field.

Conclusion

When one is just beginning to publish, gaining familiarity with the review process is a helpful way to begin to understand what journal editors look for in a submitted manuscript. Most journals pay special attention to certain aspects of the paper in both the initial, in-house review and the outside review, as outlined above. It is also important as a beginning author to understand

that rejection need not mean failure, but that reviewers' comments can sometimes help to make a good, albeit rejected, paper even better—and perhaps most importantly, ready for resubmission.

Judith A. Erlen, Ph.D., R.N., F.A.A.N. is Professor and Doctoral Program Coordinator, and Associate Director of the Center for Research in Chronic Disorders in the Department of Health Promotion & Development at the University of Pittsburgh School of Nursing.

Writing Ethics Articles for Nursing Journals: Helpful Hints

Judith A. Erlen

Over the last decades there has been a proliferation of clinical and research-based articles on ethics published in the nursing literature. The majority of these ethics papers have been published in the clinical nursing journals. Since nursing is a practice profession, many of the articles apply ethics to clinical nursing practice rather than address the more conceptual or theoretical issues in ethics.

Periodically a nursing journal will devote an entire issue to ethics in general or to a specific ethical issue. Several nursing journals feature regular columns that address ethical issues in nursing practice. Also, *Nursing Ethics*, an international journal that is published quarterly, focuses solely on ethics in nursing. Thus, there are numerous opportunities in nursing journals for one to publish manuscripts on ethics.

Identify a Mentor

Young writers may find that having a mentor to assist them with preparing a manuscript for possible publication is helpful. A trusted colleague with previous publishing experience can serve in this advisory capacity. However, the writer needs to have an understanding with the mentor in order to avoid potential conflicts related to authorship. The mentor can assist the young writer to get started. This person can help the author to clarify ideas and to order ideas in a logical manner. The mentor is often an appropriate person to review early drafts of the manuscript.

Review the Literature

When a prospective author has an idea for a paper that seems to be appropriate for a nursing audience, the way to begin is to review the nursing literature. Conducting a literature review on one's topic using the appropriate nursing, medical, and ethics related databases will help the individual to determine whether papers have been published on a particular topic, and where and when they were published.

A few hours' browsing through the tables of contents of nursing journals is also helpful. This strategy helps the person to identify the focus of particular journals and whether those journals have an interest in ethics. This browsing also assists the prospective author to determine the journal's audience. Is the audience predominantly staff nurses, nurse educators, nurse administrators, nurse researchers, or advance practice nurses?

Likewise, this browsing can help the author to discover whether the journal has recently published an article on a similar idea, and if so, when the paper was published and what the particular slant of the paper was. Also, a quick review of some of the articles in the journal will enable the author to identify the format and style of manuscripts published in specific journals.

Contact the Editor

Writing a query to the editor can be a time saver. In this query the author needs to include a working title, a brief abstract and/or content outline of the proposed article, and the reasons why this paper will be of interest to the readers of that journal.

The editor's reply will provide the potential author with feedback regarding the journal's interest in the topic and may identify that there will be a specific issue devoted to this topic in the near future. The editor may also provide information about previous articles on the same subject or suggest a different slant so that readers will get another perspective on the topic.

In order to save time, the author can send a similar query to several editors. This will help the prospective author to determine which journal is more likely to be interested in the paper. Contacting an editor helps the author to avoid sending the paper to a journal that has little or no

interest in the topic. Authors can also call or e-mail an editor about an idea. Speaking with an editor personally after receiving feedback from the editor and as one is preparing the manuscript can be advantageous, particularly to the young writer. Additionally the prospective author may receive information from the editor concerning the review process for submitted manuscripts.

Obtain Author Guidelines

Frequently, the editor will send a copy of the author guidelines when an author inquires about interest in a possible topic. However, this information is usually available in a back issue of the journal and on the homepage of the journal on the Internet. Guidelines help the writer to organize the paper as well as to present the information. They assist the person preparing tables, figures, and reference lists. They include the format for the abstract and identify whether or not key words are to be identified for abstracting purposes. Also, the guidelines will state the biographical information that is to be included about the author(s). They state the number of copies of the paper to send, as well as whether a copy on a diskette is to be included. There may also be a statement that needs to be included in the cover letter with the completed manuscript that discloses authorship. Writers need to remember that individuals who are named as authors of an article can publicly defend the paper and have made a contribution to the paper.

Know the Target Audience

Knowing who the potential audience will be is very important so that the language and examples used in the manuscript are appropriate. An assessment of clinical relevance is particularly important when one is writing for a staff nurse audience. The author needs to slant the paper toward the issue with which the readers struggle. When the writer is not familiar with a specific area of clinical practice, one can ask expert nurse clinicians who know the particular patient population to review the paper for relevance to the target audience. Sometimes these nurses can provide some examples from their own experience that will enhance the paper and make it more applicable to situations that the readers face in their patients.

Interpreting a Rejection

Do not be discouraged if your paper is not accepted as submitted. Instead revise and resubmit the paper. Reviewer's comments are often very helpful when revising a manuscript. One can ask an individual who has more experience publishing in this area to assist with evaluating the reviewer's comments. This will help the author revise the paper accordingly. A writer needs to remember that the paper may not have been sent to the appropriate journal. A mentor or a respected colleague may be able to assist the writer with finding a more suitable journal.

Summary

When writing an ethics article for possible publication in a nursing journal, the author needs to consider the following points: identify a mentor or trusted colleague to provide support and assistance, review the literature, write a query, obtain the author guidelines, slant the paper toward the target audience. Most importantly, the author is not to be discouraged by a rejection letter; the author needs to revise and resubmit the paper. These suggestions are also helpful when writing for other types of journals.

Writing for publication is hard work. It takes time, much thought, and perseverance. The reward comes in the personal satisfaction of seeing one's work in print.

Thomas H. Murray, Ph.D., is President of The Hastings Center.

When You Get That Rejection Letter...

Thomas H. Murray

Everyone gets rejection letters. Welcome to the club. The question is, what should you do when you get one?

But before I move on to that unpleasant but unavoidable topic, I want to suggest a couple of things that you should do to reduce the likelihood that your manuscript will be rejected.

Avoiding Rejection

Take a good look at the journal. Does it publish articles of the length and general style of yours? Has the journal recently published something on virtually the same topic? (If so, better to send it elsewhere.) Don't use journal editors and peer reviews as your first readers. Ask your colleagues and mentors to give a critical reading of your manuscript before you send it to a journal.

While Waiting for a Response

Once you have sent your submission to a journal that looks appropriate, the single most important thing that you can do while you wait for the response is to start another article. Editors break your heart. At the best journals, they may reject nine out of ten submissions: that leaves nine distraught authors for every happy one. The best way to avoid getting crushed is to have another project under way about which you are excited. If bad news comes, it is about something you have already let go of, at least a little.

When You Receive a Rejection

The bad news comes. Now what do you do? Journals with good editorial policies will send you both the editor's response, most likely a form letter, and if the submission was sent to readers, some version of their comments—perhaps a copy of their reviews, or perhaps excerpts or

paraphrases. Read the reviewers' comments. But take them with a grain of salt. To paraphrase Churchill on democracy, the peer review system is the worst possible one, with the exception of all the others. Reviews can miss the point badly, be dense, occasionally insulting, and often infuriating. (Early in my career I received a rejection from a major journal. The editor said he liked the piece, but one review was sufficiently negative that he could not accept my article. The reviewer in question was anonymous, sort of. This scholar's principle criticism in his review was that I had ignored *the* most important literature in the field, and then proceeded to list a dozen references—all by the same author. Wonder who that reviewer was?) Good reviewers will tell you honestly what they think is good and bad about your piece. Show the reviews along with your submission to someone whose scholarship you respect and who understands what you are trying to say in your piece. Ask them what to take seriously, what is off the wall, and what is spiteful or simply inexplicable.

Whatever else you do, don't be embarrassed and don't bury the piece. Should you send it without revision to another journal? Make minor changes? Do a major overhaul? Chalk it up to experience and go back to the new piece on which you have been working? (Remember my earlier advice.) Should you resubmit to the same journal? The editor's letter will tell you whether a resubmission makes sense. Unless the editor's letter invites a resubmission, move on. Don't let your wounded pride determine the fate of your manuscript. Can you sharpen the piece? Expand its scope to make it more interesting? Tie it more clearly to a currently important controversy? Sometimes it is best to take a deep breath and regard a particular paper as a learning experience. But that should be rare. Most of the time with the help of your colleagues you will find a way to reshape the paper to make it better. Keep in mind where you want to submit it as you revise, then send it off.

Should You Contact the Editor?

It is okay to communicate with editors—but don't whine. The editors of some journals are quite amenable to chatting with an author about whether the journal might be interested in a piece on a certain topic. Editors will not promise a favorable review. But they are often willing to say whether their journal is overloaded with manuscripts on some topic, or potentially interested in manuscripts on another subject. Another time it is okay to communicate with editors is when they fail to meet their own promises about how long they will take to respond to an author. You can call the journal and ask when you can expect to hear from them. Should you write a letter complaining about an editor's decision or the reviewer's comments? Almost never. Editors are not going to say, "Oh, well now I see that you were right all along and I was nothing but a stupid jerk, unable to appreciate the penetrating brilliance of your work." (The word "jerk" may occur to them, but in another connection!)

Conclusion

Even if you receive a rejection, the most important advice of all is to keep writing and keep submitting your manuscripts. The peer review system is often frustrating. But sooner or later, good work tends to float to the surface. Remember the first rule again: always be working on something that excites you. Eventually you will find someone else who shares your excitement.

Albert R. Jonsen, Ph.D., is Emeritus Professor of Ethics in Medicine at the School of Medicine, University of Washington

Writing a Medical Ethics Case

Albert R. Jonsen

Cases are the common coin of medical ethics. Every patient-physician contact takes the form of a case. Cases are studied and discussed among providers, at conferences, and during rounds. In recent years, medical cases in which some ethical question can be raised have appeared in the literature. Persons working in the field of medical ethics have become adept at presenting and analyzing cases. The *Hastings Center Report* has run a section containing cases for many years. Collections of cases are also available. There is even a theory or method of doing ethics, sometimes called “casuistry,” which is based on the nature and analysis of cases.

The Medical Case Format

Early in their education, medical and nursing students learn a format for presenting a case to their professors. In medicine, it is customary to begin with a brief description of the patient, often only gender and age, followed by the “presenting complaint,” the reason why the patient sought medical care. This background is followed by a history of the presenting complaint, a more extensive health history, a description based on the physical examination, and the results of any laboratory or clinical tests that are available. Students depart from this format at their peril. Even experienced physicians typically have it in their minds as they present a case, although they may not follow the format precisely. The purpose of the format is to set out the facts about the patient in an orderly fashion so that the process of clinical decision making, leading to diagnosis and therapy, can proceed.

Medical Ethics Cases

Ethics has had no similar format, although most clinical ethicists have developed some pattern for both written and verbal presentation that seems useful and clear. The ethicist must go beyond the medical format because an ethics case contains information in addition to the medical data, namely principles and values. Some years ago, Mark Siegler, William Winslade, and I developed a format for cases that we thought combined the medical and the ethical components.¹ It is our view that this format should be used whenever an ethics case is presented. The format consists of four topics: (1) medical indications, (2) patient preferences, (3) quality of life issues, and (4) contextual features. We contend that every case, regardless of its particular facts, contains these four topics; if they are reviewed in an orderly fashion, the crucial facts and values are made evident. We propose that when ethicists present cases orally or in writing, they should organize the elements of the case under these topics. Once that is done, the proper ethical analysis of probing assumptions, criticizing arguments, and examining options can begin. Often enough, the way toward resolution of a problem becomes apparent even as the topics are reviewed.

Topic 1: Medical Indications

The topic of medical indications refers to the facts about the patient's pathophysiology that brought him or her to the attention of the physician and that "indicate" the nature of his or her health or disease and the various medical interventions that might help the patient. Essentially, this topic includes all that is presented in the classical medical case format. However, underlying all of these facts are the fundamental ethical principles of beneficence and nonmaleficence. As the patient's condition is explained, the central questions are what can be done to aid him or her medically and what the various risks of proposed action and inaction might be. As this topic is presented, it often becomes obvious that a clear picture of the goals, that is, the goods that are to be achieved, is lacking. That lack may turn out to be the crucial ethical problem in the case, in which case, the case may be resolved through a clarification of goals.

¹ *Clinical Ethics* (McGraw-Hill, 1998, 4th ed.).

Topic 2: Patient Preferences

Patient preferences is the second topic, and refers to all of the information that might be available from the patient or other sources about the patient's choices, purposes, goals, and values. Sadly, this information is often sketchy in modern medical care, sometimes because the patient cannot provide it or sometimes because no one has asked. Also, the various substitutes for direct patient expression, such as surrogate decision makers, living wills, and so on, should be mentioned under this topic. Evidence about mental competency to make decisions is also relevant.

Beneath all of this data lies the fundamental ethical principle of respect for autonomy. The review of patient preferences aims at a clarification of the patient's ability to exercise autonomy and the actual or prior expressions of autonomy that should guide the professional.

Topic 3: Quality of Life

The third topic, quality of life, inquires into the general level of the patient's functioning in his or her life before the current illness, as a result of it, and in the anticipated future, with or without intervention. Some of this information is rather factual, such as descriptions of "ADLs" (Activities of Daily Living); other information is more subjective, reflecting the patient's assessment of his or her state and the providers' evaluation of the condition. Dangers of bias and prejudice must be avoided here. The principle of beneficence is operative under this topic, as well as the utilitarian principle of producing as much good as possible.

Topic 4: Contextual Features

Finally, the topic of contextual features contains any pertinent information about the social setting in which the ethical problem arises and the decision will be made. Many other persons besides the patient will be benefited or harmed by any decision about the patient's care and the consequences of various potential decisions must be assessed. Thus, financial implications, legal issues, and the effects on health resources, families, and providers must be noted. The fundamental principles of justice and fairness often underlie the facts of this topic.

Advantages of this Format

These four topics, then, include both facts and values. It is our contention that every case should be fully described in terms of all four topics before moving to an analysis or resolution. Cases are rarely simply one ethical principle in conflict with another: They are complex mixtures of various principles and values and their interpretation, as well as various interpretations of the so-called “facts.” Thus the full case presentation often can add important pieces of the picture as the case is presented which would otherwise be missed, and also assists participants in seeing the case as a whole.

A casuist believes that the circumstances of any particular case are what give moral relevance and weight to principles. If one is an adherent of casuistry, the case analysis will remain very close to this presentation of topics and a route to resolution of the case will be seen among the details. On the other hand, a principlist will attempt to see which principle takes priority, based on a theoretical ordering of principles. However, whether one is a casuist or a principlist, the case must be laid out for examination by all participants. The four topics provide a format for laying out facts and values in an orderly way. I insist that all of my students, whether graduate or medical, present their cases in this fashion, and I find (and I think they do as well) that the subsequent debates about the ethics of the case are more focused; often enough the participants quickly see the way to reasonable resolution (which may surprise those who believe ethics arguments never can be concluded).

Conclusion

The Roman philosopher and politician Cicero was one of the inventors of the “case method.” He said that a case was the place where particular persons, words, actions, times, and places met. Reflecting on the importance of the case in private and public life, he wrote:

[I]n the performance of duties, we must consider what is most needed in each individual case. In so doing, we discover that the fundamental claims of human morality are not identical in every circumstance²

These different circumstances should be carefully scrutinized in every instance, so that we may become skilled evaluators of duty and perceive where the weight of our duty lies for each person. Each medical ethicist must become a “skilled evaluator of duty” in each of the many and varied cases that come to his or her attention.

² *On Duties*, I, 59.

Hilde Lindemann, Ph.D., is Professor of Philosophy at Michigan State University.

James Lindemann Nelson, Ph.D., is Professor of Philosophy at Michigan State University.

Bioethics Writing as a Shared Cooperative Activity: Some Notes on Its Joys and Terrors

Hilde Lindemann & James Lindemann Nelson

Of the disciplinary streams that contribute to bioethics, it is probably fair to say that collaborative writing is more prevalent among its scientific and social scientific tributaries than its humanistic ones. Multiple author articles are surely found much more frequently in *The Archives of Internal Medicine* than in *The Philosophical Review*, for instance. But collaboration also takes place in bioethical writing when the agenda is more straightforwardly normative, and both real difficulties and real opportunities present themselves here. The difficulties stem from the inherent slipperiness of moral discourse: simply agreeing on how to describe a problem can be terribly difficult, agreeing on what are the most promising ways of going about solving it is equally challenging, and agreeing on what counts as a sound argument for a reasonable conclusion can be flat-out impossible—in fact, these problems are not distinct.

Virtues of Collaboration

On the other hand, the possibility of achieving a shared (and hence, sharable) insight into a moral issue and of shedding what more than one person regards as high candle power illumination on the matter is enormously attractive, both in itself and as a matter of rhetoric. After all, if two or more people have written an ethics article, that suggests that agreement on an argument supporting a position on a controversial issue is not an impossible dream, but a concrete reality. More substantially, approaching writing in ethics as a "shared cooperative activity" (to use a phrase of Michael Bratman's) subjects each participant to a sometimes uncomfortable but generally salutary discipline: each idea, each placement of each idea, each inference from idea to

idea, is scrutinized by more than one person who is deeply concerned that the overall piece hang together. Coauthoring is great for spotting what would otherwise be unnoticed and unargued presuppositions, awkward implications, and obscure prose. And, as many writers feel at some level that they are exempt from such failures, having the contrary pointed out vigorously by someone who shares the labor is no doubt good for our characters.

Collaborative Strategies

There are likely as many ways of collaborating on bioethical articles as there are bioethical collaborators, but let us suggest some of the strategies and tactics we have found useful. Writing together has at least this analogy with being married; there is something to be said for a period of courtship. Shared sympathies are important; if you can "talk ethics" with someone in an extended, productive and satisfying way, writing together might be a natural intensification of that relationship. Moreover, if the collaboration is to be successful, certain of the virtues of marriage must be cultivated—high among them, the virtues of trust, respect, and a willingness to stand corrected. If one doubted one's coauthor's kindness or good faith, writing together might still be possible, but it would certainly be no fun. If one were contemptuous of the coauthor's scholarly abilities, writing together would have no point. And if one were too stubborn or too insecure to take well-intentioned criticisms, not only would the writing process be painful for both parties, but the result would likely satisfy no one. Having established a ground of trust and respect (although we hasten to add that occasional lapses may be expected), and having further done whatever it takes to identify a promising subject and approach, we find that arguing out a fairly complete outline is a crucial part of the project. When we were writing *The Patient in the Family* (Routledge, 1995) together, we would often spend an hour and a half or so in the early morning arguing through the form that a chapter should take, trying to sort out sound from unsound arguments, and figuring out how to place them just so. With the outline for the whole chapter completed, one of us would undertake to write the first draft; the other would do a merciless rewrite; and finally, we would get together and hammer out a final version.

Was this an efficient procedure? Oddly enough, we think so. One virtue of collaborative writing is that deadlines assume a more exigent character; unlike promises to oneself (or to one's editor) they are not written in water. Was it productive of better insight, better argumentation and better writing than would have been achieved by working on our own? This is not for us to say, but each time we've done it, we learned from the other. Was it fun? Decidedly. And excruciating? Definitely. Do we recommend that you stay open for opportunities to give it a try? Indeed, we do.

Ronald A. Carson, Ph.D., is Harris L. Kempner Distinguished Professor at the Institute for Medical Humanities, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston.

Writing an Unsolicited Book Review

Ronald A. Carson

Although many journals depend on invited book reviews, others are willing to consider unsolicited reviews. Since writing a book review is a good way to begin to get experience with the publishing process, here are some guidelines for preparing an unsolicited book review.

Getting Started

Select a book that you want to read. Genuine interest in the subject is the first requirement of a reviewer. It helps to know in advance what the intended audience for the review is. Once you have decided which journal you are targeting, e-mail the book review editor offering to prepare a review, briefly spell out your qualifications, and include a previously published review, if you have one.

Alternatively, write a review and drop it over an editor's transom with a cover note identifying yourself. This latter approach is riskier, but if the review is good, it may land a berth even in journals that do not ordinarily take unsolicited reviews. If you are unsuccessful, you can always try elsewhere. The worst that can happen is that you will join the honorable company of those whose walls are plastered with rejection slips from estimable periodicals.

What a Book Review Should Contain

The primary purpose of a book review is to inform. The reader should take from a review some considerable knowledge of the content of the book being discussed. Thus you may want to give the gist of an argument or a feel for the tone of the work. It may mean putting the book in what you take to be its appropriate historical or cultural context. Another approach is to concentrate on some aspect of the work that you find particularly intriguing or think especially significant. If you take this tack, tell the reader what you are doing and say in so many words why

you are doing it and what you are leaving out of consideration. Never simply sum up the book and leave it at that.

In addition to informing readers, you owe them a critique or a commentary. Conventions of writing differ somewhat from discipline to discipline and profession to profession, so read reviews in the journal in which you wish to be published to get ideas about its approach to reviewing. Generally speaking, your viewpoint should be present in the review and obvious to the reader, whether or not you take issue with the work under discussion. When developing a critique, do not be heavy handed, but spell out what you consider to be the merits and shortcomings of the work. Given the limited length of reviews, it is usually not possible to provide more than a cursory rationale for your critique. This limitation is generally understood and accepted. An effective critique always begins with an appreciation of what the author set out to do. Needless to say, it is the author's ideas that are under consideration. Personal attacks are anathema.

Not all books call for critique. Commentary can be just as instructive and effective. A commentary is a vehicle for highlighting aspects of a work, for singling something out for special consideration, or extending a line of thinking prompted by the work.

Conclusion

Genuine interest, a desire to inform, and a willingness to engage the author of the work under review by means of either critique or commentary are the chief ingredients of a good book review. Add a little luck in sending the review to the right journal, at the right time, and presto, you are "published"!

Stephen R. Latham, J.D., Ph.D., is Deputy Director of the Interdisciplinary Center for Bioethics at Yale University.

Writing for Law Reviews

Stephen R. Latham

Law reviews are radically unlike other venues for academic publication, in two ways: in the style of article that they like to run, and in their method of selecting articles. We'll look at each in turn.

Law Review Style

First, compared to articles in almost any other sort of academic venue, law review articles are long. The *New England Journal of Medicine* wants under 2700 words for an original article; *The Hastings Center Report* around 6000; the *American Journal of Bioethics* no more than 7500 words; the *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* no more than 15,000. By way of contrast, *Harvard Law Review* “gives preference” to articles under 25,000 words long, and will only publish articles of over 35,000 words in “extraordinary circumstances.” And that’s progress—it’s the result of a deliberate and concerted effort by a consortium of leading law reviews to reduce article length back in 2005. Before then, it wasn’t uncommon for a law review article to be 100 journal pages long. Now the average length is hovering below 70 pages, and substantially shorter articles are being run. Relative change aside, however, the absolute fact remains: law review articles are long.

Next, law reviews often operate on the fiction that each article should be a gateway into the entire literature on the subject you’re addressing. Most good law review articles are centrally evaluative: the idea is to make a critical assessment of, *e.g.*, a newly-decided case, a state-law trend, a proposed policy change, or a well-known form of legal or policy argument. Before you can get to that assessment, though, you’re supposed to deliver the entire background story. Your article is supposed to be capable of bringing someone with no familiarity with your issue

completely up to speed. The history of the development of the law to this point, the leading commentary on that development, the setting for the current debate: all of that is supposed to precede and lay the groundwork for your analysis.

Hence, in part, the famous footnotes. Law review editors like them, and law review articles feature them by the score. The general rule of law review composition is, roughly, “Supply citation for every proposition”—and this doesn’t mean only one! Remember, the fiction is that your article will make a novice into an expert on your little piece of the law. You are supposed to accomplish much of that goal in the footnotes. They are meant to be a guide—a comprehensive guide—to the legal literature on your topic. If you say something like, “Only 15 states have laws addressing this issue,” your footnote is supposed to contain citations to all 15 of those state laws—and citations, also, to any law review articles that have ever discussed or evaluated those 15 laws. That way, your reader never has to wonder where to look for any further information on your topic. You’ve mapped out every possible research pathway.

Law review footnotes are also a convenient place to tuck information and arguments to which you want your reader to have access, but with which you don’t want to burden your main text. Like law review articles, law review footnotes are allowed to be very, very long. They’re where you put your excuses (“Consideration of that fascinating related topic is, sadly, beyond the scope of this article.”); your bulk quotations of boring legal materials that your reader may need to reference, but doesn’t actually want to read; consideration of various Ptolemaic secondary and tertiary arguments that don’t fit neatly into your lucid and well-crafted case-in-chief; and citations to misguided, dated or distinguishable literature or precedents that you feel obliged to mention, but not to discuss.

Because footnotes are such an important part of law-review writing style, citation format has become extremely important to law-review editors. The vast majority of law reviews—though not all of them, so you have to check—use the exhaustive guide, *The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation*, written by editors of the Harvard, Columbia, UPenn and Yale law

reviews, published by Harvard Law Review, and (at this writing) in its 18th edition. An electronic version may be purchased online at <http://www.legalbluebook.com/>.

The best way to understand law review style is to read a bunch of law review articles. (Oddly, the reading of law review articles is not a major feature of legal education at most law schools; the practice is confined largely to the faculty—and to the student law-review editors.) Don't read articles at random, though. Read only good ones, by well-respected authors. If you don't already know who those are, find someone to tell you.

Law Review Article Selection

The vast majority of law reviews are edited by students, not by professors. (There are some important exceptions, some of them in the health-law area, discussed below.) Whereas editors of academic journals in philosophy or history or medicine send articles out to expert peer reviewers for evaluation and to make recommendations about article revision, law reviews generally give this task to an overworked pool of second-year law students. The articles editors at law reviews are not experts in every area of law; indeed, they aren't commonly experts in *any* area of law. The editor who'll be evaluating your health-law or bioethics article may never have taken a course in health law or bioethics, and may have no intrinsic interest in the field.

This is both a burden and an opportunity. The burden lies in the fact that inexperienced students, like normal folk, enjoy reading “popular” stuff. Many a law professor has lamented the difficulty of getting student editors to appreciate a fine article on bankruptcy reform or commodity futures regulation. Shallow amateurs, the students prefer ripped-from-the-headlines topical pieces to specialty fare, and tend to appreciate high-flying philosophical riffs rather more than careful doctrinal analysis. The opportunity for you, dear bioethics and health-policy writer, is this: bioethics and health-policy articles often *are* ripped-from-the-headlines topical pieces, and often can include high-flying philosophical riffs. You may be just what they're after.

Editorial review in law journals is normally not blinded: the editors know whose piece they're reading. If they don't know enough about your field to make a confident judgment about

the quality of your work, you can bet that they'll Google you to try to find out something about your reputation and track-record. Well before that stage, though, you have a chance to make a case for yourself, and for your article, in your cover-letter. If the first page of your article is a cover letter, it's not apt to be deleted, and it's very apt to be the first thing your student reviewer will read. Use it to make a case for publication. Tell them who you are and what you've done. Tell them why your article makes an important contribution to the literature. A well-crafted cover-letter can have a profound effect upon the attitude with which your student-editor begins to read and evaluate your work.

Now for the strangest feature of law-review writing: Unlike any peer-reviewed journals, law reviews permit, and to some extent even rely upon, large-scale simultaneous submission of proposed articles to multiple journals. Student editors of law reviews take it for granted that when you send them an article, you've also sent it to a score or more other law reviews. With a good enough article and some luck, an author may get the luxury of choosing among several journals. Of course, some groups of student editors get around to reviewing and accepting or rejecting articles more quickly than others, and this gives rise to the strange game called "expedited review."

Suppose you submit an article to ten journals. Of the ten, *Best Law Journal* ("Best") is the most prestigious, and *Journal of Mediocre Legal Stuff* ("Mediocre") the least. Suppose that the industrious editors of *Mediocre* read your article quickly, and accept it. They give you a week or so in which to make your decision whether you'll publish with them. If you say "Yes," you'll be published. But you haven't yet heard from any of the higher-ranked journals, and you'd rather not enter into a publication agreement with *Mediocre* if you still stand a chance with, say, *Pretty Good Law Review* ("Pretty Good") or—dare you hope it?—*Best*. What to do?

The answer is this: contact *Pretty Good* and ask for "expedited review." If you're bold, you might ask *Best* for expedited review, but the better strategic advice is not to shoot so high—yet. Tell the student editors at *Pretty Good* that you've been accepted by *Mediocre*, but that you'd

really rather publish with them, if they can review and accept your article before your publication offer with *Mediocre* expires. They'll agree: this is the way everyone does it. In fact, many law reviews, and all top-ranked law reviews, routinely accept requests for expedited review, and maintain separate phone lines, e-mail addresses or websites for expedited-review requests. If, after expedited review, *Pretty Good*'s verdict is "No," you accept your original offer to publish with *Mediocre*. But if *Pretty Good* says "Yes," you get another week to think about it—and you get on the horn to *Best*, to try your luck at climbing further up the ladder.

The point of working your way up the ladder gradually is that student editors are thought to be influenced by the publication by which you've already been accepted. The editors at *Best* may scoff at an expedited review request from someone who's merely been accepted at *Mediocre*; but they'll be impressed if the author's been accepted by *Pretty Good*. That's why it supposedly makes sense to work your way up through expedited reviews more or less gradually.

All of this, of course, is predicated on their being some generally-accepted rank-order of prestige for law reviews. And there is such an order, though it's not terribly precise. Roughly speaking, the prestige order for "flagship" law reviews ("*Norwegia University Law Review*") follows the prestige-order for schools. Most schools also publish secondary, special-topic law reviews ("*Norwegia Journal of Law and the Dog*"). These have a similar pecking order among themselves, but rank below the flagship law reviews of their own schools; thus, a publication in the flagship law review of the twenty-fifth best law school in America may be a "better" placement, for tenure, promotion and similar purposes, than a publication in a secondary journal of the third best law school in America. There is a serviceable law-journal rankings list published by Washington and Lee, here: <http://lawlib.wlu.edu/LJ/index.aspx>.

A few law journals don't fit this mold, and some of them are in health law. The *Houston Journal of Health Law and Policy* and the *Yale Journal of Health Policy, Law and Ethics*, for example, are student-edited and accept simultaneous submissions, but submit their articles to expert peer review. The *Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics*, the *Journal of Legal Medicine*, and

the European *Medical Law Review* aren't student-edited, and operate on the classic peer-review model. And finally, in an effort to ensure high-quality content, many of the student-edited health-law journals have set aside one of their numbers annually for a symposium issue on a special topic, to be filled with faculty-invited papers. The career-conscious writer of law-review articles should be aware, though, that senior colleagues will have no idea that some health-law journals are peer-reviewed, and will mistakenly assume that peer-reviewed health-law journals are secondary student-edited law journals, unless you politely tell them otherwise, explicitly and often. And, holding law-school rank constant, invited symposium contributions aren't valued as highly as regular law-review publications.

If you've written a law-review article, don't forget that without too much work, you can write another version of it (shorter, with fewer and shorter footnotes) that's appropriate for a medical or bioethics journal. There is nothing wrong with getting your basic argument out, in different forms, to multiple audiences!

Resources:

These sites facilitate simultaneous electronic submissions of manuscripts to law journals:

1. U.C. Berkeley's *Expresso*, an excellent and informative law-review submission site: <http://law.bepress.com/expresso/>
2. Washington and Lee's site, which both facilitates submissions and includes journal rankings: <http://lawlib.wlu.edu/LJ/>
3. Chase College of Law's submission site: <http://chaselaw.nku.edu/faculty/ejournals.php>

Eugene Volokh's book, *Academic Legal Writing: Law Review Articles, Student Notes, and Seminar Papers*, is a superb student guide to legal academic writing, including law-review style and publication. Foundation Press, 2003. ISBN 1587784777, 9781587784774. 200 pages.

The University of Washington School of Law has a nice set of pages on law-review editing, finding good law-review topics, journal rankings, citations and submissions at: <http://lib.law.washington.edu/ref/lawrev.html>

Hilde Lindemann, Ph.D. is Professor of Philosophy at Michigan State University.

Submitting a Book Proposal

Hilde Lindemann

If your primary appointment is in a medical school or a hospital, you can probably skip this section, as you get rewarded for publishing in peer-reviewed articles, preferably in medical journals, and whatever time you have for research should probably be devoted to that. If, however, your appointment is in another academic unit (a philosophy department, for example), read on.

The best way to get tenure or promotion to full professor in humanities is to publish a book. This is true whether you are in a four-year liberal arts college or a Tier One research university. To achieve this goal, though, you will need to know four things: (1) what the difference is between a book and a dissertation; (2) how to think about your writing so that you actually produce a manuscript; (3) how to submit a book proposal; and (4) what happens after that.

The Difference between a Book and a Dissertation

Roughly, and with plenty of exceptions, of course, the difference between a book and a dissertation is that a dissertation is supposed to demonstrate to your teachers that you know how to contribute, in a sustained way, to a scholarly conversation, while a book is an actual contribution of that kind.

Think of the dissertation as a practice run, best done in the privacy of your own graduate department. It's in the process of writing it that you learn how to do serious research and to structure a sustained argument that engages this research. Because the point of the dissertation is to show that you know what you are doing, one of the first chapters of your dissertation probably consists of a critical, up-to-date review of the literature on your topic. In addition, your director

probably asked you to supply roadmaps for each chapter: “In the last chapter, I (review of the argument so far). I now need to (next step in the argument). This is the next step because (motivate the chapter: why does this matter?) To take this step, I will (strategy for making this part of the argument).” The roadmaps help you to keep track of where you are, but they also signal to your committee that you got there on purpose. The audience for your work is your committee; you are writing the dissertation for them.

A book is a very different genre of writing. It has a much wider audience than the four or five members of your Ph.D. committee. Most scholarly books don’t contain a review of the literature, and if there are roadmaps, they are much more subtle than the ones in a dissertation. The big difference, though, is in the authorial voice. Books are written to one’s peers, not one’s mentors, and while writing them is a wonderful way of continuing one’s own education, they are works of mature scholarship. That means the voice is relatively assured and the arguments don’t rely very heavily on what other authorities have said. For the most part and in general, then, turning a dissertation into a book is too much work to be worth the bother. You are better off just writing the book from scratch.

Writing to Actually Produce a Manuscript

Not everyone is a book writer, even when they are professionally mature (some such people publish books anyway, but these are usually collections of their own essays). To write a monograph, you have to have a book-length idea that you are willing to work out in chapter-by-chapter detail. There has to be a story line, a trajectory of ideas that are related from start to finish so that the book stands coherently as a whole. You should be able to say what that story line is in about four or five sentences, and when you can do that, you are ready to start writing the book.

Because a book takes a long time to write, you have to work at it steadily; once you let it get cold, it’s much harder to keep it going. Here is the only trick I know for doing this: remember that it’s your *job*. You cannot get out of teaching on a given day just because you are not in the mood or you have other pressing matters to tend to, and if you earned your paycheck in any other

way you would also have to do the work, day in and day out, whether you felt like it or not. You should treat your writing the same way. You can usually find two hours a day to devote to your book (try to pick a time of day when you are at your best), and you should make every effort to do that.

Some days, no new pages will get written during those two hours and you might even have to discard what you wrote the previous day. Other days, you will produce a few pages that are keepers. Even if a day's work results in only one good page on average, though, at the end of a year you will have a 365-page manuscript.

The Book Proposal

Once you have completed your manuscript, you are ready to assemble your book proposal. After you have published a book or two, you might be able to interest a publisher in giving you a contract on the strength of your proposal alone, before the book is written, but don't try this your first time out. Publishers want to be sure that you actually can deliver the goods, and the best way to convince them is to give them the goods up front.

Do not, however, send the manuscript along with the proposal unless the publisher's website instructs you to do so; there is time enough for that if the publisher expresses interest in the proposal. *Do* feel free to submit to several different publishers at the same time. Publishers do not like you to do this, because they do not want to invest money in sending the manuscript out for review if they are going to lose out in the end to a rival firm. But why play by their rules, when it's to your advantage to get the best publisher you can, as quickly as you can?

A book proposal consists of:

1. your cv
2. a 5-10 page (double-spaced) chapter-by-chapter summary of the book
3. a table of contents
4. a sample chapter, to give the publisher a feel for your writing style
5. a marketing statement

6. a cover letter

You might also send along the names and contact information of possible referees (of course these are people who you think would write a favorable report). The publisher might ignore your suggestions, but you never know—I have done this twice and it worked both times. The marketing statement usually consists of one or two double-spaced pages in which you explain to the publisher who is likely to buy the book: Bioethicists? Health lawyers? Physicians? Medical sociologists? Publishers love books that are course-adoptable, but do not claim yours is if it really isn't. To be course-adoptable, it must be written for undergraduate readers, at an introductory-enough level so that they would actually get something out of reading it. If it would work at the graduate level, though, by all means say so. In the cover letter—addressed to the person who is listed on the publisher's website as the acquisitions editor for bioethics—you simply say you have written a manuscript you would be happy to send if the editor is interested, and give your 4-5 sentence summary of what the book is about.

What Comes Next

If the editor is interested and asks to see the manuscript, you can expect at least six months to go by while the manuscript is out for review. If you haven't heard at the end of that time, it is perfectly acceptable to email the editor to ask when a decision might be expected. In the event that the decision is unfavorable, you can always ask to see the readers' reports so you can figure out how to strengthen the proposal for the next round of submissions.

But let us suppose the readers were perspicacious enough to see the real merit in your work and you are offered a contract. At this point in the proceedings, publishers used to give authors a thousand dollars or two as an advance against royalties, but almost nobody does that anymore. You probably will, however, receive recommendations for revision, based on the readers' reports. You will then negotiate with the editor over how soon you can make the necessary changes and turn in the manuscript, and you will let the editor know whether you want

to prepare your own index or hire someone to do it (the editor can give you the name of a professional indexer, who will charge you around \$800 for a 100,000-word book).

When the manuscript goes into production, you'll be assigned a production editor, to whom you direct any questions you might have about the process—if you have any ideas about an illustration for the cover, for example, the production editor will probably be the person to discuss them with. The production editor is likely also to be the person who asks you to fill out the author questionnaire, which you need to do as thoughtfully as you can, because this document is what the publishing firm uses to make its marketing and promotion plan for your book. Early in the production process, your book will be sent to a professional copyeditor, who will be in touch about when you can expect to review the editing. It's very important that you be available at the time specified, because if you don't respond to the edits by the deadline you are given, the book could lose its place in the production queue. Later in the process, after the book has been designed and the compositor has created page proofs, you will proofread and, if you are preparing your own index, do the indexing. Here again it's important that you meet your agreed-upon deadlines, or you will delay publication.

It's not unusual for the production of a book to take a year and a half from start to finish. When the book is ready, you will receive anywhere from one to six prepublication copies, and soon after that the book can be ordered in bookstores, on the Internet, and wherever books are sold. Make sure your publisher sends or brings copies to the ASBH book exhibit! And a final word of advice: don't forget to celebrate this major professional triumph.

Individual Journal Listings

Editors' note: What follows are a set of descriptions of journals in bioethics and medical humanities. The list is, of necessity, narrow. It doesn't include the many medical and science journals in which important bioethics and medical humanities articles regularly appear (e.g., *JAMA*, the *New England Journal of Medicine*, the various *Archives*, *Clinics* and *Annals*, the *Nature* family of journals, etc.). Listing all of those journals would be both difficult and pointless, since almost every medical journal runs such articles from time to time, when their subject matter appeals to the journal's audience. These listings also do not include philosophy and ethics journals in which bioethics articles sometimes appear (e.g., *Ethics*, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, *Utilitas*, *Mind*, etc.); nor does it include mainstream law reviews in which such articles appear (again, nearly all of them). It is only a listing of peer-reviewed specialty journals in bioethics and medical humanities, with an appended listing of student-edited health-law-specialty law reviews.

A number of websites provide lists of medical journals with links to their websites. OmniMedicalSearch.com has a list at <http://www.omnimedicalsearch.com/journals.html>. Wikipedia's developing list is here: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_medical_journals. Yahoo has a list here: <http://dir.yahoo.com/Health/Medicine/Journals/>. Lists of law reviews and specialty-areas are available at the University Law Review Project, <http://www.lawreview.org/>; and at Findlaw, <http://stu.findlaw.com/journals/index.html>; and at Washington & Lee University School of Law, <http://lawlib.wlu.edu/LJ/index.aspx>. The blog of the International Network for Philosophy and Bioethics maintains its "motherlode" of links to the tables of contents of scores of philosophy, ethics, bioethics and related journals here: <http://philosophyandbioethics.blogspot.com/2007/03/motherlode-of-philosophy-journal-tables.html>

Requests for changes or updates to these listings should be submitted electronically to Stephen Latham at Stephen dot Latham "at" yale dot edu.

Accountability in Research

<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/08989621.asp>

Editor: Adil E. Shamoo

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: 6,500 words

Accountability in Research: Policies and Quality Assurance is devoted to the examination and critical analysis of systems for maximizing integrity in the conduct of research. It provides an interdisciplinary, international forum for the development of new procedures, standards and policies to encourage the ethical conduct of research for enhancing the validity of research results."

American Journal of Bioethics (AJOB)

<http://www.bioethics.net/journal/>

Editor: Glenn McGee

Frequency: Monthly

Length Limit: 7,500 words

“The mission of the *American Journal of Bioethics* and bioethics.net is to provide the clinical, legal, academic, scientific, religious and broad community-at-large with a rapid but comprehensive debate of issues in bioethics. Our further goal is to inspire and inform research and writing across disciplines, through target articles, peer commentary, book reviews, qualitative research, literary criticism, photography and graphic arts, and comments on developments in law and medical science. In 2007, *AJOB* increased in frequency from 6 issues to 12 issues per year. As part of this expansion, three of the new issues, collectively titled *AJOB Neuroscience*, are devoted to covering critical topics in the emerging field of neuroethics.”

American Journal of Law and Medicine

<http://www.aslme.org/pub/ajlm/index.php>

Editor: Alexander J. Burakoff

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: “Minimum of 40 pages in length”

“*American Journal of Law and Medicine* is a law review fulfilling the need to improve communication between legal and medical professionals. Issues contain professional articles and case notes—on themes in health law and policy, and on the legal, ethical, and economic aspects of medical practice, research, and education -- and health law court decisions and book reviews.”

APA Newsletter on Philosophy and Medicine

Editor: Mary Rorty and Mark Sheldon

<http://www.apaonline.org/publications/newsletters/index.aspx>

Frequency: Bi-annually

Length Limit: Not specified

Behavioral Sciences and the Law

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/3512/home>

Frequency: Five issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

Behavioral Sciences & the Law is a peer reviewed journal which provides current and comprehensive information from throughout the world on topics at the interface of the law and the behavioral sciences. The journal balances theoretical, mental health, legal, and research writings to provide a broad perspective on pertinent psycho-legal topics. Most issues are devoted primarily to one special topic, often presented from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. One special issue per year is specifically targeted toward "International Perspectives" on the selected topic. In addition, one issue each year is devoted to miscellaneous research articles, special perspectives, book review/essays, adversarial forums, and articles of special concern to practitioners; such offerings are also published in other issues as space permits. The journal also appeals to clinicians, academics, researchers, and policy makers.

Bioethics

<http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0269-9702>

Editor: Ruth Chadwick and Udo Schüklenk

Frequency: Monthly

Length Limit: 6,000 words

“*Bioethics* provides a forum for well-argued articles on the ethical questions raised by current issues such as: international collaborative clinical research in developing countries; public health; infectious disease; AIDS; managed care; genomics and stem cell research. These questions are considered in relation to concrete ethical, legal and policy problems, or in terms of the fundamental concepts, principles and theories used in discussions of such problems.”

BMC Medical Ethics

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmcmedethics/>

Editor: Melissa Norton

Frequency: Monthly

Length Limit: Not specified

“*BMC Medical Ethics* is an open access journal publishing original peer-reviewed research articles in relation to the ethical aspects of biomedical research and clinical practice, including professional choices and conduct, medical technologies, healthcare systems and health policies.”

Bulletin of the History of Medicine

http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/bulletin_of_the_history_of_medicine/

Editor: Randall M. Packard and Mary E. Fissell

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 9,000 words

“A leading journal in its field for more than three quarters of a century, the *Bulletin* spans the social, cultural, and scientific aspects of the history of medicine worldwide. Every issue includes reviews of recent books on medical history. The *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* is the official publication of the American Association for the History of Medicine (AAHM) and the Johns Hopkins Institute of the History of Medicine.”

Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics

<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=CQH>

Editor: Thomasine Kushner

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: Not specified

“The *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics* is designed to address the challenges of biology, medicine and healthcare and to meet the needs of professionals serving on healthcare ethics committees in hospitals, nursing homes, hospices and rehabilitation centres. The aim of the journal is to serve as the international forum for the wide range of serious and urgent issues faced by members of healthcare ethics committees, physicians, nurses, social workers, clergy, lawyers and community representatives.”

Christian Bioethics

<http://cb.oxfordjournals.org/>

Editor: H. Tristram Engelhardt

Frequency: Three issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

“*Christian bioethics* is a non-ecumenical, interdenominational journal, exploring the content-full commitments of the Christian faiths with regard to the meaning of human life, sexuality, suffering, illness, and death within the context of medicine and health care. *Christian bioethics* seeks not to gloss over the differences among the Christian faiths, but rather to underscore the content-full moral commitments that separate and give moral substance. It is interdenominational in involving editors and inviting contributions from different Christian perspectives.”

Clinical Ethics

<http://ce.rsmjournals.com/>

Editor: Bobbie Farsides and Sue Eckstein

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 4,500 words

“Launched in 2006, *Clinical Ethics* is an important journal devoted to the discussion of key issues surrounding the application of ethics in clinical practice, research and policy. Published quarterly, the journal contains articles under the headings of Case Studies, Public Policy and Law, Empirical Ethics and Papers. Additional material is included to help develop cross-disciplinary debate and increases the understanding of the complex ethical issues confronting providers and recipients of health care.”

Developing World Bioethics

<http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=1471-8731>

Editor: Debora Diniz and Udo Schüklenk

Frequency: Three issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

“*Developing World Bioethics* provides long needed case studies, teaching materials, news in brief, and legal backgrounds to bioethics scholars and students in developing and developed countries alike. This companion journal to *Bioethics* features high-quality peer reviewed original articles. *Developing World Bioethics* is the only journal in the field dedicated exclusively to developing countries' bioethics issues. The journal is an essential resource for all those concerned about bioethical issues in the developing world.”

Ethics & Medicine

<http://www.ethicsandmedicine.com/>

Editor: C. Ben Mitchell

Frequency: Three issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

“Since 1984, *Ethics & Medicine: An International Journal of Bioethics* has tackled the tough issues of bioethics from an international perspective. The journal reasserts the Hippocratic consensus in medicine on the conviction that only a robust medical professionalism is able to withstand the challenges of emerging technologies and their clinical applications.”

Eubios Journal of Asian and International Bioethics

<http://www.eubios.info/EJAIB.htm>

Editor: Darryl Macer

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: Not specified

“The Eubios Ethics Institute is a nonprofit group that aims to stimulate the international discussion of ethical issues, and how we may use technology in ways consistent with "good life" (eu-bios). It aims at an integrated and cross-cultural approach to bioethics, and at building up an international network (see the web site). The *Eubios Journal of Asian and International Bioethics* is the official journal of the Asian Bioethics Association.”

Genomics, Society, and Policy

<http://www.gspjournal.com/>

Editors: Ruth Chadwick and Hub Zwart

Frequency: Three issues per year

Length Limit: 6,000 words

“Published by the ESRC Genomics Network, *Genomics, Society and Policy* is a peer reviewed online journal that provides an outlet for interdisciplinary research on the social, ethical and legal aspects of genomics and related emergent technologies such as nanotechnology and stem cell research. *GSP* welcomes submissions from sociological, philosophical, anthropological, legal, historical and other perspectives. We welcome submissions concerned with human medical issues, environmental impacts, human/animal relations and animal ethics. The journal will from time to time have themed special issues.”

Hastings Center Report

<http://www.thehastingscenter.org/Publications/HCR/Default.aspx>

Editor: Gregory Kaebnick

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: 6,000 words

“The *Hastings Center Report* explores the ethical, legal, and social issues in medicine, health care, public health, and the life sciences. Six issues are published each year, containing an assortment of essays, columns on legal and policy developments, case studies of issues in clinical care and institutional administration, caregivers’ stories, peer-reviewed scholarly articles, and book reviews. Authors come from an assortment of professions and academic disciplines and bring a range of perspectives and political opinions. We welcome submissions from new authors. The *Report’s* readership includes physicians, nurses, scholars of many stripes, administrators, social workers, health lawyers, and others.”

Health Affairs

<http://content.healthaffairs.org/index.dtl>

Editor: Susan Dentzer

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: Not specified

“*Health Affairs* is the leading journal of health policy thought and research. The peer-reviewed journal was founded in 1981 under the aegis of Project HOPE, a nonprofit international health education organization. *Health Affairs* explores health policy issues of current concern in both domestic and international spheres.”

HEC Forum

<http://www.springer.com/philosophy/ethics/journal/10730>

Editor: Mark J. Cherry

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: Not specified

“*HEC Forum* is an international, peer-reviewed publication featuring original contributions of interest to practicing physicians, nurses, social workers, risk managers, attorneys, ethicists, and other HEC committee members. Contributions are welcomed from any pertinent source, but the text should be written to be appreciated by HEC members and lay readers.”

International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics

<http://www.fabnet.org/ijfab.php>

Frequency: Bi-annually

Length Limit: 8,000 words

“The *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics (IJFAB)* provides a new forum within bioethics for feminist thought and debate. Sponsored by the International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics (FAB), *IJFAB* welcomes feminist scholarship on ethical issues related to health, health care, and the biomedical sciences. *IJFAB* aims to demonstrate clearly the necessity and distinctive contributions of feminist scholarship to bioethics.”

International Journal of Law and Psychiatry

http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/295/description#description

Editor: David N. Weisstub

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: Not specified

“The *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* is intended to provide a multi-disciplinary forum for the exchange of ideas and information among professionals concerned with the interface of law and psychiatry. The journal seeks to enhance understanding and cooperation in the field through the varied approaches represented, not only by law and psychiatry, but also by the social sciences and related disciplines. The Editors and Publisher wish to encourage a dialogue among the experts from different countries whose diverse legal cultures afford interesting and challenging alternatives to existing theories and practices. Priority will therefore be given to articles which are oriented to a comparative or international perspective.”

IRB

<http://www.thehastingscenter.org/Publications/IRB/Default.aspx>

Editor: Karen Maschke

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: Around 3,500 words (“though we welcome longer and shorter pieces”).
“*IRB: Ethics & Human Research* explores issues in research with human subjects, including findings and analyses of empirical studies. Six issues are published each year, containing scholarly articles and columns. All submissions are peer-reviewed. We welcome inquiries about submissions. *IRB*’s readership includes administrators and members of institutional review boards, scholars, and researchers.”

Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law

<http://www.jaapl.org/>

Editor: Ezra E.H. Griffith

Frequency: Quarterly (plus a December supplement)

Length Limit: Not specified

“The American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law is an organization of psychiatrists dedicated to excellence in practice, teaching, and research in forensic psychiatry. Founded in 1969, AAPL currently has more than 1,500 members in North America and around the world.”

Journal of Applied Philosophy

<http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0264-3758>

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 8,000 words

Editors: Suzanne Uniacke and Alan Carter

“*Journal of Applied Philosophy* provides a unique forum for philosophical research which seeks to make a constructive contribution to problems of practical concern. Open to the expression of diverse viewpoints, the journal brings critical analysis to these areas and to the identification, justification and discussion of values of universal appeal. *Journal of Applied Philosophy* covers a broad spectrum of issues in environment, medicine, science, policy, law and education.”

Journal of Bioethical Inquiry

<http://www.springer.com/medicine/journal/11673>

Editor: Kate Cregan

Frequency: Three times a year

Length Limit: 7,000 words

“The *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* is a forum for discussing and debating ethical, cultural and social issues arising in medicine, the health sciences and health care in general. Coverage includes core areas of conventional bioethics, such as research, clinical practice and medical technology. The journal also addresses questions of pressing contemporary relevance, such as the implications of current world events for the health of populations, and critical analyses of specific social policies around the world and their likely impact on health and welfare and systems of power.”

Journal of Clinical Ethics

<http://www.clinicalethics.com/>

Editor: Edmund G. Howe

Frequency:

Length Limit: Not specified

“The *Journal of Clinical Ethics* is written for and by physicians, nurses, attorneys, clergy, ethicists, and others whose decisions directly affect patients. More than 70 percent of the articles are authored or co-authored by physicians.”

Journal of Health Care Law and Policy

<http://www.law.umaryland.edu/academics/journals/jhclp/>

Editor: Melissa McDonnell

Frequency: Bi-annually

Length Limit: Not specified

“The *Journal of Health Care Law & Policy* (JHCLP) serves as a forum for interdisciplinary discussion of leading issues in health law, medicine, and health policy. *JHCLP* contributors have included physicians, legal scholars, health law practitioners, leaders in health policy, and experts in philosophy, public health, sociology, and other disciplines that consider issues related to health care.”

Journal of Health Politics, Policy, and Law

<http://www.dukeupress.edu/jhpp/>

Editor: Michael Sparer

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: Not specified

“A leading journal in its field, and the primary source of communication across the many disciplines it serves, the *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* focuses on the initiation, formulation, and implementation of health policy and analyzes the relations between government and health—past, present, and future.”

Journal of Law, Medicine, and Ethics

<http://www.aslme.org/pub/jlme/index.php>

Editor: Sandra H. Johnson and Anna Illtis

Frequency: Quarterly, with supplements

Length Limit: Not specified

“*Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics* is a peer-reviewed quarterly read by more than 4,500 health care professionals. It provides articles on such timely topics as health care quality and access, managed care, pain relief, genetics, child/maternal health, reproductive health, informed consent, assisted dying, ethics committees, HIV/AIDS, and public health. Issues review significant policy developments, health law court decisions, and books.”

Journal of Legal Medicine

<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/01947648.asp>

Editor: Marshall B. Kapp

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: Not specified

“The *Journal of Legal Medicine* is the official quarterly publication of the American College of Legal Medicine (ACLM). Incorporated in 1960, the ACLM has among its objectives the fostering and encouragement of research and study in the field of legal medicine. The *Journal of Legal Medicine* is internationally circulated and includes articles and commentaries on topics of interest in legal medicine, health law and policy, professional liability, hospital law, food and drug law, medical legal research and education, the history of legal medicine, and a broad range of other related topics. Book review essays, featuring leading contributions to the field, are included in each issue.”

Journal of Medical Ethics

<http://jme.bmj.com/>

Editor: John Harris and Søren Holm

Frequency: Monthly

Length Limit: Not specified

“*Journal of Medical Ethics* is a leading international journal that reflects the whole field of medical ethics. The journal seeks to promote ethical reflection and conduct in scientific research and medical practice. It features original, full length articles on ethical aspects of health care, as well as brief reports, responses, editorials, and other relevant material. To ensure international relevance *JME* has an Editorial Advisory Board from all around the world.”

Journal of Medical Humanities

<http://www.springer.com/humanities/journal/10912>

Editor: Therese Jones

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 25 pages

“*Journal of Medical Humanities* publishes original papers reflecting its broad perspective on interdisciplinary studies of medicine and medical education. Research findings emerge from three areas of investigation: medical humanities, cultural studies, and pedagogy. Medical humanities coverage includes literature, history, philosophy, and bioethics as well as areas of the social and behavioral sciences that have strong humanistic traditions. Inquiries based on cultural studies may include multidisciplinary activities involving the humanities; women's, African-American, and other critical studies; media studies and popular culture; and sociology and anthropology. Lastly, pedagogical perspectives elucidate what and how knowledge is made and valued in medicine, how that knowledge is expressed and transmitted, and the ideological basis of medical education.”

Journal of Medicine and Philosophy

<http://jmp.oxfordjournals.org/>

Editor: Tristram Engelhardt

Frequency: Bi-monthly

“This bimonthly publication explores the shared themes and concerns of philosophy and the medical sciences. Central issues in medical research and practice have important philosophical dimensions, for, in treating disease and promoting health, medicine involves presuppositions about human goals and values. Conversely, the concerns of philosophy often significantly relate to those of medicine, as philosophers seek to

understand the nature of medical knowledge and the human condition in the modern world. In addition, recent developments in medical technology and treatment create moral problems that raise important philosophical questions. *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* aims to provide an ongoing forum for the discussion of such themes and issues.”

Journal of Religion and Health

<http://www.springer.com/public+health/journal/10943>

Editor: Donald R. Ferrell

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 25 pages

“*Journal of Religion and Health* explores the most contemporary modes of religious and spiritual thought with particular emphasis on their relevance to current medical and psychological research. Taking an eclectic approach to the study of human values, health, and emotional welfare, this international interdisciplinary journal publishes original peer-reviewed articles that deal with mental and physical health in relation to religion and spirituality of all kinds. Founded in 1961 by the Blanton-Peale Institute, which joins the perspectives of psychology and religion, the journal provides a scholarly forum for the discussion of topical themes on both a theoretical and practical level for scholars and professionals of all religious faiths and backgrounds.”

Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal

http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/kennedy_institute_of_ethics_journal/

Editor: Carol Mason Spicer

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: Not specified

“The *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal* is an interdisciplinary quarterly journal for the members of the Joseph and Rose Kennedy Institute of Ethics, Georgetown University. It publishes opinion and analysis dealing with social, ethical, and public policy aspects of bioethics and related areas of applied ethics. It presents varied points of view and encourages open debate on critical issues.”

Lahey Clinic Medical Ethics Journal

http://www.lahey.org/NewsPubs/Publications/Ethics/index_menewsletter.asp

Editor: David Steinberg

Frequency: Three issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

“A journal for health care providers on modern medical issues.”

Law and Human Behavior

<http://www.springer.com/psychology/law+&+psychology/journal/10979>

Editor: Brian L. Cutler

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: Not specified

“*Law and Human Behavior* is a multidisciplinary forum for the publication of articles and discussions of issues arising out of the relationships between human behavior and the

law, our legal system, and the legal process. This journal publishes original research, reviews of past research, and theoretical studies from professionals in criminal justice, law, psychology, sociology, psychiatry, political science, education, communication, and other areas germane to the field.”

Literature and Medicine

http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/literature_and_medicine/

Editor: Charles Anderson

Frequency: Bi-annually

Length Limit: Not specified

“For more than a quarter of a century, *Literature and Medicine* has been exploring the resonance between literary understanding and medical knowledge. Issues of illness, health, medical practice, trauma, and the body are examined through literary and cultural texts. The journal showcases the creative and critical work of renowned physician writers, leading literary scholars, and medical humanists. Readership includes scholars of literature, history, and critical theory, as well as health professionals. Special issues of the journal have proven themselves invaluable and essential. *Literature and Medicine* features one thematic and one general issue each year. *Literature and Medicine* is sponsored by The Institute for the Medical Humanities (IMH).”

Medical Anthropology Quarterly

<http://www.medanthro.net/maq/index.html>

Editors: Mark Luborsky and Andrea Sankar

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 8500 words (including footnotes, references, etc.)

“*Medical Anthropology Quarterly: International Journal for the Analysis of Health* publishes research and theory in the field of medical anthropology. This field is broadly taken to include all inquiries into health, disease, illness, and sickness in human individuals and populations that are undertaken from the holistic and cross-cultural perspective distinctive of anthropology as a discipline -- that is, with an awareness of species' biological, cultural, linguistic, and historical uniformity and variation. It encompasses studies of ethnomedicine, epidemiology, maternal and child health, population, nutrition, human development in relation to health and disease, health-care providers and services, public health, health policy, and the language and speech of health and health care. The purpose of the journal is to stimulate debate on and development of ideas and methods in medical anthropology and to explore the relationships of medical anthropology to both health practice and the parent discipline of anthropology.”

Medical Law Review

<http://medlaw.oxfordjournals.org/current.dtl#ARTICLES>

Editor: Margot Brazier

Frequency: 3 issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

“The *Medical Law Review* is established as an authoritative source of reference for academics, lawyers, legal and medical practitioners, law students, and anyone interested

in healthcare and the law. The *Review* presents articles of international interest which provide thorough analyses and comment on the wide range of topical issues that are fundamental to this expanding area of law. In addition, commentary sections provide in depth explorations of topical aspects in the field.”

Medicine, Health Care, & Philosophy

<http://www.springer.com/medicine/journal/11019>

Editor: Wim J.M. Dekkers

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 30 pages for scientific contributions; 15 pages for other pieces

“*Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy: A European Journal* provides a forum for international exchange of research data, theories, reports and opinions on bioethics, and the philosophy of medicine and health care in general. The journal promotes interdisciplinary studies, and stimulates international exchange. Particular attention is paid to developing contributions from all European countries, and to making accessible scientific work and reports on the practice of health care ethics, from all nations, cultures and language areas in Europe. The journal covers history, ethics, anthropology, epistemology, logic, metaphysics, philosophy of science and technology, sociology and political science, law, and the philosophy of culture and religion, centered on a common object of reflection: health care, the human effort to deal with disease, illness, death as well as health, well-being and life.”

Medical Humanities

<http://mh.bmj.com/>

Editor: Deobrah Kirklín

Frequency: Bi-annually

Length Limit: 3500 words

“*Medical Humanities* is a leading international journal that reflects the whole field of medical humanities. *Medical Humanities* aims to encourage a high academic standard for this evolving and developing subject and to enhance professional and public discussion. It features original articles relevant to the delivery of healthcare, the formulation of public health policy, the experience of being ill and of caring for those who are ill, as well as case conferences, educational case studies, book, film, and art reviews, editorials, correspondence, news and notes. To ensure international relevance *Medical Humanities* has Editorial Board members from all around the world.”

Monash Bioethics Review

<http://arts.monash.edu.au/bioethics/mbr/>

Editor: Justin Oakley and Linda Barclay

Frequency: Three to four issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

“Published by the Centre for Human Bioethics, *Monash Bioethics Review* is Australia's oldest peer reviewed bioethics journal. Each issue contains several original articles by leading commentators on bioethics. Also included is an Ethics Committee Supplement, featuring original articles and news items on issues of particular interest to members of human research ethics committees. In addition, there are book reviews, news on scientific

and legal developments relevant to bioethics, and an Ethics Committee Reflection. Symposia on current bioethical issues are also a regular feature of the journal. *Monash Bioethics Review* has a wide readership which includes bioethicists, medical practitioners, medical researchers, and ethics committee members.”

Neuroethics

<http://www.springer.com/philosophy/ethics/journal/12152>

Editor: Neil Levy

Frequency: 3 issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

“*Neuroethics* is an international peer-reviewed journal dedicated to academic articles on the ethical, legal, political, social and philosophical issues provoked by research in the contemporary sciences of the mind, especially, but not only, neuroscience, psychiatry and psychology. The journal publishes high-quality reflections on questions raised by the sciences of the mind, and on the ways in which the sciences of the mind illuminate longstanding debates in ethics.”

Nursing Ethics

<http://nej.sagepub.com/>

Editors: Ann Gallagher and Verena Tschudin

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: 6,000 words

“*Nursing Ethics* takes a practical approach to this complex subject and relates each topic to the working environment. The articles on ethical and legal issues are written in a comprehensible style and official documents are analysed in a user-friendly way. The international Editorial Board ensures the selection of a wide range of high quality articles of global significance.”

Online Journal of Health Ethics

<http://ethicsjournal.umc.edu/ojs2/index.php/ojhe>

Editors: Sean R. Abram and Sheila P. Davis

Frequency: Bi-annually

Length Limit: Not specified

Penn Bioethics Journal (undergraduate submissions only)

<http://bioethicsjournal.com/fpast.html>

Editor: Michael Weintraub (Executive Editor)

Frequency: Bi-annually

Length Limit: Not specified

“The *Penn Bioethics Journal* is the nation's premier peer-reviewed undergraduate bioethics journal. The journal was established in Spring, 2004 with the first issue published April 1, 2005 as part of the National Undergraduate Bioethics Conference hosted by Penn. The editorial board has included undergraduates from all four schools at the University of Pennsylvania with faculty advisors Jonathan D. Moreno, Ph.D. and Connie Ulrich, Ph.D., R.N.”

Perspectives in Biology and Medicine

http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/perspectives_in_biology_and_medicine/

Editor: Robert L. Perlman and Alan N. Schechter

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 7,000 words

“*Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, an interdisciplinary scholarly journal whose readers include biologists, physicians, students, and scholars, publishes essays that place important biological or medical subjects in broader scientific, social, or humanistic contexts. These essays span a wide range of subjects, from biomedical topics such as neurobiology, genetics, and evolution, to history, philosophy, and medical education and practice. The editors encourage an informal style that has literary merit and that preserves the warmth, excitement, and color of the biological and medical sciences.”

Public Affairs Quarterly

<http://www.press.uillinois.edu/journals/paq.html>

Editor: Robert B. Talisse

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 9,000 words

“*Public Affairs Quarterly (PAQ)* is devoted to current issues in social and political philosophy. It specializes in contributions that examine matters on the current agenda of public policy in light of philosophical reflections and assessments. The journal offers tightly focused philosophical case studies of particular issues in such areas as social and economic justice; public welfare; individual entitlements, rights, and duties; inheritance, taxation, and distributive justice in general; population policy, abortion, and euthanasia; environmental problems; science policy; the social and political status of women, senior citizens, minorities, and other social groups; arms control, war and deterrence; loyalty, duty, and patriotism; ethical issues in medicine, business, and the professions; criminality, criminal justice, and punishment; and similar topics.”

Public Health Ethics

<http://phe.oxfordjournals.org/>

Editors: Angus Dawson and Marcel Verweij

Frequency: Three issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

Public Health Ethics is the first peer-reviewed international journal to focus on a systematic analysis of the moral problems in public health and preventive medicine. It contains original articles, reviews, and case studies about the nature of public health and related concepts (e.g. population, public, community, prevention); discussions of values in public health; and ethical issues in relation to all aspects of public health policy and practice. This includes normative issues in epidemiological research, health promotion, infectious diseases control, screening, population genetics, resource allocation, health care system reform, vaccinations, environmental and lifestyle factors relevant to health, equity, justice and global health. *PHE* combines theoretical and practical work from different fields, notably philosophy, law, and politics, but also epidemiology and the medical sciences.”

Research Ethics Review

<http://www.research-ethics-review.com/index-2.html>

Editor: Not specified

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 3,000 words (“but longer articles are not excluded”)

“*Research Ethics Review* (RER) is the official journal of The Association of Research Ethics Committees. The journal is designed for all readers interested in research ethics and the procedures and process of ethical review, whether aligned to the NHS or within the university or independent sector.”

Social Science & Medicine

http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/315/description#description

Editor: Ellen Annandale

Frequency: Twice monthly

Length Limit: 8,000 words

“*Social Science & Medicine* provides an international and interdisciplinary forum for the dissemination of research findings, reviews and theory in all areas of common interest to social scientists, health practitioners and policy makers. The journal publishes material relevant to any aspect of health from a wide range of social science disciplines (eg. anthropology, economics, geography, psychology, social epidemiology, social policy and sociology), and material relevant to the social sciences from any of the professions concerned with physical and mental health, and with health care practice, policy and organization. It is particularly keen to publish findings or reviews which are of general interest to an international readership.”

Sociology of Health & Illness

http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/shil_enhanced/

Editor: Clive Seale

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: 8,000 words

“*Sociology of Health & Illness* is an international journal which publishes sociological articles on all aspects of health, illness, medicine and health care. We welcome empirical and theoretical contributions in this field in the form of original research reports or review articles. In addition to the six regular issues published each year, subscribers receive a further special issue. These themed issues aim to identify and contribute to new areas of debate and research in the discipline and each issue is devoted to an important topic of current interest.”

Studies in Ethics, Law, and Technology

<http://www.bepress.com/selt/about.html>

Editor: Anthony Mark Cutter

Frequency: Three issues per year

Length Limit: Not specified

“*Studies in Ethics, Law, and Technology* is a peer-reviewed and policy-focused journal that examines the ethical and legal issues that arise from emerging technologies. While

much attention has gone to specific fields such as bioethics, this is the first journal to address the broad scope of all technologies and their impact on the environment, society, and humanity. Topics include biotech, nanotech, neurotech, IT, weapons, energy and fuel, space-based technology, and new media and communications. Articles explore the synergy between law and ethics, and provide a robust policy response to technology's opportunities and challenges.”

The Milbank Quarterly

<http://www.milbank.org/quarterly.html>

Editor: Bradford H. Gray

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: Not specified

“*The Milbank Quarterly* is devoted to scholarly analysis of significant issues in health and health care policy. It presents original research, synthesis, policy analysis, and commentary from academicians, clinicians, and policymakers. The in-depth, multidisciplinary approach of the journal permits contributors to explore fully the social origins of health in our society and to examine in detail the implications of different health policies. Contributions are published from many disciplines, including history, law, medicine, epidemiology, bioethics, and the full array of social science and health services research disciplines. Topics addressed in *The Milbank Quarterly* include but are not limited to the impact of social factors on health, disease prevention, allocation of health resources, legal and ethical issues in health policy, health care management, historical analysis of health policies, and the organization and financing of health care.”

The Pharos

<http://alphaomegalpha.org/pharos/>

Editor: Edward D. Harris, Jr.

Frequency: Quarterly

Length Limit: 5,000 words

“*The Pharos*, Alpha Omega Alpha's quarterly journal, is unique among medical journals for its humanities focus. In an age of rapidly evolving technology and forced efficiency, *The Pharos* continues to emphasize the artistic, the literary, and the place of music, language, and culture in medicine. Although themes may shift—now touching upon the economics or the ethics of times—humanism is the enduring content of our AQA journal.”

Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/103004/>

Editor: Daniel Sulmasy

Frequency: Bi-monthly

Length Limit: Not specified

“*Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics* provides a forum for interdisciplinary studies in the philosophy and methodology of medical practice and research. Matters of particular interest are the developments of the philosophy and methodology of clinical judgment and clinical decision making; the study of problems of medical language, of knowledge acquisition and of theory formation in medicine; the analysis of the structure and

dynamics of medical hypotheses and theories; the discussion and clarification of basic medical concepts and issues; the application to medicine of advanced methods in the general philosophy of science, classical and non-classical logics, and mathematics; and the study of the interplay between medicine and other scientific or social institutions. Particular attention is paid to heuristic approaches in developing new methods and tools for the better analysis and understanding of the conceptual and ethical presuppositions of the medical sciences and health care processes.”

Virtual Mentor

<http://virtualmentor.ama-assn.org/>

Editor: Editors change with each themed issue

Frequency: Monthly

Length Limit: 1,200 words

“*Virtual Mentor* is the American Medical Association's online ethics journal. The journal is open-access and advertisement-free—we strongly believe that ethics education for physicians and physicians-to-be is in the public's interest and should be made available without charge. Founded in 1999, *Virtual Mentor (VM)* explores the ethical issues and challenges that students, residents, and other physicians are likely to confront in their training and daily practice. For this reason, the journal is a valuable teaching resource for medical educators at all levels as well as for doctors and doctors-to-be. Each monthly issue of *VM* contains original articles and commentary on a given theme-e.g., access to care; quality-of-life considerations in clinical decision making, public roles of physicians, ethical issues in endocrinology, conflict of values in the clinic.”

Yale Journal of Health Policy, Law, and Ethics

<http://www.yale.edu/yjhple/>

Editors: Kathy A. Hunt and Kristen Underhill

Frequency: Bi-annually

Length Limit: Not specified

“The *Yale Journal of Health Policy, Law, and Ethics* is a biannual publication of the Yale Schools of Law, Medicine, Epidemiology and Public Health, and Nursing. The *Journal* strives to provide a forum for interdisciplinary discussion on topics in health policy, health law, and biomedical ethics. It targets a broad and diverse readership of academicians, professionals, and students in medicine, law, and public health, as well as policy makers and legislators in health care”

Student-edited health law journals

Annals of Health Law

<http://www.luc.edu/annalshealthlaw/index.html>

Bi-annually

Health Law & Policy

<http://www.wcl.american.edu/org/hlp/>

Bi-annually

Health Matrix

http://law.case.edu/student_life/organizations/HealthMatrix/

Frequency: Bi-annually

Houston Journal of Health Law and Policy

<http://www.law.uh.edu/hjhlp/>

Bi-annually

Indiana Health Law Review

<http://indylaw.indiana.edu/iplr/>

Bi-annually

Journal of Contemporary Health Law and Policy

<http://law.cua.edu/students/orgs/jchlp/>

Frequency: Annually

Journal of Health Law & Policy

<http://law.slu.edu/healthlaw/journal/index.html>

Bi-annually

Journal of Law and Health

<http://www.law.csuohio.edu/academics/jlh/>

Bi-annually

Journal of Medicine and Law

<https://www.msu.edu/~msujml/>

Bi-annually

Law and Psychology Review

<http://www.law.ua.edu/lawpsychology/>

Annually

Quinnipiac Health Law Journal

<http://law.quinnipiac.edu/x199.xml>

Bi-annually

Index to Journals

This index highlights types of published articles that may be of special interest to beginning authors. While every effort was made to accurately represent all journals publishing the types of articles below, it's possible that journals not on the list nevertheless publish case studies, critical responses, and the like. For accurate and up-to-date information on a journal, visit its website or contact its editor. If you are a journal editor and wish to edit your entry, please contact Stephen Latham electronically at Stephen dot Latham "at" Yale dot edu..

Case Studies

- Accountability in Research
- AJOB
- American Journal of Law and Medicine
- APA Newsletter on Philosophy and Medicine
- Bioethics
- BMC Medical Ethics
- Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics
- Clinical Ethics
- Developing World Bioethics
- Ethics & Medicine
- Hastings Center Report
- HEC Forum
- International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
- International Journal of Law and Psychiatry
- IRB
- Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law
- Journal of Applied Philosophy
- Journal of Bioethical Inquiry
- Journal of Clinical Ethics
- Journal of Health Care Law and Policy
- Journal of Health Politics, Policy, and Law
- Journal of Law, Medicine, and Ethics
- Journal of Legal Medicine
- Journal of Medical Ethics
- Lahey Clinic Medical Ethics Journal
- Medicine, Health Care, and Philosophy
- Medical Humanities
- Monash Bioethics Review
- Neuroethics
- Nursing Ethics
- Public Affairs Quarterly
- Research Ethics Review

- Social Science & Medicine
- Sociology of Health & Illness
- Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics
- Virtual Mentor

Commentaries/Critical Responses

- AJOB
- BMC Medical Ethics
- Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics
- Christian Bioethics
- Ethics & Medicine
- Genomics, Society, and Policy
- Hastings Center Report
- Health Affairs
- HEC Forum
- Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law
- Journal of Bioethical Inquiry
- Journal of Clinical Ethics
- Journal of Health Politics, Policy, and Law
- Journal of Law, Medicine, and Ethics
- Journal of Legal Medicine
- Journal of Medical Ethics
- Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal
- Medical Law Review
- Medical Humanities
- Monash Bioethics Review
- Nursing Ethics
- Online Journal of Health Ethics
- Perspectives in Biology and Medicine
- Research Ethics Review
- Social Science & Medicine
- Sociology of Health & Illness
- Studies in Ethics, Law, and Technology

Book Reviews

- Accountability In Research
- AJOB
- American Journal of Law and Medicine
- APA Newsletter on Philosophy and Medicine
- Bioethics
- Bulletin of the History of Medicine
- Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics
- Developing World Bioethics
- Ethics & Medicine

- Genomics, Society, and Policy
- Hastings Center Report
- Health Affairs
- HEC Forum
- International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
- Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law
- Journal of Applied Philosophy
- Journal of Bioethical Inquiry
- Journal of Health Politics, Policy, and Law
- Journal of Law, Medicine, and Ethics
- Journal of Legal Medicine
- Journal of Medical Humanities
- Lahey Clinic Medical Ethics Journal
- Literature and Medicine
- Medical Anthropology Quarterly
- Medical Law Review
- Medicine, Health Care, and Philosophy
- Medical Humanities
- Monash Bioethics Review
- Online Journal of Medical Ethics
- Neuroethics
- Nursing Ethics
- Perspectives in Biology and Medicine
- Public Health Ethics
- Research Ethics Review
- Sociology of Health & Illness
- Studies in Ethics, Law, and Technology
- Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics

Bibliography of Resources

This bibliography is by no means exhaustive, but merely attempts to give a sampling of various resources that may be helpful as you begin to write in the areas of bioethics and medical humanities. Entries are selectively annotated.

Advice on Writing for Publication and Related Issues

-Academic Writing Generally

Project Muse's *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* is full of articles on every aspect of the enterprise. If your university or institution subscribes, the journal is available online here: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_scholarly_publishing/.

Robin M. Derricourt, *An author's guide to scholarly publishing*. 1996, Princeton U. Press. ISBN 0691037094, 9780691037097.

William Germano, *Getting It Published, 2nd Edition: A Guide for Scholars and Anyone Else Serious about Serious Books*. 2nd ed. 2008, U. of Chicago Press. ISBN 0226288536, 9780226288536

Rob Kitchin and Duncan Fuller, *The academic's guide to publishing*. 2005 SAGE. ISBN 1412900832, 9781412900836.

Beth Luey, *Handbook for academic authors*. 4th ed. 2002, Cambridge U. Press. ISBN 0521891981, 9780521891981.

-Philosophy

Hoffman, E. *Guidebook to Publishing in Philosophy*. Bowling Green: Philosophy Documentation Center, 1997. Out of print and out of date, but containing useful advice. Available online at <http://www.pdcnet.org/guide.html>.

-Dissertation to Book

Eleanor Harman, Chris Bucci, Siobhan McMenemy and Ian Montagnes, *The thesis and the book: a guide for first-time academic authors*. 2nd ed. 2003, U. of Toronto Press. ISBN 0802085881, 9780802085887. Although specifically about transforming dissertations into books, contains general advice applicable to revisions of manuscripts that are underway or have been rejected.

Beth Luey, *Revising Your Dissertation: Advice from Leading Editors*. 2004, U. of Cal. Press. ISBN 0520242556, 9780520242555.

-Medical and Scientific Writing

Hannah Brown, "How impact factors changed medical publishing—and science," *BMJ* 2007; 334:561-64. Available at <http://www.bmj.com/cgi/content/full/334/7593/561>. An article that sparked one of many debates on the impact of "impact factor" and citation counts on journal publication and selection.

N. W. Goodman and Martin B. Edwards, *Medical writing: a prescription for clarity : a self-help guide to clearer medical English*. 3rd ed. 2006, Cambridge U.P. ISBN 0521498767, 9780521498760.

Noni E MacDonald, Lee Ford-Jones, Jeremy N Friedman, and Judith Hall, "Preparing a manuscript for publication: A user-friendly guide," *Paediatr Child Health*. 2006 July; 11(6): 339–342. Available at <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2528624>

Robert W. Matthews, *Successful Scientific Writing: A Step-by-Step Guide for the Biological and Medical Sciences*. 3rd ed. 2007, Cambridge U. Press. ISBN 0521699274, 9780521699273.

Robert B. Taylor, *The clinician's guide to medical writing*. 2004, Springer. ISBN 0387222499, 9780387222493.

-Choosing a Journal

Philip J. Thompson, "How To Choose the Right Journal for Your Manuscript," *Chest*, September 2007, 132:1073-1076; available at <http://www.chestjournal.org/content/132/3/1073.short>. This article includes useful discussion of quantitative journal rankings such as "impact factor," for people in medical schools and other programs that refer to quantitative factors in hiring, promotion and tenure decisions.

General Advice on Prose Style

Jacques Barzun, *Simple & Direct: A Rhetoric for Writers*. Rev'd ed. 1994. U. of Chicago Press. ISBN 0226038688, 9780226038681. Discusses techniques to make your prose more clear and agreeable to read, and ways to develop your own style. Includes exercises using sample texts.

Richard Lanham, *Revising Prose*. 3rd ed. 1992. Maxwell Macmillan Int'l. ISBN 0023674458, 9780023674457.

William Strunk and E. B. White, *The Elements of Style*. 3rd ed. 2005. Penguin Press. ISBN 1594200696, 9781594200694. The classic text.

Joseph M. Williams and Gregory Colomb, *Style: toward clarity and grace*. 1995, U. of Chicago Press. ISBN 0226899152, 9780226899152.

William Zinsser, *On writing well: the classic guide to writing nonfiction*. 30th ed. 2006, HarperCollins. ISBN 0060891548, 9780060891541. Said to be the "natural companion" to Strunk and White; generally reviews principles of writing, including a chapter on "trusting" your material (not overpresenting).

Style Manuals

American Psychological Association, *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 5th ed. 2001. American Psychological Assn. ISBN 1557988102, 9781557988102. Includes advice on content and organization of manuscripts, expression of ideas, writing without bias, converting a dissertation into a publishable manuscript, preparing manuscripts for electronic production; also raises awareness of publishing ethics issues.

Judith Butcher, Caroline Drake and Maureen Leach, *Butcher's copy-editing: the Cambridge handbook for editors, copy-editors and proofreaders*. 4th ed. 2006, Cambridge U. Press. ISBN 0521847133, 9780521847131.

Chicago Manual of Style, 15th ed. 2006. U. Chicago Press. ISBN 0226104044, 9780226104041. This handbook is used by most book publishers and many journals.

Gibaldi, J. and Modern Language Association of America Staff, eds. *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. 6th ed. 2003. Modern Language Assn. of America. ISBN 0873529871, 9780873529877. Another standard style manual, favored by some journals in lieu of the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language. Prepared by V. Warren for the Executive Committees of the American Philosophical Association divisions. Originally published in 1986. American Philosophical Assn. Revised version available online at <http://www.apaonline.org/publications/texts/nonsexist.aspx>. Must be followed for papers submitted to the American Philosophical Association meetings.

Harvard Law Review Editors. *Uniform System of Citation*, 18th ed. 2005. Harvard Law Review Assn. Must be followed for articles to be submitted to the vast majority of law journals. Available for purchase online at <http://www.legalbluebook.com/>.

International Committee of Medical Journal Authors, "Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals," available online at <http://www.icmje.org/>. More than 400 journals use these style and ethics requirements.

Cheryl Iverson, ed. *The American Medical Association Manual of Style*. 9th ed. 1998. Williams and Wilkins. ISBN 0683402064, 9780683402063. Although generally a manual of the AMA's style, also contains sections on preparing different types of articles, stylistic considerations, as well as details about proper medical terminology.

Karen Patrias, *National Library of Medicine Recommended Formats*. 1991, with 2001 supplement. United States HHS/PHS, NIH. Available at <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/formats/recommendedformats.html>.

Kate Turabian, Wayne Booth, Gregory Colomb and Joseph Williams, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*. 7th revised ed., 2007, U. of Chicago Press. ISBN 0226823369, 9780226823362. Standard manual for students on style for presentation of academic work.

Marie Claire Van Leunen, *A Handbook for Scholars, Revised Edition*. 1992, Oxford U. Press. ISBN 0195069536, 9780195069532. Extensive advice on the mechanics of preparing a scholarly manuscript (citations, quotations, footnotes, and references).

Miscellaneous

Nat Bodian, *How to Choose a Winning Title: A Guide for Writers, Editors, and Publishers*. 1989, Oryx Press. ISBN 089774540X, 9780897745406. A practical guide to choosing book and article titles.

Edward Cremmins, *The Art of Abstracting*. Information Resources, 1996. Very detailed work on abstracting articles, with good advice on how to write clear, complete, coherent abstracts.

Jalongo, M.R. "On the Compatibility of Teaching and Scholarly Writing," *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 18:49-58, 1987. Discusses the benefits of writing for the teacher, in an attempt to refute the idea that publishing interferes with teaching.

Lynette Felber. "The Book Review: Scholarly and Editorial Responsibility," *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 33:3, 166-172, 2002.

Keith Noble, "Publish or Perish: What 23 Journal Editors Have to Say," *Studies in Higher Education* 14: 97-102, 1989. Editors reported that a manuscript which looked professional tended to be preferred; early rejection is often the result of not following journal's guidelines, lack of depth, or poor writing style.

Weaver, F.S. "Teaching, Writing, and Developing," *Journal of Higher Education* 53: 587-592, 1982. Discusses ways that writing can help with teaching.