

Experience about publishing with the “*Book Publisher International*”

by **Dmitrii Kouznetsov**¹ (this version is compiled 2020.10.14)

ABSTRACT

By request from the Editor Ms. Ruma Bag, I describe my experience of publishing my chapter (Place of science in the human knowledge) in book “New insights into physical science, v.6.”

1. Preface

2020.09.10, book “New insights into physical science volume 6” [1] with my chapter “Place of science in the human knowledge” [2] had been published by the “Book Publisher International”.

2020.09.30, Ms. Ruma Bag asked me to write my opinion about interaction with the Editorial, describing my experience. Here I describe my experience.

Also, I suggest few recommendations and I formulate questions to Ms. Ruma Bag, that could help her to describe her point of view on the same events.

2. History

Here, I describe the most some events that happen in 2020 with respect to book “New insights into physical science volume 6”. I mention only few, the most important messages, that caused the publication.

2020.03.18, Editors Rimi Jana and Ms. Ruma Bag invite me to participate in book “New Insights into Physical Science” with my chapter based on my previous publications.

They promise:

1. Professional review, editing and plagiarism checking.
2. Professional cover-page design and typesetting.
3. Specialized English editing and proofreading
4. Digital Object Identifier (DOI) allotment.

and other advantages with publication at the “Book Publisher International”.

2020.03.26, I accept the invitation by Ms. Ruma Bag. I agreed to prepare the chapter on the base of my previous publication “TORI Axioms and the Application in Physics” of year 2013 in Journal of Modern Physics [3], my publication of year 2010 in UFN [4] and the English version [5]. I had extended the manuscript with figures and recent examples.

2020.06.06, my chapter is accepted for publication by the Editorial

2020.06.15. the receipt of the payment of the author fee had been acknowledged by the Editorial.

2020.06.16. Ms Ruma Bag asked me to modify my chapter, following the Latex template she sent.

2020.06.18, the Editorial confirm, that they got the address, where to deliver the authors exemplars of the book.

2020.06.24, I sent to the Editorial the revised version with hope, that it will be forwarded to reviewers for critics.

No critics from the official reviewers had been received. I had found the Reviewer 1 by myself.

2020.07.01, I got from the Editorial the “Galley Proof”, but it was not in the Latex format. It happened to be converted to DOCX format. The numeration of figures and references had been destroyed there.

2020.07.01, I tried to correct the “Galley proof”, taking into account the critics by the Reviewer 1,

That time, I had almost no experience with DOCX files. I did not realize, that there, by default, the hyperrefs are destroyed at the the copy pasting.

I found no professional editing from the side of the Editorial. Even the broken links had not been detected by the Editorial.

In September, Ms. Ruma Bag and I tried to correct the numeration of references, using the DOCX format. Our iterates had converged very slowly, if at all. New spaces and new “newline” characters suddenly appeared inside the URLs, making them invalid.

Then I converted the manuscript back into Latex, following the first template I got from Ms. Ruma Bag in June. I corrected the numeration of references. (Latex has system of numeration of references; this work is difficult to do with *.docx)

Also, I found few links, that become not available during the consideration and revision of my chapter. I had the reserve copies; I loaded them to my site and replaced the invalid URLs with links to these copies. (In such a way, several Russian sites are revealed to be unstable; the instability confirms qualification of those sites as non-scientific.)

Ms. Ruma Bag liked the resulting PDF, but she asked me to convert the latex document again into *.docx I did this conversion.

After one more iterate (I indicated few more misprints), the final text had been published

¹ *Institute for Laser Science, University of Electro-Communications, 1-5-1 Chofugaoka, Chofushi, Tokyo, 182-8585, Japan*
*Corresponding author: E-mail: dmitriikouznetsov@gmail.com

I got from Ms. Ruma Bag the "final" PDF version of my chapter and the final PDF version of the book.

The URLs in the versions I got are not clickable; so, they are difficult to use.

I did not yet get the URL of the online publication of the book, nor that of my chapter.

They are mentioned at the site of the Editorial [], but the content seems to be not available. Perhaps, there are some misprints in the code, that makes the links not clickable.

I did not yet get the author's exemplars of the book.

Ms. Ruma Bag explains this in terms of COVID19.

I still hope to get the books promised (as they are already payed).

Then, Ms. Ruma Bag asked me to write out my opinion about our collaboration; I answered, that I have not yet receive my published book (paper version).

2020.10.03, Ms. Ruma Bag indicates that the book is not sent to the authors, because there is no access to the printing division. As I understand, the book is not yet printed. So, I looked for more misprints, and I have found three:

1. Error indicating the source of figure 4 (should be ref. [36])
2. Misspelled word "hystory",
4. Missed line that cites reference [63].

As the book is not yet printed, then, I think, the Editorial still have opportunity to improve the content.

2020.10.08, Ms. Ruma Bag indicates that the book "was published", and cannot be improved anymore.

I reminded that I did not get the book.

2020.10.09, Ms. Ruma Bag again sends me message with PDF attached. However, the links are not yet clickable, as in the previous version.

I see, our communication already come to some periodic loop; I see no civilized way to get my paper print version of the book, nor to convince Ms. Ruma Bag to correct the site www.bookpi.org where the book is mentioned, but the names of chapters are not clickable.

For this reason, I think, I can conclude this partial report and formulate my suggestions.

3. Suggestions

On the base of my experience above, I have few suggestions, recommendations for the Editorial. I think, following them should significantly improve quality of publications by the **Book Publisher International**.

1. The template of the chapter for the book should be posted at the first page of site of the **Book Publisher International**. Link to this template should appear at the beginning of the messages by the editors send to the potential authors, inviting them to prepare a chapter for the **Book Publisher International**. Such a link is the most important part of the information for authors. Currently, this information seems to be just missed.

2. As soon as you get the first version of any manuscript submitted, you should send it to colleagues and ask, whether it satisfies criteria below: s1. Applicability, s2. Verifiability, s3. Refutability, s4. Self-consistency, s5. Principle of correspondence, and s6. Pluralism. If it satisfies all the 6 criteria, you may put questions: t1: Are the results free of mistakes? t2. Are there results interesting for colleagues? t3. Are the results well described in the manuscript? t4. How to describe them better? Some reviewers afraid to criticize colleagues; so, you may consider to keep the name of the Reviewer(s) in secret from the Authors. Many editorials to this.

3. You send the reviewer(s) notes to the corresponding author, get his/her opinion and make your decision: should you accept or reject the Manuscript. Then, the result will be SCIENCE!

4. Questions

I would like your Editorial to promote namely Science.

You can see, I try to help you to act in this way.

From my side, I expect similar cooperation from you.

For me, it would be interesting to get also opinion by Ms. Ruma Bag, Especially important would be to get her answers on the following questions.

1. Why the Editors begun to work with the manuscript instead of to send it to the Reviewers (as it is promised in the first message I got)?

Why I had to search Reviewer 1 by myself?

2. What happened with the original manuscript in Latex?

There were several errors there; in particular, font "Arial" did not switch well in the first version. (First, I did not guess, that it should be Arial.) Why the command, that specifies the Arial font, had not been corrected by the Editorial?

Why Chapter had been converted from Latex to DOCX?

3. Why the URLs in the version you sent are not clickable?

With all disadvantages of the DOCX format, it still has option to make URLs clickable.

The clickable links help to colleagues, who read the online version.

Also the clickable links help the Author to check, that they are correct and still valid. This boosts the check of the manuscript for orders of magnitude; no need to convert the text to other format in order to check the references.

Why you do not use the clickable links?

4. What happens with the online publication [2]?

Why the chapters do not open with a click at the table of the content?

Could you, please correct this?

5. When the book will be printed and sent to authors?

6. Do you send the books you publish to some libraries?

How the authors can know, which libraries have their books?

The reference to COVID19 does not look serious: Before the masks and the "social distance" become popular, the reproduction coefficient had been estimated between unity and two. The mask are reported to provide drastic reduction the transmittance probability, it is supposed to be significantly below unity. So, the "second wave" of COVID19 cannot be interpreted in terms of unwanted transfer of the infection from ill patients to new victims.

How can it affect working of the printing machines? (This question is answered with references to the order of government, but still without link to this order.)

7. Many times you mention the COVID19.

Hence, you are supposed to be specialist in this topic:

7.1. What was, from your point of view, coefficient of transmission of the infection, before all the people began to use face masks?

7.2. What is, from your point of view, the efficiency of the face masks?

Do you think, the "second wave" of COVID19 can be interpreted as a result of unwanted transfer of decease from ill patients to new victims?

5. Conclusion

I think, that the performance of the "Book Publisher International" can be improved. I show the ways. Here is the summary:

1. Link to the template of the article should appear at the main page of your site and in the first paragraph of the first message, that invites authors to the collaboration. It is most important information for authors.

2. The manuscripts submitted should be sent to reviewers.

The following questions should be answered about each manuscript:

2.1. What is area of applicability of the concepts suggested?

2.2. Which observations could be interpreted as confirmation of these concepts?

2.3. Which observations could be interpreted as refutation of these concepts?

2.4. Are the result self-consistent?

2.5. Do the result agree with commonly accepted concepts?

2.6. If there exist other results on the same topic? Do they agree or disagree with the concepts of the manuscript?

3. If the editor edits the manuscript, the editor should check, that, after his/her edition, the numeration is still correct, and the links are still clickable. If some link is not valid, it may be marked as "not available" (assuming, that it was available at the moment of submission of the manuscript).

4. The book should be printed. Some exemplars of the paper version, books, should be and sent to authors.

5. The PDF version of the book should be available at the site – in order that the reader may see it before to buy the printed version.

I think, the hints above can significantly improve the quality of publications.

REFERENCES

1. <https://www.bookpi.org/bookstore/product/new-insights-into-physical-science-vol-6/> New Insights into Physical Science Vol. 6. Dr. Mohd Rafatullah, (Editor) Senior Lecturer, Division of Environmental Technology, School of Industrial Technology, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia.
2. <http://bp.bookpi.org/index.php/bpi/catalog/book/265>
<https://mizugadro.mydns.jp/PAPERS/2020insights.pdf> Dmitrii Kouznetsov. Place of Science in the Human Knowledge. in book *New Insights into Physical Science*, Vol. 6., chapter 8, p.137-161.
3. https://file.scirp.org/Html/1-7501430_36560.htm Dmitrii Kouznetsov. TORI Axioms and the Application in Physics. *Journal of Modern Physics* Vol.4 No.9(2013), Article ID:36560,6 pages DOI:10.4236/jmp.2013.49155
4. <https://ufn.ru/tribune/trib120111.pdf> Д.Ю.Кузнецов. Место Науки и Физики в человеческом знании. *Трибуна УФН*, декабрь 2010. (In Russian)
5. <http://mizugadro.mydns.jp/PAPERS/2010mestoe.pdf> Dmitrii Kouznetsov. Place of science in the human knowledge. Preprint, Compiled December 27, 2010.