
News



This page is supposed to serve as a guideline for authors on the following aspects:

IMED-C 2023

1. Manuscript writing while preserving the formatting

Proceedings

2. Addressing review comments and following the review process

Delays in Publishing

Often, conference organizers have found that authors ignore basic formatting and typesetting guidelines during the review to publication stage. This leads to long review cycles and proofreading cycles, causing significant delays in manuscript publication. Such delays create unpleasant experiences for everyone involved in the process, including authors, reviewers, organizers, and publishers.

Tip 1: Always type your manuscript in the template provided by the conference organizing committee.

You can write your manuscript in any word document and later copy and paste the contents into the template.

When you paste the text, it is important that you use the option "keep text only" (see Figure 1 below). This step will ensure that the formatting guidelines in the template provided by the publisher are always maintained.





Figure 1. While pasting your text use the Keep Text only option

Tip 2: Tables & Figures

It has often been found that authors tend to use screenshots from their presentations in place of tables. This practice is **highly discouraged** and leads to **delays** in the publication process. See Figure 2, where the proper method of including tables is shown directly in the provided template.








Figure 2. Use the tables provided in the manuscript itself

In addition, always try to use the fit content option to ensure the text inside the tables is preserved. See figure 3 as an example of this.

Please refer to this useful learning resource from youtube or the Video Below.




Figures: Many authors have found it difficult to comply with the figure requirements of the publisher. Here are some useful ways to get around this issue.




caption

News



More



Reviewer Comments: Peer review process relies on reviews by the peers. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary for the authors to address any peer review comments in a timely fashion. Typically no longer than 5 working days.

The following section describes the process in some details. Below is the sample of the review comments that has been received for a submission and the response to the review comments by the authors. For both the reviewers the authors must create responses in a single document and this document must be uploaded during the revision on the online system. Without this the peer review process will not be completed, the papers would be rejected, and the papers would never be indexed in SCOPUS or WoS.

Reviewer A

Through this article the authors have presented their study on the dependence of "factor x" on "factor y" under the variation in "factor z" and "factor g". The study is well supported by experiments. However, the reviewer feels that the introduction part of the paper is too long and the authors can focus more on their work in this paper, this way their contribution would be well recognized by the researcher community. Hence are my suggestions

	Search
Review Comment	Response by the authors
They should categorically mention their major contribution in the introduction section in a pointwise format if they wish. But please be wary of space restrictions.	Thank you for your helpful review comments. Our major contribution through this paper are as follows: 1. Our study shows that the earlier findings by various researchers to be true. However, the factor z was not well studied, through this study we show that factor z must be taken into account while studying the dependence of factor x . 2. Likewise, our study also shows that factor g affects the factor x in a significant way. These points have now been mentioned in the introduction section in the updated manuscript.
2. The authors must also present or atleast comment on the limitations of their study in the light of the fact that factor y is also dependent on the combined effect of "factor z" and "factor g". Also make any suggestions to the improve the study as a part of the future work.	Thank you for the comment, we have now included the limitations of this study in the discussions section. You are absolutely right that the combined effect must be taken into consideration and the days following our submission we too realized the same.
3. Likewise, the text in the plots/graphs are not legible and the authors must provide high resolution images with clear text appearing inside their figures.	Thank you for taking time to pay specific attention to improve our manuscript. We have now updated the quality of all the 4 figures appearing in our manuscript. We hope the changes reflected are sufficient.
The authors must ensure that the text inside the figures must be atleast of the same size that of the figure captions.	The text within the figures have now been made as large as the figure caption. Kindly go through the updated manuscript

Download documents

Manuscript template Author Response Sheet

