

We Take It Personally

At *ACS Nano*, we take every aspect of the journal personally. We have strived to put together the journal of our own dreams from our points of view as authors, readers, referees, editors, and scientists.

We treat each submitted manuscript received with a fresh eye. A manuscript will either go out for external review, or at least two expert editors will review it internally, in which case a decision can be made to reject the manuscript prior to going out to external referees. Almost every manuscript we receive has interesting science and results, and these decisions are most difficult. *All* decisions are made exclusively by our editors—leading scientists and engineers—never by our staff. Nonetheless, we do everything we can to work expeditiously; the editor-in-chief looks at each manuscript within a few hours of submission, and thus our other editors see a manuscript within its first day in our hands. We have many discussions over submitted manuscripts, where editors with relevant expertise in the area contribute their thoughts. These discussions are both stimulating and illuminating. One perspective that is difficult to convey to authors of a specific paper is where it fits within the context of the many manuscripts that we receive in an area. We count on our editors to point out what is important and why in arguing for a manuscript to proceed to further review. With the rapidly increasing submission rates we have seen, we are only able to send one manuscript in three or four out to external referees; in some areas, the rate is even lower.



Despite the extraordinary number of manuscripts submitted, we have been able to get the top scientists and engineers in our community to serve as referees and to complete reviews quickly. Please join us in thanking our wise and hardworking referees, who have been critical in making *ACS Nano* what it is and what it is becoming. We watch manuscripts in process and sometimes change editors or referees to keep them moving expeditiously. We require at least two substantive referee reports to make a decision. When authors contest a decision, we have an appeals process where all relevant editors can comment on and discuss the manuscript, referee reports, and related correspondence. Again, the discussion centers on the importance and quality of the work, where it fits into the field based on what we see in manuscripts submitted to us and papers published in *ACS Nano* and other top journals. While these discussions were once held monthly, this year, we have found a way to work more quickly and to have more substantive discussions. All our interactions are designed so that we treat our authors and handle their manuscripts the way that we would like to be treated when submitting our work to a top journal.

When we and/or referees identify a paper as being of interest to the public, we work with our and the authors' institution's press offices to make sure that people around the world find out about the advance. We use our networks of connections to alert the right journalists and others in a timely way to the work that we are about to publish. We have seen a great deal of attention to some of our top papers, especially this year. This form of public outreach is important in raising the profile of our field and in letting the world know what we are doing and what we are trying to do.

As editors, we frequently get together to discuss where the field is going. We have monthly calls, and meet in person twice a year. Many of these conversations, however, occur in the daily traffic discussing specific manuscripts, as described above. We also rely heavily on our Editorial Advisory

Published online December 21, 2012
10.1021/nn305696y

© 2012 American Chemical Society

Board in these discussions. You may note that our board has been expanding greatly, with a number of top scientists and engineers joining us for the new year (these additions will be announced in next month's issue). One of the roles we have defined for ourselves is to use *ACS Nano* to lay out the challenges and opportunities in and for nanoscience and nanotechnology. We do this through solicited articles such as Reviews, Perspectives, Nano Focus articles, and Conversations. We have been overwhelmed with the positive response to these articles, and many have already become touchstones for the field. Having written several ourselves, we can also say that they are fun to write, as authors have the chance to put on paper what is already in the forefront in our heads and to guide the future of our field.

We have tried to share what we have learned as editors with you, through editorials that we hope serve as tutorials for some of the key aspects of writing and publishing the science that we do.^{1–11} Many of these pieces have been inspired by your questions, and we thank you both for the interest and for the extraordinary attention that they have been getting.

We enjoy hearing from you and meeting you. If you are interested in finding out where we will be speaking and seeing us, we now tweet our seminar and presentation schedules ahead of time from @acsnano (where we also announce interesting papers and news from our nanoscale world).

Finally, we wish you and yours happy holidays and an exciting, peaceful new year full of discoveries and joy.

Disclosure: Views expressed in this editorial are those of the authors and not necessarily the views of the ACS.

We have tried to share what we have learned as editors with you, through editorials that we hope serve as tutorials for some of the key aspects of writing and publishing the science that we do.



Dawn A. Bonnell
Associate Editor



Jillian M. Buriak
Associate Editor



Warren C. W. Chan
Associate Editor



Jason H. Hafner
Associate Editor



Paula T. Hammond
Associate Editor



Mark C. Hersam
Associate Editor



Ali Javey
Associate Editor



Nicholas A. Kotov
Associate Editor



Andre E. Nel
Associate Editor



Peter J. Nordlander
Associate Editor



Reginald M. Penner
Associate Editor



Andrey L. Rogach
Associate Editor



Ray E. Schaak
Associate Editor



Molly M. Stevens
Associate Editor



Andrew T. S. Wee
Associate Editor



C. Grant Willson
Associate Editor



Paul S. Weiss
Editor-in-Chief

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Weiss, P. S. What Do Images Mean? *ACS Nano* **2008**, *2*, 1–2.
2. Weiss, P. S. The Best Referee Report. *ACS Nano* **2008**, *2*, 177.
3. Kotov, N. A. Fraud, the *h*-index, and Pasternak. *ACS Nano* **2010**, *4*, 585–586.
4. Hafner, J. H. The Art of the Cover Letter. *ACS Nano* **2010**, *4*, 2487.
5. Buriak, J. M. Rejecting without Review: The Whys, the Hows. *ACS Nano* **2010**, *4*, 4963–4964.
6. Schaak, R. E. Comprehensive and Full. *ACS Nano* **2011**, *5*, 6767–6768.
7. Buriak, J. B. Summarize Your Work in 100 Milliseconds or Less... The Importance of the Table of Contents Image. *ACS Nano* **2011**, *5*, 7687–7689.
8. Bonnell, D. A.; Buriak, J. M.; Hafner, J. H.; Hammond, P. T.; Hersam, M. C.; Javey, A.; Kotov, N. A.; Nordlander, P.; Parak, W. J.; Rogach, A. L.; *et al.* Recycling Is Not Always Good: The Dangers of Self-Plagiarism. *ACS Nano* **2012**, *6*, 1–4.
9. Weiss, P. S. Who Are Corresponding Authors? *ACS Nano* **2012**, *6*, 2861.
10. Buriak, J. M.; Schaak, R. E.; Weiss, P. S. In Response. *ACS Nano* **2012**, *6*, 3643–3645.
11. Tierney, H. L.; Hammond, P.; Nordlander, P.; Weiss, P. S. Prior Publication: Extended Abstracts, Proceedings Articles, Preprint Servers, and the Like. *ACS Nano* **2012**, *6*, 7543–7544.