# The HRI Journal Publishing Guide

Transcript of the Human-Robot Interaction Podcast Episode 25. Published on 22 September 2023 by Christoph Bartneck at:

https://www.human-robot-interaction.org/2023/09/22/the-hri-journal-publishing-guide/

[00:00:00] **Christoph:** Okay, you finished your exciting human robot interaction project and now it is time to write up the paper and submit it to a journal. But where should you submit it to? Maybe a highly specialized engineering journal? Or how about a more general human computer interaction journal? Today, we're going to explore the HRI specific publishing options to enable you to find the right journal for your paper.

This is the Human Robot Interaction Podcast.

I'm your host, Christoph Bartneck.

Human robot interaction is a multidisciplinary field. Researchers from engineering, psychology and design contribute to it. You could send your paper to a specialized robot or psychology journal. This could work. If your paper is strongly focused on just one discipline. But if you have developed new technology and you did a psychological experiment, then the choice for journals is less obvious. For a couple of years, we have dedicated HRI journals. You no longer have to try to fit into the more general HCI journals. But which one should you pick? Which one has the highest impact factor? Which one has the fastest peer review process? What open access options are available?

Today, we're going to talk to the three editors in chief about their HRI journals. We'll proceed by seniority. The oldest journal goes first. Agnieszka could you please introduce yourself?

## Elevator Pitch

[00:01:51] **Aga:** Hi, I'm Agnieszka Wykowska. I'm Principal Investigator at the Italian Institute of Technology, where I lead the team Social Cognition and Human Robot Interaction, and I'm Editor in Chief of the International Journal of Social Robotics.

[00:02:05] **Christoph:** Why should authors submit to your journal?

[00:02:07] **Aga:** The advantage of our journal is to offer to authors a venue where interdisciplinary work can be published. The authors, associate editors, and reviewers of our journal span across the area of robotics, computer science, psychology, philosophy, and even arts. So our journal is really perfect for authors who need this kind of interdisciplinary venue. And it's also a perfect venue for those who work on societal applications of robotics, such as elderly care, child care, and health care.

[00:02:44] **Christoph:** The ACM transactions on human robot interaction is almost as old as the international journal of social robotics. It was conceived roughly at the same time. But in the beginning, it followed a pure open access publishing model with the title journal of human robot interaction. In 2018, it was integrated into the ACM and became the ACM transactions on human robot interaction. Selma Sabanovic which is one of the editors in chief and she's here today to talk with us about the journal. Selma, could you please introduce yourself?

[00:03:23] **Selma:** Sure. I'm Selma Sabanovic. I'm a professor of informatics and cognitive science at Indiana University Bloomington, and I'm also the editor in chief of ACM Transactions on Human Robot Interaction.

[00:03:37] **Christoph:** Why should authors submit to your journal?

[00:03:40] **Selma:** ACM THRI is the flagship journal of human robot interaction. And for us, that means that it covers human robot interaction research and all its breadth of disciplines, applications theories, consequences. It also has a 5. 1 impact factor, which doesn't hurt authors. And we follow what we see as a very open minded reviewing process where we really cheer on every single paper that comes in and hope that it gets published. Even though not everything can, that's the perspective that we bring to the editing process.

[00:04:23] **Christoph:** The human robot interaction section of the frontiers in robotics and AI journal is the newest of the three HRI journals. It is part of the frontiers platform, which is trying to take new paths in the world of science publishing. It's approach to publishing slightly different to that of traditional publishers. Today we have Bilge Mutlu with us to talk about this journal. Bilge, could you please introduce yourself?

[00:04:53] **Bilge:** My name is Bilge Mutlu I'm a professor of computer science at the University of Wisconsin Madison. Before that I got my PhD from Carnegie Mellon University in Human Computer Interaction. I'm also the field chief editor of Frontiers in Robotics and AI on the section called Human-Robot Interaction.

[00:05:13] **Christoph:** Why should authors submit to your journal?

[00:05:15] **Bilge:** Great question. I think there are two ways in which I can answer this. The first way is from the Frontiers perspective. As you might know, frontiers is a family of journals. There are many, many journals under it, and it's more of a publication platform. So the way that Frontiers does things have several benefits.

And then the second way I can answer this is in through what we do in our section. So, as far as the first way, it's an open access platform as a very fast review process publications are available as soon as the review is complete. The moment it's accepted, your publication appears right away online.

There are research topics to emerging topics so we can spin them up very quickly . If you think that a special issue should be developed on a particular topic, it can happen very quickly. Once papers are published there's a lot of social media and other promotion by the journal platform. So the work gets a lot of visibility the right way. There's very easy access through the web very accessible type setting. If you look at the papers, they look beautiful, well designed. So these are the things that come with Frontiers publication platform.

And within the H R I section we try to have a broad umbrella for H R I. From the technical to the theoretical we publish qualitative work, quantitative work. We publish social robotics, collaborative robotics, and really try to target a high quality peer review process and try to achieve a certain level of quality with the papers that we include.

[00:06:44] **Christoph:** All three journals claim that there are offering an umbrella for all HR topics. This is to be expected. But it does not help you when you are trying to select one of them. Let's see if the focus of the journals is different.

## Focus

[00:07:00] **Christoph:** What is the focus of the journal?

[00:07:04] **Aga:** The focus is on social robotics. What do I mean by social? Robots that assist humans in various applications that are meant to become potentially our social companions, partners, in daily activities, in care, and that is in terms of application areas. And then social in terms of research is, I would say, a social robot is a robot that evokes mechanisms of our brain that have developed for social interactions with others.

[00:07:39] **Christoph:** Would it then be fair to say that compared to the IEEE transactions on robotics, that you focus more on the human side of things?

[00:07:48] **Aga:** It is not our strategic decision, but it's more bottom up what comes from the authors. So in a sense, yes, because that's the type of papers we are receiving, but we are of course very much also interested in any contributions that are related to developments on the robot side for, again social robots.

[00:08:10] **Selma:** So the journal, obviously, quite broadly focuses on human robot interaction. And by that we mean that we really, in each paper, accept that there is some form of human component, some form of robot component, and really some focus about how those two are going to interact with each other. So papers maybe that focus only on robotics without a perspective on how those systems might interact with humans wouldn't necessarily be a great fit, or papers that focus only on, a human psychological aspect or even, theoretical aspects that don't really bring in the question of how this pertains to robots. Those might also not be a great fit. Having said that I think the journal looks at really a lot of broad aspects of HRI. There, we obviously accept things that have to do with design, with user studies, with the computational aspects, with mechanical aspects of human robot interaction, conceptual, ideas about HRI and design, as well as sometimes people's kind of perspectives, opinions maybe not just empirical work that pertain to human robot interaction studies.

[00:09:25] **Christoph:** I have to ask you a few more questions on this. Is your journal different from any of the other H R I journals?

[00:09:34] **Bilge:** Not necessarily. In some ways, yes, in some ways, no. For example, think about the international journal of Social Robotics, which only focuses on social robotics. We don't only focus on social robotics, so there are focus differences that way. At the same time I think if you want to publish open source, there aren't many alternatives. There are some author pays models, so ACMHRI is a great alternative right now. It's not clear if it's gonna stay free open source. So I think because our section has started as an open source venue, it will stay that way and it's structured that way. So it's definitely has that focus. Additionally, I would say that our kind of list of topics, if you look at what we cover, we try to really capture a sort of a definition of the field, methodologically types of research, both technical and empirical and practical.

It, if you have a very special need for a publication, let's say that I really work on social robotics. I'm gonna capture a social robotics audience, and really want to, target a particular audience, you might go to a more specialty journal, but if you want to capture the broad H R I readership, I think our journal is a better fit by keeping the topics broad.

We also keep the audience very broad. Our papers get a lot of views, not necessarily from the H R I community very broadly, and you might know that our section is only one of the about a dozen sections under frontier and robotics and ai. So we get a lot of cross-listing with other sections. So we get a lot of readership that is broadly in robotics, ai, computer science, social science related to that.

[00:11:30] **Christoph:** I'm not sure if these answers make the situation any clearer. Both Frontiers and THRI focus on all aspects of human robot interaction. While the social robotics journal focuses on well, social robots. But social robots are an integral part of human robot interaction. Maybe we'll find more differences in other aspects of the journals.

## Submission types

[00:12:03] **Christoph:** What type of submissions do you accept?

[00:12:06] **Aga:** We have primarily research articles, and we also accept review articles, surveys, and each issues, of course, are accompanied by also editorials, and special issues have a little bit extended editorials.

[00:12:19] **Selma:** We have, of course, research papers that often focus on some kind of empirical component. It can also be a technical contribution a design contribution. We have tutorials and survey papers as well as something that I think might be a little different from some other journals. We also accept something we call perspectives. We started those with the very first journal that journal issue that we published and those are meant as more opinion pieces. They're shorter. And the idea is to bring a kind of new idea or new perspective on our thinking in HRI.

[00:13:00] **Bilge:** I would say, the most common types are original research, which is where we see probably 90% of the submissions. These are your, papers that present some kind of technical, empirical or theoretical work hasn't been published anywhere before. Then there are reviews. There are systematic reviews or regular reviews. Those are also very common. In addition to that, we have many other publication types, like policy review, just proposing a hypothesis having a methods paper, opinion pieces. Those are much less common. But they do exist and. I think the Frontiers article types gives people a good kind of framework for it.

## Characteristics of a successful paper

[00:13:45] **Christoph:** Original research papers are probably the fast majority of papers and the journalists are open to a variety of other formats. Again, there are pretty similar. Maybe we can shed some lights on potential differences by asking them about what are the characteristics of a successful paper?

[00:14:04] **Aga:** First and foremost, good methods. And significant scientific contribution. So I would say that this is something that we look for and evaluate primarily on those criteria.

[00:14:18] **Christoph:** And what is a scientific contribution?

[00:14:21] **Aga:** Significant scientific contribution, yes. It's a contribution that offers a unique new insight original insight into our body of knowledge that we have in science. It's, of course, with these kind of questions, it's easier to give examples of what is not a significant scientific contribution.

So for example , one of the key points or key criteria for rejection for us is an extended conference paper. So the paper has already been published as a conference paper and then authors submit to our journal a paper that extends the findings by I don't know, collecting five more participants, but there's no new let's say, scientific conclusion that take home message is the same the analysis are very similar.

That is not a scientific a significant scientific contribution. But if there is a scientific question, a new scientific question that is answered by study then that is a significant scientific contribution.

[00:15:24] **Selma:** The other editor in chief and I talked a little bit about this today because thinking about this very broadly can sometimes be challenging. And we both agreed that one of the things we expect a really good paper to be is inspiring. And... Inspiring of both wanting to make the reader kind of delve in more into the paper, potentially apply it to their own work.

But I also think inspiring of opening. Wanting to allow to get somebody to open their mind to a new perspective on the world, a new perspective on what human robot interaction might be like for my the other editor in chief, Chad, who works more on the kind of the system side and builds and program systems one of the things that he talked about was basically a paper that he can not only read, but actually want to implement in his own work.

I do more of the social and human side of HRI and I, Similarly, think of something that you really want to, when you read it you can see connections with things that you're thinking about. It might bring a new ideas into your own mind about what kinds of things you could do, what kinds of things you could you could try out. So that's what we think of as a really great inspiring paper.

[00:16:44] **Bilge:** Yeah. In a successful paper I'd like to see a clear research question, and this research question should be situated and matters of significance and either theoretical or real world relevance. we'd like papers to follow a method that matches the research question well. That fit between the research question and method is always a bit of an open question.

Then once the method has is selected, then we want a rigorous execution of that method, which could be in data collection, analysis, interpretation. Once the work is completed, we want. Somehow a good substantiation of the conclusions in data or the work that was performed rather than a lot of speculation.

And generally, especially for the trisection, we want maximal sharing of sources. So if you ran an experiment, we'd like your And the questionnaires you use and your data de-identified as supplementing material so that people can scrutinize your work, replicate your work reanalyze your work. so we want maximum sharing of sources in general. Papers that follow, check These boxes, in my opinion, are very strong paper and will have a very easy kind of time with the review process. Getting your paper accepted is just part of the work. We want papers to also be read and have an impact on the community. These are the papers that meet these qualities will not only appear in publication, but they'll also have a bigger impact on other researchers because they will be stronger pieces of work that is clearly articulated and shared in a way that allows other people to build on.

## Rejection of papers

[00:18:32] **Christoph:** Good papers do normally get published. But more often than you might expect, get papers rejected right away. Arguably due to not matching the focus of the journal. Let's find out what papers, the HRI journals I reject immediately.

[00:18:48] **Aga:** Papers that are out of scope for the journal, that those are rejected immediately. So any papers that are dealing with robots that are not social robotics. I don't know, military drones, for example, that would be a paper that is definitely not in our scope. Studies that do not adhere to good scientific practices so for example, if there's a study with human subjects and there's no report on ethical approval for running this kind of study. And as I mentioned earlier extended conference papers, so papers that do not offer significant scientific contribution.

[00:19:23] **Christoph:** So you mentioned the military here, but I mean it's also conceivable that controlling or remote controlling a drone is also human robot interaction. So is there any particular reason why you would say no to drones?

[00:19:40] **Aga:** That is actually the difference probably between a human robot interaction and a social robot. I wouldn't call a robot like this a social robot. There is human robot interaction for sure, but the robot is not a social robot.

[00:19:52] **Selma:** We try not to reject that many papers immediately. I think mostly things that we reject are basically in two piles. One is it's outside of the scope of the journal, so it doesn't cover something related to human robot interaction.

So if we can't, if there are papers that, maybe provide Let's see. Some kind of machine learning on human data, but it actually doesn't really connect to a robotic application in any very clear way. That might be something to reject. But really, it's mostly issues of scope, or in other cases, it might be things that are just very preliminary.

Things where there might not be You know clear enough evidence or kind of enough substance in the paper to really move it forward to full review. We very rarely, to tell you the truth, make these decisions just among the editors. We usually involve a few people in the editorial board to precheck the papers, make sure that there's a broader consensus that, this might not be ready for review.

[00:20:58] **Bilge:** Yeah, so desk rejects exist, but our user use somewhat sparingly to make sure that we're not rejecting unusual papers. Sometimes unusual papers are rejected even though they shouldn't be rejected. So we catch them, we bring them back into the process. The ones that are desk rejected and that they do get rejected are ones that don't pass ethical analysis. So before papers are passed to the review team, there's a partly automated, partly human involved review process by the editorial office. Look at for plagiarism.

So there's an outcome of that could lead to rejection. Papers could be completely out of scope. Although I said that we try to publish, we try to be a broad umbrella for HRI research. the main contribution of the paper is to flu dynamics, probably outta scope. Or sometimes papers don't fit the submission category, so it is maybe a submission as a method paper, but it's more of a review. So in those situations, we get back to the authors immediately or try to get back to the authors immediately and say, is this what you meant with the submission? So I'd say that these are the general types that I've seen that result in immediate rejection.

## Open Access

[00:22:25] **Christoph:** Making the results of your work available to everybody for free is becoming increasingly important. Almost all journals do at least offer an open access option but their approach, vision and fees differ.

[00:22:40] **Aga:** There's this option of publishing open access in the journal. Since our journal is with Springer, Springer has agreements with various countries and various institutions to waive or reduce the publication fee for open access.

[00:22:54] **Christoph:** And what is your article publication fee?

[00:22:57] **Aga:** I think it's without any discounts 3, 690 American dollars.

[00:23:04] **Selma:** So the journal is open access. It's a gold open access journal and it started actually we have a period with ACM where people actually don't pay fees to publish yet. At some point there will be a fee process, but at that point there will also be waivers per ACM policies.

[00:23:28] **Christoph:** And when do you expect that to happen?

[00:23:31] **Selma:** I don't know. It's up to the ACM publications board.

[00:23:35] **Christoph:** What is your article publication fee?

[00:23:38] **Selma:** for now, zero.

[00:23:42] **Bilge:** I think it has some advantage, disadvantages. It took me a while to get used to this. At first it feels odd that I'm doing all this work, then I want to go publish this. And if I'm doing great work, journalists should really get in line to publish my work.

when you think about it in a different way, you might think that publishing is more of a service and I go and seek the services of a public publisher. I pay for those services and hopefully I'm getting a lot of value at the end. This seems very straightforward. If you think about the conventional model where I don't pay anything and that service actually sells my work in order to obtain funds cover the costs associated with that publishing with that service. Now, when you think about that sounds more odd to me than the open access. so I think once you have a shift of mindset open access makes much more sense. And if the reason why you are seeking. A conventional publication model is that you can't afford or do not wanna pay these fees the journal already provides waivers and mechanisms for not covering that. For example, they have partnerships with library systems or universities or entire nations to, for all the fees to waived.

If you don't have the funds and you can demonstrate that you don't have the funds, most of the times the fees are waived. So in a sense, for a lot of authors, the open access fees are not relevant.

[00:25:22] **Christoph:** what is your article publication fee?

[00:25:26] **Bilge:** So the publication fees are set by the platform and it's the different fee for each journal and each section, and also different for different article types. Most submissions to. The HRI section, I say submissions, but once they get accepted, we'll pay $2,125. That's the fee set by the journal. So this would be the original research review and comment long form types.

Then there are other fees for shorter contributions that range between $490 to $975. If you go to the website, you'll see that the article types are categorize under type A, B, C, a, D and type A. Is this the highest fee? And that's mostly where people will submit. So this is the fee and this is actually much lower than a lot of open access publication fees that we see in the open access publishing industry.

[00:26:24] **Christoph:** While ACM currently publishes all HRI papers for free springer does have an open access option. If you want to publish in frontiers there is no free option. Unless you can make a case. Open access is publishing is important but also expensive.

## Artificial Intelligence

[00:26:43] **Christoph:** The arrival of large language models makes writing easier. Similar to spell checkers, they can improve your writing. Some tools are already widely accepted, such as Grammarly, but newer tools such as chatGPT or Jenny. AI are not yet widely accepted. The journals may or may not accept your paper that was co-authored by an artificial intelligence.

[00:27:08] **Aga:** AI or large language models do not at the moment satisfy criteria for authorship. Because one of the criteria for authorship is accountability. And let's say responsibility for several aspects of the work. Large language model wouldn't be able to assert presence or absence of conflict of interest or manage copyright and license agreements being non legal entities.

With the use of AI in a paper, it needs to be very well documented in the methods. So that needs to be stated in either a method section or wherever else it's appropriate if there's no method section in a paper, but authorship for AI is not an option.

[00:27:52] **Christoph:** And if I use an AI tool or a large language model to help me write the literature review, would that be acceptable?

[00:28:02] **Aga:** Yes, but not as a, so it should be stated in the method section.

[00:28:07] **Christoph:** And is that an official policy for this journal or is it Springer or where are

[00:28:11] **Aga:** It is Springer's policy. It is Springer's policy, yes.

[00:28:15] **Selma:** So ACM has a position on AI co authorship, which is clearly described on its website. And it is that AI cannot be a co author, so it can't be listed as a co author. But you could use generative AI tools to prepare the manuscript. However, there are particular requirements. That they don't plagiarize, misrepresent or falsify content in the submission that this is really the author's underlying work and novel intellectual contribution and not a result of the tool, and that the author accepts the responsibility for the material presented.

[00:28:58] **Christoph:** so if I would use chat GPT. To write a literature review section, would that be acceptable?

[00:29:10] **Selma:** You mean to fully write a literature review section?

[00:29:14] **Christoph:** I could easily prompt ChatGPT, like, Summarize the developments in human robot interaction in the application area of schoolchildren. And it would give me some response, and I could just copy and paste that over.

[00:29:32] **Selma:** I'm actually looking at the rules right now. But is that if you do use such a tool, you have to acknowledge it in the submitted article. And then if you do whole sections where the tools are used, then you have to also both disclose which sections these are and then explain which tools are used to generate those sections in an appendix or a supplementary material.

[00:30:04] **Bilge:** That's a great question. Of course. Very timely. And the journal has a stance on that, and I can tell you what I think, because I has additional points. The journal's point is that in publication, We always consider intellectual property for authorship, and it's a very well delineated topic. And what AI tools is unclear who owns the IP for content generated by ai. And I actually pulled up the Journal's own policy on this. And they say authors should not list a generative AI technology as a co-author or author of any submitted manuscript. Generative AI technologies cannot be held accountable for all aspects of a manuscript and consequently do not meet the criteria for required authorship.

## The future

[00:30:55] **Christoph:** Scientific publishing moves forward. The arrival of the internet changed the publishing world dramatically. Copying and distributing knowledge has become trivial. Everybody can just post their PDF on a webpage. But what visions do the journals have for scientific publishing?

[00:31:15] **Aga:** Ideally, I would like to see more quality. Let's say less papers altogether being published, but more quality papers that are actually read by more people. Because right now we are, I think, publishing way too much and papers that are often read by just a few number of people.

So higher quality less in quantity, I would say, and with this comes the big, I think a huge issue of, that we're struggling these days is the referee fatigue. So it's very, very difficult to find reviewers. It's very difficult for reviewers to find time and therefore everything is becoming first of all, extremely delayed because it's, and it's not only our journal.

I hear this a lot from everyone around and not only journals, but also, so on and so forth. Yeah, to somehow make sure that we have good quality peer review for good quality papers. I would like to see reviewers work more appreciated in terms of like general assessment of, in science and research.

So we are being assessed for actually, the number of publications or whatever, the impact factor of our publications. But nobody looks in your CV whether you have reviewed or not, and sure there are some these days more modern approaches that you can reward reviewers in the journal and give certain, yeah, awards to reviewers.

But in reality, when there's an application, I don't know, for a tenure track nobody looks in the CV for it. Whether and how much has this person reviewed or how much they've been involved in and reviewing. So I think this is probably the only way to actually make sure that reviewers have some incentive to review and that this is appreciated by the system and together with decreasing the number of publications that should hopefully heal the system a little bit, because I think we're a bit in trouble right now.

[00:33:31] **Selma:** So in terms of scientific publishing, I think what I would love to see is more of a focus. Just in publishing in general for all of us on kind of quality over quantity Even though I think the push in general is in the other direction.

And in some sense for publishing through journals As venues where, things go through peer review, and there is a full process of in some sense kind of verifying the quality of the material I think, those can go hand in hand with more self publishing methods, which people already use. So put it, to put out there their work much more speedily for people to be able to see and use and, think about.

I think, the other thing that is at least as thinking as an both, as an editor and as a reviewer, that's become very hard to manage is the process of reviewing. I think, the community is very on the one hand I think people get a lot of requests for reviews because of the increasing quantity of work being put out there. And and so it's very hard to get things moving in a. In a timely manner. And I think that also makes potentially the quality high quality reviews much harder to receive, which. In that case maybe isn't giving kind of due diligence to the work that's being presented by the authors.

So I think working through also that system and, maybe we expect people to be to give as well as they get things from the community. So if they're submitting papers. Everyone is hoping that authors are also reviewing papers, but, that's not necessarily always the case.

I was just recently in a conversation with another editor and with ACM because ACM is trying to figure out how to improve the peer review process and one of the things that they mentioned is that they were trying to put in a system whereby when you review papers you basically get a credit in some sense for the journal.

When you try to publish a paper, you're using up credit. When you're asking somebody to review your work. So in some sense, you get some credits to start with, but as you keep publishing, if you're not reviewing, you don't have a credit to use in order to get your piece reviewed. That seems like a fair way to go about it.

[00:36:13] **Bilge:** Great question and hard to answer of course. And I don't really have that strong of a vision. I am in the system and the trenches, making things work for the community. But I think there are a few preferences that I have that I can communicate. I think venue or system where it's very merit based.

So there are no, like, who knows who's involved in publishing things. There are journals where unless you know someone in the editorial team, you can't even make a submission. I'd like things to be kind of open to everyone to submit and meritoriously evaluated based on the quality of the work.

Open peer review is a very interesting model. At the same time, it incentivizes people to write reviews in a particular way. So it has some challenges. I think there are some limitations I see being justified with the peer review process, but I generally want things to be as open as possible. And when I say open, I want access to be open materials to be all shared. A lot of disclosure on. Technologies, like the ones that you mentioned are used so as open as possible about what was done.

I also see a place for working papers. I don't think our community does well with this. We hold on work until it's ready to publish and we think that we're gonna be scooped if we somehow open it up or somehow share it. There are a lot of communities that do really well with working papers. Economics is an example. Before a paper appears in an archival venue, maybe for 10 years, it's openly available as a working paper under. Certain databases like archive. So I think we can do better with working papers to know who's working on what and establish novelty of your work by putting out the first working paper and allow other people to see the progress of it over time and build on it.

On this editorial side of things, I see a lot of burnout by people who do editorial work and review work, and the incentives are not really well. It's very, very hard to find reviewers for papers these days. I think that's more of

a platform question, but I think that this is a problem to be solved and possibly thinking about what incentives there are for people are doing the reviews, editorial work is a helpful conversation for platforms to have and for the communities to also have and also to demand from publication platforms.

## HRI related journals

[00:38:55] **Christoph:** These three journals directly target HRI. But there are some journals that explicitly include HRI as a topic without being completely dedicated to just this topic. The interaction studies journal is an example. Kestin, could you please introduce yourself.

[00:39:16] **Kerstin:** My name is Kerstin Dautenhahn. I'm full professor and Canada 150 research chair here at University of Waterloo and I'm one of the editors in chief of the journal Interaction Studies. My co editor in chief is Angelo Cangellossi from University Manchester in the UK.

[00:39:35] **Christoph:** Why should authors submit to your journal?

[00:39:40] **Kerstin:** Interaction Studies a very interdisciplinary journal in terms of the scope, but also the readership. So it means when people submit to this journal, they could potentially target a wider audience. We are also quite flexible in terms of the research methodology, as long as it's solid. So for example, we are not necessarily limited to quantitative methods that are very dominant in HRI in terms of experimental psychology. Interaction Studies is also quite generous in terms of open access. The open access fees are certainly not as high as many other journals in this field. And also Interaction Studies, the publisher, John Benjamins, is quite generous in terms of archiving both of submitted manuscripts as well as accepted manuscripts. For example, on authors homepages or institutional archives or on Any other archiving services.

[00:40:37] **Christoph:** What is the focus of the journal?

[00:40:39] **Kerstin:** The vision of the journal is to understand communication and interaction in natural and artificial systems. This means social interaction and communication in humans. In other animals, for example, primates or or birds or cetaceans. But also in those domains that Herbert A. Simon coined the sciences of the artificial. So this could be AI or cognitive science. and it could be robotics, it could be engineering, but it's really this desire to understand more deeply principles of communication and interaction.

[00:41:18] **Christoph:** If your work is more on the technical side you might want to consider the IEEE transactions on robotics. Ram, could you please introduce yourself?

[00:41:29] **Ram:** Yes, I'm Ram Basubhavan. I'm an associate professor of mechanical engineering and robotics at the University of Michigan. I'm also a senior editorial board member and senior editor in the journal TRO. So the transactions on robotics. I'm actually their inaugural science communications editor. Before that I actually was the associate editor at TRO for three years.

[00:41:52] **Christoph:** And what is a science communication editor?

[00:41:56] **Ram:** Yeah, it's a good question. What we're finding in a lot of ways is the material the journal TRO publishes, things that Are extraordinarily important to the robotics community, but I think we're not doing as effective of a job as we want to in communicating the work that we do inside of the journal.

So we write, for instance, I'll pick on myself. We write these beautiful papers about, how do you control soft robots and, developing beautiful algorithms for how you actually do that, well, what we aren't doing is, translating that into a way that is accessible for the general audience.

And TRO thought it would be important for us to have someone whose goal was to actually make that connection feasible. And so as part of that role, which I just began at the beginning of the year, I've been working on trying to connect the authors of TRO and the articles in TRO with appropriate journalists and appropriate social media platforms to try to make the information that's appearing in TRO more accessible.

[00:42:53] **Christoph:** So why should authors submit to your journal?

[00:42:57] **Ram:** Yeah, so the, IEEE transactions on robotics is the flagship journal for the Robotics and Automation Society. We try to publish papers that are across the entire spectrum in robotics. So despite being a niche community, robotics has become quite large. And there are different, subgroups inside of this, ecosystem that is robotics.

But what we do in TRO is make sure that all of that material is published so it can be. HRI work, it can be soft robotics work, it can be control and dynamics work, it can be mechanism design work, it can be anything. And we try to make sure that all of those articles appear together and are accessible to the entire robotics community.

So I think, for each of these sub niches, making sure that their work is actually read by this broader robotics community is actually really important. The other thing is, I think we do a really important job in TRO by essentially making sure that the material that appears in the paper or appears in the journal actually achieve the standard that we view as acceptable as a community in robotics.

And I think that makes sure you know that novice viewer readers can come in and read these papers and feel comfortable that the material that's being presented is actually recognized as important and impactful by experts broadly in robotics.

[00:44:14] **Christoph:** And how is that different from other HRI journals?

[00:44:20] **Ram:** you. Yeah, so I think in other HRI journals you're going to see something more focused on just HRI. And I'm using the word just there maybe in a limiting way. But what I mean to say is, you're going to find articles in TRO that are HRI articles, but you're also going to find the, articles that are unrelated to HRI.

They're going to be articles about optimization or the theory of soft robot design or other things. So it's a much broader set of papers. Why is that useful for the HRI community? Well, in fact, it's giving you access to a group of readers who is looking at things, from a bunch of different areas.

So it isn't just going to be HRI people who generally read this journal. It's going to be roboticists writ large. And so that means that, your article on HRI is going to be seen by a larger community, hopefully all of robotics.

[00:45:08] **Christoph:** Would it be fair to say that the emphasis is slightly more on technology?

[00:45:13] **Ram:** Yeah, I think that would be fair to say.

## Conclusions

[00:45:28] **Christoph:** The three dedicated HR journals have many similarities. They all welcome HRI studies and claim to cover a wide spectrum of topics. Social robotics focuses on social robots while the other two also accept non social robots. ACM's journal currently offering free open access publishing. For Springer's social robotics, it is an option. And for Frontiers it is a must.

Make no mistake. Frontiers is owned by a company. Frontier's media. And in 2013, the nature publishing group acquired a controlling interest. The nature publishing group is a division of the Springer nature group that owns all the Springer journals. Spring a nature. It's owned by the whole spring publishing group and its CEO. Stefan fun. Whole spring is a board member of frontiers media. The duopoly of Springer and Elsevier remains and frontiers is just another commercial publisher. The fact that they operate open access journals. Changes nothing. And the problems we have with the current business model for scientific publishing.

There are also several journals that try to attract HRI papers from less established and respected publishers. The international journal of humanoid robotics, is an example. I included them in our HRI publishing guide on our website, but I did not try to interview the editors. And of course there are a number of problematic journals that often hijack the open access movement to make a quick buck. I will link a page to a list of flaky conferences and journals.

All three journals are doing a good job. I asked them a wealth of additional information that we cannot talk about here in the podcast. Instead, I added this information to the webpage. There you will find a detailed table with all the indicators I could think about such a their processing speed, acceptance rate, and impact factor. Scientific publishing must move forward. But with the article publication fees of up to 3000 us dollars, it is hard to see how this will happen quickly. It is interesting to see that we have three journals that are publishing by three different types of publishers. You have a traditional publisher in this case Springer, professional association, the ACM, and a new open access publisher frontiers. It will be interesting to see how they will develop. There are some major challenges that they all face. Recruiting good reviewers, processing manuscripts quickly and making open access publishing affordable. Hope that this guide to publishing your HRI paper, it's useful to you and I wish you all the best of luck with reviewer two.