

## Journal of Energy Storage Guide for Authors: Your Roadmap to Publication Success

### Who Reads This Journal (And Why You Should Care)

Let's cut to the chase - if you're holding a cup of coffee while reading this, you're probably part of the Journal of Energy Storage's core audience: researchers, engineers, and clean energy innovators working on battery tech, thermal storage systems, or next-gen solutions like hydrogen storage. These folks aren't just browsing - they're hunting for actionable insights to solve real-world energy challenges.

Recent data from Scimago Journal Rankings shows a 27% year-over-year increase in submissions about solid-state batteries and AI-driven energy management systems. But here's the kicker - 63% of rejected manuscripts get axed in the first review round due to formatting errors. Yikes!

### What Editors Secretly Crave

- Novelty with practical applications (no "me too" studies)
- Clear connection to UN Sustainable Development Goals
- Data visualizations that could make a toddler understand redox reactions

### Manuscript Preparation: Beyond the Template

You wouldn't show up to a Michelin-star restaurant in flip-flops, right? Same logic applies here. The Guide for Authors isn't just suggestions - it's the secret sauce for avoiding the dreaded "return to sender" status.

Pro tip: Dr. Li Wei from Tsinghua University increased her acceptance rate by 40% after using automated LaTeX templates with built-in compliance checks. Her secret weapon? A custom Overleaf script that flags:

- Nomenclature inconsistencies
- Missing COI statements
- Over-optimistic battery cycle life claims

### Common Submission Blunders (And How to Dodge Them)

Remember that team who submitted a breakthrough in flow battery technology... using Comic Sans? True story. Their content rocked, but the editor nearly rejected it on principle. Moral of the story? Presentation matters almost as much as the science.

### The Peer Review Gauntlet: Survival Tips

Here's where most authors faceplant. A 2023 study by Elsevier revealed that manuscripts using structured abstracts with problem-solution-benefit framing get 22% faster review times. Smart move: bake your review

responses into the original submission using a "anticipated questions" section.

"Treat reviewers like curious colleagues, not adversaries," advises Prof. Maria Gonzalez, who's handled 150+ papers as associate editor. "When we asked for additional cycling data, one author sent a 3D-printed model of their battery stack. We published it within weeks!"

## Open Science Mandates: Friend or Foe?

The journal now requires FAIR data principles compliance - that's Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable. But here's a silver lining: authors sharing code repositories see 300% more citations. Case in point - Stanford's open-source battery degradation model got cited in 47 papers before their manuscript even published!

## APCs vs. Impact: The New Calculus

With Article Processing Charges (APCs) hitting \$2,500, smart authors are using institutional memberships or negotiating fee waivers. But wait - papers opting for gold open access average 89% more downloads in the first quarter. Talk about ROI!

## When Life Gives You Revisions...

A rejected manuscript isn't dead - it's just needing CPR. Take Dr. Ahmed's story: His work on phase-change materials got rejected twice... until he added a machine learning twist. Now it's the most-downloaded paper in Q2 2024. The lesson? Treat criticism like free R&D consulting.

72-hour rule: Let rejection emails marinate before responding

Leverage ORCID to showcase related work

Use the journal's Twitter hashtag (#JESChat) for real-time feedback

## The Preprint Tightrope Walk

Here's where things get spicy. Posting to arXiv or SSRN can stake your claim without jeopardizing publication. But remember - 33% of editors frown on verbatim preprint submissions. The sweet spot? Share the core findings, but keep some secret sauce for the final manuscript.

## Ethics Minefields: Don't Get Cancelled

Last month, a promising paper got retracted because the authors "forgot" to mention their startup's commercial interest in the tech. Awkward! The new CRediT taxonomy requirements force you to specify exactly who did what - from data curation to chatbot wrangling.

Hot trend: Some labs now include blockchain-based contribution tracking in supplementary materials. Overkill? Maybe. But it sure makes authorship disputes vanish faster than lithium in aqueous solution!

## Beyond PDFs: The Interactive Paper Revolution

Why settle for static figures when you can embed Jupyter notebooks or 3D battery models? The journal now accepts supplementary AR/VR files - perfect for showing off that fancy new zinc-air battery prototype. Early adopters report 40% longer reader engagement times.

One author even created a playable simulation showing different thermal management strategies. Readers loved it, though rumor says the editor spent 2 hours "testing" it before realizing it wasn't actually a game. Talk about immersive peer review!

Web: <https://www.sphoryzont.edu.pl>