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Agenda

Dr. Barbara Given
• 1:00-1:45 Overview of CON Publication Productivity
• Details for getting started
  – Modes of dissemination
  – Consider who will read your paper
  – Establish authorship (hand out CON document)
  – Consider which journal/s are best
  – Consider impact factor

Dr. Rebecca Lehto
• 1:45-2:20 How to structure your paper & develop good writing habits
• Selecting the right structure
  – IMRD for research (hand out sample)
    • CONSORT (hand out)
  – PRISMA for full literature review
  – Scoping for focused literature review
  – Structuring your abstract
  – Determine if a conceptual or theoretical model is required

Dr. Gwen Wyatt
• 2:20-2:55 Development of each section of a research paper
• Knowing the components
  – Literature review: brief but must point to gap and your RQs
  – Research question, aims or hypothesis
  – Include fidelity for intervention reports
  – What to say about your measures
  – Results: just the facts
  – Discussion: compare with state of the science and add your ideas
  – Check all references for currency, no old websites

• 2:55-3:00 Preview of March seminar and how to prepare
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Modes of Dissemination

- Websites
- Reports
- DVD
- Journals – print
- Podcasts
- Video

- Professional presentations
- Drama
- Book chapters
- Exhibition
- Media
- Workshop media
Who will read the paper?

• Who is the target audience?
• What should the paper be?
  – Systematic review
  – Case study
  – Commentary
Who will read the paper?

- Discipline specific or includes multidisciplinary?
- What is the contribution to the science and the procession?
- What opportunities are there for what you want to do?
- Aims and scope (how narrow or comprehensive)
Authorship

• Author guidelines
  – See journal guidelines

• Authorship
  – Participate actively
  – Final approval
  – Ability to explain or defend in public

• Acknowledgements

• Lead author and order of authorship

• Disputes and conflicts

• Funding sources

• Format written agreements
Pick a journal

• Read a few articles

• What is format (structure) and outline
  – Length
  – Use of tables and data presentation
  – Components
  – References / style
  – Word counts

• Instructions for style
Targeting Journals

Factors you might consider when selecting a journal to submit to:

Does your paper contain new knowledge or a new interpretation?

If your answer to this question is NO, then go back and start again (most journals will quickly reject submissions of this type)
Targeting Journals

Is your paper of very general interest/significance? Or is it more interest to a specialist group?

If the former, your work might be appropriate for a high-impact generalist journal; if the latter, it may be appropriate to target a good quality specialist journal.
Getting Start - Writing

• What is the topic of the paper?
• Who publishes the paper?
  – What are the requirements of that journal?
• Don’t waste your effort on low impact or limited circulation journals
• Put it down for 10 days to 2 weeks and review again
Getting Start - Writing

• Check turn around time
• What is the key message?
• Is the journal picked up by google scholar, PubMed, PsychInfo?
• Make time
• Is it peer reviewed
• Recent literature
The Writing Process

What is the one thing you need but often can’t get enough of (for writing)?

Time

You must make this available so that you can really concentrate
Impact Factors

• The journal impact factor is a measure of the frequency with which the “average article” in a journal has been cited in a particular year.

• The impact factor will help you evaluate a journal’s relative importance, especially when you compare it to others in the same field.

(ISI Citations Database, n.d.)
Impact Factors

Impact Factor = \frac{\text{no. of citations}}{\text{total no. articles}}

Calculated over the last 2 years

This looks simple. Is it too simple?
Impact Factors

• Granting agencies and grant “assessors” may use the impact factor of journals in which you publish as an indicator of the quality of your work
  – i.e. they may form an opinion of the value of your work without actually reading it
What Publishers Want

They want well-written submissions that:
1. Fall clearly within the field(s) prescribe by the journal (see journal website for this information)
2. Provide an advance in science

Your manuscript will be more desirable to the editor if it contains a “big” advance in knowledge and/or addresses a current topical area.
Open-Access Publications

• Open Access (OA) is the practice of providing the public with unrestricted online access to scholarly journal articles
Open-Access Publications

• Pros
  – Free access = wider audience
  – Author often retains copyright

• Cons
  – Author fees
  – Some predatory journals
  – Concerns about quality control and authenticity
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“If you want to be a writer, write…”
Epictetus
Objectives

• Developing good writing habits
• Selecting the right structure for your paper
  – IMRD
  – Consort
  – PRISMA
  – Scoping
• Structuring your abstract
• Do I use a conceptual or theoretical model?
Developing good writing habits

– Set aside 20 minutes every day to write (rather than waiting for a clear day)
– Planning before you write
– Only the best and most practiced can effectively squeeze it in between other work
Developing good writing habits: Planning

• Free writing
• Notes/sketches
• Idea lists
  – Ideas on post-it notes
• Mind map
• Skeleton paper with sub-headings
• Outline
Developing good writing habits: Planning

• Focus
  – What is the specific problem, or research question that my review helps to define?
  – What is the scope?
  – Identifying a focus that allows you to:
    • Sort and categorize information
    • Eliminate irrelevant information

• Type
  – What type of literature review am I conducting?
  – Theory; Methodology; Policy; Quantitative; Qualitative
Developing good writing habits

• Write without editing initially
  – Don't try to get it right first time
  – Resist the temptation to edit as you go; you will tend to get stuck and waste time

• Keep to the plan of your outline
  – Use the sentences from your outline to focus what you want to say
  – If you find yourself wandering from the point, stop and move on to the next sentence in the outline
Developing good writing habits:

The Writing Process

- Rough Draft
- Final Draft
- Edit
- Edit Again
Developing good writing habits: summary

1. Write to communicate, not to impress.
2. Follow the instructions.
3. Use good models.
4. Gather plenty of suitable information.
5. Organize the information carefully.
6. Set aside blocks of time for writing.
8. Write readably.
Selecting the right structure for your paper: **IMRAD Format**

- **Introduction**: What was the question?
- **Methods**: How did the research(s) try to answer it?
- **Results**: What did the researchers find?
- **Discussion**: What do the results mean?
Selecting the right structure for your paper: structure of review articles

- Literature reviews are in reality a type of research
- Should conform to the anatomy of a typical scholarly article
  - Abstract
  - Introduction
  - Methods
  - Results
  - Discussion
  - Conclusion
  - References
Selecting the right structure for your paper: A Good Literature Review is:

- **Focused** - The topic should be narrow. Only present ideas and only report on studies that are closely related to topic.
- **Concise** - Ideas should be presented economically. Don’t take any more space than needed to present ideas.
- **Logical** - The flow within and among paragraphs should be a smooth, logical progression from one idea to the next
- **Developed** - Don’t leave the story half told.
- **Integrative** - The paper should stress how the ideas in the studies are related. Focus on the big picture. What commonality do all the studies share? How are some studies different than others? Your paper should stress how all the studies reviewed contribute to your topic.
- **Current** - The review should focus on work being done on the cutting edge of your topic.
Selecting the right structure for your paper:
Large number of studies – need to synthesize & summarize


Source: Evidence-based Nursing
http://ebp.lib.uic.edu/nursing/node/12
Selecting the right structure for your paper: Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials
Selecting the right structure for your paper: PRISMA Flow diagram


www.prisma-statement.org
Selecting the right structure for your paper: Scoping for focused review

• “A scoping review or scoping study is a form of knowledge synthesis that addresses an exploratory research question aimed at mapping key concepts, types of evidence, and gaps in research related to a defined area by systematically searching, selecting, and synthesizing existing knowledge”.

Selecting the right structure for your paper: Why do a Scoping review

- Determine ability to do a systematic review
- To disseminate research findings
- To identify research and general gaps
- Make recommendations for future research
- Evaluate a body of literature with regard to location (context), sources (peer-reviewed, grey, etc.), and field (clinical, academic, etc.)
Selecting the right structure for your paper: Systematic Review

• A review of a clearly formulated research question that uses systematic and explicit methods to identify, select and critically appraise relevant research, and to analyze data from the studies that are included in the review.
Selecting the right structure for your paper: Key characteristics of Systematic Reviews

• Focused well defined research question
• Clearly stated title and objectives
• Comprehensive strategy for identification of all relevant studies (published & unpublished)
• Explicit (and justified) predefined inclusion & exclusion criteria
• Critical appraisal of studies
• Clear analysis of the results of eligible studies
  – Quantitative (meta-analysis)
  – Qualitative
• Structured report
Selecting the right structure for your paper: use of summary tables

• It is useful to prepare summary tables.
• Such a table provides a quick overview that allows the reviewer to make sense of a large mass of information.
• The tables could include columns with headings such as
  – Author
  – type of study
  – Sample
  – Design
  – data collection approach
  – key findings
Selecting the right structure for your paper: Structuring the abstract

- Introduction
- Framework/theoretical background
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion/Conclusions

Note: scientific journals may use headers or summary form. Word counts vary (250-350 generally).
Deciding whether a model or framework is needed

- Process: systematic and thorough
- Product: coherent evaluation of the state of the science and gaps needing to be filled.
- Clarify relationships between empirical and theoretical.
- May lead to framework development.
Questions ????
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Knowing the Components of a Research Manuscript
IMRAD

I-ntroduction
M-ethods
R-esults
A-nd
D-iscussion
Introduction
Why was the study done?

• Purpose: Importance of topic; may include stats of population
• Research Literature Review: Needs to be brief but must point to gap or limitation to prior studies
• Background: Context of topic; what is the health problem being addressed?
• Research Questions, aims, hypothesis
Methods
What was done?

• Model: check journal for requirements
• Design: RCT
• Setting/Sample: source, n=, recruitment, criteria, randomization, power, attrition, incentives, IRB
• Intervention: describe what each group gets
• Procedures: training staff, etc
• Measures: Established V & R; how used in study
• Data Analysis: General and by RQ
Include Fidelity for Intervention Studies

NIH Treatment Fidelity Workgroup

1. Intervention dose- frequency, duration and interval
2. Training interveners- predetermined protocol
3. Delivery of intervention- consistency checks
4. Receipt of intervention- # of sessions completed
5. Enactment of intervention- Permanent change
Results

• Describe highlights of sample (demographics, clinical characteristics)
• Present significant findings first; repeat research questions as a guide.
• Present only the facts
• Create tables that clearly match text, but also add more detail
• Include CONSORT
Discussion

- Interpret results, but do not repeat results.
- Discuss whether findings are consistent with current work and cite.
- Do not overstate implications for practice or research; state how generalizable.
- Limitations and future research.
- Follow by a short summary paragraph that highlights key findings.
References

• Some journals have a limit on number of references; check guidelines
• Have the majority be current within last 5 years or explain why older
• Be sure website citations are current
• Use the required format; check early so if APA you allow space
Ask yourself these questions when you think your paper is done

• Are the purposes of the study, research questions, and/or hypotheses stated clearly for readers?

• Are the gaps in knowledge and limitations of prior studies emphasized to provide support for the current study?

• Does the methods section adequately describe the study design, subjects, measures, procedures, and data analysis?

• Does the results section present the findings of the study, addressing the original purposes of the research?
Ask yourself these questions when you think your paper is done

- Are the main findings present first?
- Are the findings presented without discussion, which is provided in the subsequent section of the paper?
- Are the results described accurately and precisely?
- Are statistics reported correctly, using conventional format?
Ask yourself these questions when you think your paper is done

• Does the discussion section interpret the results and explain what the findings mean in terms of the purpose of the study and how they advance previous studies?

• Are inconsistencies with prior research addressed?

• Are implications of the study discussed?