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  • **Writing** your paper
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  • **Preparing** your paper
  • **Following** the peer-review process

• Your role, and ours

• Where to find help

• Getting started
Some general guidelines...

• Make sure you have something worthwhile to say
  • Methodology quality is a key publishing criteria
• Find the right journal to say it in
• Read articles from your chosen journal to get a sense for what they publish
• Find their specific submission guidelines and follow them completely
• Ask a friend, colleague or peer to proofread your work before submission
• Submit to only one journal at a time
• Take any feedback constructively – not personally
Conducting publishable research

Make sure…

• ... Your question is researchable and interesting
  ✓ Spend time refining the question and seek guidance from a supervisor

• ... Your research has not been done before
  ✓ Conduct a thorough literature review before and during methodology design stage

• ... Your methodology is appropriate
  ✓ Choose the most appropriate data collection and analysis techniques

• ... Your data is good-quality, relevant and representative
  ✓ Pay attention to sampling your population and maximising the validity of your data

• ... Your write-up answers your research question
  ✓ Write critically and analytically, not descriptively
Conducting publishable research

But how?

Speak to your supervisor
• *They are there to help you, particularly regarding your research design and methodology*

Communicate with other researchers
• *Fellow researchers may have first-hand experiences they can share*

Take advantage of your library’s services:
• *Your library will probably provide training sessions and workshops about designing your research project, academic writing, preparing manuscripts, understanding Open Access etc*
• *Your library will also offer databases and digital and print resources to help with your research project, for example books, journals and databases such as SAGE Research Methods Video*
A library database of streaming video dedicated to research methods and the research process, unlike any other database available

- Helps you **refine** your skills, **learn** new ones, and **justify** choices you make in your research projects

- [https://methods.sagepub.com/video](https://methods.sagepub.com/video)
Writing your paper

When finished:

- Title
- Abstract
- Keywords
- Main text
  - Introduction
  - Methods
  - Results
  - Discussion
- Conclusions
- Acknowledgement
- References
- Supporting materials

When writing:

- Data and findings
- Figures and visualizations (tables, graphs etc)
- Methods, results, discussions
- Conclusion
- Introduction
- Abstract and title
Choosing the right journal is key to acceptance. Consider:

- Which journals do you read and cite regularly?
- Which journals focus most closely on your field of research?
- What is the publisher’s reputation?
- Who is the editor?
- Who is on the editorial board?
- How international is the journal’s scope?
- Do you know someone who has published in the journal?
Choosing the right journal

But how?

Once you have created your shortlist of potential journals…

• What are their aims, scope and subject area?
• Are they a member of COPE?
• What is their impact factor?
• How well-ranked are they?
• What is their open-access policy?
• How long would the process take?

Review previous issues of each suitable journal…

• Do they publish your kind of work?
• Do you like their style?
• Do you think they would accept your work?
• What are their individual submission guidelines? Can you meet them?
Adhering to submission guidelines

• Different journals have different submission rules
  • Even journals published by the same publisher!

- CMR does not accept multiple submissions (manuscripts simultaneously submitted to other publications).
- CMR does not give publication consideration to manuscripts that have been previously published or are posted online.
- CMR uses the Chicago Manual of Style as primary reference source.

• Each journal makes its submission guidelines publicly available.
  • These are usually found on the journal website.

• Most submissions are done through a website such as ScholarOne or ManuscriptCentral.
Preparing your paper: Writing a good title and abstract

• The better your title and abstract, the more your work will be:
  • Discovered
  • Read
  • Cited

• Consider what your audience would be searching for (keywords)

• Choose these words carefully - test them with your own internet searches: are you finding what you would expect?

• Include your keywords in:
  • The title
  • In your abstract (3 to 4 different keywords)
  • Throughout your paper
    • All without losing the natural flow of language!
Preparing your paper: Copyright and publication ethics

• Obtain permission for all copyrighted material
• Authorship / Acknowledgement
• Funding statement
• Conflict of interest
• Research ethics
• COPE - http://publicationethics.org/
Submit!

- Check the submission guidelines one more time
- Check your formatting and additional submissions
- Have it proof-read
- Submit to one journal at a time

- And now wait….

… but for how long?
The publication process

1. Write
2. Submit
3. Review
4. Revise
5. Re-submit
6. Acceptance
7. Online publication
8. Print publication
Following the peer-review process

• Initial decision
  • Desk reject: immediate decision
  • Peer review

• Peer review decision
  • Reject
  • Accept with major revisions
  • Accept with minor revisions
  • Accept and publish

The peer review process

Paper is sent out to two or three referees by an Associate Editor

Referees write a report and make recommendation to the journal Editor
Following the peer-review process: Handling revisions

- Read the reports and Editor’s letter carefully
- Follow the *timeframes* requested
- **Address each referee point in a covering note**
  - Clearly demonstrate what you have changed
  - If you can’t meet all criticisms, explain why
- Be **positive** and **polite**
- Process can take **2 to 3 iterations** – be patient
Why do papers get rejected?

• Referees are not convinced of the contribution to the knowledge base
• Methods are not robust enough for the journal
  • e.g. too few observations on quantitative papers
  • e.g. transparency of qualitative methods
• Specific sections are weak
  • Conclusion
  • Discussion
• Bad grammar and written style
If your paper isn’t accepted…

• Stay calm
• Read the referees’ report and the Editor’s letter
• Try and re-work the paper according to their recommendations
• Consider submitting to an alternative journal
• Write another paper!
Your role, and ours
The responsibilities of the author

- **Professional ethics** as a researcher searching the truth *no fraud or distortion*
- **Accurate and professional account** of research and relevance to others *clear concise communication*
- A commitment to **the public good** and public values *despite intense competitive pressure in research*
- Respect to peers and to the public served *issues such as privacy*
Author responsibilities in the digital age

• Copyright situation can be complex
• Funders may require authors to make their papers available in repositories
  • Responsibilities sometimes at odds with publisher requirements
  • It may be up to you to ensure the paper is posted in the right place
• Publisher policies vary

Stay informed and if unsure, ask!
The responsibilities of the publisher

- Sustainability of journals
- Quality of journals
- Quality of editor and editorial boards
- Relevance of the journal as a field develops (managing the aims and scope)
- Dissemination of content
- Uphold ethical values of the publication
Where to find help

Your colleagues, faculty, the library!

Think. Check. Submit

• A campaign designed to help researchers follow best-practice during the submission process

Sense About Science

• Offers free resources to help scientists ensure their work is academically rigorous and reaches the widest possible audience

SAGE is dedicated to helping researchers be the best they can be

• SAGE Journal Author Gateway provides plenty of tips on improving your chances of publication

• SAGE Research Methods Video helps researchers refine and improve their research skills
Apparently Wikipedia doesn’t count as a literature review

For help with your research visit methods.sagepub.com
Getting started

Writing and disseminating research
The skill of putting into writing and spreading the information produced from your research.

View content on Writing and disseminating research (21)
Thank you for listening!

Rebecca Evans | Training Manager
SAGE Publishing

Rebecca.Evans@sagepub.co.uk
Your publication choices
Dr Emma Smith & Steve Carlton, The Library
### Your publication choices: scenario activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ali  | (solar tech)           | - Co-authoring with supervisor  
- Wants to work in international energy industry  
- EPSRC funded  
- Findings evidence significant efficiency improvements from use of new materials in solar technology |
| Georgina | (dementia care) | - Co-authoring with supervisors & NHS colleagues  
- NHS practitioner doing part-time PhD to advance NHS career  
- NHS sponsored  
- Primary findings identify practical improvements to be made in healthcare practices |
| Ernst | (music history)        | - Single author  
- Aiming for an academic career in the UK  
- Self-funded  
- Original archival research uncovers details of the life and contribution of a little-known female jazz musician |
Use this decision tree to make choices that best suit each character’s scenario

Where will you aim to publish and why?

Academic journal ranked in 2nd quartile for your field → Will you make it open access immediately?
- Yes - the publisher will likely charge £1,000-£2,000
- No - readers without a Library subscription won’t be able to read it for first 12 months

Professional publication widely read in the industry → What will you do to reach fellow academics?
- Upload to USIR (with publisher’s permission) + tweet/blog about it
- Share a PDF via ResearchGate or Academia.edu straight away
- Nothing - I don’t need an academic audience or evidence of citations

Popular public blog that publishes related content → What will you do to make sure it reaches your target readers?
- Follow up with a fuller version in an established journal
- Share via social media, conferences & networks
- Nothing - I just want to raise my profile/share my ideas

Beware – may breach copyright!

But what about your co-authors?
Your publication choices

- Get advice from your supervisor first
- Who’s authoring? (Name? Order & role of authors?)
- What’s your focus? What’s your innovation?
- Who are you writing for?
- Meet the specific requirements (length, style, format etc)
- How are you making your work openly available?
- Check credibility and quality of the journal/publisher
- Which publication best reaches the audience?
- Who will give you feedback & support along the way?
- Once published, publicise!

For the red boxes, the Library Research team can help. Email usir@salford.ac.uk
Becoming an author: identity

• Make sure you get credit for all your publications:
  • Use a consistent, preferably distinctive name
  • Get an ORCiD and link to it everywhere (USIR, Scopus etc)

• Accurately state your primary affiliation to the University of Salford
  • You can usually cite multiple affiliations but only be for institutions where the research *took place*, not for funders/sponsors)
Becoming an author: co-authorship

• First author = largest contribution
• All significant contributors should be credited as authors, but no one else
• Agree roles and responsibilities at the start
• Power dynamics are at work between co-authors
• All authors are responsible for accuracy and integrity of the whole publication (even if you’re tenth author!) – so check it carefully
• Authors should discuss and agree publication choices, e.g. journal choice, intellectual property, open access

Read Good Practice in Authorship of Research Publications guide via https://www.salford.ac.uk/ethics/research-governance
How are you making your work openly available?

• Do you want/need your work to be open access immediately on publication?
• Will the publisher allow you to share your work in a repository?
• Do you need to share your research data too?
How are you making your work openly available?

• Do you want/need your work to be open access immediately on publication?
• Will the publisher allow you to share your work in a repository?
• Do you need to share your research data too?
• Make your thesis openly available
Open Research Network

an informal network of staff and PGR students who are interested in open research and developments in scholarly communications

Sign up at bit.ly/openresearchnetwork and we might send you some freebies!

@OpenResSalford
Checking the credibility and quality of a publisher
Checking the credibility and quality of a publisher

http://thinkchecksubmit.org/
Top 10 reasons for rejection

According to Graham Hobbs, Editorial Director of Taylor & Francis:

1. Sent to the wrong journal, does not fit the journal’s aims and scope
2. Not a proper journal article (i.e. too journalistic, or clearly a thesis chapter, or a consultancy report)
3. Too long […] or too short
4. Poor regard to the conventions of the journal (failure to consult Notes for Contributors) or to the conventions of academic writing generally
5. Bad style, grammar, punctuation; poor English
6. Fails to say anything of significance (i.e. makes no new contribution) or states the obvious at tedious length
7. Not properly contextualised (e.g. […] ignores the needs of an international or generally wider readership)
8. No theoretical framework
9. Scrappily presented and clearly not proofread
10. Libellous, unethical, rude

From Thesis to Article

What’s the difference?
Writing for examination vs publication: key differences

- Purpose
- Audience
- Length
- Use of evidence
- Format, style, referencing
- Third-party copyright
This thesis investigates the use of sport technology to arrive at a coherent understanding of the ethical issues raised by genetic modification (GM) in sport. The approach draws upon methods in analytical philosophy, notably in the areas of applied philosophy and casuistic reasoning. Beginning with a conceptualisation of technology in sport, the thesis develops discussions about the socio-philosophical significance of sport technology. From here, the thesis derives a framework of technological effects, which is then placed into the context of three case studies to clarify the moral content of the varying technological effects. From these examples, it is argued that ethical conclusions about technology in sport must be addressed to the particular case, rather than aspiring to a general theory about technology in sport. Genetic modification is argued as a particularly interesting case from which to understand the ethical and philosophical issues arising from the manner in which performance modification is evaluated in sport. It is argued that the use of genetics presents a significant challenge for the future of sports ethics and sport policy in relation to preserving sporting values, because it is unlike any other method of performance modification. A detailed consideration of the various ways in which genetics might be used in sport is then provided as a basis for framing the ethical discourse (encompassing genomics, somatic cell, germ-line cell, and pre-selection). The case study is placed into the conceptual framework of technological effects, to establish how genetics give rise to ethical concerns. The analysis of genetics identifies the three concepts of: sport, harm and, humanness as the limiting parameters of the ethical discussions. From these, the concepts of personhood, autonomy, and human dignity serve to ground the ethical discussions in a rights-based approach to determining ethical conclusions about genetics in sport. It is concluded that sports ethics cannot remain secularised in respect of the genetics case and must be premised upon broader, bioethical arguments.

This paper explores the prospect of genetic tests for performance in physical activity and sports practices. It investigates the terminology associated with genetics, testing, selection and ability as a means towards a socio-ethical analysis of its value within sport, education and society. Our argument suggests that genetic tests need not even be used (or widely used) as a tool for talent identification to have an impact on the way in which abilities are recognised and celebrated within sport. Just the development of these tests may consolidate discourses associated with performance and techno-scientific views of the bodies which are drawn upon in selecting, labelling and positioning some, rather than others, as 'able'. The attachment of sports institutions to these technologies may be helping to shape a theoretical and wider social construction of how performance is viewed. Our paper problematises the place that such testing may assume in the culture of physical activity and potentially physical education. In doing so, we explore how the development of these tests may impact educational practices related to sport in two keys ways. Firstly, the direct impact in terms of the ways in which the information from these tests may be used to influence the sports experience of young people, within both physical education and sports arenas. Secondly, we consider how, on a broader level, the increasing importance given to genetic science may be (re)constructing wider social understandings of the nature of 'ability' within sport and physical activity. Our response to these developments extends Feinberg's thesis on an 'open future', which argues that selecting the characteristics of children would be unacceptable on account of it diminishing the openness of that child's future - the range of prospects they might encounter that could lead to the flourishing of their life. On this view, we argue that genetic tests for performance might violate the child's right to an open future and that this concern should be taken into account when considering how and whether such tests should be used.

In a provocative analysis of sport ethics and human values, *Genetically Modified Athletes* imagines the brave new world of sport. The internationally acclaimed book examines this issue at a crucial time in its theorisation, questioning the very cornerstone of sporting and medical ethics, asking whether sporting authorities can, or even should, protect sport from genetic modification.

This book brings together sport studies and bioethics to challenge our understanding of the values that define sport. We already allow that athletes can optimise their performance by the use of technologies; without wishing to assert that 'anything goes' in sports performance enhancement, Andy Miah argues that simply being human matters in sport and that genetic modification does not have to challenge this capacity.

*Genetically Modifies Athletes* includes examination of:

- the concept of 'good sport' and the definition of cheating
- the doped athlete - should we be more sympathetic?
- the role of the medical industry
- the usefulness (or not) of the terms 'doping' and 'anti-doping'.

Useful sources of advice

Face to face
• Your supervisor
• Academic colleagues
• Library’s Research team (usir@salford.ac.uk / researchdata@salford.ac.uk)
• Academic Support Librarians (http://www.salford.ac.uk/library/help/academic-support)

Online
• Pat Thomson’s ‘Patter’ blog: https://patthomson.net/
• Thesis Whisperer blog: https://thesiswhisperer.com

Books
• Kamler, B & Thomson, P 2013, Writing for Peer-reviewed Journals, London, Routledge
• And many more available in the Library!