

How to Publish

Advanced Faculty Workshop ETSU College of Nursing

Presenter: Lee Glenn, PhD, Professor

Introduction

Relation between publishing and research grants, teaching grants, and service grants.

Books on writing for journals.

Finding the right journal: Read the table of contents (and maybe the journals mission statement).

Different types of journal articles that are possible.

Recommended Practices

Importance of getting help from peer experts and writing editors early in the process.

Why some journals charge fees.

Prepublication review. Colleagues are valuable, especially the sour ones. Ask one to critique your submission for you. Pick someone nasty if possible.

The mechanics of submitting a manuscript to a journal through their online portals (Appendix A).

What editors do once a paper is received until a decision is made on it.

Factors that go through an editor's mind when trying to decided on acceptance vs. rejections.

Research studies on the strengths and weaknesses of journal peer review.

What to do if the manuscript is rejected.

When and how to challenge/appeal the decision of a journal editor.

You are a non-stop submission machine: Importance of incorporating referee comments and resubmitting elsewhere quickly.

Odds of getting published is according to how many journals the article is sent to.

Tricks of the Trade

How to go about assembling a manuscript to optimize odds of publication:

Modeling Papers of Others

- Using a model paper is great, as a template or guide to writing yours.
- Imitation is extremely common in science and in writing.
- Orthodox research principle: There is no such thing as an original idea. All ideas come from others.
- People tend to select the poorest study to model their own paper after because they take less time and effort to execute. The trouble is that many of these got published by a fluke and you are unlikely to have such luck with your paper.
- Copy articles with a some rigor. 100% rigor in all areas is not possible to achieve, so do not shoot for this.

If reviewing an article it is fine to say that you are not familiar enough with certain topics or aspects to review them, and then review the parts you are comfortable with. In writing an article, you can't say this, but you can say "The topic of _____ is beyond the scope of this article and the reader is referred to Doe et al. (2017).

Orthodox: Only read and cite original research articles and read through them at least once. If you only read reviews, the shallowness of your understanding can come through in your writings sometimes intuitively. Chance of mischaracterizing or explaining the findings in a study due to the person that wrote the review.

Use the newest of the new to decide on a topic to research

OK to cite old original research studies. In fact, **you generally have to**. Tricyclics and depression. Stick to the last five years or less, though, for reviews, clinical updates, book chapters, and so forth.

Ideal writing methods for publications.

Don't start writing at the beginning. Write from middle outward

To write, you need to get on a roll. You need to get into a trance where nothing in the world enters your mind except the topic of your writing. It is like entering and going through tunnel.

Start writing in morning before doing ANYTHING else. Do not check email; do not add things to your shopping list. Do not do anything else or think about anything else until exhausted.

Do not write days on when you have something else to do that day, whether a meeting, a course to teach, a run to the grocery store that MUST be done, an appointment, house cleaning or repair to be

done, a problem to fix, or anything. The day is only for writing and you protected. If you have things scheduled, do not start writing.

If this is not possible, Early, early mornings and late, late nights are great times to write. Go rent a cabin that has internet and write for four days straight, taking many breaks as needed but doing to other form of work. If you write early, early in the morning. It stays with you all day and you might be able to pick up again when time permits later in the day and get right back into the groove.

If you have crazy dreams about what your writing about or wake up at 4am and get a new idea you didn't think of before, this is where you want to be. Total immersion is the ideal.

REM sleep, memory, problem solving, and creativity.

Three writing composition tips:

1 Every sentence should be understood on the first reading. This means it should be clear and unambiguous. If the reviewers have to read and re-read each sentence to try and figure out what it means, this is a quicksand of manuscript death. The reviewers will see a manuscript with blown pupils.

2 When you make an important point, such as the conclusion of the paper, use a short sentence. When getting into something complicated to explain, revert to short sentences only- - step-by-step. Writers sometimes use long confusing sentences intentionally in order to cover up that they did not do the work necessary to understand the topic they are writing about. Stop yourself and study the latest research more if you find yourself slipping into this mode.

3 Put the most important sentence, the one with punch, at the end of the paragraph.

Phrases to avoid from Maeve O'Connor's book.

The dictatorial nature of author guidelines. Follow them to the letter or else. No detail too small. Editors hate manuscripts with misspellings or format errors – damages your image.

The ultimate fantasy paper

Selecting a topic. This is critical. Must be novel or needing to be redone for particular reasons.

Faculty tend to redo things that were done in the past because that's what you see, hear, and read.

Instead, add a new variable (apricot pits) or review something never was never the principle topic of a review before.

Abstract

Do not write until article is finished.

Introduction

Why you selected this topic and this research questions. Justification.

Ends in a purpose statement, research question, hypothesis, or all three.

Methods

Setting

Participants (sample size, sampling method, and participation rate (refusers))

Instruments (give measurement reliability –alpha- and measurement validity – r)

Procedure

Data Analysis

Results

Short and sweet. Should mostly be explanations of table and figures showing data.

Discussions

Hardest section to write. See Appendix E.

Appendix A

How to register on the journal's web site.

- Do a google search on the journal's name in double quotation marks next to the words *submit author guide* .
- Look for a link of where to submit to the journal. For Elsevier journals like this one, this will be on a site that starts with *ees.elsevier.com* .
- Click on the link at the top of the page that says *Register* and then register yourself as an author. You may have to register me to, depending on the journal. Either you or I can be the corresponding author, whatever works for you and the journal. This all takes only a few moments.
- Read the "Author Guidelines" or "Information for Authors" page, whichever it is named, under the Author button on the upper toolbar. Double check that the manuscript meets all of the many requirements, especially the maximum number of words for letters or commentaries.

When it is time to submit:

- The submission web sites are generally crazy mazes, so brace for that.
- Go to the submission web site, which is at [http://ees.elsevier.com/\[journal abbreviation goes here\]](http://ees.elsevier.com/[journal abbreviation goes here])

- Click on *Register* at the top of the page and register yourself as the main author and me as the co-author.
- The cover letter and manuscript are uploaded separately as .doc or .docx documents (not pdf). Some journals also want the title page and body uploaded separately. If so, the manuscript document will have to be split into two, and a short title only added to the beginning of the body file (as in the APA format). The web site has instructions on what goes into each uploaded document.
- Indicate that you want to submit a manuscript. The instructions on how to do this are at: http://support.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/116. The Interactive Tutorial videos are recommended.
- Letters to the Editor, Editorials, and Commentaries do not have an abstract. There is no abstract to submit. If the web site requires one, just insert the last paragraph. It will not be used for anything.
- You will have to confirm your email address and may have to select various categories for things (which is annoying).
- You do not have to suggest any reviewers. Leave that blank. If so, you are doing the editor's job for them. If so, suggest your friends who respect you but not from ETSU.
- There are no figures or tables to upload.
- After you upload the MS Word documents, the submission site will create a single pdf file out of everything submitted, and a few extra things you did not submit. This can take up to five minutes. After that, click on the *Action Links* button on the main page, then *View the PDF* option, and do a brief check that the pdf is in good order. Put a check in any boxes that may appear to accept the terms of submission, then click on *Action Links* again and *Approve the Submission* or *Approve the PDF* option.
- It is very important for you to "Approve the pdf". Until you "Approve the pdf", the article is hung in their system and not submitted to the journal.
- Logoff, check your email for a confirmation email with a submission ID number assigned by Elsevier. As soon as the number is received, you are done with the enhanced assignment and will receive credit for it.
- Within a few days, you will receive a formal Manuscript Number. These are assigned by the journal editor and indicates the editor is starting to work on the manuscript. The editor will recruit one to three peer reviewers to evaluate it and give him a recommendation of whether to publish it or not. This takes two days to six months, depending on how soon the unpaid volunteer peer reviewer gets to it.
- It is customary for all email communications with the journal to be forwarded to all authors of the manuscript.

Appendix B. Sample Cover Letter

1 XXXXXXXXX 2017

Joyce J. Fitzpatrick, PhD, RN, FAAN
Editor, *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*
Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio USA

Dear Dr. Fitzpatrick,

The manuscript entitled “The Role of Brain Tissue Regrowth in the Effectiveness of Psychotherapeutic Agents” is being submitted to *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing* for publication as a review article.

We would like to draw your attention to our observation that the Archives of Psychiatric Nursing has not published any articles on a new, explosive research front that has emerged. The research front is on the importance of treating psychiatric conditions with anti inflammatory and antioxidative medications or nutrients. The explosiveness can be seen in Fig. 1 of our manuscript. The advances on this research front are covered comprehensively in our manuscript and we think it would be of great benefit to readers of the journal to be made aware of the exciting progress.

Please send us the comments and criticisms of the referees.

Thank you.

XXXX XXXX, DNP, RN
First Author
(423) 439-xxxxxx
xxxxx@etsu.edu

Appendix C. Example of a Commentary

Effect Size in Clinical Education Using Standardized Geriatric Patient Simulation

Author Names Go Here^a

^aCollege of Nursing

East Tennessee State University

P.O. Box 70676

Johnson City, TN 37604

U.S.A.

[192 words, 0 Figures, 0 Tables]

[Running Head: STANDARDIZED GERIATRIC PATIENTS]

Keywords: simulation; standardized patient; effect size;

community health; older adults; nursing students

Please send correspondence and proofs to: Authors Names Go Here, P.O. Box xxxxx, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN 37614. Phone: (423) xxx-xxxx Email: xxxxxx@etsu.edu

Abstract

The recent study by Skinner (2017) that was published in *Clinical Simulation in Nursing* concluded that student assessment of standardized geriatric patient supported its integration into community health courses. However, the data and findings presented in the study did not fully support that conclusion due to near zero effect sizes and unvalidated qualitative findings.

Highlights

A recommendation of use standardized geriatric patient simulations was weakly supported.

The effect size for student knowledge before and after the simulation was only $r = 9.1\%$

No methods were used to evaluate the credibility or dependability of the qualitative findings.

The recommendation to use the simulations in community health courses is premature.

Effect Size in Clinical Education Using Standardized Geriatric Patient Simulation

The recommendation by Skinner (2017) that a standardized geriatric patient simulation should be integrated into community health courses was not fully supported by the data and findings. First, in addition to the lack of statistical significance noted by the authors, we calculated the effect size for the difference in aging knowledge test scores before and after the simulation and found it was only $r = 9.1\%$, which is low according to Cohen's criteria (Cohen, 1988), so there was not even a trend towards effectiveness in increasing knowledge of aging. Second, in a qualitative component, many of the student participants made positive statements about how much was learned about older adults, but this conflicted with the unimproved knowledge scores. No negative statements were presented. The discrepancy between the quantitative and qualitative findings can be possibly explained by the absence of any methods for assessing the credibility or dependability of the qualitative findings, such as the classic methods of Lincoln and Guba (1985).

Due to the absence of consistent and dependable evidence, the conclusion that the geriatric standardized patient simulation program developed should be integrated into all older adult community health curricula is premature.

Acknowledgements

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. The Author(s) declare(s) that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Cohen, J. (1988), *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.), New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lincoln, Y.S., Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Skinner, H.M. (2017) Simulation: Preparing nursing students to work with community-dwelling older adults. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 13, 520-523.

Appendix E. Discussion Section Composition

1. Summarize the findings presented in the results section in the first paragraph.
2. *Consistencies*. Describe the studies that have made findings that are consistent with your findings in another paragraph or two.
3. *Discrepancies*: Describe again where your findings are different, inconsistent, or incompatible with other findings. Go through each study and point out the differences.
4. Spend many, many paragraphs -- in fact a whole section if you can -- coming with the main explanations possible for each of the discrepancies. Then, go through each possible explanation one-by-one and state why it is likely to be the explanation or why it is unlikely to be the explanation for each discrepancy. This is very important and usually requires an appraisal of the quality of your study as compared to the other studies.
5. It is now theory time: Formulate your overall ideas (i.e., theory) of why the findings came out the way they did. How does your idea compare to the others. Go through nursing theories and other theories or ideas. Make sure you compare theories rather than findings. Theories are nothing more than potential explanations for all of the dependable findings of all quality studies to date.
6. Summarize the state of your research field. You don't just summarize your study, but all studies including yours. Especially, try to specify where your study added knowledge to this growing understanding. This should lead to the conclusion statement. It should lead so logically and clearly that the conclusion statement will be obvious when it is later stated.
7. State the limitations of your study. Not the main limitations, but all of the limitations. Cut yourself to pieces where it is deserved. Readers will respect you for it.
8. State the conclusions and implications of the conclusions for practice. State any recommendations for practice or future researchers that come out of your study