



From a Thesis to a Paper

Report of the 2020 Summer Course

Jennifer Stewart Williams

Department of Epidemiology and Global Health

Umeå University

Sweden

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are most grateful to the Taylor & Francis Company for the payment of tuition fees for ten students from low- and middle-income countries to participate in the 2020 “From a Thesis to a Paper” Course. The recipients, all early career researchers, have gained competencies in scientific writing for publication. The Course enables, and builds capacity for, the dissemination of public health research and policy and action.

My sincere appreciation is also extended to the Leadership Group in the Department of Epidemiology and Global Health at Umeå University, in particular to Professor Anna-Karin Hurtig and Dr Klas-Göran Sahlén. Last but not least, I am indebted to Angelica Johansson for her tireless and meticulous administrative assistance.

Jennifer Stewart Williams
Sydney, Australia, November 2020
Email: Jennifer.Stewart.Williams@umu.se

Background

This report describes the 2020 “From a Thesis to a Paper” Course hosted by the Department of Epidemiology and Global Health (EpiGH) at Umeå University, Sweden, and run across weeks 26-35 2020 (22nd June -28th August). The Course guides and advises early career researchers in scientific writing for targeted peer reviewed journals. Students develop papers based on their own research – typically a masters’ thesis. They work in small groups reviewing one another’s work and revising and re-drafting their manuscripts with support and input from the teacher. By the end of the Course students are expected to produce formatted draft documents suitable for submission to a peer reviewed journal of choice.

Eligibility requires either one- or two-year masters’ qualifications in public health (MPH), health care or health education. Students and alumni from EpiGH are the target group. Applications and enrolments are processed by Umeå University. Students residing outside the European Union (EU) or European Economic Area (EEA) are required to pay University tuition fees (12,367 Swedish Krona).

The majority of students enrolled in EpiGH masters’ courses are from low- and middle-income countries. In 2019 the Taylor & Francis Company (T&F) introduced a Scholarship Fund to pay tuition fees for up to ten non-EU/EEA students to enrol in the “From a Thesis to a Paper” Course each year. This report is in accordance with section 4.4 of the contract between T&F and Umeå University which affirms this financial support. See Appendix A.

Promotion

A two-hour information seminar was held on 18 February to promote the 2020 “From a Thesis to a Paper” Course. Approximately 35-40 students, mostly from EpiGH, attended. Presentations were delivered by the Course teacher, Jennifer Stewart Williams, and Duncan Nicholas, the then Acting Portfolio Manager/Allied and Public Health, T&F. Jennifer’s presentation outlined the learning objectives, delivery, content, time frame, and milestones as well as the formal processes required for University applications and the T&F fee waiver scholarships. Duncan presented online. He spoke from the publisher’s perspective, providing insights into issues and processes from initial submission through to peer review, editorial decisions, publication and media promotion.

Questions covered the following:

- How much time and effort will I need to devote to the Course?
- Will there be an examination? If so, what form will that take?

- What is the difference between a masters' thesis and a journal paper?
- When do I need to decide whether I wish to take the Course?
- How do I decide which content I need to transfer from my thesis to the paper?
- How rigorous does the research need to be for journal publication?
- My study has a small sample size. Is that acceptable for journal publication?
- What analysis methods are preferred by journal editors?
- How many words are allowed in a typical journal article?

Applications

All interested students, regardless of country of residence, were required to apply online to Umeå University from 20 February 2020. No payments were required at that time. Invoices for tuition fees were issued pending eligibility checks and formal admission to the Course. Applications could be withdrawn without penalty. Appendix B includes the University syllabus. The examination conferred three grades: Fail (U), Pass (G) or Pass with Distinction (VG). The Course awards five-credit points, under the European Credit Transfer System, for a Pass or higher grade.

The teacher set the maximum class size at fifteen. When applications reached this number, the University opened a waiting list. Students were therefore encouraged to apply early. The University received 26 applications between February and June 2020. However not all applicants met the University eligibility requirements and some were admitted from the waiting list.

The applications process for the T&F scholarships was separately managed by EpiGH. The following announcement was posted on the 2019-2020 MPH Cambro platform on 29 April.

If you have placed an application to enrol in the "From a Thesis to a Paper" Course (22 June -28 August 2020) and you are a non EU/EEA resident then you would be required by the University to pay tuition fees.

However, we do have some scholarships that will cover 100% of these fees. If you wish to be considered for one of our fee-waiver scholarships, please complete and submit the google form by 17:00 hours (Umeå time) on Friday 1 May 2020.

This announcement was timed to concur with the MPH thesis subject run by EpiGH. Our view was that by the end of April, students should have been well placed to judge whether they had the motivation, time and capacity to enrol in the Course. We were also able to speak with supervisors regarding their students' academic progress. The key dates for the EpiGH MPH 2020 Thesis Course

were: 8 May (submission of draft theses); 25-26 May theses seminars; 27 May - 11 June revision of theses, and 12 June submission of theses for assessment prior to the summer break.

Fee waivers

There were initially twelve applications for ten T&F fee waiver scholarships. Two applicants subsequently withdrew citing changes in personal circumstances as reasons. Letters of offer were emailed to the remaining ten eligible students on 5 May. See Appendix C. All offers were accepted. The ten students in receipt of the 2020 fee waivers were from Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, Korea, Nigeria, Myanmar (2), Pakistan, The Gambia, and Uganda.

Enrolments

Under Swedish Study Regulations students can re-enrol in courses they previously began but did not complete. One such EU student from the previous year was a late admission to the 2020 Course. This brought the official class size to sixteen. However, three enrolled EU students did not finish. A total of thirteen students participated in the Course, ten of whom were awarded T&F fee waiver scholarships. Eleven gained the Pass grade and two were awarded a Pass with Distinction.

Introductory letters were emailed to all enrolled students during the last week of May. See Appendix D. This letter requested that students upload “manuscript plans” to the Cambro platform by 17:00 Umeå time on 15 June. These plans were to comprise a summary of the research, including an overview of the study design, methods, results and conclusions. Students were also asked to include provisional titles, authors’ names and email addresses and the names of three target journals.

Course implementation

All teaching was conducted using the Zoom platform. The opening session was held on Tuesday 23 June 2020 from 10.00-12:30 Umeå time. Participants were physically located in Korea, Uganda, The Gambia and Sweden. The COVID-19 pandemic limited students’ usual travel to their home countries for the summer break and many remained in Sweden. See Appendix E.

After the opening seminar the teacher divided the class into five groups for ongoing peer review of one another’s work-in-progress. Group 1 comprised four health economics students, Group 2 comprised four students whose papers involved secondary analyses of cross sectional survey data, Group 3 comprised three students whose research used qualitative methods and Group 4 included two EU students with whom the teacher had previously worked. The papers written by these two students included: 1) a study protocol for an economic evaluation of an intervention to reduce falls

in the elderly, and 2) a secondary analysis of Demographic Health Survey data in Cambodia which investigated association between women's empowerment and child undernutrition.

The teacher distributed a formatted Microsoft Word template for drafting manuscripts. This template suggested styles for headings and body text as well as prompts for additional end materials (acknowledgements, author contributions, ethics, conflict of interest etc), the correct reference style for the target journal, and the layout of the title page.

The Course was run in two-weekly rotations with set time points at which students were expected to upload the latest revisions of their "work-in-progress" manuscripts for review by peers and the teacher. At the first time point students were expected to upload their *Draft Introductions*. At the second they uploaded their *Revised Introductions and Draft Methods*. At the third they uploaded their *Revised Introductions, Methods and Draft Results* and at the fourth, they uploaded their *Revised Introductions, Methods, Results and Draft Discussion*. By the end of the Course students were expected to have uploaded their completed *Revised Manuscripts and Abstracts*. See Appendix F.

Zoom seminars, of one to one and a half hours duration, were held in parallel with the work-in-progress time points. Students were pre-assigned a peer whose work they reviewed throughout the Course. The allocation was non-symmetrical to allow for odd numbers in the groups and promote impartiality. Peer review involved discussion in the seminars whereby the reviewer first presented a brief report followed by the author's response. The teacher moderated each seminar and provided critical input. Peer review reports were prepared using a standardised template with prompts for comments. These were distributed within one or two days of the seminars to enable students to revise and move forward to the next tasks in drafting their "work-in-progress" manuscripts.

For the examination, students were asked to submit the latest revised version of their research paper - correctly formatted for submission to their nominated target journal. Journal submission was not a requirement for assessment.

Academic outputs

All enrollees were early career researchers with demonstrated aptitude and motivation to further develop their MPH research. The titles of manuscripts developed by students in the 2020 "From a Thesis to a Paper" Course are listed below.

Fee Waiver Student: Asad Zakreen: "Cost-effectiveness analysis of a physical therapy intervention

program used for multiple sclerosis in Norway. A Markov model". Co-author Lars Lindholm. Target Journal: European Journal of Health Economics.

Fee Waiver Student: Famata Colley: "The economic burden of road traffic injury in the Gambia; a cost-of-illness study protocol". Co-authors: Curt Löfgren, Yaya Barjo. Target Journal: Applied Health Economics and Health Policy.

Fee Waiver Student: Muhannad Hamada: "Economic evaluation of tele-dentistry in early detection of oral cancer among elderly in Sweden". Co-authors: Klas-Göran Sahlén, Sun Sun. Target Journal: Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare.

Fee Waiver Student: Sergio Flores: "Evaluating the impact of the 2008 Constitutional Health Reform in Ecuador on the performance of primary health care services: An Interrupted Time Series Analysis". Co-author: Miguel San Sebastian. Target Journal: Pan American Journal of Public Health.

Fee Waiver Student: Jieun Kim : "Association between patient satisfaction and social-demographic factors as well as patient experience among outpatients in South Korea". Co-authors: Fredrik Norström, Sun Sun. Target Journal: American Journal of Medical Quality.

Fee Waiver Student: Min Wai Lwin: "The association of maternal BMI and age with abnormal newborn outcomes: a study of 5225 pregnancies in Västerbotten Area, Sweden". Co-authors: Marie Lindkvist, Eva Eurenus. Target Journal: Maternal and Child Nutrition.

Fee Waiver Student: Myo Myint Tun: "Association between exclusive breastfeeding and infant growth failure in Myanmar". Co-author: Arian Rostami. Target Journal: Plos One.

Fee Waiver Student: Obinna Princewell: "Postpartum contraceptive adoption and its predicting factors among fecund women: an analysis of 2018 Nigerian Demographic Health Survey data". Co-authors: Håkan Jonsson, Fredrik Norström. Target Journal: International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynecology.

Fee Waiver Student: Asebe Abreham: "Study Protocol on exploring how women articulate their experience of violence and perceive facilitators and barriers to disclose the violence at One-stop Centres in Ethiopia". Co-author: Kerstin Edin. Target Journal: Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters.

Fee Waiver Student: Kirabo Joan Suubi: “Contraceptive use and its determinants. A cross sectional study of migrants in Sweden.” Co-author: Faustine Kyungu Nkulu Kalengayi. Target Journal: Scandinavian Journal of Public Health.

EU Student: Sander Kuerus: “A scoping literature review: about the perceived and objectively measured built environment”. Co-author: Mikael Emsing. Target Journal: International Journal of Behavioural Nutrition and Physical Activity.

EU Student: Abdelrahman Yahia: “An economic evaluation for an intervention to reduce falls in the elderly”. Co-author: Magnus Zingmark. Target Journal: Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation

EU Student: Florian Trauner: “Association between women’s empowerment and childhood undernutrition in Cambodia: evidence from the 2014 Demographic Health Survey”. Co-author: Jennifer Stewart Williams. Target Journal: Social Science & Medicine.

Course Evaluation

Appendix G comprises the anonymous EpiGH evaluations uploaded to the Cambro platform. The denominator (sixteen) reflects official University enrolments as explained earlier. There were thirteen active participants. Feedback from these evaluations will be taken into account in planning the 2021 Course.

Course Alumni

A number of Course alumni have now successfully published. Their papers are listed below.

1. Pedrós Barnils N, Eurenus E, Gustafsson PE. Self-rated health inequalities in the intersection of gender, social class and regional development in Spain: exploring contributions of material and psychosocial factors. International Journal for Equity in Health. 2020;19:14.
2. Anyango CN, Kyungu Nkulu Kalengayi F, Goicolea I, et al. “A one-size-fits-all model is not good”?: ambivalent perceptions and experiences of African immigrant parents towards Swedish sexual and reproductive health services for young people. BMC Research Notes. 2020;13(449):5.
3. Nyamande FN, Mosquera PA, San Sebastián M, et al. Intersectional equity in health care: assessing complex inequities in primary and secondary care utilization by gender and education in northern Sweden. International Journal for Equity in Health. 2020;19(159):12.
4. Jenkins C, Thu Ngan T, Bao Ngoc N, et al. Experiences of accessing and using breast cancer services in Vietnam: a descriptive qualitative study. BMC Open. 2020;10(e035173.):8.
5. Mar Win Z, Löfgren C. Analyzing the technical efficiency of health systems in Asian countries: What Myanmar can learn from Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. BMC Public Health. 2020;Preprint.
6. Chowdhury M, Stewart Williams J, Wertheim H, et al. Rural community perceptions of antibiotic access and understanding of antimicrobial resistance: qualitative evidence from

the Health and Demographic Surveillance System site in Matlab, Bangladesh. Global Health Action. 2019;12(1824383).

At the time of writing other alumni were awaiting feedback from peer reviewed journals regarding manuscripts developed in this Course.

Conclusions

Over ninety percent of health research is published by lead authors from high-income countries. Emerging researchers from the world's poorest countries, where the burden of morbidity and mortality is greatest, lack the knowledge, skills, support and confidence needed for scientific manuscript preparation, publishing and research dissemination.

The annual financial subsidy given by the T&F Company for the "From a Thesis to a Paper" Course provides valuable opportunities for early career public health researchers from low- and middle-income countries to develop the competencies needed for translating research into publications. The use of robust evidence, from multiple sources, methodologies and settings, to inform public policy development is a worthy societal goal.

The final attachment to this report (Appendix H) includes 2020 Course Notes written by the teacher, Jennifer Stewart Williams.

APPENDIX A



SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT

This SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT is made on 28th March 2019 between
INFORMA UK LIMITED, trading as TAYLOR & FRANCIS GROUP (company number 01072954) whose registered office is 5 Howick Place, London SW1P 1WG in the United Kingdom (the “Publisher”, including where applicable the Publisher’s assigns or successors in business as the case may be); and UMEÅ UNIVERSITY, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden (the “University”). Each a “Party” and together the “Parties”.

PREAMBLE:

- A. The Parties wish to cooperate in sponsorship of tuition for non-EU/EEA citizens attending the Course (as defined below) at the University.
- B. In accordance with Swedish codes of statutes SFS 2010:543, all non-EU/EEA citizens are due tuition-fees for studies at undergraduate and graduate level. Non-EU/EEA students currently enrolled in masters’ programmes in the Department of Epidemiology and Global Health (EpiGH), taking part in the Course are the intended beneficiaries of the sponsorship.
- C. The Parties agree to cooperate in such tuition sponsorship activities by establishing a Scholarship Fund (as defined below) in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

IT IS AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

1. DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATION

Agreement	means this Sponsorship Agreement, as amended at any time by mutual written agreement between the University and the Publisher.
Course	means the course provided by Umeå University during the Summer of each year aimed at providing publication mentorship and guidance on how to get research published, currently called the “From a Thesis to a Paper” Course (Course Code: 3FH079).
Scholarship Fund	means an annual scholarship fund consisting of payment received by the University from the Publisher to support Waivers for students to attend the Course.
Waiver	means a 100% reduction on the Course fee of 12,367 SEK per student for attendance of the Course.

Clause and paragraph headings are for convenient reference only and shall not affect the interpretation of this Agreement.

- 1.1. A person includes a natural person, corporate or unincorporated body (whether or not having separate legal personality), and that a person's personal representatives, successors and permitted assigns.
- 1.2. Unless the context otherwise requires, words in the singular shall include the plural, and in the plural shall include the singular.

2. SCOPE

- 2.1. The Course upon completion currently provides 5 European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and the tuition for the Course as set by the University is currently 12367 SEK per student.
- 2.2. This Agreement is confined to:
 - 2.2.1. The Course only;
 - 2.2.2. Non-EU/EEA students, that are due tuition;
 - 2.2.3. Eligible candidates who are admitted to the Course, or placed in reserve;
 - 2.2.4. A selection process defined by the University for the Waivers;
 - 2.2.5. Payment of funds to be used for Waivers, and any refunds payable.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES

- 3.1. The Publisher shall provide a Scholarship Fund of up to XXXX to support subsidies for up to 10 students to attend the Course at the University in each year of the Agreement.
- 3.2. The University is solely responsible for the application process for admission to the Course as well as the separate applications of eligible students for selection for the Waiver.
- 3.3. Admissions to the Course will be in accordance with the University's criteria and based on the Course curriculum.
- 3.4. The University shall be responsible for the selection of students who will receive the Waivers. The criteria for selection of such students will be on academic merit.

4. PAYMENTS TO THE UNIVERSITY

- 4.1. The University shall issue an invoice for the value of the Scholarship Fund to the Publisher annually indicating the number of students eligible for the Waiver and the total amount due.
- 4.2. The invoice shall be issued no later than 10th of May in each year and shall be payable within 30 days of receipt of the valid invoice. Payment of the invoice in full is required prior to the start of the Course for Course registration.
- 4.3. The University shall offset the Waivers from the Scholarship Fund when the accepted students are enrolled onto the Course. If the total Scholarship Fund is not used in any year, the funds will remain in the Scholarship Fund to be used in subsequent years for the duration of this Agreement.
- 4.4. The University shall provide the Publisher with an annual report detailing the implementation of the Waivers and the sponsored students' academic progress. The report will be provided annually upon completion of the Course. The University will ensure that the report is in compliance with any applicable data protection legislation and the General Data Protection Regulation 2016/679.

5. TERM AND TERMINATION

- 5.1. The University and the Publisher agree to sponsor the Course for a minimum period of one (1) year from the first day of January 2019 and this Agreement shall automatically renew thereafter for a further period of one (1) year , unless either Party gives the other Party six (6) months written notice of its intention to terminate the Agreement.
- 5.2. The Agreement will automatically terminate if the University ceases to provide the Course.
- 5.3. Either Party may terminate this Agreement with immediate effect by giving written notice to the other Party if:
 - 5.3.1. the other Party commits a breach of any term of this Agreement which breach is irremediable or, if such breach is remediable, fails to remedy that breach within sixty (60) days after being notified in writing to do so;
 - 5.3.2. the other Party is convicted of any criminal offence;
 - 5.3.3. the other Party (or any party acting on its behalf) commits any act which brings or is likely to bring the other party into liquidation whether voluntary or is declared insolvent or if an administrator or receiver is appointed over the whole; or opinion is prejudicial to its interests; or
 - 5.3.4. the other Party goes into liquidation whether compulsory or voluntary or is declared insolvent or if an administrator or receiver is appointed over the whole or any part of the other Party's assets or if the other party enters into any arrangement for the benefit of or compounds with its creditors generally or ceases to carry on business or threatens to do any of these things or suffers any analogous event in any jurisdiction.
- 5.4. The provisions of clause 5.3 shall be without prejudice to any other rights either Party may have at law, whether in respect of the termination of this Agreement or otherwise.
- 5.5. If any funds remain in the Scholarship Fund upon expiry or termination of this Agreement, howsoever caused, such funds will be returned to the Publisher by the University on the date of expiry or termination.
- 5.6. Clauses 5.5, 6, 8 and 10 shall survive the termination or expiry of this Agreement.

6. CONFIDENTIALITY

- 6.1. Each Party ("Receiving Party") undertakes to:
 - 6.1.1. maintain as secret and confidential all know-how and other technical or commercial information ("Confidential information") obtained directly or indirectly from the other Party ("Disclosing Party") in the course of or in anticipation of this Agreement.
 - 6.1.2. use the Confidential Information exclusively for the purposes of this Agreement; and
 - 6.1.3. only disclose the Confidential Information to those of its employees, contractors and sub-licensees (if any) reasonably necessary for the purposes of this Agreement.
- 6.2. The provisions of clause 6.1 above shall not apply to Confidential Information which the Receiving Party can demonstrate:

- 6.2.1. was, prior to its receipt from the Disclosing Party, in the possession of the Receiving Party and at its free disposal; or
 - 6.2.2. is subsequently disclosed to the Receiving Party without any obligations of confidence by a third party who has not derived it directly or indirectly from the Disclosing Party; or
 - 6.2.3. is or becomes generally available to the public through no act or default of the Receiving Party or its agents, employees, affiliates or sub-licensees; or
 - 6.2.4. the Receiving Party is required to disclose to the courts of any competent jurisdiction, or to any government regulatory agency or financial authority, provided that the Receiving Party shall, where lawful (i) inform the Disclosing party as soon as is reasonably practicable: and ii) at the Disclosing Party's request and cost seek to persuade the court, agency or authority to have the information treated in a confidential manner, where this is possible under the court, agency or authority's procedures.
- 6.3. The Receiving Party shall procure that all of its employees, contractors and sublicensees who have access to any Confidential Information, shall have entered into written undertakings of confidentiality at least as restrictive as those set out in this clause 6.

7. FORCE MAJEURE

- 7.1. Neither Party shall be in breach of this Agreement nor liable for delay in performing, or failure to perform, any of its obligations under this Agreement if such delay or failure result from events, circumstances or causes beyond its reasonable control. In such circumstances, the time for performance shall be extended by a period equivalent to the period during which performance of the obligation has been delayed or failed to be performed. If the period of delay or non-performance continues for three (3) months the Party not affected may terminate this Agreement by giving thirty (30) days' written notice to the affected Party.

8. DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

- 8.1. If a dispute arises out of or in connection with this Agreement or the performance, validity or enforceability of it then the Parties shall follow the procedure set out in this clause:
- 8.1.1. either Party shall give to the other Party written notice of the dispute, setting out its nature and full particulars, together with relevant supporting documents;
 - 8.1.2. on service of the dispute notice, the editorial directors of each Party shall attempt in good faith to resolve the dispute;
 - 8.1.3. if the dispute remains unresolved within thirty (30) days of service of the dispute notice, the dispute shall be referred to the University Officer and the Global Publishing Director of the Publisher who shall attempt in good faith to resolve it; and
 - 8.1.4. if after a total of sixty (60) days from the issuing of the notice of dispute the dispute remains unresolved, the Parties shall attempt to settle it by mediation in accordance with the Centre for Effective Dispute Resolution (CEDR) Model Mediation Procedure. To initiate mediation a Party must give notice in writing to the other Party requesting mediation. A copy of the request should be sent to the Centre for Effective Dispute Resolution (the "Alternative Dispute

Resolution Notice"). The mediation shall start not less than (30) days after the date of the Alternative Dispute Resolution Notice.

8.2. If the dispute is not resolved via mediation, the dispute may be referred to an English Court.

9. NOTICE

9.1. Any notice required to be given with respect to this agreement shall be directed to:


For the University:	For the Publisher
Jennifer Stewart Williams, Dept of Epidemiology and Global Health, Umeå University	Todd Hummel, Editorial Director, Medicine & Health Journals, Taylor & Francis
jennifer.stewart.williams@umu.se	Todd.hummel@taylorandfrancis.com

10. GOVERNING LAW AND JURISDICTION

10.1. This Agreement and any dispute or claim arising out of or in connection with it or its subject matter or formation (including non-contractual disputes or claims) shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of England and Wales. Each Party irrevocably agrees that the courts of England and Wales shall have exclusive jurisdiction to settle any such dispute or claim.

THIS AGREEMENT HAS BEEN ENTERED INTO ON THE DATE STATED AT THE HEAD OF THE AGREEMENT:


Authorized Signatory, for and on behalf of Umeå University

Signed 
Anna-Karin Hurtig

Name
Prof, Head of Department Epidemiology and Global Health, Umeå University

Title

Authorized Signatory, for and on behalf of Informa UK Limited (trading as Taylor & Francis Group)

Signed 
Deborah Kahn

Name
Publishing Director

Title

APPENDIX B

From a thesis to a paper

Från examensuppsats till artikel

5.0 hp

Course Code: 3FH079 **Established:** 28 February 2019

Established by: Board of undergraduate education

Syllabus valid from: 2019, week 10

Responsible Department: Department of Epidemiology and Global Health

SCB Subject: Public Health

Main Field of Study and progress level: Public Health: Second cycle, has second-cycle course/s as entry requirements (A1F)

Grading System: Three-grade scale

Form of Education: Higher education, study regulation of 2007

Level of Education: Second cycle

Study Cycle (Sökandewebben/Applicant Web Site): Advanced level

Requirements

One-year master's degree in public health, health care, or health education. English proficiency equivalent to English B/6 from Swedish Upper Secondary Education.

Learning Outcomes

Knowledge and understanding

After this course, students are expected to have:

- basic understanding of how to extract and transfer key elements from thesis to scientific paper
- familiarity with the publication process in epidemiology and global health
- knowledge of journals and author guidelines
- understanding of plagiarism

Skills and abilities

After this course, students are expected to have skills in:

- scientific writing
- planning and organizing content for scientific papers
- the use of EndNote referencing software
- responding to peer reviews

Judgement and approach

After this course, students are expected to be able to:

- critically discuss and assess peer reviewed publications in epidemiology and global health

Contents

This aim of this course is to teach students how to write scientific papers suitable for publication in peer reviewed journals. Students will be encouraged to use material drawn from their Master of Public Health/Global Health or equivalent thesis. There will be a strong emphasis on clear and concise scientific writing. The course will cover topics such as authorship, choice of journals, title, abstract, layout and order of content, data presentation, additional files, referencing, plagiarism, acknowledgements, and response to reviewers.

Instruction

Teaching will be performed through plenary lectures, group exercises, practical writing exercises and seminars. Teaching will be in English.

Examination

For the examination, students will be asked to prepare a manuscript suitable for submission to a peer reviewed journal. The examination will apply the following grades: Fail (U), Pass (G) or Pass with Distinction (VG). Students who do not pass the examination can be given a further examination within three months following the first examination. If there are special considerations, the examiner will have the right to decide whether another form of examination is appropriate.

Regulation of Course Changes

Students will have the right to request whether previous education or equivalent knowledge and skills acquired can be credited for the corresponding course at Umeå University. Applications are to be submitted to Student centrum/Examina. Details on crediting can be found at Umeå University's student web, www.student.umu.se, and the Higher Education Ordinance (Chapter 6). A refusal of accreditation may be appealed through the University Appeals Board. This applies to the whole or part of the application if accreditation is refused.

APPENDIX C

Dear STUDENT NAME

Umeå University is delighted to offer you a Taylor & Francis scholarship for enrolment in the 2020 summer course 3FH079 (From a Thesis to a Paper).

Following are the scholarship terms.

1. The scholarship is disbursed in the form of tuition waiver and corresponds to 100 % of tuition waived for enrolment in 3FH079 at Umeå University.
2. The scholarship is only valid for the duration of your enrollment and registration in 3FH079 at Umeå University.
3. Umeå University reserves the right to withdraw the scholarship if you do not fulfill requirements.

ACCEPTANCE OF SCHOLARSHIP

Name

Programme

Master's Programme in Public Health

I confirm that I accept this Scholarship and agree to the stated terms and conditions.

DATE

SIGNATURE

A signed copy of this document ought to be scanned and sent as PDF to angelica.johansson@umu.se as soon as possible but no later than 17.00 on 8 **May 2020**.

Sincerely

Klas-Göran Sahlen

Chair of the Program council for International Master Programmes in Public Health (PRPH)



APPENDIX D

Dear STUDENT NAME

Thank you for registering in the 2020 “Thesis to Paper” summer course. The course will run over summer from Monday 22nd June (week 26) to Friday 28th August (week 35).

Communication during the course will be electronic. Meetings will be held using Zoom and messages and resources will be posted on the Cambro platform.

The opening session for Course will be held by Zoom on Tuesday 23 June from 10-11.30 AM (Umeå time). Please mark that in your calendars. At that meeting, we will discuss your manuscript plans.

In previous years most students have used material from their masters’ theses to develop papers in this course. Accordingly, masters’ supervisors have typically been co-authors because they contributed to the original research. Common practice has been for the student to be first author and the supervisor last author – the latter indicating the role of an advisor who has steered and guided the research. Sometimes there have been additional authors. However some papers from students in previous years of this course have included just two authors i.e. the student and their supervisor. The situation varies from case to case. However if you are undertaking this course using material from your masters’ thesis it is most important that you discuss this with your supervisors and clarify all issues regarding authorship.

You will be required to upload your manuscript plans to a Course folder on Cambro (marked with your name) by no later than 5 PM (Umeå time) on Monday 15th June. The plans will outline your study design and provide a balanced summary of the reason for the research - what you did, what was found, and the main conclusions or implications. This may be similar to your thesis abstract. It must also include the provisional title, all authors’ names (in order) their email addresses and the names of possible journals for publication.

A reminder will be sent via Cambro in early June.

Through this Course you will gain experience both as an author and a peer reviewer. Peer review is a defining feature of scientific discourse and a most important task that aims to improve the quality of published literature through constructive commentary and criticism.

For the examination, you will be expected to submit a draft manuscript that is considered, both by you and your co-authors, to be close to the version that you plan to submit to a peer-reviewed journal after the finish of the course. Assessment will be based primarily on this manuscript but the timeliness and content of your peer review reports will also be taken into consideration.

There is no official textbook for this course. Resources will be made available on Cambro throughout the course.

If you have any questions about any of this, please get in touch with either Jenny or Angelica.

I am looking forward to working with you on your papers.

Jennifer Stewart Williams Course Teacher.

APPENDIX E

Welcome to the 2020 “From a Thesis to a Paper” summer course (weeks 26 to 35).

The opening seminar will be held by Zoom next Tuesday 23 June from 10-11.30 AM (Umeå time).

The link is as follows:

Join Zoom Meeting Tuesday 23 June @10 AM Umeå time.

<https://umu.zoom.us/j/69973052360?pwd=Nm5FcjY2K1RCNlBHLORHTEdgSHdtQT09>

Please now upload your manuscript plans to the Cambro Dropbox marked with your name under the “From a Thesis to a Paper VT 20 Course”. The plans are to outline your study design and provide a balanced summary of the reason for the research - what you did, what was found, and the main conclusions or implications. This may be similar to your thesis abstract. It must also include the provisional title, all authors’ names (in order) their email addresses and the names of possible journals for publication.

Some of you have asked whether there is a Course requirement for supervisors to be your co-authors. We strongly recommend that if your paper is closely related to your thesis, it is appropriate for your supervisor to be a co-author. However, this is not mandatory and individual circumstances can vary. Regardless, you must discuss your plans with your supervisor.

First year MPH students will need to have passed their thesis assessment before being given entry to the Course. We have alerted all the examiners to this and asked to have theses marked by 18 June.

If you have any questions about any of this, please get in touch with myself, Jenny Stewart Williams (Email: Jennifer.Stewart.Williams@umu.se).

I am looking forward to working with you on your papers.

Best regards,

Jenny

Jennifer Stewart Williams

APPENDIX F

THESIS TO PAPER COURSE MILESTONES

Peer review will be conducted in small group Zoom sessions

June 22-26, 2010	draft Introduction
Wednesday, 1 July 2020	UPLOAD draft Introduction
July 6-10, 2020	Peer review & revision of Introduction
Wednesday, 15 July 2020	UPLOAD revised Introduction & draft Methods
July 20-24, 2020	Peer review & revision of Methods
Wednesday, 29 July 2020	UPLOAD revised Introduction, Methods & draft Results
August 3-7, 2020	Peer review & revision of Results
Wednesday, 12 August 2020	UPLOAD revised Introduction, Methods & Results & draft Discussion
August 17-21, 2020	Peer review & revision of Discussion
Wednesday, 26 August 2020	UPLOAD revised manuscript including Abstract

APPENDIX G

From a thesis to a paper (VT20)

Evaluations conducted between 9 – 30 September 2020

Response rate: 50% (8 / 16)

1. Do you think you have been given the opportunity to achieve the learning outcomes for the course?

No

Somewhat

Mostly

Yes

0 % (0)

0 % (0)

50 % (4)

50 % (4)

Number of answers: 8

Weighted average: 3,5

Comments

No Comments

2. Do you think that all students on the course have been given the same opportunity to pursue studies on equal terms, regardless of gender, ethnicity, religion or belief, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity or age?

No

Somewhat

Mostly

Yes

0 % (0)

0 % (0)

25 % (2)

75 % (6)

Number of answers: 8

Weighted average: 3,75

Comments

No Comments

3. To what extent did the structure/implementation of the course help you to achieve the learning outcomes?

Unsatisfactory

Inadequate

Adequate

Good

Excellent

0 % (0)

0 % (0)

0 % (0)

63 % (5)

38 % (3)

Number of answers: 8

Weighted average: 4,38

Comments

No Comments

4. How would you assess the way you have been treated in general as a student during the course?

Unsatisfactory

Inadequate

Adequate

Good

Excellent

0 % (0)

0 % (0)

25 % (2)

13 % (1)

63 % (5)

Number of answers: 8

Weighted average: 4,38

Comments

No Comments

5. How do you evaluate your learning process during the course?

Unsatisfactory

Inadequate

Adequate

Good

Excellent

0 % (0)

0 % (0)

25 % (2)

38 % (3)

38 % (3)

Number of answers: 8

Weighted average: 4,12

den 30 September 2020 - Page 3

Comments

Course teacher and course structure is good enough, I can't concentrate enough during the course as of my personal issues. I suppose it is good if we can concentrate well during the summer period and this course is good for the career.

Number of Comments : 1

6. How did the examination reflect the expected learning outcomes and the content in the course?

Unsatisfactory

Inadequate

Adequate

Good

Excellent

0 % (0)

0 % (0)

13 % (1)

75 % (6)

13 % (1)

Number of answers: 8

Weighted average: 4

Comments

No Comments

7. Mention the most useful aspect of the course.

- It is a new knowledge for me.
- The slow, deliberate building of the manuscript is a good way to approach what seems to be a very hard task.
- We can clearly analyze and modify our thesis work into the paper submission form. I can also manage to amend my weak points in my thesis work as well.
- Received tailored feed back about my work and the progress I was making.
- group discussions regarding paper drafts. The aspect of doing the review itself and knowing what to check during peer reviewing.
- The peer-review session between students during the course.

Number of answers : 7

8. Please give some advice how to further develop the course and give us other reflections you might have.

- Allow the progress and peer-reviewing to all the people in the group.
- None
- It will help to have sessions with other lecturers to talk on various areas on which the students are writing. To give an insight into how to write a good paper, what is expected, and provide guidelines on the most relevant aspect of the topic.

Number of answers : 3

APPENDIX H

Thesis to Paper Course

Department of Epidemiology and Global Health Umeå University

Notes prepared by Course Teacher, Jennifer Stewart Williams. Updated June 2020

The journey

This course will take you through the practical steps needed to organize, structure and frame your research into a clear and concise document that you can submit to a peer-reviewed journal.

You are encouraged to critically examine your research, what new evidence it brought to light and how the findings can improve public health.

Your paper will be a work-in-progress involving ongoing assessment and revision. It is advised that you work with your co-authors and keep them updated on your progress.

The first author is usually responsible for drafting the manuscript. The last author is typically the “senior” advisor, and in some cases a mentor who guided the research. The corresponding author is the person who submits the manuscript. The journal addresses correspondence to this person, who is usually either the first or last author. All authors must declare that they have read and approved the final version submitted to the journal.

Writing requires good time management. If you are motivated and committed you must prioritize your time. The course has a number of ongoing tasks with deadlines that you must meet.

Target journal

In this course, each student will choose their target journal. It is important to do this early so that you start to write to meet the journal’s specifications in terms of, for example, word length, layout, reference style etc. It is advisable to keep a short list of two or three alternative journals. In the event that your manuscript is rejected, it is good to be able to move swiftly to the next preferred target journal. This can save time and also alleviate some of the disappointment.

In order to identify your target journal, review the websites of journals with which you are familiar. Look closely at the aims and scope. If your research is not relevant to the journal, look for others. Check with your co-authors. Perhaps they know of others who have published in this journal? If the journal charges fees, do you have a strategy for payment?

Most open access journals charge a publication fee. This is known as the article processing charge (or APC). Umeå University gives discounts and fee waivers for articles published in many open access and hybrid journals. Acquaint yourself with this information when you are seeking to identify your target journals.

<https://www.umu.se/en/library/publish/open-access/oa-discounts/>

Beware of predatory journals that engage in unscrupulous promotion with little regard for scientific quality. These journals target early career researchers who are keen to publish.

The quality of many papers published in these journals is questionable because peer review can be compromised at the expense of fast tracking a publication for the fee payment.

After you decide on a target journal, familiarize yourself with other papers published in the journal. Look for similarities or overlap with your topic. Have you cited any of the authors who have already published in this journal in your paper? It is often good to do so. Also, look at the authors of papers in the reference lists. Are there any familiar names? Some journals ask you to suggest possible peer reviewers when you submit your paper. It is a good idea to start such a list early when you are immersed in the literature.

A useful website for locating author guidelines is <http://mulford.utoledo.edu/instr/>. When you locate your journal of interest from the alphabetical list, you can link to the journal's author guidelines. Study your journal's author guidelines carefully. You must write to these specifications.

Some journals provide a downloadable PDF version of their guidelines. The author guidelines cover issues such as the number of documents (e.g. whether tables and figures are to be included in the main document or kept separate), title page, layout, font size, line spacing, word limits, end materials, tables, figures, referencing, appendices, page and line numbering.

Journals can ask for a separate section with bullet points laying out what is already known in relation to the topic/research questions, what the paper adds to the topic and what the implications of the paper are. Even if your target journal doesn't ask for this, it is a good idea to think about and write these points for your own purpose. It can help keep you on track when drafting and revising.

Check the journal's reference style. Ensure that you have this style in your reference software. The function of a reference list is to allow the reader to retrace the evidence that you cite. Sources therefore have to be open and available. Include the Digital Object Identifiers, or DOIs, in the records entered into your referencing software. The DOIs are unique alphanumeric strings assigned by the publisher when the article is published.

As you write your paper, ensure that your references are accurately cited. If editors see a lot of mistakes in the reference list, this suggests that there has been carelessness in writing and they may not be so inclined to continue reading your paper.

Journals have different categories for papers e.g. original research articles, review articles, commentaries, PhD reviews etc. Journals usually specify word limits.

The journal editor is like the journal's "gatekeeper". He/she checks aspects such as writing style, structure, formatting, and referencing and ensures that the article falls within the journal's scope. The editor also checks to ensure that submitted paper complies with the journal's author guidelines. This is most important and the reason for many "desk rejections" by editors. If the editor is happy that the submission has sufficient merit, he/she may decide to go to the next stage – the one known as "peer review".

Being sent for peer review does not guarantee that the manuscript will be accepted. An editor typically searches the journal database to identify other researchers who have relevant knowledge of the topic and research methods, and invites these "peers" to review your manuscript. Reviewers are generally asked to submit their report within two or three weeks but many request extensions. Peer reviewers must declare conflict of interest i.e. if

they know you on a personal or professional level, this association must be declared and assessed by the editor.

Plagiarism

Converting a thesis into a journal article is acceptable practice. However this can be seen as plagiarism if your thesis, or parts thereof, are in the public domain. Journals today use what is known as a similarity check or plagiarism screening service using iThenticate software to detect duplication and similarity in content. Editors reject papers in which a high proportion of the content appears to have been copied. It is acceptable to refer to your own previously published research but you must cite it. It is not acceptable to use data or words that originated from someone else and imply that this was your work. Use your own words when you cite others' research. This is most important.

At Umeå University only the abstracts from MPH theses submitted to the Department of Epidemiology and Global Health are uploaded online. This is done through the Academic Archive Online known as DIVA - a collaborative effort between universities in the Scandinavian countries. In order to avoid potential plagiarism claims (even if the work is your own) it is important to rewrite content and cite all relevant references. This applies also to your thesis, and any other previous work that you have authored. This is not as difficult as it sounds because you will be re-writing material from your thesis to comply with the journal's style regarding format, structure, word length etc. Start by re-writing your abstract and altering the title.

Ethics

Journals require that any paper that involves collecting data on human subjects must have appropriate ethical clearance from a competent authority in the territory where the data are collected (e.g. the Ethics Committee associated with a Ministry of Health). This information is typically included as a sub-section within the manuscript and/or as part of the end materials specified in the author guidelines. Journals typically also ask for information on ethics clearance at the time of submission.

However these rules are a somewhat flexible when it comes to collecting data from persons acting in their professional capacity (e.g. interviewing health managers about a program in which they are working). While the interviewees would need to give consent, it is usually not necessary to seek formal approval from an ethics committee.

The writing

Writing doesn't come easy to everyone and "writer's block" is real. Most writers have experienced this frustrating mindset at some time. Many practical tips for overcoming writer's block can be found on the web. Everyone is different so find and test the solutions that work best for you.

Writing for journals must be clear, precise and concise. Keep sentences short and include one idea only per sentence. Present your ideas and arguments in a logical sequence – supported by evidence not opinion.

Focus on just one issue in each paragraph. Long paragraphs that include multiple issues should be split. The opening sentence must link from the preceding paragraph and the closing sentence must link to the next paragraph. When referring to the literature (e.g. in the introduction and discussion) introduce each paragraph by stating the key issue and then

outline the evidence (referenced articles). All this needs to be done while ensuring good linkage and flow between sentences and paragraphs.

Each paragraph must develop the concept or idea using multiple sentences. Although there are some exceptions, e.g. when including quotes, one sentence paragraphs suggest that the author is either writing sentences that are too long or not effectively using paragraphs to cover and delineate a concept/view/position etc.

Style

Academic journals require a formal objective scientific writing style. In general, it is preferable not to write in the first person, e.g. “I found”, “We developed” etc. The reason has traditionally been that readers may regard this as subjective and opinion-based and scientific papers should present objective information and procedures that can be reproduced by others. Yet style conventions are changing. It is important to read some of the papers in your target journal to get a sense of what is acceptable.

Tenses present a relationship between the present and another moment in time which may be past, present or future. The abstract is usually written in the past tense (e.g. this is what you did and what you found). The introduction can be written in the present tense when you are presenting evidence and arguing why it is important to do this work. The past perfect tense is also used (e.g. “Research has been conducted on...”). The aims and objectives can be written in the present tense, e.g. “the aim of this study is to...” Past tense is generally used to report the methods and results (e.g. “the questionnaire was administered by...”; “more than 70% of women were...”). The present tense can be used when referring to tables and figures (e.g. “table 1 demonstrates...”; “figure 1 shows...”). Conclusions use a combination of tenses (e.g. “the study found...”; “further studies are needed...”). Yet there are no hard and fast rules and the “correct tense” is often intuitive.

“Acronym” is a name that refers to a word made from the first letters of a series of related words. e.g. World Health Organization (WHO), low-and middle-income countries (LMICs). Acronyms are useful in scientific writing because they can speed up the reading and shorten sentences. Using acronyms can save space and prevent unnecessary repetition but it is preferable to use acronyms only when the term in question is going to be repeated several times in the paper. If it is only used once or twice, avoid the acronym. Editors do not like excessive use of acronyms. Also most journals prefer that you do not use acronyms in the abstract. Start afresh in the main text.

In summary some basic tips on acronyms are as follows.

- Always spell out each acronym the first time it is used and then use consistently thereafter.
- Try not to start a sentence with an acronym.
- Avoid using acronyms in the title and Abstract. If used in tables and figures include a footnote to define.
- When in doubt use fewer acronyms.

Some journals ask for a list of abbreviations (i.e. acronyms and their definitions) to be added at the end of the manuscript.

Numbers can be written as words or numerals. There is no firm rule but in general, try to use text not numbers from zero to nine and numbers thereafter. For example, you would say “five of the men were ...”; “15 of the 20 subjects were... ”.

Drafting the manuscript

Drafting and re-drafting will be ongoing throughout this course.

You will begin by drafting the introduction. The first paragraph is important and should engage the readers. The introduction should convince your readers that you are knowledgeable, have insights and something to add to what is already known. Ensure clarity and try to keep sentences short and to the point.

A well-written introduction will: inform the reader about the topic; provide a rationale for the research; review the relevant literature; pose key questions, and state the aims and objectives. The introduction must always include a literature review that covers up to date relevant evidence. It should read as if you are well-informed but also critical of the literature. Refer to what previous studies have found (or not) as this will support the rationale for your work.

Don't add references to impress. Ensure that they are of relevance. Only add those citations that add value to what is being said. Ask yourself: if my reader is to look up references I have cited will he/she agree that they add value and are appropriate and relevant to the points that I am trying to make?

After drafting your introduction, you will move to the methods section. The methods must be clearly explained so that a reader could replicate or reproduce your study. Although few might actually do this in practice, readers and peer reviewers need to be able to verify the validity of the work. Internal validity means that the conclusions are supported by the methods and results. External validity refers to whether the results can be more broadly generalized. If the methods section is not sufficiently clear and transparent, then it is difficult to judge the validity of the work.

Figures and flow charts can be useful to have in methods sections. For example they can show how a sample was drawn from a population, specifying inclusion and exclusion criteria.

The results section is where you describe the outcomes of your research. Start with the main findings. Make sure that any aspects reported in the discussion are included in the results. Don't report too much detail in the text. The tables and figures should tell the story and their titles should unambiguously indicate content. Use footnotes to the tables and figures if clarification is needed.

In the final part of the paper, the discussion and conclusion, you will describe, explain and discuss how specific aspects of your research fit into a body of evidence. Start the discussion with an outline of the key findings and how they met (or not) the objectives. The purpose of the discussion section is to interpret and describe the significance of your findings in light of what was already known about the research problem before your study, and to explain any new understanding or fresh insights that your work brings to light.

The discussion should explain how the study has moved the reader's understanding of the problem forward from the point where they were at end of the introduction or background section. The discussion is where you show that your study has given you a deeper understanding of the research problem/questions that you investigated.

Do not present new results. Reconcile your findings with the literature. How did your study fill gaps in the literature? Were the findings expected or unexpected? Interpret the findings

in this light and present the policy implications of your research. You may include recommendations for policy and action and for further research.

It is important to reflect on the strengths and limitations of your work. These comments are usually added (sometimes as a new sub-section) before the conclusions. Do not write in an apologetic style. Describe the shortcomings that kept your work from being optimal. Many of these may be outside the scope of your paper.

The discussion section gives you an opportunity to engage in creative and critical thinking about issues you investigated through an evidence-based interpretation of your findings.

Papers should end with a conclusion, which is often just a short concise paragraph. This is not a summary of what you did. That part belongs in the abstract. This is not the place to introduce new evidence. Keep your reader focused and avoid using the first person (e.g. I or we). Finish with a clear concise key “take-home” message.

Although you have probably drafted an abstract earlier, this most important part of the paper is finalized after the working draft is finished. The purpose of the abstract is to attract the readers for whom the material is intended. Remember titles and abstracts are read first.

The abstract should be self-contained. It is preferable not to cite references in the abstract. All the information contained in the abstract must also be included in the main body of the manuscript.

Like the abstract, the final version of the title can be written last. A good title captures the aim of the work and informs somewhat about the methods and setting.

Journals specify the number of allowed key words. As words in the title automatically become key words in an online search, there is no need to duplicate the words in the title as key words. Include as many new key words as possible to maximise your paper’s chances of being located in online searches.

Most journals ask for end materials. This can be included under any of the following sub-headings: Acknowledgments, Author Contributions, Disclosure Statements, Funding Information, Ethics and Consent, and Availability of Data and Materials. Check the author guidelines.

The title page includes the title of the paper and the names of all authors, with their affiliations. Clarify this with your co-authors and layout the information to comply with the journal’s author guidelines.

Peer review and revision in this course

In addition to being authors, you will also be peer reviewers in this course. Both roles are important and both will count towards your assessment and final grade. We will form small groups to review one another’s work. You will be given three or four days to review the introduction, methods, results or discussion written by a “peer” and submit your brief report. It is most important that you upload these reports promptly to Cambro so that the author (your peer) can take your feedback on board in revising the working draft.

The peer review report should start with a brief overview of the quality of the work and follow by mentioning specific issues – first major than then minor. This need be no longer than one page in this course because we are reviewing section by section. Refer to the line numbers in the manuscript to help the author locate the issue. The important thing here is

that you have read and critically reviewed your peer's work. It is OK to also include a copy of the document with MS track changes showing your comments and edits but this should be in addition to your report.

When you, the author, receive reviewers' comments, you will address these in revising your paper. You will also draft the next section of your paper. This process will continue until you have worked through the entire manuscript. You may not necessarily agree with all the comments. However, it will be important to reflect on how you think the reviews have strengthened your paper.

Your participation in the above will allow you to gain experience both as an author and as a peer reviewer. Peer review is a defining feature of scientific discourse. This is a most important task that aims to improve the quality of published literature through constructive commentary and criticism. Here the focus is on authorship and peer review. You will learn by doing and interact with members of your cohort.

This year we plan to hold small group peer review Zoom sessions in the course.

Teacher's role

As teacher I will coach, mentor and guide you through the steps outlined here. I will provide additional commentary and peer review. I will point out where the English expression needs improvement but I will not make detailed corrections. Having passed your thesis we expect that your written English is at an acceptable standard and that you can write in an objective scientific style.

There is a large volume of material on scientific writing on the web. There are also numerous online courses. Topics such as composition, technical writing, academic literacy, English grammar and vocabulary are covered. Feel free to browse these resources without getting too distracted. Remember to stay focused on your working draft.

There will be some resources uploaded to the Cambro platform. I will not overload you with too many because they may distract you from the key purpose of this practical course – which is to develop your manuscript while taking on board the comments of your peers, and the teacher.

Cover letter to the journal

When you submit your paper to a journal, you will include a cover letter the purpose of which is to introduce your work to the editor and explain why you think your work is deserving of publication in this journal.

A cover letter is formatted like a standard business letter and addressed to the Editor in Chief (or similar title) of the journal. The cover letter can include: manuscript information, (title and type of article); the topic/problem that is addressed; suggested reviewers; the significance and importance of the work, and reasons why you think the paper will appeal to the journal readership. In addition, the cover letter should have a statement declaring that the manuscript has not been previously published and is not currently in press or being considered for publication by another journal. The cover letter will give you an opportunity to cite your thesis and minimize any plagiarism claims.

Finish with the name and email of the corresponding author. He or she is the person to whom the journal office will direct all correspondence related to your submission. In most cases, this is either the first or last author.

Examination

For the examination, you will be expected to submit a draft manuscript that is considered (by you and your co-authors) to be close to the version that you plan to submit to a peer-reviewed journal after the finish of the course. Assessment will be based primarily on this manuscript but your peer review reports will also be taken into consideration, as will the extent to which you have met course deadlines.

File uploading in this course

All students will have their INDIVIDUAL NAMED folders in the Cambro Dropbox. This is where your files are to be uploaded. Please include your name and the date written as (year- month- day) in naming the document. For example, Joe_James_Introduction (2020-06-23).

And finally

This as we move through the course, feel free to make suggestions and ask questions if anything is unclear. Good luck!

ATTACHMENT A

What do editors and reviewers look when assessing manuscripts?

- Are the title and key words appropriate?
- Is the paper written with clarity and brevity? Are the arguments presented in a logical convincing manner?
- Have the authors established a clear evidence-based rationale for this work?
- Does each paragraph include one key message and more than one sentence?
- Does the introduction begin by setting the context for the paper and then focus down, paragraph by paragraph, to establish the rationale for this work?
- Is there excessive unnecessary information in the introduction? Is it repetitive? Is some of the information presented as background, redundant or unnecessary?
- Do the authors back up their claims or assumptions with evidence from the literature?
- Is the literature up to date? Has the latest research literature been used to inform the research questions?
- Upon reading the introduction, are the research questions clear?
- Is the terminology clear? Are different terms used to describe what is essentially the same concept?
- Are the study variables defined?
- Are the methods, including the statistical analyses, clearly explained? Could they be reproduced?
- Is it easy to understand the representativeness of the study sample in the wider population from which it is drawn?
- Are the results presented and interpreted in a concise explicit manner?
- If the paper uses data from an analysis that has been performed previously by others (e.g. a principal component analysis for a wealth index) is this made clear?
- Are the tables and figures easy to understand? Is the format consistent? Is all the relevant information included? Are footnotes included, if applicable?
- Do the tables and figures support the text? Are the titles concise?
- Was the analysis appropriate? Did the authors “over-analyse” the data or exaggerate the importance of the findings?
- Does the discussion link back to the introduction? It is advisable not to introduce too many new references in the discussion but those used in the introduction can be re-cited.
- Are the conclusions valid?
- Are the strengths and limitations included in the discussion?
- Is this paper a “minor extension” of a body of work that has been done before or does it add something new? What is the “take home message” from this work?
- Are the references in a consistent style and one that is recommended by the journal? Are there obvious errors in the way the references have been added to the referencing software?

ATTACHMENT B

The following study design guidelines are used by both authors and peer reviewers. Download those as appropriate for the study design.

Enhancing the quality and transparency of health research -see EQUATOR website <http://www.equator-network.org/>.

For trials follow the CONSORT guidelines found at <http://www.consort-statement.org/?o=1011>

For observational studies follow the STROBE guidelines found at <https://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=strobe-home>

For systematic reviews and meta-analyses follow the PRISMA guidelines found at <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>

For original qualitative studies follow the COREQ guidelines found at <https://academic.oup.com/intqhc/article/19/6/349/1791966>

For synthesis of qualitative studies follow the ENTREQ guidelines found at <http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/entreq/>

For health economics studies follow the CHEERS guidelines found at <http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/cheers/>

For health care quality papers follow the SQUIRE guidelines found at <http://squire-statement.org/>

Use the checklists provided by the relevant guidelines before you submit your manuscript.

ATTACHMENT C

The peer review processes following by journals generally follow a number of steps as outlined here.

1. The corresponding author applies for an account with the journal. This is done online and most journals register authors immediately. The corresponding author submits the manuscript and attachments. When the process is complete he/she will receive email confirmation.
2. The manuscript passes through quality control checks by journal staff. If there are deficiencies the journal staff will contact the submitting author. Issues that arise can include not numbering pages, not separating the title page from the main body of the manuscript, not including all end materials and not declaring that the work hasn't been previously published. In such cases, the corresponding author should work expediently with the journal staff.
3. The manuscript is then passed through the similarity check plagiarism software. If there is sufficient content similar to that published elsewhere, the corresponding author will be asked to explain.
4. If the manuscript passes the above stages it will then be allocated to one of the journal's editors. The editor reads and assesses the paper in terms of scientific merit and appropriateness for the journal's readership.
5. The editor may decide either 1) to reject the manuscript or 2) to send it for peer review.
6. If the former decision is made the editor will write to the authors giving reasons as to why their manuscript was judged unsuitable. If the latter decision is made, the editor will identify peer reviews using the journal's data base and send automated requests by email.
7. Peer reviewers are usually asked to report back within two or three weeks. Generally at least two peer reviews are sought. Peer reviewers are usually over-committed academics and often only about 10% of the requests are met with a positive response i.e. an agreement to peer review the relevant paper.
8. After the reviews are returned the editor assesses their quality and decides whether to send the manuscript for further review (i.e. search for other reviewers) or make a "reject" or "revise" decision at this time.
9. Multiple rounds of peer review are possible. For example, the first editorial decision may be a request to the authors that they revise as per the reviewers' comments, but after they upload their revised manuscript, the editor may decide to send the revision out for another review – either by the same or new reviewers.
10. If the manuscript is accepted, the authors receive an email first from the editor and later from the publisher regarding the process of copyediting and proofreading.
11. When the submitting author on behalf of all co-authors, declares that he/she has checked all proofs and has no further changes to make, the paper can be published. Online versions are usually published within a day or two. The timing for print versions (if available) varies from journal to journal.