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Introduce yourself to the person next to you…

- What is the main thing you do in your everyday practice?
- What types of things have you written before?
- What are your areas of interest?
- What topics would you potentially like to write about in the future?
Hello, my name is Maria…

- What is the main thing you do in your everyday working life?
  - I co-ordinate a dissertation module for the MSc Nursing programmes
  - Contribute to literature reviews within the school

- What types of things have you written before?
  - Book reviews
  - Project reports
  - Peer reviewed journal articles
  - Twitter accounts
    (@MariaJGrant @HILJnl)
Hello, my name is Maria…

• What are your areas of interest?
  – Writing for Publication

• What topics would you potentially like to write about in the future?
  - Moving from what we believe works well to gathering confirmatory evidence of what actually works well
Introduce yourself to the person next to you...

• What is the main thing you do in your everyday practice?
• What types of things have you written before?
• What are your areas of interest?
• What topics would you potentially like to write about in the future?
What are our expectations as writers?
What are our expectations as readers?
Who’s Expectations?

• Matching readers expectations with those of you as a writer

http://bit.ly/2c09M1a
The Unspoken Question...

So what?!!

Things we consider when reading...

- Do the arguments that the authors put forward make sense?
- Are the views of the authors consistent with the evidence provided?
- Is it possible to distinguish fact and opinion?
- Are there any omissions in this work?
- Is there ambiguity?
- Is there bias?
- How current is the material?
- How well referenced is the work?

http://bit.ly/zvDO7h
What can we learn from reading other peoples writing?

- Reading puts us in touch with how an author has organised information, selected words and structured arguments
- We acquire the habit of expressing our ideas in a clear and coherent way

http://bit.ly/2c09M1a
What can we learn from appraising on other people’s writing?

- Privately
  - Critical appraisal to understand strengths and weaknesses
  - Providing peer feedback to a colleague
- Publicly
  - Providing peer feedback within a writers group
  - Open peer review
- Semi-Privately
  - Blind peer review

http://bit.ly/2c09M1a
We’re all experts…

- Where does your professional knowledge lie?
- What are your areas of interest?
- What are your areas of expertise?
Writing for publication can take many forms

- Peer reviewed article
- Non-peer reviewed article
- Book review
- Newsletter item
- Blog post
- Twitter or Facebook
- Project or management report
What Did You Do With the Referee/s Comments?

What is Peer Review?

‘Peer review is the process by which reports of, or proposals for, research are scrutinised by other researchers.’

(Committee of Publisher Ethics 2011)
The key similarities between research, evaluation and audit is that all begin with a question. They all expect to inform practice and require data collection using appropriate methods to reach their conclusions.”

(Grant et al 2013 p5)
What is the purpose of peer review?

• To ensure that only the best quality manuscripts are published
• To provide constructive feedback on how a manuscript can be further developed

http://bit.ly/1JHacVg
How many have written referee comments?

http://bit.ly/2c7mhJk
What We Can Learn from Other People’s Writing

• Four manuscript extracts
• Drawing on your expertise as readers
• Note your thoughts
• Share with your neighbour
Methods: Extract

“A qualitative study was chosen using an online questionnaire, which permitted a range of descriptive responses from NHS managers and library electronic services leads, to form the basis of a thematic discussion and series of recommendations.”
Feedback

“It is questionable that this is truly a qualitative study. Questionnaire surveys tend to be quantitative in nature. Acknowledging that there are some open-ended questions included in the survey, this is a mixed methods study at best.”

“A UK survey was completed in March 2013 and both quantitative and qualitative data were collected using an online questionnaire. The questionnaire allowed survey participants to indicate their contact details if they wanted to be contacted in the future for similar projects. This provided some indication of the staff categories responding to the survey. The open ended questions in the survey permitted a range of descriptive responses that could be captured to form the basis of a thematic discussion and series of recommendations which are highlighted in this study.”
Results: Extract

Findings

Clusters (Level 2)

Understanding of Trust, Ward and Personal Objectives

• There was a strong focus on informal patient-centred objectives (“patients dictate objectives”). The words “safety” and “care” were used a lot, but statements were often generalised—“patients come in poorly and we make them well”.

• Ward objectives were seen as being more relevant on a day to day basis, however they are not specific and staff could not name them.
Feedback

“The findings are presented in bullet points. I assume this is evidence of the ‘clusters’ arising from the data analysis though this would benefit from an introduction/scene setting.”

Results
Data Analysis

Coding (Level 1)
The data from focus groups… (Level 1)…

Coding (Level 2)
These codes were clustered (Level 2) by comparing the substantive codes and determining groups that were mutually exclusive or had similar traits…
“When asked for details of the types of mobile applications or mobile-enabled web resources offered… the number of libraries who did not provide a mobile resource, far outweighed those that did.”
Feedback

“Some extra references to support your statements would be helpful.”

http://bit.ly/2cn6Qxe
“When asked for details of the types of mobile applications or mobile-enabled web resources offered, the number of libraries who did not provide a mobile resource was far greater those that did… Research has shown users not only want to use mobile technology but want more sophisticated devices.”

http://bit.ly/2cn6Qxe
Conclusion: Extract

“Using promotional tools and working with new and old partner’s health libraries have a chance to share costs and reach users at the point of care. Clinical Librarian roles are common\textsuperscript{12,13} and with NHS drivers and developing resources new opportunities are beckoning.”

Feedback

“No new material to be included in the conclusion which should represent only the findings not those from other studies; if important to the study it should be included in the discussion.”

http://bit.ly/2c38CA7
“The survey highlighted the diverse range of mobile technology in use in health libraries. Libraries were using both external and internal partners to extend their knowledge and promotion of devices. Inadequate local IT networks and lack of individual expertise were cited as issues to be overcome. More research is needed into what is locally available and how services are used once delivered… Good practice was found in many areas, but was sporadic, depending largely on individual interest and motivation. Despite this, health libraries have an opportunity to share good practice through their networks.”
General comments

“Please structure your manuscript to mirror the structure of the abstract.”

http://bit.ly/2cg54eN

4. MANUSCRIPT TYPES ACCEPTED

Review article: up to 10,000 words including references, abstract, tables, illustrations and key messages; subject to peer review. Intending authors are advised to consult “A typology of reviews” and to contact the Review Editor (for address please see inside front cover) prior to starting the development of their review.

Original articles: of 3000-5000 words excluding references, abstract, tables, illustrations and key messages; subject to peer review. Papers should present interesting and important developments within the field, original ideas and findings, case studies and service innovations. The paper should be structured to include an abstract, background, objectives, methods, results, discussion, conclusions, bibliography and key messages. In most cases the structure should be:

Abstract – structured abstract of no more than 200 words

Background – describing the problem/issue the study seeks to address incorporating a review of the international literature

Objectives – a clear description of the aims of the study

Methods – describing research tools/processes use

Results – a brief summary of main results with figures where appropriate

Discussion – provide an interpretation of your findings in light of what is already known about the subject and explain how the study moves the subject forward from what is presented in the background section of your manuscript

Conclusions – primary conclusions and their implications, suggesting areas for further investigation if appropriate

All manuscript must include keywords and key messages. If reporting a survey, a copy of the questionnaire should be supplied as part of the appendices.

Keywords – No less than 4 and up to 10 keywords should be provided during the submission. These should be selected from MESH headings available at http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html

Key Messages – Key messages are important because they tell the reader why the report or study is important and highlights its implications for health science librarians and information scientists.

When submitting an article to HILJ a key messages box should be provided.

• This should contain no more than 5 key messages.

• Focus: messages should relate to implications for practice OR implications for policy OR implications for future research. (If appropriate you may use two categories as long as there are not more than 5 messages.)

• Word count: each key message should contain no more than 25 words.

Click here for further guidance on how to write engaging key messages.

Other items: such as letters, short reports, brief news items and book reviews are likely to be more appropriate for publication in the HLG Newsletter and should be sent the HLG Newsletter Editor. The Editor may also suggest publication in the HLG Newsletter, where appropriate, and also reserves the right to refuse any material.
Who’s expectations...

“The author appears to be trying to include everything they learned...”
Positive and Constructive

“I also found the inclusion of the steps you have taken to address the findings of your research very useful as it provides others with practical ways to improve library service usage on wards.”

http://bit.ly/2cg54eN
What We Can Learn From Reading Other People’s Writing

• It encourages us to articulate what it is we’re seeing
• By articulating what we’re seeing, we start to internalise our understanding
• By internalising our understanding, we can start to apply their knowledge to our own writing

http://bit.ly/2cg54eN
How can we engage in “reading for writing” in our everyday practice?

http://bit.ly/2c8Z89U
Review for the Health Information and Libraries Journal!

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/hilj
Learning together...

• Pair a novice referee with a more experienced referee from the *Health Information and Libraries Journal* referee database

• Receive a copy of the other referees review when a decision is recorded on the manuscript

Dear Referee,

A decision of major revisions has been rendered for XXX, which you recently reviewed for Health Information and Libraries Journal. The comments of all referees are listed at the bottom of this email.

Your participation in the peer-review process is critical to the journal’s success and directly impacts the quality of the journal we publish. We appreciate your assistance with the evaluation of the manuscript and hope that we may contact you for assistance with future submissions falling within your areas of interest and expertise.

In appreciation of your review, we are pleased to offer you a 30% discount on Wiley books. Visit http://www.wiley.com and use code JRREV in the promotion code field. Discount excludes major reference works.

Yours sincerely,

Maria J Grant
Editor, Health Information and Libraries Journal

Referees comments to the author:

Referee 1:
XXX

Referee 2:
XXX
Some hidden benefits…

• Read about something new before anyone else!
• Gain confidence in our own writing – no manuscript is as perfect as appears in its published state
• By internalising our understanding of how to write through critical reading & feedback, we can start to apply their knowledge to our own writing
To the consenting corresponding author of the manuscripts used in today’s examples.
Committee of Publisher Ethics (2011) Written evidence submitted by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (PR 34) to Science & Technology Select Committee. Web site: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmsctech/writev/856/m34.htm


Maria J Grant

Email: m.j.grant@salford.ac.uk
Twitter: @MariaJGrant
Facebook: http://on.fb.me.ovBuiM