

Instruction for Newbie Scientists on How to Prepare a Scientific Paper

Melaku Tafese Awulachew

Food Science & Nutrition Research, Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Email address:

melakutafese12@gmail.com

To cite this article:

Melaku Tafese Awulachew. Instruction for Newbie Scientists on How to Prepare a Scientific Paper. *American Journal of Applied Scientific Research*. Vol. 8, No. 1, 2022, pp. 11-17. doi: 10.11648/j.ajars.20220801.12

Received: March 7, 2022; **Accepted:** April 16, 2022; **Published:** April 26, 2022

Abstract: The abstract is the essence of the full text. Before the main body, the purpose of the abstract is to let readers understand the full text briefly. When an abstract is used, it is always placed at the start of a manuscript or typescript, serving as the starting point for any academic paper or patent application. Abstracting and indexing services for various academic disciplines have the goal of compiling a body of literature on that subject. Furthermore, an abstract summarizes the major aspects of the entire paper in a prescribed sequence, usually in one paragraph of between 200- 400 words, and includes: the overall purpose of the study and the research problem(s) you investigated; the basic design of the study; major findings or trends found as a result of your analysis; and, a brief summary of your interpretations and conclusions. Writing scientific publications is difficult for many new researchers, and few receive formal training in how to communicate their findings in writing. Nonetheless, publication is frequently necessary for employment advancement, funding, academic qualification, or a combination of these factors. Generally, an abstract is a short summary of a research article, thesis, review, conference proceeding, or any in-depth analysis of a specific subject that is frequently used to help the reader determine the paper's purpose quickly.

Keywords: Scientific Manuscript, Title, Introduction, Method, Result, Discussion, Conclusion, Reference

1. Background

At some point in their career, every researcher has come face to face with a blank page, unsure of where to begin and what to write first. It's not easy to describe one's research work in a way that others can understand and that is publishable. You become closely and emotionally invested in your research when you commit a lot of time, energy, and often money in it.

Naturally, you believe in the significance of your study and its worth to the scientific community. However, the subjectivity that comes with significant engagement might make it difficult to step back and consider how to present the study in a clear and intelligible manner so that others – usually non-experts in your field can comprehend the importance of your results.

Many young researchers feel compelled to publish scientific publications in order to progress their careers, validate funding requests, justify earlier funding allocations, or complete university requirements. Research and scientific writing may be seen as secondary tasks that are not a high priority and on which only little amounts of time can be spent on an irregular basis due to clinical pressures. Because the

competition for high-quality articles submitted to journals is already tough, mastering the fundamentals is crucial if you want your work to get published.

Don't you believe your work deserves to be examined on its scientific merits rather than being dismissed because of bad language and a jumbled and confused data presentation?

With this in mind, we've put together a step-by-step approach to producing a scientific paper that isn't specific to the field of geriatrics/gerontology, but can be applicable to a wide range of medical specialties. We'll start by establishing the article's main sections, then go over the main features that should be included in each section in further detail. Finally, we'll offer some advice on how to write the abstract and title of the piece.

This guidance is intended to assist young researchers with limited writing experience in producing a high-quality first draft of their work, which can then be circulated to co-authors and senior mentors for further refining, with the ultimate goal of publishing in a scientific journal. It is obviously not comprehensive, and there are other great resources in the existing literature [1-8]. Moreover, Collaboration emerged the Six Step Approach (Read to

write; Select the journal you intend to write for; avoid writing the article before you plan what you have to say; Contact the editorial team; Use the journal as a template for structuring your writing; and prepare the final manuscript for publication) to write for publication. Collaborative writing refers to the process where two or more authors combine efforts to develop a single writing project [4]. An immediate challenge is developing an inner belief that you already do have the ability to become published. Whilst there might initially be doubts about academic ability resulting in a lack of confidence [9], of no doubt is that many practitioners reading this article already have, and use writing skills on a daily basis [10].

One of the greatest skills in writing is to keep it simple. A good place to start to prepare an article for publication is to write about something you are already familiar with [11]. A key premise of this paper is to offer practical support and encouragement for new authors to overcome some of the challenges faced in becoming published.

2. Before You Write a Single Word, There Are a Few Things You Should Do

Before you write a single word of your essay, you must complete some preliminary work. This preliminary research should be completed. By the time you arrive, the majority of the work will have already been completed. Since it also serves as a backdrop to the writing stage. You're writing about a research project. You've put in a lot of effort. Creating a protocol for your project is a step forward from developing it the title of the article that will be produced as a result of your project. As a result, you've most likely already conducted a thorough literature analysis to determine the current level of knowledge on the topic and assure the uniqueness of your research when establishing the procedure, and this can be used as the basis for your article. When examining the literature, make a list of essential themes or words that you want to include in your piece, along with the appropriate sources. A reference management software tool (either free versions or commercially available programs) can assist you manage the vast number of references you'll have to look through before deciding what's significant.

Typically, you will also have the final results of your data's statistical analysis. Your results section will be built around this. Figures will be created from some of the graphical representations of before starting to write, you should identify the target journal in which you intend to submit your research. This will have consequences for the formatting, but more importantly, for the orientation of your writing style, since the writing must be appropriate for the type of reader you are targeting. For example, are you targeting a specialist journal, where readers are expected to be experts in your field, or a general medicine journal, where readers may be experts from other disciplines? This will have implications for the amount and type of information that you must include. In addition, the editorial policy of the target journal should also be taken into

account. For instance, in a given area of expertise, some journals favour papers reporting basic research, whereas other journals give precedence to more clinical work. The choice of the target journal depends on a range of factors, which are beyond the scope of this article. However, at the very least, you should check that your paper falls within the scope of the journal you have chosen your results.

3. The Most Important Parts of a Scientific Paper

The vast majority of scientific publications adhere to the so-called double-blind peer review process. Introduction, techniques, results, and discussion in the "IMRAD" format.

There are certain exceptions to this rule, and you should always verify the guidelines for authors of the journal where you plan to submit your manuscript to be sure that this is the suggested format. We will only discuss the IMRAD format in this article because it is the most extensively used.

An introduction, a methods part, a results section, and a commentary should all appear in this order in your essay. The abstract, which is essentially a synopsis of these main components, and, of course, the title will be added to this. There must be a list of bibliographic references, tables, and legends for any figures at the end. Each of these sections in more below, detailing the key aspects to bear in mind while you write them.

3.1. The Title Sections

Finally, but certainly not least, your article's title. After the title, it is necessary to describe the information of the authors: names, their affiliation with address, their email and their ORCID number.

The title should include keywords that reflect the article's primary points. It should also pique the curiosity of the potential reader and make them want to read the rest of your work. Remember that most people searching for articles on a specific topic will use PubMed/Medline or other online archives, thus your title should include the most important terms and keywords so that it may be found quickly in PubMed. If your title is poorly written, your work will be difficult to recognize and will never appear in other people's search results, resulting in your paper never being cited by others because they did not locate it or read it. Once your title has been found and listed amid dozens, if not hundreds, of other papers on the same topic, it should stand out by describing how your piece adds to the literature or fills a knowledge gap. This may seem like a huge order for a simple title, but it's not as difficult as it appears. Table 1 provides some guidelines for composing the title. For samples of what forms an effective title, look at the titles of papers in highly regarded medical journals (both general medicine journals and the most highly mentioned specialized journals in your field). Keep in mind that the length of your target journal's title may be limited (in terms of words or characters). It's harder to keep it short here than it is to come up with a 4-line title.

Table 1. The main elements to be included in a successful title.

Pointer	Example
Mention the most important factors that were investigated.	Give the medicine or intervention's name.
Cite the population setting in which the research was conducted.	Acute myocardial infarction, intermediate-risk pulmonary embolism, and septic shock in the early stages
Cite the design	Controlled, randomized, double-blind trial/registry/cohort study/case-control study
Cite the main finding	Increases/reduces/prevents.
Put the most important aspect first	If the focus is on the intervention, because this is what distinguishes your article from others, then start the title with the intervention name
Avoid imprecise formulations that serve no specific purpose	Avoid terms such as “a report of...” or “the effects of...”. If there are effects, state what they are!
For drug names, use international common denominations.	Clopidogrel, ticagrelor, prasugrel. Commercial names should be avoided. They indicate propriety (of the pharmaceutical company), and may be construed as indirect preference for a particular company. Also, they are not always the same across different countries
Subtitles should be used sparingly	Reserve subtitles for names of study groups. Specific recommendations may apply, depending on your target journal

3.2. The Abstract

An abstract is a summary of the study and findings written by the author.

It is a condensed version of the article divided into sections (usually background, methods, result and conclusion). It is utilized for referencing purposes in online bibliographic databases (such as PubMed), and as a result, it should be a separate unit that can be read without having to refer to the complete text. When a potential reviewer is invited to examine your manuscript for publication in a journal, it is frequently the first thing they see. As a result, it is critical that the abstract be brief, yet comprehensive and appealing, in order to give the potential reader a taste of the primary content and pique their interest in reading the whole work. Because it is the most

important marketing tool for your company, it is worth dedicating some time and attention to its creation. There are a few key aspects to bear in mind when preparing the abstract, but space is limited, so keep it brief. Table 2 summarizes the important points for the abstract. The development of the abstract should not take long if you have devoted enough time and attention to planning your research and composing the subsequent piece. You'll almost certainly discover a sentence or two in the introduction that may be reused in the abstract (with some minor changes). Similarly, the findings will primarily be copied and pasted from the article's results section. The conclusion can be thought of as the key takeaway message from your work. Indeed, the most difficult aspect of the abstract is frequently condensing it to fit under the word restriction of your desired magazine.

Table 2. Main points to keep in mind when writing the abstract.

Item	Notes
Background	A quick reminder of the background, as well as a concise description of the principal goal. It should be concise and to-the-point. Two to three sentences are generally sufficient Identify the gap in knowledge that you hope to fill The main methods should be outlined: The main inclusion criteria to define the population Define the study groups, if any
Methods	Describe (very briefly) the main interventions or treatments State the primary endpoint You will not have room to explain all the methods in great detail, so stick to the overall defining criteria with septic shock, defined as persistent hypotension despite adequate vascular filling) List the main results, with means, odds ratios, p-values... for each group. List the result of the primary endpoint first, followed by secondary outcomes
Results	Ensure that you have given a result for every method you mentioned in the methods section There should be enough detail to back up your conclusion
Conclusion	A one-line conclusion summarizing your main finding is sufficient, with perhaps a short sentence with the implications for future research, if you have enough space The conclusion should be directly related to the main objective and endpoint
References	There should be no references in an abstract
Discussion	There should be no discussion, or no judgmental statements in the abstract (i.e. remarks such as “Surprisingly, we observed...”)
Figures	There should be no figures, tables or other illustrations in an abstract

3.3. “Introduction (Background and Justification)” Section

Introduction (Background and Justification)" section is a

statement of what is currently known about the study subject that articulates the questions being investigated. It cites other scholarly works, lays the foundations of the study and sometimes states a hypothesis to be tested.

The beginning is crucial in capturing the reader's interest (Table 3). The start should get the reviewer "hooked," wanting to read more and asking to themselves, "How come I never thought of this?" especially during the review process. Thus, in this section, you will explain why you conducted your research, what you hoped to accomplish with it, and how it contributes to the current body of knowledge on the subject.

In concrete words, you should begin by briefly explaining what is already known about this issue, using appropriate references. You should then restrict the scope and indicate the regions where there is still some uncertainty, referencing any earlier (and possibly contradictory) data where applicable. This will logically lead to a description of a specific knowledge gap that your study aims to close.

The reasons that inspired you to go on this journey can be found in the backstory. The reader should be able to understand and justify your study. Current level of scientific knowledge with citations it's not the case. It is required to cite every publication on the subject in the literature; an It is sufficient to make a careful selection of the most relevant publications. It is also unnecessary to state universal facts that may or may not be true. Appear overly simplistic or self-evident Nonetheless, you should make an effort. To strike a good balance between important background information and excessive detail it's important to remember this in this

regard. The demographic you're looking for. This will be determined by the circumstances, readership profile of the journal in which you wish to publish, as previously stated, you must submit your study.

If you're writing for a specialist journal, your background can be more extensive and technical than if you're writing for a non-specialist audience in your profession.

The introduction should naturally lead to the discovery of the knowledge gap that you intend to close. This is your chance to highlight the study's extra value or the fresh information it will produce. Will your findings have an impact on clinical practice? Will they help the scientific community as a whole reach an agreement on a previously divisive issue by presenting hard data in one side or the other? This is your opportunity to pitch your piece, in the appropriate language, of course.

Avoid deviating from the topic at hand as much as possible. Every sentence should have a specific goal in mind. Many journals place a limit on the length of the introduction, allowing only a certain amount of words or pages, so you'll have to keep focused. You should carefully read the guidelines for writers in your target journal to see if there are any recommendations for the length of the introduction. In the absence of any stated recommendations, the introduction is estimated to be one to one and a half pages long.

Table 3. Outline of the main features of the Introduction section, with examples.

Feature	Example
Background describing what is known on the subject	Percutaneous coronary intervention is the cornerstone of therapy for acute coronary syndromes, but may be associated with procedure-related complications
What is not known? What elements are still subject	It remains unknown whether...
To controversy? What is the exact gap in the	To date, it has not been proven...
Knowledge that your study hopes to fill? Cite	No study to date has investigated the effect of...
any existing data, especially conflicting data	There are few data to quantify...
that indicate uncertainty	The effect of... on... remains unclear
Objective (working hypothesis)	We hypothesized that the administration of... would reduce/increase... in the context of...
Cite the exact parameter you plan to measure	We aimed to identify/assess/evaluate/investigate...
Cite the type of patient population or clinical context	
Cite any secondary objectives	Through a prospective, single-/multicentre, observational/interventional... study

Table 4. Suggestions for the tense to use when writing your introduction section.

Aim	Tense	Example
To describe the current state of knowledge	Present	Cancer is a common disease
To describe observations previously published by others	Past (imperfect)	Smith et al. showed that drug A reduced the rate of death, whereas drug B did not
To describe a process that began at some unspecified time in the past, and is not yet complete	Present perfect	Several researchers have investigated the effect of drug A on this disease
To describe something that has not happened yet	Present perfect	It has not yet been determined whether...
To formulate your hypothesis	Past tense for first verb	We hypothesized that drug A increases the risk of bleeding
To formulate your objective	Present tense for second verb	We aimed to measure...
	Past tense	

The phrasing of your goal is crucial, and you should give it great consideration. The goal must be stated properly, and it should contain the particular parameter you want to evaluate and how you plan to do it. The goal of your study, as stated in the article, is the same as the goal specified in your study protocol (remember, every research project should start with a written protocol!). It's a good idea to choose one formulation for your goal and apply it throughout the work, including the

introduction, results, discussion, abstract, and even partially in the title. Don't be scared to appear repetitious; in an article, repetition isn't always a bad thing. It at least shows the reader that you know what you're talking about, and utilizing the same terminology throughout eliminates any ambiguity. Finally, a note on the proper tense to use in the introduction. For many researchers, English is not their first language, and this presents an additional challenge in the writing process that

must be overcome. You should try to use all of the resources at your disposal to improve the quality of your written English. Many large universities have translators or scientific writers on staff who might be able to help you with your text. Those who do not have access to such resources should look for samples of the desired format in key articles published in high-quality journals. Table 4 provides suggestions for the tense to use in the introduction.

3.4. The Section on Methods

The section on method is about description how the studies were conducted, with sufficient detail so that others can repeat them exactly. The goal of the methods section is to describe exactly what you did and how you did it in such detail that any average reader with the same resources might replicate your research. Every result you plan to include in your results section must have a method stated for it – you cannot show the outcomes of a test or analysis that was not mentioned in the methods. If, on the other hand, the details of any or all procedures have already been published elsewhere, a concise synopsis with a reference to the relevant publication will suffice.

Begin by describing the study's design (prospective/retrospective, randomized or non-randomized, double-blind or open-label, controlled, crossover, factorial, and so on). Any unusual methodology used in the study design should be explained, either through acceptable references or guidelines, or by an explanation of the specific circumstances that necessitated your special approach.

It's worth noting that the procedures for retrospective research should start with a description of the study's source data, such as the inclusion and exclusion criteria, as well as the final number of case records and/or patients chosen. However, for prospective research, the methods section should specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria, but the ultimate number of patients included should be listed in the results section, not the methods section.

Following the description of the study population, you can go over all of the procedures employed to measure all of the primary parameters reported in your research. The major and secondary endpoints, as well as the techniques used to measure them, must be specified.

Because the primary endpoint is so important to the study's success, this is critically essential. It is the only criterion that allows you to make official conclusions about the study's outcome, thus it must be properly chosen. This point will, once again, have been well considered during the planning phase. This emphasizes how good discussion and thought throughout the design stage of your research topic substantially facilitates the composition of your paper.

Returning to the techniques, each blood test, intervention, operation, questionnaire, imaging technique, and so on should be described in depth, with the manufacturer's details (manufacturer's name, city, and country of business) provided when necessary for any specific equipment or tests performed. To describe why each measurement was collected, use short sentences. Subtitles can also be used to divide the methods

section into portions that are relevant to the reader.

In the methods section, provide a brief remark about ethical considerations, stating that the project has received ethics committee approval (or if not, explain why). You must also affirm that all subjects gave their written informed consent, or the consent of their next of kin or surrogate, if applicable. In the case of randomized clinical trials, it's also a good idea to mention that the study was registered with a reputable clinical trial database (e.g., www.clinicaltrials.gov) and provide the registration number. The name of the ethical committee and the date of approval are required in most journals, and some may even ask for the file number. There may also be differing opinions on where to put all of this information. For more information, consult the instructions for writers of your desired journal. Finally, the statistical analysis should be described in the methods section's concluding paragraph. Standard statements concerning data presentation should come first; for example, quantitative, normally distributed data is provided as mean standard deviation, non-normally distributed data is presented as median [interquartile range], and qualitative data is presented as number (percentage). The exact statistical procedures employed should then be listed – which test for which type of variable; multivariate analysis type and variables included in it; survival analysis approach... Here you can give the sample size reason, which should contain the working hypothesis for the frequency of the result and its variance, the difference you expect to see, and the alpha and beta risks you used in your calculations. The program used, as well as the level of significance for the analyses, should be included. To minimize any complaints concerning post-hoc research in non-predefined subgroups, any planned sub-group analyses should be stated in this paragraph. It has to be.

Table 5. Suggested list of items to be included in the methods section for retrospective and prospective studies.

Retrospective study	Prospective study
Subjects	
Inclusion and non-inclusion criteria	
Ethical considerations (ethics committee approval, name of committee, date and file number, informed consent)	
Primary endpoint	
Secondary endpoints	
Statistical analysis	
Data recorded	Study registration, if randomized
Source(s) of study data	Sample size calculation
Subgroups (if any)	Randomization procedure
Number of subjects/samples	Interventions

This portion should not be difficult for you if you are well-versed in methodology and statistics. If statistics aren't your strong suit, your study almost certainly got methodological help from a skilled methodologist and/or statistician, so you can enlist their help for this section of the manuscript to ensure correctness and thoroughness. Table 5 provides a proposed list of topics to discuss in the methods section for retrospective and prospective research. In terms of writing tense, the procedures should mostly be presented in the past (imperfect) tense, i.e. we performed, we recorded, we

measured, we tested... After describing events that occurred before your study, use the past perfect tense, such as "when thrombolysis failed, we commenced..."

3.5. The Section on the Results

The result section is the description of the research conducted and the results obtained. Results are presented as tables, large datasets and figures, which can include graphs, diagrams and photographs.

The findings section's goal is to summarize what you saw without adding any opinion or discussion. It is no longer required to discuss the procedures; this was already done in the methods section; instead, simply state the outcome. If the reader pays attention to the methods section, they will recall what methods were used. It is also unnecessary to remark or interpret the results, thus statements like "surprisingly..." or "interestingly..." are often considered out of place in the results section.

You must provide a result for each method described in the methods section, and it is best practice to give the outcomes in the same order as the methods to make the article easier to follow and read. When writing the results section, many researchers wonder whether they should describe the results in the text or use a table or figure. While there are no hard and fast rules, findings that can be stated in one or two lines can often be written in the text. Tables should be used when describing the same variables for two or more groups, such as baseline characteristics, outcomes, and treatments. Tables usually contain the most essential results, and they should be enough to provide the reader a good sense of your findings on their own. Figures are useful when the source data is either too complex to convey or too difficult to interpret. Relationships and trends can be shown graphically in figures. Depending on the target journal, there may be a restriction to the overall amount of visuals (figures and tables) you can include, so check for instructions before inserting too many. Also, avoid including too many images to prevent them from losing interest, and avoid repeating material in the text that previously occurs in a table or figure.

3.6. The Section on Discussion

The section on discussion is an analysis and interpretation of the data presented that integrates the new information with prior findings, states the implications of the work, and sometimes generates new hypothesis to be tested.

This is where you interpret and explain the relevance of your findings, as well as how they fit into the larger picture of what has previously been seen and published on the same subject. The discussion should begin with a quick overview of your study's principal findings, preferably using the same language as the primary aim (in the introduction) and primary endpoint (in the conclusion) (in the methods). The interpretation of your results can then be done. When interpreting, be careful not to just repeat the results, or, on the other hand, not to over-interpret. Because this is a scientific essay, not a narrative, you should describe your findings in a

factual manner. Putting your findings in the context of other studies is a crucial aspect of the conversation.

How do your findings compare to those of other studies? Do you have any plausible explanations if your findings differ? What are some of the conceivable differences in situations, populations, or techniques that could explain why you saw what you saw? Any discoveries that are particularly surprising or intriguing should be highlighted, as well as possible explanations. Is it possible to extrapolate your findings to other contexts or populations, and if not, why not?

If you conducted numerous analyses or interventions, you should go beyond focusing on individual outcomes to explain the overall importance of the results when all tests or analyses are considered.

You will naturally want to describe what other writers have found in comparable circumstances so that you may compare your findings to theirs. It's important to remember to be polite when criticizing other people's work. Instead of pointing out flaws in other people's work, rephrase to highlight the strengths of your own - the message will be clear without you having to criticize your peers' publications overtly. Instead of proclaiming that "Smith's study was underpowered," adopt a softer tone and a more cautious phrase, such as "Smith's study may have been underpowered," or even better, "Our study had adequate statistical power to find"... This will signal to the reader that Smith's study may not have had sufficient power in the context of a direct comparison. When paraphrasing for readers who do not speak English as their first language, be careful not to affect the sentence's emphasis. The order in which the results or parts of debate are stated could shift the attention away from what the other author intended.

Again, rigorous re-reading by co-authors and senior mentors, or members of your publications department (if one exists), will aid in avoiding these problems. What are the study's unique findings? The importance of your work, and its added value to the literature, will be substantiated by highlighting how your findings provide new evidence or a new contribution to the state of knowledge, as opposed to being "simply another paper" on a "worn-out" issue. You might debate whether your article succeeded in filling the "gap in knowledge" that you justified in the beginning.

Don't be hesitant to write an article that contains bad findings. A well-conducted study that does not provide positive results is always a valuable addition to the current body of knowledge, and you can convey the implications appropriately.

3.7. The Section on Conclusion

Overall, while writing an article from scratch may appear too many young researchers to be a daunting task, the process can be greatly aided by good groundwork when planning your research project and a systematic approach to writing, which follows these simple guidelines for each section. It's worth the time and effort to properly write your essay because getting it published is a rewarding experience.

After all, contributing to the body of evidence on a given topic, sharing your knowledge with others, and capitalizing on

your research with print publications are all components that will help to your career's success. So, grab your pen and paper out and start writing: it's what your hard work deserves!

3.8. The Section on References

References are the list of the articles cited in the paper that provide information on the research topic and methods used.

The reference section includes a list of all the sources you used to develop your hypothesis and conduct your study. It is your ethical and professional responsibility to properly document your work and be completely transparent about your sources. It is also necessary to cite the sources that your theories are founded on in order to demonstrate that they are valid. The references back up your work and set it in the context of other research on the same subject, while also pointing readers in the right direction if they want to learn more about the subject. Many novice researchers struggle to determine whether a reference must be cited.

Basically, any notion or truth that comes from a source other than yourself must be verified. The reference section includes a list of all the sources you used to develop your hypothesis and conduct your study. It is your ethical and professional responsibility to properly document your work and be completely transparent about your sources. It is also necessary to cite the sources that your theories are founded on in order to demonstrate that they are valid. The references back up your work and set it in the context of other research on the same subject, while also pointing readers in the right direction if they want to learn more about the subject. Many novice researchers struggle to determine whether a reference must be cited. In general, any notion or information that comes from a source other than yourself must be backed up with a reference. Apart from specific studies that name a symbol or classification system, as in the examples above, you should prioritize works published in English-language, peer-reviewed journals when citing references. Citing passages from published books is also permissible, but you must be very particular and mention the actual names and titles of the chapter in question, along with page numbers, as well as the names of the book's authors and/or editors, as well as the year of publication.

Personal conversations and unpublished material, as well as Internet sites, should be avoided wherever possible. If you

have numerous options, you may choose to go with the most recent or the one published in the most reputable and authoritative source journal. Instead of reviews, try to prioritize actual research pieces. If you want to credit an idea from a publication where the authors already cite another source for the same idea, go back to the original article and double-check your citation, then cite the original authors, not the intermediate work.

References

- [1] Driscoll J, Aquilina R (2011). Writing for publication: a practical six-step approach. *International Journal of Orthopaedic and Trauma Nursing* 1 (15): 41–8.
- [2] El-Serag HB (2012). Writing and publishing scientific papers. *Gastroenterology* 142 (2): 197–200.
- [3] Guyatt GH, Brian Haynes R (2006) Preparing reports for publication and responding to reviewers' comments. *J Clin Epidemiol* 59 (9): 900–906.
- [4] Keen A (2007). Writing for publication: pressures, barriers and support strategies. *Nurse Education Today* 27 (5): 382–388.
- [5] Pierson DJ (2004). The top 10 reasons why manuscripts are not accepted for publication. *Respir Care* 49 (10): 1246–1252.
- [6] Powell K (2010). Publish like a pro. *Nature Macmillan Publishers Limited* 467 (7317): 873–5.
- [7] Whitehouse S (2013) How to write for publication in medical journals. *Translational Research* 162 (6): 270–273.
- [8] Writing for books and journals; <https://www.publishingcampus.elsevier.com/pages/14/College-s/College-of-Skill-training/Writing-for-books-and-journals.Html>.
- [9] Redmond, M., 2002. Simplifying the writing process for the novice writer. *Journal of Peri-Anesthesia Nursing* 17 (5), 310–317.
- [10] Taylor, J., Lyon, P., Harris, J., 2004. Writing for publication: a new skill for nurses? *Nurse Education in Practice* 3, 1–6.
- [11] Masterson, A., 2001. Writing skills and developing an argument, Ch. 9. In: Maslin-Prothero, S. (Ed.), *Bailliere's Study Skills for Nurses*, second ed., Bailliere Tindall Harcourt, London, p. 195.