

how to write a paper

FIFTH EDITION

Edited by George M. Hall

How to Write a Paper

How to Write a Paper

FIFTH EDITION

Edited by

George M. Hall

Professor of Anaesthesia
Department of Anaesthesia & Intensive Care Medicine
St George's
University of London
London, UK

This edition first published 2013, © 2013 by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

First published 1994 by BMJ Second edition 1998 Third edition 2003 Fourth edition 2008

BMJ Books is an imprint of BMJ Publishing Group Limited, used under licence by Blackwell Publishing which was acquired by John Wiley & Sons in February 2007. Blackwell's publishing programme has been merged with Wiley's global Scientific, Technical and Medical business to form Wiley-Blackwell.

Registered office: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex,

PO19 8SO, UK

Editorial offices: 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030-5774, USA

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell

The right of the author to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book. This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

The contents of this work are intended to further general scientific research, understanding, and discussion only and are not intended and should not be relied upon as recommending or promoting a specific method, diagnosis, or treatment by physicians for any particular patient. The publisher and the author make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of fitness for a particular purpose. In view of ongoing research, equipment modifications, changes in governmental regulations, and the constant flow of information relating to the use of medicines, equipment, and devices, the reader is urged to review and evaluate the information provided in the package insert or instructions for each medicine, equipment, or device for, among other things, any changes in the instructions or indication of usage and for added warnings and precautions. Readers should consult with a specialist where appropriate. The fact that an organization or Website is referred to in this work as a citation and/or a potential source of further information does not mean that the author or the publisher endorses the information the organization or Website may provide or recommendations it may make. Further, readers should be aware that Internet Websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. No warranty may be created or extended by any promotional statements for this work. Neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for any damages arising herefrom.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data How to write a paper / edited by George M. Hall. – 5th ed.

p.; cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Summary: "This concise paperback is about writing a paper for publication in biomedical journals. Its straightforward format – a chapter covering each of part of the structured abstract – makes it relevant and easy to use for any novice paper writer. How to Write a Paper addresses the mechanics of submission, including electronic submission, and how publishers handle papers, writing letters to journals abstracts for scientific meetings, and assessing papers. This new edition also covers how to write a book review and updated chapters on ethics, electronic publication and submission, and the movement for open access" – Provided by publisher.

ISBN 978-0-470-67220-4 (pbk.)
I. Hall, George M. (George Martin)
[DNLM: 1. Writing. 2. Publishing. WZ 345]
808.06'661-dc23

2012030230

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Set in 9.5/12 pt Minion Regular by Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited

Contents

List of Contributors, vii Preface to the Fifth Edition, x Preface to the Fourth Edition, xi

Chapter 1 Structure of a scientific paper, 1 *George M. Hall*

Chapter 2 Introduction, 6 Richard Smith

Chapter 3 Methods, 16 *Gordon B. Drummond*

Chapter 4 Results, 22 *Charles W. Hogue*

Chapter 5 Discussion, 29 *George M. Hall*

Chapter 6 Titles, abstracts and authors, 33 *Kevin W. Eva*

Chapter 7 Who should be an author?, 42 *Richard Horton*

Chapter 8 References, 47 Simon Howell and Liz Neilly

vi Contents

Chapter 9 Electronic submissions, 57

Michael Willis

Chapter 10 Open access, 64

Mark Ware

Chapter 11 How to write a letter, 71

Michael Doherty

Chapter 12 How to prepare an abstract for a scientific meeting, 78

Robert N. Allan

Chapter 13 How to write a case report, 83

Martin Neil Rossor

Chapter 14 How to write a review, 89

Paul Glasziou

Chapter 15 How to write a book review, 98

Mark W. Davies and Luke A. Jardine

Chapter 16 The role of the manuscript assessor, 102

Domhnall MacAuley

Chapter 17 The role of the editor, 115

Jennifer M. Hunter

Chapter 18 What a publisher does, 124

Gavin Sharrock and Elizabeth Whelan

Chapter 19 Style: what it is and why it matters, 133

Sharon Leng

Chapter 20 Ethics of publication, 141

Chris Graf and Elissa Wilson

Index, 151

List of Contributors

Robert N. Allan

Editor, Clinical Medicine
Royal College of Physicians
London, UK
Formerly: Consultant Physician
and Gastroenterologist
University Hospital Birmingham
NHS Foundation Trust
Birmingham, UK

Mark W. Davies

Senior Staff Specialist in Neonatalogy Associate Professor of Neonatalogy Royal Brisbane & Women's Hospital Queensland, Australia

Michael Doherty

Professor of Rheumatology University of Nottingham Nottingham, UK Formerly: Editor, *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*

Gordon B. Drummond

Honorary Clinical Senior Lecturer University Department of Anaesthesia and Pain Medicine University of Edinburgh Edinburgh, UK Formerly: Editor, *British Journal of Anaesthesia*

Kevin W. Eva

Senior Scientist, Centre for Health Education Scholarship Associate Professor, Director of Education Research & Scholarship Department of Medicine University of British Columbia Vancouver, Canada Editor-in-Chief, Medical Education

Paul Glasziou

Director
Centre for Research in EvidenceBased Practice (CREBP)
Bond University
Queensland, Australia
Formerly: Editor, Evidence-Based
Medicine

Chris Graf

Editorial Director Health Sciences Wiley Richmond, Australia

George M. Hall

Professor of Anaesthesia
Department of Anaesthesia &
Intensive Care Medicine
St George's
University of London
London, UK
Formerly: Chairman, British Journal
of Anaesthesia

Charles W. Hogue

Professor of Anesthesiology & Critical Care Medicine
The Johns Hopkins University
School of Medicine
Baltimore, USA
Associate Editor, Anesthesia & Analgesia

Richard Horton

Editor-in-Chief/Publisher, *The Lancet* London, UK

Simon Howell

Senior Lecturer in Anaesthesia University of Leeds Leeds, UK Editor, *British Journal of Anaesthesia*

Jennifer M. Hunter

Emeritus Professor of Anaesthesia/ Honorary Clinical Fellow University of Liverpool Liverpool, UK Formerly: Editor-in-Chief, *British Journal of Anaesthesia*

Luke A. Iardine

Senior Staff Specialist in Neonatalogy Associate Professor of Neonatalogy Royal Brisbane & Women's Hospital Queensland, Australia

Sharon Leng

Technical Editor, *BJU International* Wiley Oxford, UK

Domhnall MacAuley

Editor, *Primary Care* BMJ London, UK

Liz Neilly

Medical Librarian University of Leeds Leeds, UK

Martin Neil Rossor

Professor of Clinical Neurology Editor, Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry Dementia Research Centre Institute of Neurology, University College London The National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery London, UK

Gavin Sharrock

Publisher Health Sciences Journals Editorial Wiley Oxford, UK

Richard Smith CBE

Director Ovations, UnitedHealth Group London, UK Formerly: Editor, BMJ

Mark Ware

Vice President & Lead Analyst Outsell (UK) Ltd London, UK

Elizabeth Whelan

Associate Editorial Director Health Sciences Journals Editorial Wiley Oxford, UK

Michael Willis

Editorial Services Manager Wiley Oxford, UK

Elissa Wilson

Associate Journal Publishing Manager Life Sciences Wiley Richmond, Australia

Preface to the Fifth Edition

For the fifth edition, it is a pleasure to welcome Mark W. Davies, Kevin W. Eva, Chris Graf, Charles W. Hogue, Luke A. Jardine, Sharon Leng, Gavin Sharrock, Elizabeth Whelan and Michael Willis as new contributors. A new chapter 'How to Write a Book Review' has been added.

I am grateful to all the authors for revising their chapters and, in particular, to Robert N. Allan, Michael Doherty, Gordon B. Drummond and Richard Smith for contributing to all five editions.

George M. Hall

Preface to the Fourth Edition

For the fourth edition, it is a pleasure to welcome Paul Glasziou, Jennifer M. Hunter, Liz Neilly, Martin Rosser and Mark Ware as new contributors. An additional chapter 'Open Access' has been added.

I am grateful to all the authors for revising their chapters and, in particular, to Robert N. Allan, Michael Doherty, Gordon B. Drummond, Richard Smith and Alex Williamson for contributing to all four editions.

George M. Hall

Chapter 1 Structure of a scientific paper

George M. Hall

Department of Anaesthesia & Intensive Care Medicine, St George's, University of London, London, UK

The research you have conducted is obviously of vital importance and must be read by the widest possible audience. It probably is safer to insult a colleague's spouse, family and driving than the quality of his or her research. Fortunately, so many medical journals now exist that your chances of not having the work published somewhere are small. Nevertheless, the paper must be constructed in the approved manner and presented to the highest possible standards. Editors and assessors without doubt will look adversely on scruffy manuscripts – regardless of the quality of the science. All manuscripts are constructed in a similar manner, although some notable exceptions exist, like the format used by *Nature*. Such exceptions are unlikely to trouble you in the early stages of your research career.

The object of publishing a scientific paper is to provide a document that contains sufficient information to enable readers to:

- assess the observations you made;
- repeat the experiment if they wish;
- determine whether the conclusions drawn are justified by the data.

The basic structure of a paper is summarised by the acronym IMRAD, which stands for:

Introduction (What question was asked?)
Methods (How was it studied?)
Results (What was found?)

And

Discussion (What do the findings mean?)

The next four chapters of this book each deal with a specific section of a paper, so the sections will be described only in outline in this chapter.

Introduction

The introduction should be brief and must state clearly the question that you tried to answer in the study. To lead the reader to this point, it is necessary to review the relevant literature briefly.

Many junior authors find it difficult to write the introduction. The most common problem is the inability to state clearly what question was asked. This should not be a problem if the study was planned correctly – it is too late to rectify basic errors when attempting to write the paper. Nevertheless, some studies seem to develop a life of their own, and the original objectives can easily be forgotten. I find it useful to ask collaborators from time to time what question we hope to answer. If I do not receive a short clear sentence as an answer, then alarm bells ring.

The introduction must not include a review of the literature. Only cite those references that are essential to justify your proposed study. Three citations from different groups usually are enough to convince most assessors that some fact is 'well known' or 'well recognised', particularly if the studies are from different countries. Many research groups write the introduction to a paper before the work is started, but you must never ignore pertinent literature published while the study is in progress.

An example introduction might be:

It is well known that middle-aged male runners have diffuse brain damage, ¹⁻³ but whether this is present before they begin running or arises as a result of repeated cerebral contusions during exercise has not been established. In the present study, we examined cerebral function in a group of sedentary middle-aged men before and after a six month exercise programme. Cerebral function was assessed by . . .

Methods

This important part of the manuscript is increasingly neglected, and yet the methods section is the most common cause of absolute rejection of a paper. If the methods used to try to answer the question were inappropriate or flawed, then there is no salvation for the work. Chapter 3 contains useful advice about the design of the study and precision of measurement that should be considered when the work is planned – not after the work has been completed.

The main purposes of the methods section are to describe, and sometimes defend, the experimental design and to provide enough detail that a competent worker could repeat the study. The latter is particularly important when

you are deciding how much to include in the text. If standard methods of measurement are used, appropriate references are all that is required. In many instances, 'modifications' of published methods are used, and it is these that cause difficulties for other workers. To ensure reproducible data, authors should:

- give complete details of any new methods used;
- give the precision of the measurements undertaken;
- sensibly use statistical analysis.

The use of statistics is not covered in this book. Input from a statistician should be sought at the planning stage of any study. Statisticians are invariably helpful, and they have contributed greatly to improving both the design and analysis of clinical investigations. They cannot be expected, however, to resurrect a badly designed study.

Results

The results section of a paper has two key features: there should be an overall description of the major findings of the study, and the data should be presented clearly and concisely.

You do not need to present every scrap of data that you have collected. A great temptation is to give all the results, particularly if they were difficult to obtain, but this section should contain only relevant, representative data. The statistical analysis of the results must be appropriate. The easy availability of statistical software packages has not encouraged young research workers to understand the principles involved. An assessor is only able to estimate the validity of the statistical tests used, so if your analysis is complicated or unusual, expect your paper to undergo appraisal by a statistician.

You must strive for clarity in the results section by avoiding unnecessary repetition of data in the text, figures and tables. It is worthwhile stating briefly what you did not find, as this may stop other workers in the area undertaking unnecessary studies.

Discussion

The initial draft of the discussion is almost invariably too long. It is difficult not to write a long and detailed analysis of the literature that you know so well. A rough guide to the length of this section, however, is that it should not be more than one-third of the total length of the manuscript (Introduction + Methods + Results + Discussion). Ample scope often remains for further pruning.

4 How to write a paper

Box 1.1 Writing the discussion

- · Summarise the major findings
- Discuss possible problems with the methods used
- Compare your results with previous work
- Discuss the clinical and scientific (if any) implications of your findings
- Suggest further work
- Produce a succinct conclusion

Many beginners find this section of the paper difficult. It is possible to compose an adequate discussion around the points given in Box 1.1.

Common errors include repetition of data already given in the results section, a belief that the methods were beyond criticism and preferential citing of previous work to suit the conclusions. Good assessors will seize upon such mistakes, so do not even contemplate trying to deceive them.

Although IMRAD describes the basic structure of a paper, other parts of a manuscript are important. The title, abstract and list of authors are described in Chapter 6. It is salutary to remember that many people will read the title of the paper and some will read the summary, but very few will read the complete text. The title and summary of the paper are of great importance for indexing and abstracting purposes, as well as enticing readers to peruse the complete text. The use of appropriate references for a paper is described in Chapter 8; this section is often full of mistakes. A golden rule is to list only relevant, published references and to present them in a manner that is appropriate for the particular journal to which the article is being submitted. The citation of large numbers of references is an indicator of insecurity – not of scholarship. An authoritative author knows the important references that are appropriate to the study.

Before you start the first draft of the manuscript, carefully read the 'Instructions to Authors' that every journal publishes, and prepare your paper accordingly. Some journals give detailed instructions, often annually, and these can be a valuable way of learning some of the basic rules. A grave mistake is to submit a paper to one journal in the style of another; this suggests that it has recently been rejected. At all stages of preparation of the paper, go back and check with the instructions to authors to make sure that your manuscript conforms. It seems very obvious, but if you wish to publish in the *European Annals of Andrology*, do not write your paper to conform