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Consider the ethics of publication

• This relates mostly to authorship and plagiarism (most often self & to be discussed later)
• Determine roles & authorship up front
  ▫ Some journals require that you state the role each person had in preparation of the manuscript
  ▫ Protects against abuses and assures ethical standards
Authorship

• If new author, work with a mentor or hire an editor
  ▫ In these cases you will need to discuss authorship, roles and revisit this often.
  ▫ May need to shift from single authored to co-authored or may need to change order of authorship.
Authorship

• Person should be included if all 3 of the following conditions per the criteria of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) have been met by the author(s):
  ▫ Made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data;
  ▫ Created a draft the article or revised it critically for important intellectual content; and
  ▫ Provided final approval of the version to be published (Albert & Wager, 2003).
Authorship - abuses

• All forms are unethical:
  ▫ Ghost authorship
    • Professional writers who are typically paid – often they are not involved in study design, data collection etc. They write the manuscripts, but are not acknowledged as author. The work does not meet the criteria of the ICMJE and often raises issues around conflict of interest.
    or
    • They do meet the ICMJE criteria and have not been acknowledged.
  ▫ Gift
    • People are listed, but did not contribute – often occurs with senior authors who are given credit to curry favor.
    • Also occurs colleague to colleague in hopes that favor will be returned (Albert & Wager, 2003).
Considering the journal

- Is it a sham journal?
- Check the list! (Beal’s)
- [http://scholarlyoa.com/2014/01/02/list-of-predatory-publishers-2014/](http://scholarlyoa.com/2014/01/02/list-of-predatory-publishers-2014/)
- Examples:
  - [http://scholarlyoa.com/](http://scholarlyoa.com/)
- Nursing Editor’s respond:
  - [http://nursingeditors.com/2014/10/05/editors-for-our-predatory-publishers-project/](http://nursingeditors.com/2014/10/05/editors-for-our-predatory-publishers-project/)
Considering the journal

- Consider:
  - The journal and the types of manuscripts they accept
- Read:
  - Author Guidelines
  - Aims and scope of journal
- Know:
  - Intended audience
    - Would the readers of this journal want to see this sort of manuscript?
    - Am I citing from previous publications in this journal?
    - Is it written in the style of published articles for this journal?
- If you are not sure, send a query to the editor.
Query the editor?

- Cover letter is important and usually adequate, but consider a query if:
  - You are questioning the fit of your idea with journal
  - If you are writing more than one article from a thesis or research project and you are not sure how to “split” the work.
  - You may want to query more than one editor to determine interest, best fit, but you can only submit the paper to one journal.
Title, key words & abstracts

- **Title:** catchy, but...you will be known for your work
  - Toto rides again: evaluating the evidence
  - "The Wizard of Oz:" a depiction of TBI-related neurobehavioral syndromes.
  - Robin Hood caught in Wonderland: brain SPECT findings.
  - Competing perspectives on erasing the stigma of illness: what says the dodo bird?

- **Key words, abstract – are equally important.**
  - Abstract should capture what is important about the work... AKA the elevator speech.
  - Key words: captures what you want to be known for... The waiting for the elevator speech.
Plagiarism - what it is and what it is not

- Many journals utilize plagiarism detection programs to detect issues of plagiarism.
- Most cases are self plagiarism.
- Often this is in the methods section, but there can be other examples of self plagiarism.
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Abstract AIM: To identify the concepts of spirituality and existential proposed in nursing literature. METHOD: Integrative literature review held in July 2011. RESULTS: Spirituality refers to the meaning of life, connection, transcendence, values and beliefs. The term existential is associated with the methodological research framework, nursing intervention and the way to understand the patients' answers in all domains of their existence. CONCLUSIONS: According to other domains of taxonomy, the spiritual domain proposal is considered more in line with the ontological perspective instead of existential...
Plagiarism

- For example, you need to be aware that you cannot present findings on the same population more than once, i.e. a quantitative study in which you present findings of an intervention to reduce pain and anxiety on 104 subjects undergoing hip surgery and you try to place 2 manuscripts – one addressing pain, one addressing anxiety.
- But if you had a second unrelated aim i.e. examining biomarkers related to stress, this can be published in another manuscript.
Plagiarism

• If you are not sure – talk to the Editor.
• You need to cite not only others work, but your previous work.
• Cite your own work as (XXXX, 2014) so that you remain blinded to the peer reviewer.
Before submitting your manuscript

• Read it again and ask yourself:
  ▫ Is it important that this be published in this journal?
  ▫ Did I cite important work in this area?
  ▫ Did I synthesize, not summarize the literature?
  ▫ Did I identify a gap or need?
Submitting your manuscript

- Most journals if not all, require you to use the manuscript central system throughout the process.
- Do not try to bypass this system.
- If not in proper English, APA or journal format, the manuscript may be returned to you/rejected immediately.
Peer review

- Peer review is most often a double blinded process.
- Expect feedback no sooner than 6 weeks and up to 3 months post submission.
- Feedback is a given.
Peer review

• Respond to each point.
• Include a cover letter describing how you addressed each point.
• Turn-around in two weeks or at stated time provided in Editor’s letter.
The review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the problem significant and concisely stated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the theoretical framework/conceptual model described comprehensively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the language acceptable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate the priority for publishing this article (1 is the highest priority, 10 is the lowest priority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The critique

This is a very important piece of work describing the use of nursing diagnosis in the perioperative setting across 4 operating rooms in Finland. The study seeks to validate the PNDS in Finnish perioperative settings and determine if it adequately captures the work of nurses in these settings. The findings from the study distinguish the types of nursing diagnoses used based on acuity, age, procedure and setting. The manuscript has small edits throughout, but are mostly related to translation concerns. Some suggestions for clarification follow.

Abstract in both purpose of the study and methods section: It is not to test, but rather describe the use of nursing diagnosis across 4 operating departments in Finland by comparing identified nursing diagnosis to the PNDS (I think). Language throughout needs to be changed from "to test nursing diagnosis" to "to describe the use of".

Aims need to be clarified and if I am understanding them correctly they should be two aims:
1) to identify nursing diagnoses in the perioperative setting
2) to compare those to the PNDS and determine if they are captured within this data set

Findings: This sentence needs to re-worded - perhaps "While intraoperatively nursing diagnoses focused on physiological concerns, particularly related to patient safety, postoperatively the focus shift to that of recovery."

In the introduction - Validation of the PNDS was initiated .....this sentence is confusing and needs to be re-worded - "The PNDS was validated in a preliminary study conducted (in what context?). Findings from that suggest......."

Lt Review: Nursing diagnosis is not the first step (assessment is so you may want to say an early step or just go right to the next sentence and start that with "As part of the nursing process, the nurse makes a clinical judgment about actual or potential problems......"

Aims and objectives - again you are describing use not testing so just re-word that

Findings: Rather than starting sentence with When - page 10, state In or Through

Discussion - very comprehensive. clear, well written

Conclusion: Again it is not testing, but describing. Delete the beginning of the second sentence - "At the same time"
Last page of text - state validating the use of the PNDS rather than testing. Lastly, I would suggest re-wording the last sentence so that it is a declarative sentence rater than a question
Receiving and responding to the critique - step one

• First, read the critique.
• Take a deep breath.
• Set aside your manuscript, but not for long, just a few days.
Responding - cont’

- Chip away at each reviewer’s comments.
- If you do not agree, explain why not.
- Do not be upset or mad; they are trying to help you get published and do this work voluntarily.
- Respond to the review in a timely manner, in detail, and professionally.
Critique - step two

• You may want to ask a mentor to read it.
• Re-submitting
  ▫ Don’t be afraid to do so;
  ▫ Use system in place and do not try to bypass;
  ▫ Be sure you follow all steps in process including copyright forms.
• Be open to feedback.
Peer review - appropriate response - style 1

First, we like to thank the reviewers for their valuable and constructive comments. We have carried out the most of them as such. In addition, we found minor spelling mistakes that now have been corrected. The revised text has been highlighted with red font.

Our detailed response to the comments follows:

Abstract: In both purpose of the study and methods section: It is not to test, but rather describe the use of nursing diagnosis across 4 operating departments in Finland by comparing identified nursing diagnosis to the PNDS (I think). Language throughout needs to be changed from "to test nursing diagnosis" to "to describe the use of".

---> We have revised the whole article by avoiding the expression "to test nursing diagnoses". Due to this, also the title of the article has been revised.

Aims need to be clarified and if I am understanding them correctly they should be two aims: 1) to identify nursing diagnoses in the perioperative setting 2) to compare those to the PNDS and determine if they are captured within this data set

---> The purpose was not to identify nursing diagnoses in the perioperative setting and to compare the outcome with the original PNDS. This has been carried out in our earlier studies (Junttila et al. 2002, 2003). In this study, our aim was to clinically validate the nursing diagnoses of the first Finnish version of PNDS by using them in perioperative documentation. In other words, the nurses used the diagnoses of the Finnish PNDS in their documentation.

Findings: The sentence needs to be re-worded - perhaps "While intraoperatively nursing diagnoses focused on physiological concerns, particularly related to patient safety, postoperatively the focus shifted to that of recovery."

---> The sentence has been corrected.

In the introduction: Validation of the PNDS was initiated .... this sentence is confusing and needs to be re-worded - "The PNDS was validated in a preliminary study conducted (in what context)? Findings from that suggest ....."

---> We have clarified the sentence although not totally according to the suggested wording.

Lit Review: Nursing diagnosis is not the first step (assessment is so you may want to say an early step or just go right to the next sentence and start that with "As part of the nursing process, the nurse makes a clinical judgment about actual or potential problems......"

---> In the text, the first step has been changed to "an early step".

Aims and objectives - again you are describing use not testing so just re-word that

---> The aims and objectives have been revised as follows: This study aimed to clinically validate the nursing diagnoses of the first Finnish version of PNDS by using them in perioperative documentation. The study objectives were: 1) to describe the use of nursing diagnoses in different surgical patient populations, 2) to examine the clinical relevance of nursing diagnoses to develop further the Finnish version of PNDS.

Findings: Rather than starting sentence with When - page 10, state In or Through

---> The wording has been corrected.

Conclusion: Again it is not testing, but describing. Delete the beginning of the second sentence - "At the same time" Last
Response to review- style 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comments</th>
<th>Author’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What a wonderful idea you and your team have had. I hope it goes worldwide.</td>
<td>Thank you for your positive feedback!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg 2, line 48. Check your punctuation, esp. the dash in “report – The” and the comma that follows “Nursing.”</td>
<td>We removed the dash and comma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg 3, line 37. Your period after “levels” may need to be a comma.</td>
<td>We deleted the period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg 11, line 27: change “heir” to “their.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References: Newman, Smith, Pharris and Jones, 2008 is not 2008a. The references written by Newman alone get the a, b, etc. In your paper, you listed Newman, 2004 (pg. 7) and a Newman, 2008a, but they are not listed in your reference list. I expect Newman 2008a is Newman, Smith, Pharris and Jones, but that is not correct.</td>
<td>Thank you, we corrected according to APA and there is no need for an A or B because the sol Newman works are in different years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was unable to find the Cowling, 2001 and Watson and Smith 2002 citations in your text, though you have listed them in your references.</td>
<td>This was an oversight and these references have been inserted in the paper under the discussion of nurse scholars and the discipline of nursing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The revised manuscript
Resources

- For APA format: https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/
- Nurse, Author, Editor (on line resource for which you need to register)
- Wiley- Blackwell’s Writing for publication by Christine Webb
- Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Guidelines
  - http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines
- Elements of style - Strunk & White
- On writing – Stephen King