STRiDE GUIDE TO ACADEMIC WRITING

Klara Lorenz-Dant, Sumaiyah Docrat, Adelina Comas-Herrera, Nick Brawn, Wendy Weidner, Maximilian Salcher-Konrad and Martin Knapp

STRiDE Research Tool No.4

Version 2: June 2021

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

1 Planning your paper 2

2 Writing your paper 4

3 Submitting your paper 9

4 Persisting with your paper 9

Annex: Publications policy for the STRiDE project 10

A1 Introduction 10

A2 Data sets 11

A3 Criteria for authorship 11
Attributing authorship
Order of authors
Acknowledgments

A4 Procedures for writing and submitting a publication 13
Suggestions for outputs
Process for producing outputs
Exceptional circumstances
Choice of journal and publishing guidelines

A5 Presentations 15

A6 Duration and review of policy 15

References 16

FOR CITATION PURPOSES
Lorenz-Dant K, Docrat S, Comas-Herrera A, Brawn N, Weidner W, Salcher-Konrad and Knapp M (2021) STRiDE Guide to Academic Writing. STRiDE Research Tool No.4 (version 2), Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, LSE, London.

The STRiDE Project is supported by the UK Research and Innovation's Global Challenges Research Fund (ES/P010938/1)

INTRODUCTION

This guide was originally developed to support researchers working on the Strengthening Responses to Dementia in Developing Countries (STRiDE) project, in particular to support the in-depth situational analysis on the dementia care situation in seven middle-income countries.

As part of the situational analysis, STRiDE researchers carried out a desk review following a 'topic guide' (Comas-Herrera et al. 2021) to gather published information relevant to understanding the reality and context of dementia care, treatment and support in their countries.

While this document refers frequently to the topic guide – and its coverage is in response to specific queries which emerged as the topic guide was compiled ¬– it may also be helpful to the wider group of researchers working across all STRiDE work packages.

This guide provides information and indicates resources on good practice in academic writing, style and referencing, and gives advice on how to make the process of writing up academic papers more effective. It concentrates on papers presenting research findings and issues relating to joint-authorship.

A companion guide (Lorenz-Dant et al. 2020) from the STRiDE project gives advice and information on conducting literature reviews, managing sources and citing them correctly.

1 PLANNING YOUR PAPER

The most important step when planning a paper is to be clear about the main question the paper poses and will answer. Once the main question of the paper has been decided, it helps to think of its contents as a short story, with clear stages.

Different structures will suit different types of papers – those presenting original research, review articles, presentations of data or resources, policy briefs and commentaries or opinion pieces, for example. Although this short guide will focus on academic papers reporting quantitative or qualitative evidence, we have collected a few additional resources (see Box 1) should you be planning on writing a different type of paper.

Box 1: Resources on preparing different types of papers

A Writing up a literature review: Resource provided by the University of Toronto; Resource provided by the University of Michigan; Gregorich E (2019) 'How to write a review paper' CSA news.

B Writing an op-ed or column: Resource provided by the Harvard Kennedy School: https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/hks-communications-program/files/new_seglin_how_to_write_an_oped_1_25_17_7.pdf.

C Commentary: Resource provided by Jull A (2007) 'How to write a commentary – an editor's perspective' Evidence Based Nursing, 10, 100–103.

D Writing a policy brief: Resource provided by RESYST: Resilient and Responsive Health Systems Wolfe, R. (2013). Policy briefs. A guide to writing policy briefs for research uptake. http://blogs.lshtm.ac.uk/griphealth/files/2017/01/Policy-briefs-guide_2015.pdf.

Before you start writing, it is important to identify the type of journal to target (in terms of topic area, discipline, national or international, etc.). It might be useful to look for journals where articles relevant to your research question have been published previously. The standing of the journal (perhaps with reference to published measures such as its 'impact factor') may affect your decision. You might find it useful to discuss your thoughts with experienced researchers or co-authors. It can also be helpful to think about the field in which you would like to be seen to be publishing: a paper on the cost-effectiveness of supporting carers of older people with dementia could be targeted on a general health services journal, a dementia journal, a gerontology journal, or even a health economics journal.

When you have settled on a target journal, read the journal requirements and advice about the structure of the article, word limit, format and style. This will save you editing time later in the process. Some editors like it if you cite previous papers in their journal (although most would deny this) as it helps push up their impact factor.

For academic papers that report empirical findings such as quantitative or qualitative evidence, the following structure is widespread and effective:

- The introduction sets out the research question(s) you are addressing in the paper, outlines why that question is relevant and raises the reader's interest in the article. In addition to showing why the particular question is important, and what (in brief) we know about it already, the introduction should also include a brief 'what is not known' section (maybe two or three sentences), further emphasising the need for the study. It can be helpful for the reader to see the aims of the study (maybe the research questions) explicitly stated, so that they know what to expect the study to address (and what not). Many authors recommend keeping your introductory section quite short: the aim is to excite the reader and entice them into reading more. A long introduction risks losing the reader before they get to the core of the paper.

- The methods section is where you set out how you conducted the research to generate the empirical evidence. The key thing to remember is the need to provide enough detail to allow another researcher to replicate your study. It can be difficult to get the balance right. There should be enough detail to explain what you did, but journals impose word limits, and you will need to leave enough space to present the findings and discuss their relevance.

- In the results section you present the answer to your research questions: all the relevant findings. Different types of empirical research will need different content and different structures: it can be helpful to look at previous studies that have used similar methods to your study to get an idea of what might be suitable for your paper.

- The discussion section is where you will briefly summarise your main findings, then note the strengths and limitations of your study, locate your findings in the context of other relevant research that supports or tests your argument, before discussing the implications of what you have found (e.g., for policy or practice or further research). Some authors also like to add a brief conclusion section, but it is generally sufficient to weave any concluding remarks into the final paragraph of your discussion section unless the journal specifically requires a 'conclusion'.

It might help to see the research question as the storyline that runs through the article, keeping the reader clear at all times about the focus of the paper.

Your research question itself may be a suitable title for your paper or you may be able to devise a title related to your research question that arouses interest in a different way. It may also be helpful to include the study design and setting of your research in your title. Try to achieve a balance in choosing the title: accurately describing the content, but written in an engaging style.

You may find the paper 'Writing a research article: advice to beginners' by Perneger and Hudelson (2004) a helpful resource for planning and structuring your paper. The book 'They Say/ I Say: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing' by Graff and Birkenstein (2006) also provides useful tips on academic writing.

2 WRITING YOUR PAPER

You will need to decide who will be named as authors of the paper. There are widely accepted criteria for authorship and in collaborative projects it is a good idea to have agreed a publications policy that includes authorship criteria (see the annex showing the STRiDE project's publication policy as an example). The four criteria in Box 2 below are the most commonly stated.

These criteria will ensure that people who have contributed to the paper are not excluded as co-authors, and that people who are included as co-authors have contributed sufficiently to the research being reported and the writing of the paper. These criteria are not merely intended as guidelines for who qualifies as co-author: some journals require all authors to confirm that they all meet the stated criteria and that no other person who met the criteria was excluded (see for example: BMJ).

Box 2: Conditions to be a named author

1. Made a substantial direct contribution (i.e., through intellectual responsibility and substantive work) to:
   - either the conception and design of the research or related activity
   - or the acquisition of data
   - or the analysis and interpretation of data;
2. Made a substantial contribution to the preparation of the output (generally this will mean writing) or to critically reviewing successive drafts of the output and adding important intellectual content;
3. Gave final approval of the version to be submitted for publication;
4. Agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the reported work in ensuring that the questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work they have done, an author should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific parts of the output. In addition, authors should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.

All those designated as authors should meet all four criteria for authorship, and all who meet the four criteria should be identified as authors. Those who contributed but do not meet all four criteria should be acknowledged in the output.

For a more in-depth discussion of authorship and these four criteria, see for example International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) (2020) and the British Sociological Association's Equality of the Sexes Committee (2001).

Before you start writing the first draft of your paper, you should make a plan with your colleagues, outlining a skeleton structure and organising the main points into a clearly presented argument. In addition, it might be helpful to clarify who is to take responsibility for contributing specific information and/or sections of the paper. At this stage it is also advisable to decide who will lead and coordinate the paper (and who therefore probably becomes first author). You may also want to decide in what order to list all the authors. It is usually better to have discussions about who are the authors and the order in which they are to be listed quite early in the process. There may, of course, be other ways in which you agree to share the workload. For example, the lead author may prefer to take the lead in drafting a full first draft and co-authors then comment and provide their input on the first draft. Any such approaches are absolutely fine, provided they meet the criteria of co-authorship outlined in Box 2.

As you start writing, be clear about your aims and hypotheses and try to communicate them succinctly. Tables and figures (graphs, illustrations or diagrams) are excellent ways to communicate some methods or findings but use them sparingly. Journals usually allow only a small number of tables and figures, so always reflect on what the visual material adds to the paper. Visually appealing illustrations can be helpful in communicating your findings (or methods) but remember that many journals publish only in black and white. (Some may publish in colour but charge you for this; check!)

There are likely to be many rounds of revisions and editing before you as a team feel the paper is ready to be submitted. You should not be alarmed or discouraged by this!

Other points you might want to bear in mind while revising a paper:

- **Is your message clear?** Re-read your paragraphs with a critical eye or give the document to a colleague for constructive feedback. Read your paragraphs out loud to yourself: this process often reveals grammatical mistakes, non sequiturs and missing verbs. It also helps to identify over-long sentences, which is a common failing when writing up academic research. In the more text-heavy introduction and discussion sections, a way to check the flow of why your research is important and what it tells the reader is to read the opening sentences of each paragraph and see whether you are still able to follow the story.

- **Jargon and abbreviations:** first, think whether you are clear yourself about the meaning of jargon, then think about your target audience. Is your reader likely to know the meaning of specific terms? (Of course, whether something is 'jargon' depends on the type of journal in which you are publishing your work. What is jargon to a clinician might be a well-accepted abbreviation to an economist, and vice versa.) If in doubt, provide an explanation (see Example 1) or avoid using jargon altogether. The same holds true for abbreviations. These should also be given in full the first time they appear in your paper (see Example 2). Once you have provided this, the abbreviation can be used on its own.

Example 1

'Many people with dementia require help with Activities of Daily Living (ADLs). These are personal care tasks, such as washing, dressing or going to the toilet.'

Example 2

The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

- **Using unnecessarily complicated language** (such as the 'passive voice') or sentence construction tends to frustrate and alienate readers. Write in simple and clear sentences so that your readers can follow your thoughts and arguments. Avoid obscure words so that readers do not have to divert their attention to follow language that is difficult to understand (and which some readers might anyway find rather pretentious).

- **Tests are available to give an indication of the readability of your writing**. For example, the Flesch-Kincaid test (which can be run in Microsoft Word) provides you with a score from zero to 100 for a given piece of writing. The lower the score, the more readable the text. A score of zero indicates readability for young children; for academic writing, the ideal score would be between 10 and 12. The score is based on average sentence length and average number of syllables per word. It does not provide an evaluation of content, but an indication of the complexity of the wording. For detailed information on using the Flesch-Kincaid test see: https://support.office.com/en-us/article/get-your-document-s-readability- and-level-statistics-85b4969e-e80a-4777-8dd3-f7fc3c8b3fd2. As you can see from the example below, your Flesch-Kincaid improves if you use shorter sentences and shorter words.

Example 3

The cost of dementia is projected to increase over the next decades as the number of people living with dementia continues to rise. Policy makers across countries are emphasising the importance of restructuring long-term care financing and the provision of services. In addition, many countries face a shortage of healthcare workers and this gap in service provision is expected to widen over the coming years. Some countries try to reduce the service gap by offering qualified labour force from other countries, typically countries with lower wage rates, to recognise their qualifications and ease visa restrictions.

Readability Statistics	
Counts	
Words	95
Characters	523
Paragraphs	1
Sentences	4
Averages	
Sentences per Paragraph	4.0
Words per Sentence	23.7
Characters per Word	5.4
Readability	
Flesch Reading Ease	34.0
Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level	14.4
Passive Sentences	0.0%

Example 4

The number of people with living with dementia continues to rise over the next decades. Simultaneously, the cost of dementia is expected to increase. Policy makers across countries emphasise the importance of restructuring long-term care financing and the provision of services. In addition, many countries face a shortage of healthcare workers. This increases the risk of gaps in the provision of services to widen over the coming years. Some countries try to reduce the service gap by trying to attract qualified workers from other countries. This typically is done by implementing legislation that recognises qualifications from specific countries and by easing visa restrictions from countries with lower wage rates.

Readability Statistics	
Counts	
Words	109
Characters	612
Paragraphs	1
Sentences	7
Averages	
Sentences per Paragraph	7.0
Words per Sentence	15.5
Characters per Word	5.5
Readability	
Flesch Reading Ease	39.6
Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level	11.5
Passive Sentences	0.0%

- Are you consistent in your spelling? For STRiDE publications, we recommend the use of British English (in Microsoft Word this is 'English (United Kingdom)'; for some differences between British and American spelling see Example 5). If you are writing for a particular journal, you should follow their publication guidelines which often state whether journals prefer British or American spelling. Sometimes these advice sheets also specify the spelling of words relevant to the topic area (e.g., they may specify whether they prefer 'well-being', 'wellbeing' or 'well being'). It is good practice to follow such guidance where available. If there is no guidance available, agree with your co-authors on whether you will follow English or American spelling and how to spell words for which there are different possibilities. Please also consult reliable dictionaries for guidance on spelling, capitalisation and hyphenation where there may be alternative or preferred forms (see Example 6 and Box 3).

Example 5

British English: centre, colour, programme (but computer program) …

American English: center, color, program …

Note that the spelling used by organisations for their titles should be respected. (For example the 'World Health Organization (WHO)' and the 'Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)'.) (Outside specific names like this, the 'z' spelling in this kind of word ending is used in American English. Using 's' is the more common choice in British English.)

Example 6

Capitalisation: when to use north or North?

In the North of England; in northern England; in northern parts of England; in Northern Ireland (name of a country).

For an explanation see the guidance given at: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/east-or-eastern-north-or-northern (Accessed 19 July 2019).

More such resources are given in Box 3 below.

- As well as spelling and capitalisation, you should aim to be consistent in other areas of written style. A few examples are given below, but the important thing is to be consistent when there are alternatives. For example, dates should be presented in the same way throughout, e.g., '25 January 2020' rather than 'January 25th 2020'. You will also need to decide when to spell out numbers in text – many publications standardise on spelling out one to ten and then use numerals for 11 upwards. You should not start a sentence with a numeral: put 'Twenty-two people…' rather than '22 people' when starting a new sentence. (If the number is going to take a long time to write out, change the word order; e.g., 'Altogether, 12,567 people participated…' is easier than 'Twelve thousand, five hundred and sixty-seven people…' Quotations should be marked with either single or double quotation marks (if you choose to use single quotation marks then a quote inside a quote should have double quote marks or vice versa). Again, journals may have style guides on this. Normally, short quotations will be formatted in with the main text, but you can decide to indent quotations if they exceed say 100 words or five lines.

- You may find it useful to keep and share a list of your preferred forms. Box 3 below gives a selective list from the many resources on written style.

Box 3: Style Guides

Many academic institutions make available their own guides to written style. Most academic publishers will also have a 'house style' guide, for example Wiley at https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/book-authors/prepare-your-manuscript/house-style.html

Some comprehensive resources are described below.

PRINTED STYLE GUIDES

The Economist Style Guide
Wroe A (2018) The Economist Style Guide, Profile Books, London
Succinct and sensible advice on writing clearly (which also applies to academic work) as well as useful reference information on awkward words and variant forms, and a section on British and American English.

The New Oxford Dictionary for Writers and Editors
Ritter RM (Ed.) (2014) New Oxford Dictionary for Writers and Editors, Oxford University Press, Oxford
Compact but very comprehensive reference, also available in a combined volume (The New Oxford Style Manual) with New Hart's Rules.

ONLINE GUIDANCE

The Guardian and Observer newspapers' online style guide
https://www.theguardian.com/guardian-observer-style-guide-a
Provides extensive information and advice, aimed mainly at journalism and from a UK standpoint, but also useful for general or academic writing.

In addition to the points outlined above please ensure that you use dementia-friendly language in your writing. The STRiDE project is committed to working with people with dementia and their carers in an inclusive and non-stigmatising way. We refer to 'people with dementia' or 'people living with dementia' instead of using 'PWD', 'PWLD' or potentially stigmatising expressions, such as 'demented people'. While people living with dementia are at times negatively affected by the symptoms they experience, and may sometimes even suffer from them, avoid referring to people as 'dementia sufferers' or 'victims' – this takes away from people's agency and undermines their ability to adjust and to live well despite the limitations they may experience.

Please refer to the dementia language guidelines (at: https://www.dementia.org.au/files/resources/dementia-language-guidelines.pdf) for more information on appropriate use of language in the context of dementia.

For guidance on managing sources and citing them correctly, see the STRiDE guide to conducting literature searches (Lorenz-Dant et al. 2020).

3 SUBMITTING YOUR PAPER

Once your team of authors agrees that the paper is ready for submission, take some time to write a covering letter. The submission of an academic paper is usually accompanied by a letter to the editor in which the authors have the opportunity to convince the editor that their article provides an important addition to knowledge and summarizes exactly how the paper would benefit the journal and its readership if published. If the journal has previously published articles on the same or a related topic, you can refer to them in your covering letter to remind the editor of previous interest by their journal.

The 'instructions for authors' provided by the journal should be revisited at this stage to ensure that all guidelines have been followed. For example, journals typically require authors to confirm in their covering letter that the paper has not been submitted to any other journal simultaneously.

4 PERSISTING WITH YOUR PAPER

If your paper gets accepted by a journal without corrections – congratulations! However, in practice this is rarely the case. Receiving suggested revisions from editors and reviewers is usually not a sign of poor research or authorship but an important aspect of academic scrutiny. You will probably find the reviewers' comments useful and constructive. As you revise the article it is important to engage with all the points raised in detail and without rancour both in the text and in the covering letter.

If your paper has been rejected – don't despair! Should the comments of the reviewers be mainly positive you can appeal against a rejection, although you might not want to do this too often.

Papers that have not been accepted by the initial target journal can be revised and resubmitted to a different journal and you might find it useful to ask an experienced researcher for advice on what target journal to try next. The rejection of a paper does not necessarily mean that the paper is of poor quality. It might be that it just does not fit the target journal at the time of submission, or that it could be improved through further revision and then submitted elsewhere.

ANNEX:

PUBLICATIONS POLICY FOR THE STRIDE PROJECT

STRiDE Publication Policy
Version: May 2020

A1 INTRODUCTION

This policy addresses the publication procedures related to the STRiDE (Strengthening Responses to Dementia in Developing Countries) project. It is intended to promote a fair and transparent process that maintains the capacity-development focus of STRiDE while also ensuring timely production of high-quality research outputs.

This policy refers specifically to STRiDE outputs; these include all forms of publication conducted as part of STRiDE and/or using data generated by STRiDE itself or analyses of secondary data. Throughout this document, the term 'data' refers to information or evidence (quantitative or qualitative; this could include documentary material such as policies and published literature, economic, health or demographic data obtained from individuals and service information obtained from providers. These outputs include, but are not restricted to, peer-reviewed journal papers (which are our most important outlets for academic work), conference reports, book chapters, policy briefs, other reports, blogs, media reports and audio-visual materials. Further detailed plans for outputs will be drawn out in WP10.

This publication policy does not apply to outputs produced by members of the STRiDE collaboration that do *NOT* use data, evidence or information generated as part of STRiDE or analyses of secondary data *NOT* conducted as part of STRiDE. These latter – which can be called 'indirect STRiDE outputs' – may nevertheless be related to the overall aims or substantive focus of STRiDE. Examples might include editorials written by one or more STRiDE members on a subject related to dementia in middle- or low-resource settings and peer-reviewed papers by one or more STRiDE members that report on data from another project which has similar objectives and clear synergies with STRiDE.

This policy relates specifically to members of the STRiDE project team.[1]

The STRiDE Project Management Team (SMT), led by the PI (Martin Knapp), will coordinate submission of information about STRiDE outputs, outcomes and impacts to the funding body (UK Research & Innovation (UKRI)). Information to support these submissions will be requested from the STRiDE project team through biannual project reporting.

1. A separate policy will be drawn up relating to outputs by non-STRiDE members who may be given access to STRiDE data in the future in order to extend the potential impact of these data. It will be necessary for STRiDE data to be made available outside the project in due course – it is a contractual requirement – and we should later discuss and, as necessary, develop publication guidelines to cover shared data.

A2 DATA SETS

This policy should be read alongside the STRiDE Work Package-specific policies and procedures for data management which set out information on data generated within the project and ownership matters.

Queries should be sent to the STRiDE Management Team as needed.

A3 CRITERIA FOR AUTHORSHIP[2]

The authors of an output and the order of authors should reflect the relative contribution of each individual to the writing of the paper/output as well as the design, analysis and conduct of the research activity.

Authorship should be discussed between contributing STRiDE colleagues at an early stage in the proposing of an output and should be renegotiated as necessary (e.g. if roles change within the group of contributors over the course of the work). There should be agreement on which outputs will be written jointly (and the ordering of authors) and which will be single-authored, with an agreed acknowledgement given to contributors. A record should be made of these discussions.

Early drafts of outputs should always include details of authorship (including proposed order) and other credits to ensure early discussion of these matters, with the aim of trying to avoid future difficulties. These discussions should be coordinated by the STRiDE member(s) who lead the Work Package from which the work to be published originated. The STRiDE Executive Group will review planned outputs regularly and will comment on issues of authorship as needed.

The expectation should be that a student would normally be first author on any multi-authored output based heavily on their doctoral or other thesis, if the research for their degree is substantively linked to STRiDE.

Principles of capacity-building should be inherent in the choice of authors. More junior members of STRiDE (in terms of research or other relevant experience) should be encouraged and supported to take the lead on appropriate outputs and thus qualify for first authorship. However, it is important to ensure that the authorship group has the necessary technical skills to complete the output. It is also important that authorship (inclusion and order) is as fair as possible to all relevant STRiDE members.

Attributing authorship

Authorship should be reserved for those who have made significant intellectual contribution to the research or relevant STRiDE activity. All persons who qualify for authorship should be listed.

---

2. Criteria for authorship in this guideline are informed by the principles of good professional conduct and ethical practice set out by the British Sociological Association's Equality of the Sexes Committee (2001) and the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2019).

A STRiDE member or external party should meet all four of the conditions below to be a named author:

1. made a substantial direct contribution (i.e. intellectual responsibility and substantive work) to:

   – either the conception and design of the research or related activity

   – or the acquisition of data

   – or the analysis and interpretation of data

2. made a substantial contribution to the preparation of the output (generally this will mean writing) or to critically reviewing successive drafts of the output and adding important intellectual content

3. given final approval of the version to be submitted for publication

4. agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the reported work in ensuring that the questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work they have done, an author should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific other parts of the output. In addition, authors should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.

All those designated as authors should meet all four criteria for authorship, and all who meet the four criteria should be identified as authors. Those who contributed but do not meet all four criteria should be acknowledged in the output.

These authorship criteria are intended to ensure that the status of authorship is reserved for those who deserve credit and can take responsibility for the work. The criteria are not intended for use as a means to disqualify colleagues from authorship who otherwise meet authorship criteria. Therefore, all individuals who meet the first criterion should have the opportunity to participate in the review, drafting and final approval of the output.

External authors may collaborate with STRiDE members on outputs, including taking the role of lead author, providing that they fulfil the criteria for authorship, that they are identified in the Intention to Publish form, and that this has the agreement of the STRiDE Executive Group.

Order of authors

The first author should be the person who takes responsibility for the drafting of the output, in addition to taking overall responsibility for relevant other aspects of the process including research design, related activity within the STRiDE Work Package or data analysis; i.e. the first author should be the person who has led on these substantive elements of research and reporting. Generally, it would be expected that authors will then appear in order of relative contribution to the work reported in the output. Where there is no difference in the size of contributions, authors should be listed in alphabetical order of their surnames. The equal contribution made by all authors should be indicated in a footnote in the output. The last author is generally regarded (in most health journals) as the senior author, who has played a supportive or oversight role in the published research.

Decisions about who should be an author, the order of authors and who should be included in the acknowledgements should be made collectively by all authors. In the event of disagreement, the WP lead will decide on author order. If there is disagreement, and if the WP lead is one of the authors, then author order will – if time permits – be decided by the Executive Group, or by the Principal Investigator (Martin Knapp) if there is insufficient time to consult the EG.

Acknowledgments

All those individuals who make a substantial contribution to an output without fulfilling the criteria for authorship should be acknowledged. These might include interviewers, fieldwork supervisors, gatekeepers, computing staff, administrative staff, statistical advisers, colleagues who have reviewed the paper, students who have undertaken some sessional work and user groups. But it should also be emphasised that any of these listed people could be co-authors of STRiDE outputs if they fulfil the criteria described above.

Outputs must state "This work was supported by the UK Research and Innovation's Global Challenges Research Fund (ES/P010938/1)".

If applicable, each output should include a statement on how underlying research materials, such as data, samples or models, can be accessed. However, the policy does not require that the data must be made openly available unless specified in the relevant WP-specific data management arrangements. If there are considered to be compelling reasons to protect access to the data (e.g. legitimate sensitivities around data derived from potentially identifiable human participants) these should be included in the statement.

A4 PROCEDURES FOR WRITING AND SUBMITTING A PUBLICATION

Suggestions for outputs

The SMT will consult all STRiDE members to get an initial idea of papers and other outputs that might be expected to be written from STRiDE. This consultation will generate a potential publication list that will be produced by the SMT in close collaboration with WP leads. This will then be shared with all other STRiDE members. The aim is to produce a consolidated list that covers all outputs that can be envisaged at this stage, but of course further ideas for STRiDE outputs are very likely to emerge over the course of the project. The idea is to get a general sense of outputs that STRiDE members see as important, whether to a particular policy or practice theme, or disciplinary area or country.

Thereafter, the SMT will aim to provide regular updates – both updates on individual outputs (if there has been progress) and on new suggestions for papers. Publications will be a standing item for discussion at full project meetings.

Country partners will be encouraged to take responsibility for their country-specific outputs, working alongside the WP lead. This does not exclude cross-country partners working with data from a single country or country partners working with cross-country data. Cross-country partners wishing to produce an output based on country data should discuss this with the STRiDE country team where the data were collected, the WP lead and any other collaborators they wish to include. (Any data-sharing arrangements that will need to be in place to facilitate this will need to be discussed separately.)

Process for producing outputs

Once an outline of the output and list of authors have been established, the lead author should submit an *Intention to Publish* form to **stride.dementia@lse.ac.uk**. This form is available on the Workspace.[3] Once the form has been received, the SMT will check the intended paper against the potential publication list and the database of all other Intention to Publish forms received at that point to determine if there is any potential duplication with an existing intended publication, and how it aligns with other papers on the potential publication list. This information will be relayed to the lead author as soon as possible, but normally within 11 working days. The purpose of this process is not to dampen enthusiasm to communicate STRiDE work to the wider world! It is to coordinate the various STRiDE outputs across WPs and countries. In most instances it is expected that there will be minimal or no changes to the plans outlined in the Intention to Publish submission.

Exceptional circumstances

In exceptional circumstances, such as the need to get an output from STRiDE into the public domain as soon as possible, an alternative approach is possible. The lead author should contact Martin Knapp and Adelina Comas-Herrera as soon as possible to set out the intention to submit. If both Martin Knapp and Adelina Comas-Herrera are involved in the output, then another member of the SMT should be contacted.

The principles set out in this *Publications Policy* should be adhered to, the STRiDE project should be named, and there should be the usual acknowledgment to the funding source.

This provision is *ONLY* available in truly exceptional circumstances. An example is the learning from individual STRiDE countries about COVID-19 and its impacts on people living with dementia and carers, where the outputs (in that case they are blogs) will be of greatest benefit if they are in the public domain rapidly.

Choice of journal and publishing guidelines

Outputs that report important methodological aspects of STRiDE or that report findings should ideally be targeted first towards higher-impact ISI-listed peer-reviewed journals.

Each STRiDE publication must be made open access as per RCUK's Policy (2017). Wherever possible, STRiDE authors should publish in immediate open access format (e.g. a paper is freely available on a journal website as soon as it is published). As a second option when this is not possible, STRiDE authors should publish in a delayed open access format with an embargo of no more than 12 months (e.g. a paper is freely available on a journal website within 12 months of it being published).

Some journals may require a fee to be paid to make an article available publicly. The STRiDE project does not have a budget specified for open access fees but will be able to request funding from internal LSE resources for a limited number of papers. Authors should consider applying for funding from their own institutions for support.

3. https://stridedementia.glasscubes.com/share/s/j2naai2e4b928chmrkvb8p69ti

Another open access option is so-called 'green open access'. This option may be selected if other options for open access are not possible. With this option, authors should self-archive a pre-publication version of the output on the STRiDE website and their institution's repository if it has one. This version should be the final draft of the output after completion of the peer-review process. This 'green open access' option is, however, dependent on reaching agreement with the journal or book publisher.

The best option and arrangements to manage the process will be discussed between the authors and the STRiDE Management Team during review of the Intention to Publish form.

A5 PRESENTATIONS

The above principles for publications also apply to presentations of the project and other non-written outputs (videos etc.). These guidelines are not intended to stop or unnecessarily delay plans for presentations, but to ensure that STRiDE activities, methods and findings are communicated in ways that have the agreement of all project members who have worked on the material, and also to ensure that presentation does not jeopardise publication in a journal or other outlet.

The template for STRiDE slides for use in conference presentation with the appropriate logos, acknowledgements and disclaimers is available on the Workspace. As far as possible, this standard STRiDE design should be used, although it is recognised that this is not always possible at some conferences or in some contexts.

A6 DURATION AND REVIEW OF POLICY

The principles of this guideline will apply to the publishing of all STRiDE methods, findings, research tools, guides etc. They also apply to the analysis of secondary data accessed as part of STRiDE until 31 December 2026 (i.e. five years after the formal completion of the project as currently timetabled). The SMT will review this publication policy annually and, if necessary, recommend modifications to the policy for agreement by the Executive Group.

We would like to thank the PRIME and AFFIRM projects for the use of their publication policies as a guideline for developing this protocol.

REFERENCES

See also the full references to style resources in Box 3

British Sociological Association (2001) Authorship Guidelines. Retrieved from www.britsoc.co.uk/publications/guidelines-reports/authorship-guidelines.aspx.

Comas-Herrera A, Docrat S, Lorenz K, Ilinca S, Hussein S, Schneider M, … the STRiDE team (2021) *Situational Analysis of the Dementia Care Landscape: Desk Review Topic Guide,* STRiDE Research Tool No. 2 (version 2), Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, London.

Graff G, Birkenstein C (2006) *They Say/ I Say: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing,* W.W. Norton & Company

Gregorich E (2019) How to write a review paper, *CSA News*, 64, 1, 16–18.

Harvard Kennedy School (nd) *How to write an OP-Ed or Column*. Available at: new_seglin_how_to_write_an_oped_1_25_17_7.pdf (harvard.edu) (Accessed 3 June 2021).

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) (2020) Defining the role of authors and contributors. Retrieved from www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html

Jull A (2007) How to write a commentary – an editor's perspective, *Evidence Based Nursing*, 10, 100-103.

Lorenz-Dant K, Docrat S, Fry A, Comas-Herrera A (2021) *STRiDE Guide to Conducting Literature Searches*, STRiDE Research Tool No. 2 (version 2), Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, London.

Perneger TV, Hudelson PM (2004) Writing a research article: advice to beginners, *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 15, 3.

Pollock A, Berge E (2018) How to do a systematic review, *International Journal of Stroke*, 13, 2, 138–156.

Wolfe R (2013) Policy briefs. *A guide to writing policy briefs for research uptake*. Available at: http://blogs.lshtm.ac.uk/griphealth/files/2017/01/Policy-briefs-guide_2015.pdf (Accessed 03 June 2021).