

Manuscript Preparation

The following summary of the parts of manuscripts is too brief and generic to handle all issues concerning manuscripts appropriate for submission to *JERHRE*. Prospective authors are encouraged to refer to previously published *JERHRE* articles to find relevant examples.

Your cover letter should contain the following:

- A statement about all submissions and previous reports that might be regarded as redundant publication of the same or similar work. Copies of such possibly redundant material should be sent to the editor at the time the manuscript is submitted.
- A statement that the manuscript has been read and approved by all authors, that the requirements for authorship (see above) have been met, and that each author believes that the manuscript represents honest work.
- Verification that the treatment of human subjects was in accord with ethical standards and other requirements, as set forth in the country in which the research was conducted.
- A copy of the permission granted to reproduce or adapt any copyrighted material from another source or a notice that permissions are pending.
- Nomination of reviewers: Prospective authors are invited to nominate one of their three peer reviewers. Your nominee is to be someone whose special expertise is in your area, who has no conflict of interests with the role of reviewer of your manuscript, and whose critical comments you would greatly appreciate. Please provide one or more nominees, along with the email address and a very brief statement about each.
- A statement about whether any of the authors have an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Abstract. The abstract of your article is its most important paragraph. It is used by readers to decide whether to read the article, and by information services to index and retrieve articles. The abstract must reflect the content of the article accurately. It must be non-evaluative (report, rather than evaluate, what is in the text), readable and vigorous, using verbs rather than noun equivalents and active rather than passive voice. Abstracts of empirical studies should describe (a) the problem, in a sentence, if possible, (b) the research subjects, (c) the research method, (d) the findings, and (e) the conclusion. An abstract for a review article should describe (a) the topic, (b) the purpose and scope of the article, (c) the main sources used, and (d) conclusions. Succinct, accurate, informative and clear abstracts increase the audience and retrievability of an article. Please see [“Help Readers Find Your Article”](#) on the SAGE Author Gateway for more information on writing an abstract optimized for search engines. Abstracts should not exceed 120 words.

Title Page. The title page should contain:

1. A concise title of the article containing information that makes electronic retrieval both sensitive and specific.
2. Authors' names and institutional affiliations in the following format:
John Doe¹ and Mary Smith²

¹University of California, San Diego (USA); ²Harvard University (USA)

3. Disclaimers, if any.
4. Corresponding author's name, mailing address, telephone and fax numbers, and email address. Email addresses of all authors.
5. Source(s) of support.
6. Running head no more than 40 characters long.
7. Word counts of the text only, excluding abstract, acknowledgements, and references.
8. The number of figures and tables that belong with the manuscript. (Note: figures and tables must be submitted as separate documents, rather than embedded in the manuscript.)
9. A list of three to nine key words.

Introduction. The body of a manuscript should open with the title of the article, but not the byline, since the manuscript will be "blind" reviewed. The introduction should answer the following questions in one or two paragraphs, giving the reader an overview of what was done and why:

1. What problem is addressed and why is the problem important? What are its practical implications for understanding or solving ethical problems in human research? Bear in mind *JERHRE's* diverse readership: investigators, ethics committee staff and members, students, research administrators, and policymakers. Your writing should be lively, perhaps with examples or vignettes of the problem designed to capture the interest and imagination of any of *JERHRE's* readers.
2. How does the hypothesis or research design relate to the problem?
3. What are the theoretical implications of the research and how does it relate to previous work in the area? How does it relate to research policy or practice?
4. What theoretical propositions are tested?

Develop the background by discussing relevant literature. Discuss and cite only works pertinent to the specific issue, emphasizing pertinent findings, relevant methodological issues, and major conclusions. Refer the reader to general surveys or overviews of the topic if they are available.

Method. This section describes in detail how the study was conducted and enables the reader to evaluate the appropriateness of the methodology, and the reliability and validity of the results. This section should be written in accord with the requirements of your scientific society or the discipline within which your research was conducted.

Results. This section summarizes the data collected and the data-analytic treatment used, and should be sufficiently detailed to justify the conclusions. Authors should employ the reporting standards of their scientific discipline. Report all results, including those that run counter to expectations. Statistical presentations should include descriptive statistics such as per-cell sample size, means or medians, and standard deviations or ranges, using parametric or nonparametric measures appropriate to the characteristics of your data. Statistical data should include the magnitude of observed effects and confidence intervals, so that the reader can judge the practical significance of the findings for purposes of ethical decision making. Qualitative data may be presented in a wide variety of ways; authors should not hesitate to consult with the editor concerning the most effective ways to do so and the formats that are feasible.

The electronic version of *JERHRE* is hosted on the SAGE Journals platform which provides extensive multimedia capabilities for presenting results and other details of the research, as well as hosting a variety of data sources and replication code.

Discussion. Open the Discussion section with a clear statement of the support or nonsupport of your hypotheses. Interpret any similarities or differences between your results and the work of others. As you interpret the implications of your findings, bear in mind the applied nature of *JERHRE*; investigators, ethics committee members and policy makers will want to know how you have increased understanding of the problem and what insight your study provides into practical solutions to ethical issues.

In addition to the usual parts of a manuscript (title page, abstract, introduction, method, results, and discussion) and before the reference section, brief additional sections should appear, as follows:

Best Practices is a thoughtful, practical set of recommendations based on your findings. Typically this will include recommendations in relation to one or more specific cultures and contexts or whatever other variables seem relevant. These recommendations should include discussion of limits of generalizability of your findings. Think of "Best Practices" as your recommendations to the relevant stakeholders in the human-research enterprise, based on your paper.

Research Agenda is a discussion of useful kinds of additional research on aspects of your topic. In some cases, "Research Agenda" should be a nuanced discussion of exactly what needs to be investigated and why such investigation would be an important way to advance the field. In other cases, the agenda is simpler and more obvious than this, and would require little or no discussion. Think of "Research Agenda" as your recommendation to other investigators of important specific research on your general topic that they might usefully pursue. In many cases, it is also useful to treat the research agenda as an invitation to others elsewhere to join you in a Collaboratory. Be prepared to share your raw data (with identifiers removed) with others who wish to extend the research to other contexts or cultures and publish a comparison of their data with yours; depending on wishes of the collaborators and the degree to which each contributes to the research, collaboratories may result in a joint publication.

Educational Implications is a discussion of how key concepts from your article may be taught effectively to relevant audiences. In most cases, the audiences are investigators, ethics committee members and staff, and students at various stages of their training; in other cases audiences are other stakeholders such as the media and general public, research participants, and policy makers.

Acknowledgements is a paragraph that may include the source of funding, thanks to persons or organizations who helped with the research, disclosure of any relationships that might be perceived as a conflict of interest, and any disclaimer required by your employer, for example, stating that the paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the organization.

Author Note is a brief paragraph telling readers where they may direct correspondence. It includes only the corresponding author's name, mailing address, email address, and phone and fax numbers.

Authors' Biographical Sketches. Because *JERHRE*'s authors and readership cut across many professional and scientific boundaries, readers will be interested to know who the authors are and why they are credible. Hence, appearing at the end of each article is a brief, three-sentence statement that connects the author with the general or specific topic of the paper, stating the author's current role, main

research interests, and the author's role in the research that is reported. This brief biographical statement should not discuss general credentials or educational background, but rather the author's specific experience as it relates to your paper.

Multi-authored articles should contain a biographical sketch about each author and conclude with a statement of the role of that author in the work reported. Each author thus certifies responsibility for that aspect of the article. The order of authorship on the byline should be a joint decision of the co-authors; where the order is alphabetical, that should be stated here. Individuals who played a minor role in the development of the article, perhaps contributing ideas but not seminal theory or methodology, should be thanked in the Acknowledgements, not treated as an author. For further guidance on the criteria for authorship, see the 6th edition of the [APA Publication Manual](#) or, see II.A.1 (pp. 2-3) of the [Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals](#).

In keeping with requirements of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals, and [the Council of Science Editors](#), all authors must have read and approved the final manuscript and believe that it represents honest work. Understand the right of the editor to respond to allegations of scientific misconduct by authors.

End Notes. JERHRE employs endnotes thus: ¹ (small superscripted numerals) rather than footnotes. The end notes are placed in the manuscript just before the Reference section. Endnotes are for additional information that is too limited for an appendix or supplementary online document. Please use endnotes sparingly, if at all.

References. Employ 6th edition APA style. All citations in the manuscript must have a corresponding reference; there should be no references to sources that are not cited in the manuscript.