



# Workshop on How to Publish Papers in International Journals: February 2018

Coordinator and Lecturer: Dr. Raymond J. Ritchie



## How to write the Discussion. Discussion (I)



**Scholarly  
Civilised  
Discussion  
of a Joint  
Paper.**

*Tropical Plant Biology, Faculty of Technology and  
Environment, Prince of Songkla University Phuket  
Campus, Kathu, Phuket 83120 Thailand E-mail:  
[raymond.r@phuket.psu.ac.th](mailto:raymond.r@phuket.psu.ac.th)*

# Discussion

## Main Points

- **State what your study has shown.**
- **Compare your results with existing knowledge.**
- **How does your study advance knowledge?**
- **Discuss every issue brought up by you in the Introduction and from what you found out in the study.**
- **Make sure the paper looks complete. If you bring up any issue in the Introduction that is not talked about in the Discussion then remove it from the Introduction. You can usually get away with moving it to the Discussion as a paragraph about future avenues of research.**
- **Must have some sort of Conclusion as a paragraph or last section.**
  
- **Must be properly referenced. Use the literature properly.**

Here are the important points about your **Discussion**.

- The point of the **Discussion** is to talk about your results and interpret them in the context of how your findings fit in with previous knowledge and how your results have improved understanding of the topic.
- Talk **integratively** about the results of your study. You can of course talk about what each Table and Figure shows but it is important to talk about what the **whole** of your study shows.
- **A fault of the combined Results and Discussion format** is that it is very easy to write a paragraph about a particular experiment and then write an interpretation and then go onto the next experiment you did until you reach the last **Figure** or **Table**.
- **Results and Discussion format encourages you to forget to write an overall synthesis of what you found.**

- A good **Discussion** is interpretive and integrates your work into previous work and talks about its implications for future work.
- The **Discussion** needs to tally with the **Introduction**. You need to modify the **Introduction** to fit what you found. Do not put stuff that you did not deal with in the Introduction. It makes your paper look incomplete.
- You are free to talk about things you did not do in the Discussion in the context of the implications of your work and what your work leads onto.

# **Some things you should not do in the Discussion.**

- Remember that tables and graphs do not explain themselves. You must state explicitly what they show. That goes for the Discussion as well as the Results. Refer to Figures and Tables in a logical order.**
- Unless the information in the results is merely background material, for example, freshweights and dry weights of the plant leaves used, you need to Discuss everything in your Results, otherwise why did you put the material in the paper at all?**
- Repeating what I said. With only minor exceptions, all your Results need to be mentioned in the text of the Discussion. Do not forget to talk about every single Table, Graph and Figure.**
- Try not to write a Discussion that is too short (not making enough of your data) or too long. I tend to write L-o-n-g. Thais tend not to Discuss enough. You need to make as much of your work as possible.**

# Basic Structure of Discussion

- Open by basically saying what you found out.
- Interpret and evaluate your results in terms of the background information you gave in the Introduction. Any problems about the validity of your results, do they concur with previous work or conflict with it?
- Try to Discuss your results in logical order.
- Do not leave any of your work out including some **Results** you do not like.
- **Admit to the limitations of your study but do not turn your Discussion into a devastating critique of your own work. Multiple authorship tends to generate this problem. First Author needs to maintain consistency.**
- Put in suggestions about where your findings lead to. Anything you had in the draft **Introduction** that your findings do not touch upon might be easily moved to the **Discussion** and talk about the material in terms of future work.
- Write a **Conclusion** so that the **Discussion** does not end flat.



Research, Graduate Studies and Academic Services Unit, Faculty of Science, PSU

# “Scientific writing Workshop, Let’s Play the Game”

March 3-4, 2016 : at 09.00 a.m. - 04.00 p.m.

Seminar Room, Faculty of Science, PSU

“We would like to invite graduate students,  
young researchers to join the workshop”



**Facilitator : Dr. Raymond Ritchie**  
Faculty of Technology and Environment, PSU.

## Topics

- Searching journals related to the subject.
- Choosing a target Journal.
- Scientific papers : Abstract, Introduction, Material & Methods, Results and Discussion.
- Abstract or Summary
- Submitting a Paper to an International Journal.
- Responding to referee’s comments on your manuscript.

## Please bring your First draft

### Contact :

Research, Graduate Studies and Academic Services Unit  
e-mail : thanyaporn.b@psu.ac.th, tel :(074) 28 8075

Registration Deadline - February 29, 2016  
(Registration Free : Lunch and coffee break are provided.)

**30 persons Only !!**

Note the value of  
proof-reading  
**SCIENTIFIC**

The key disadvantage of writing sole-author papers is that it is extremely difficult to spot your own mistakes. Your brain automatically corrects things sub-consciously and the conscious part of your brain is not made aware of it.

Finishing a paper and then completely ignoring it for a while helps to find mistakes.

# References

- Beall, J. (2015) Beall's List: Potential, possible or probable predatory scholarly open-access publishers. [<http://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/>, accessed 24 Nov 2015]
- Cooper, B.M. (1975) Writing technical reports. Penquin Books, Hamondsworth, England.
- Day, RA (1998) How to Write & Publish a Scientific Paper 5th Edition. Oryx Press, Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3397 (Downloadable from Internet)
- Hodson, D. (1998) Teaching and learning science. Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia.
- Lanham, R.A. (1974) Style: an antitextbook. Yale University Press, New Haven & London.
- McCain, G. and Segal, E.M. (1973) The game of science. Brooks/Cole Publishing, Monterey, California.
- Sand-Jensen, K (2007) How to write consistently boring scientific literature. Oikos 116: 723727, 2007 doi: 10.1111/j.2007.0030-1299.15674.x
- Willingham, DT (2007) Critical Thinking Why Is It So Hard to Teach? American Educator 2007, 8 – 19.

