



Energy Future: The Role of Impact Assessment,  
32nd Annual Conference of the International Association for Impact  
Assessment, 27May–1June 2012, Porto, Portugal

## Writing and Submitting Papers to IAPA Journal: An Interactive Workshop

Angus Morrison-Saunders & Francois Retief

- IAPA Editors

**Impact Assessment  
and Project Appraisal**

### Refereeing and journal publication process (1)

#### Editor process

- Editor receives paper from author (online manuscript submission)
- checks if suitable for journal (e.g. subject matter relevance + novelty)
- checks if suitable to send out to review (e.g. sufficiently well written, conforms with length)
  - may reject outright or require author to rework manuscript
- if OK, ensures author identity is removed from manuscript and sends to 2-3 peer reviewers with review guidelines
- Peer reviewers send in reports and/or annotated manuscript (e.g. Track Changes) with recommendation (i.e. accept/modify/reject)
- Editor checks peer review reports for appropriateness (may need to send manuscript to additional reviewers to get better feedback)
- Editor makes decision and sends reviewer feedback to author along with any comments/instructions of their own
- papers subject to major change may undergo 2<sup>nd</sup> (or 3<sup>rd</sup>) review process

### Refereeing and journal publication process (2)

#### Peer-reviewers

- they are volunteers (and busy people like you)
  - getting timely reviews back is challenging for Editor
- chosen as appropriate experts in the field – but independent of the author; e.g.
  - international expert in field (e.g. SEA) as professional or academic
  - from country where paper set so understand context even if not expert in field (e.g. Sth Africa case studies)
  - special interest in type of publication (e.g. IAPA Prof Practice)
- asked to be constructive and helpful
- provided with feedback criteria by journal Editor to refer to (some journals require reviewers to score criteria)

### Refereeing and journal publication process (3)

#### Author process

- author is expected to engage with reviewer feedback
  - rework or modify paper accordingly
  - provide brief written account to Editor of how feedback was addressed
  - OK to disagree with reviewer feedback, but need to explain why
  - unwise to ever ignore reviewer feedback

**The worst thing an author can do is to ignore a reviewer's criticism and send it back without an explanation**

Powell K 2010 Publish Like a Pro, *Nature* **467**: 873-875

## Instructions for Authors

- <http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/tiap20/current>

## Instructions for Authors

### Manuscript submission

IAPA is an international refereed journal. We welcome papers on all forms of impact assessment (environmental, social, health, sustainability etc.) of projects, programmes, plans and policies.

Papers and Professional Practice Reports for consideration should be sent to the Editors by email:

Dr Angus Morrison-Saunders , a.morrison-saunders@murdoch.edu.au  
(Environmental Science, Murdoch University, Australia)

Dr Francois Retief , Francois.Retief@nwu.ac.za (School of Environmental  
Sciences and Development, North West University, Potchefstroom, South  
Africa).

Authors should submit manuscripts as email attachments using a standard word processing program.

## Instructions for Authors

Full papers should normally not exceed 7500 words. Papers that engage extensively with the published literature may be acceptable up to a total of 8,000 words. Short original papers describing conceptual, methodological, or empirical innovations are also encouraged. Professional practice papers (not exceeding 4000 words) should describe innovations in practice that are likely to be generally applicable.

## Instructions for Authors

All submissions will be assessed in terms of:

- i) originality of approach or insights;
- ii) validity of the work reported (e.g. robust methodology adequately explained);
- iii) quality, brevity and clarity of presentation;
- iv) significance, relevance and timeliness;
- v) adequacy of references;
- vi) appropriate messages/conclusions directed at the IAPA audience.

## Instructions for Authors

### MANUSCRIPT PREPARATION

#### 1. General guidelines

- Titles should normally comprise 12 or fewer words and must not exceed two lines (approximately 20 words) in type-set articles.
- Abstracts must not exceed 175 words.
- Please provide 4 to 6 key words.
- For author affiliation provide Department, University, City, Zip code/Postal code, Country and email address for each author (or organization equivalents if not at a university). The corresponding author will need to be clearly identified.
- Submit your manuscript with headings (bold, lower case, minimal capitals) and the main text in 12 point Times New Roman font. Please clearly differentiate heading levels and use a maximum of four levels of subheading within an article. The minimum permissible font size in figures or tables would normally be 8 point.
- Articles can be accepted in any standard spelling (UK, US, Australian etc.) but will normally be published using UK spelling with ize word endings unless the authors specifically request otherwise.
- The readership is diverse, so define any technical terms, avoid spurious jargon, and explain all acronyms.
- Tables, figures and boxes should be mentioned in the text, and numbered 1, 2, 3 etc.
- Notes should be avoided or used sparingly and be indicated with raised numbers and then be given at the end of the paper, between the text and the list of references.
- Equations can be included in the main text manuscript.
- Any acknowledgements should appear after the conclusion section and before any endnotes or list of references.

## Notes for Reviewers

### IAPA Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal

Dr. Robert  
English Institute  
School of Environment Science  
Health University  
Barnsley  
A.english@open.ac.uk

Professor Paul  
School of Environment Science  
South West University (Dorset campus)  
Dorset, Dorset  
Paul@sw.ac.uk

#### NOTES FOR REVIEWERS:

Thank you for agreeing to review the attached article. All reviews are carried out anonymously. Full time to complete the copy of the manuscript provided but be sure not to disclose your identity on doing so (e.g. Track Change function may identify your name).

Please provide a comment of your views on the paper which can be sent to the editor (other than the manuscript file of making amendments here or a separate document).

The main criteria for publication are:

- 1) Originality of approach or insights;
- 2) Validity of the work reported (e.g. robust methodology, well used and explained);
- 3) Quality, brevity and clarity of presentation;
- 4) Significance, relevance and timeliness of the topic;
- 5) Adequacy of references;
- 6) Appropriate messages/conclusions directed at the IAPA audience.

In making a report the referee is requested to pay particular attention to the following points:

- 1) Are there any obvious faults in the empirical basis, or theoretical reasoning?
- 2) Are there any demonstrable errors in mathematics, calculations, units, etc.?
- 3) Are all tables or figures appropriate, comprehensible and accurate?
- 4) Is the order of presentation logical (allowing for individual preferences)?
- 5) Are there any parts which should be expanded or condensed, if so which?
- 6) Are there any additional references that should be considered, if so which?

Please recommend one of the following:

- 1 - Accept as presented.
- 2 - Accept subject to amendments (please list in your open report).
- 3 - Encourage the author to revise the paper and resubmit (please list required revisions in your open report).
- 4 - Paper unsuitable for IAPA, but of publishable quality (please suggest an appropriate journal, if possible).
- 5 - Reject.

If you wish, please make additional comments to the editors in confidence.

## Notes for Reviewers

In making a report the referee is requested to pay particular attention to the following points:

- a) Are there any obvious faults in the empirical basis, or theoretical reasoning?
- b) Are there any demonstrable errors in mathematics, calculations, units, etc.?
- c) Are all tables or figures appropriate, comprehensible and accurate?
- d) Is the order of presentation logical (allowing for individual preferences)?
- e) Are there any parts which should be expanded or condensed, if so which?
- f) Are there any additional references that should be considered, if so which?

## Notes for Reviewers

Please recommend one of the following:

- 1 - Accept in present form;
- 2 - Accept subject to amendments (please list in your open report)
- 3 - Encourage the author to revise the paper and resubmit (please list required revisions in your open report)
- 4 - Paper unsuitable for IAPA, but of publishable quality (please suggest an appropriate journal, if possible)
- 5 - Reject

If you wish, please make additional comments to the editors in confidence.

## Tips for authors – content

- be about or related to impact assessment in some way
  - e.g. if focus is EMS or climate change, some connection to IA is needed
- engage with relevant literature
  - build on previous knowledge
- have a robust method (explained well)
- give clear messages to a clearly identified international audience
  - consultants, regulators, academics...?

## Tips for authors – style

- write in first person?
- tell a story with a simple/clear message
- be honest and humble
  - say what you learnt, but avoid major claims or global generalisations
- get straight to the point and stay focused always on the story/messages
- use terminology consistently
  - do not invent new terms or acronyms!