ROMANIAN ACADEMY - SCOSAAR
DOCTORAL SCHOOL: LIFE SCIENCES

SUBJECT SHEET

Subject: GENERAL RESEARCH METHODS AND SCIENTIFIC PAPER PREPARATION METHODOLOGY
Holder of course activities: Prof. dr. Octavian Popescu
Year of study: **I**

Number of hours per week/Verification/Number of ECTS credits			
Subject content	**Number of hours per week**	**Form of examination**	**Number of ECTS credits**
Course	2	Written exam	15
Seminar	2	Case studies	

A. OBJECTIVES OF THE SUBJECT (The objectives are formulated in terms of professional skills):

The general objective of the subject:	Knowledge and deepening of the strategy for publishing the results obtained in scientific research.
The specific objectives:	1. Communication of scientific ideas at conferences, in journals and/or books. 2. Choosing the most suitable journal for publication. 3. Organizing a scientific text for publication. 4. The mechanisms of the peer review process of a manuscript. 5. The reasons why a scientific article is published or rejected. 6. The impact factor and other scientometric indicators with relevance for a scientific communication. 7. Knowledge of ethical issues specific to scientific research in the field of life sciences.

B. TERMS (where applicable)

of course implementation	Adequate room, blackboard, video projector, internet access, dedicated software.

C. ACCUMULATED SPECIFIC COMPETENCES (It concerns the competences ensured by the study program of which the subject is a part)

Professional skills	1. Knowledge of the general principles of writing a scientific paper. 2. How to write and publish a scientific paper. 3. How to illustrate a scientific paper. 4. How to write a scientific research project. 5. Knowledge of the notion of "copyright" and its ethical implications.
Transversal skills	1. The ability to use the professional skills mentioned above in everyday life. 2. Use of ethical principles of scientific research in new contexts. 3. Use of theoretical knowledge in solving practical problems encountered in a scientific research laboratory.

D. SUBJECT CONTENT

a) Course

Chapter	Contents	Hours
1.	What does the phrase "scientific career" mean?	2
2.	Communication of scientific ideas in journals, conferences, books.	2
3.	The fundamental principles of writing a scientific paper.	2
4.	Types of scientific papers.	2
5.	Writing a scientific paper.	2
6.	The process of evaluating a scientific article (peer-review).	2
7.	Scientific manifestations.	2
8.	Copyright.	2
9.	Databases and scientometrics (bibliometrics).	2
10.	Hierarchy of journals.	2
11.	Hierarchy of scientific researchers.	2
12.	Elaboration of a scientific book.	2
13.	Computer tools.	2
14.	Ethical aspects of scientific research.	2
Total hours		**28**

b) seminar

Deployment mode	Hours
Case studies. Debate. Discussion.	**28**

E. EVALUATION (The methods, forms of evaluation and their weighting in determining the final grade are specified. The minimum performance standards are indicated, related to the skills defined in point **A. Objectives of the subject**)

Type of activity	Evaluation criteria	Evaluation methods	Weight in the final grade
Course	Acquired knowledge	Written exam	75%
Seminar	Activity	Presented case studies	25%
The results of the subject evaluation are expressed by the following qualifications: "*Very good*"; "*Good*"; "*Satisfactorily*"; "*Unsatisfactory*". The grades "*Very good*", "*Good*" and "*Satisfactory*" allow the doctoral student to obtain the ECTS credits.			

F. METHODOLOGICAL LANDMARKS

Frontal lecture combined with dialogue. Use of modern teaching aids (PowerPoint). Course support.

G. CORROBRATION OF THE CONTENTS OF THE DISCIPLINE WITH THE EXPECTATIONS OF THE LEGATES OF THE EPISTEMIC COMMUNITY, PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND REPRESENTATIVE EMPLOYERS IN THE FIELD RELATED TO THE PROGRAM

1. The content of the course is similar to courses in other Western universities, the information is updated and takes into account the basic training level of the PhD students.
2. The course includes theoretical and practical aspects related to the latest regulations on scientific publications.

3. During the seminars, through the debated case studies, the PhD students demonstrate their ability to accurately analyze and propose practical solutions to the problems raised.

H. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Gopen GD, Swan JA. 1990. The science of scientific writing: if the reader is to grasp what the writer means, the writer must understand what the reader needs. *American Scientist* **78**(6):550–558. http://www-stat.wharton.upenn.edu/~buja/sci.html.
2. Day RA, Gastel B. 2006. *How to write and publish a scientific paper*. 6th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. [COPE flowcharts] Committee on Publication Ethics flowcharts.Version one. 2006. http://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts.
4. [RIN] Research Information Network. 2008. Acknowledgement of funders in journal articles. http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/research-funding-policy-and-guidance/acknowledgement-funders-journal-articles.
5. Norris CB. 2009. *Academic writing in English*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. http://www.helsinki.fi/kksc/language.
6. Goozner M, Caplan A, Moreno J, Kramer BS, Babor TF, Husser WC. 2009. A common standard for conflict of interest disclosure in addiction journals. *Addiction* **104**:1779-1784. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02594.x.
7. Hartley J. 2010. Citing oneself. *European Science Editing* **36**(2):35-37. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/may_2010_362.pdf.
8. World Conference on Research Integrity. 2010. Singapore Statement. http://www.singaporestatement.org/statement.html.
9. Kerans ME, de Jager M. 2010. Handling plagiarism at the editor's desk. *European Science Editing* **36**(3): 62-66. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/ese_aug10.pdf.
10. Hengl T, Gould M, Gerritsma W. 2012. *The unofficial guide for authors: from research design to publication*. Wageningen, Arnhem. http://www.lulu.com/spotlight/t_hengl.
11. Baranyiová E. 2013. Correct terminology in science: the role of editors. *Science Editor* **36**(2):63. http://www. councilscienceeditors.org/wp-content/uploads/v36n2p63.pdf.
12. Roig M. 2015. *Avoiding plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and other questionable writing practices: a guide to ethical writing*. Office of Research Integrity http://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/plagiarism/0.shtml.
13. Heidari S, Babor TF, De Castro P, Tort S, Curno M. 2016. Sex and Gender Equity in Research: rationale for the SAGER guidelines and recommended use. Research Integrity and Peer Review 1:2. doi: 10.1186/s41073-016-0007-6.
14. [EASE] European Association of Science Editors. 2017. EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators of Scientific Articles to be Published in English. *European Science Editing* **43**(4):e1-e16. doi:10.20316/ESE.2017.43.e1.
15. Rubiola E. 2018. *The Scientific Publication*. http://rubiola.org.

Course holder	Director of Doctoral School
Prof. dr. Octavian Popescu	**Dr. Felicia Antohe, Senior Researcher first degree**