Thesis by Publication
The University of Adelaide offers four modes of completion

• Conventional written narrative;
• Publication, including publications that have been published and/or accepted and/or submitted for publication and/or which have been prepared in publication format;
• Combination of conventional and publication formats; and
• Major Work (creative, musical or visual) with exegesis.
The University of Adelaide Thesis by Publication

– The publications/manuscripts must be closely related in terms of subject matter, form a cohesive research narrative and not have been accepted for any other University award.

• a contextual statement which includes the aims underpinning the publications/manuscripts;
• The discussion should not include a detailed reworking of the discussions from individual papers within the thesis
The University of Adelaide Thesis by Publication

- All papers included in the thesis must be prefaced by a statement of authorship which details each author’s contribution;
- The length and number of publications to be included in the thesis will be determined by your supervisory team.
  - The primary consideration is that the body of work included in the thesis satisfies the requirements for the degree for which it is presented.
The STHS

• Conventional, written narrative;
  – No change to process

• Publication, including publications that have been published and/or accepted and/or submitted for publication;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Discipline</th>
<th>Number of papers</th>
<th>Publication Status of papers</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Submission or publication not required</td>
<td>No stated requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medical Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accepted for publication</td>
<td>≥2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline of Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accepted for publication</td>
<td>≥2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline of Surgery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accepted for publication</td>
<td>≥1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Paediatrics and Reproductive Health</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Accepted or published</td>
<td>No stated requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Health and Clinical Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accepted for publication</td>
<td>No stated requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accepted for publication</td>
<td>≥1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Translational Health Science</td>
<td>2 (Masters) 3 (PhD)</td>
<td>Submitted or Accepted for publication</td>
<td>Must be: JBISRIR, or International, or high profile National Journal. Peer Reviewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thesis by Publication

STHS Structure
Overview

• Contextual Section (3000 words)
• Publications (X2 MCLINSC, X3 PhD)
• Discussion Chapter (5000 words)
Overview

• Thesis table of contents can include the sub headings of included papers,
• A separate list of tables and figures,
• If discussions are embed in each paper, the final chapter may simply be titled ‘Conclusions’.
Contextual statement

• This is a narrative section; use of sub-headings within this section is at the discretion of students and their supervisory panel. It is strongly recommended that a clear structure be discussed and agreed in the development of this section.
• an introduction of the topic,
• overview of the aim and objectives,
• a description of the phenomena or intervention or disease etc, and explores:
  – relevance to the profession/s,
  – certainties or uncertainties in the extant literature and how this research proposes to address the uncertainties or contribute to the field of knowledge in light of what is already known,
• consideration of evidence from other paradigms,
• description of choice of systematic review methodology over primary research (i.e. what’s the empirico-logical explanation of why a review would be valid compared with a primary research study),
• a detailed description of the specific methodology and rationale for choice of methodology,
• a narrative perspective on the current Policy/Clinical context
• a narrative perspective on potential Policy/Clinical impact
Example contextual statement
content (4,500 words)

- Background to the topic selection
- The EBHC movement
- The systematic review of evidence
- The pooling of evidence
- The use of animals in health care
- Rationale of this thesis
- Composition of this thesis
Publications

• Master of Clinical Science Students:
  – 2 publications is the minimum, not the maximum,
  – You may develop more than one paper from a systematic review,
  – The two minimum can be the protocol and systematic review if both are published in the JBI database of SRIR, however;
  – Consider a second paper from your SR if NOT publishing in the JBI database of SRIR
Statements of authorship

- Per contributor, per paper,
- As described in the University HDR Handbook, these precede each paper,
- Some schools place these in an appendix, rather than prior to the paper so as to not disrupt the flow of the thesis
• By signing the Statement of Authorship, each author certifies that their stated contribution to the publication is accurate and that permission is granted for the publication to be included in the candidate’s thesis.
# Authorship Statement

## Statement of Authorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Paper</th>
<th>Cross-national comparisons of background and confidence in visual arts and music education of pre-service primary teachers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication Status</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/20" alt="Published" /> <img src="https://via.placeholder.com/20" alt="Accepted for Publication" /> <img src="https://via.placeholder.com/20" alt="Submitted for Publication" /> <img src="https://via.placeholder.com/20" alt="Publication Style" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Include: names of all authors, year of publication/submission, title, name of the journal, issue and page numbers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Lead author declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Principal Author (Candidate)</th>
<th>Lesley Russell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Paper</td>
<td>contribution to paper, its realisation, and its documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performed analysis on all samples, interpreted data, wrote manuscript and acted as corresponding author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Russell</td>
<td>1/1/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Co-Author declarations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Co-Author</th>
<th>Sam Marshall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Paper</td>
<td>Supervised development of work, helped in data interpretation and manuscript evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Sam Marshall Date 6/1/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Co-Author</th>
<th>Robert Young</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Paper</td>
<td>Helped to evaluate and edit the manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Robert Young Date 8/1/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion Chapter

• This is a narrative section that is broader than the discussion presented in the published (accepted for publication) papers.

• It is strongly recommended that a clear structure be discussed and agreed prior to the development of this section,
  – this section can draw on literature that was not included in the review; however, it should do so to compare and contrast, not to introduce new findings
Discussion Chapter

• Policy/political implications
  Implications associated with economic impact, or other aspects of FAME if those elements were not included in the review itself (allows for extended literature inclusion)
  What is new that we now know about the evidence in this topic area
  Overall completeness and applicability of the evidence,
Discussion Chapter

• Discussion of internal and external validity (or cross case generalization) of the review findings. A summary section of what works for whom in what circumstances – using a narrative approach to dissect the intervention or phenomena of interest and present.

• Where/how it fits within the translational cycle, exploring relationship to other aspects of the translational cycle.
Discussion Chapter

• Comparison and contrast with other reviews/primary studies
  Differences (if any) between protocol and review
  Feedback from peer reviewers (if available) and how it might have influenced the direction and outcomes of your findings.
Conclusions

• Broad, not a re-presentation of the review findings or implications.
• bring together the review/study findings within the context established in the final discussion, and
• HOW these relate to evidence-based practice/quality improvement.
Example Conclusions

- Restate the purpose of the thesis and give a brief overview of the methods that were used,
- Revisit the key implications of the context,
- Statement of the PICO questions,
- Summary of the work undertaken,
- Discussion of synergy between papers,
- What the thesis demonstrates as a whole.
Examination
Examiners receive

• a covering letter;
• the thesis;
• the program rules;
• the program cover sheet; and
• the program report form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The thesis as a whole is a substantial and original contribution to knowledge of the subject with which it deals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The candidate shows familiarity with, and understanding of, the relevant literature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thesis provides a sufficiently comprehensive study of the topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The techniques adopted are appropriate to the subject matter and are properly applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results are suitably set out and are accompanied by adequate exposition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of English and general presentation are of a standard for publication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examiner comments

• standard of work completed;

• possibility for publication; and

• further work that may arise from the research completed.
• http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/handbook/06-conduct-research/05-authorship/