Edited Collection Guidelines for Contributors and Editors

About the Collection
This Edited Collection: *When does evidence really matter? Sharing lessons of improving development processes with research*, which is co-funded by the ESRC DFID Impact Initiative and IDS, will present and explore the critical challenges faced by evidence-based development through a diverse set of case studies. The use of research in the sphere of public policy is an extraordinarily complex phenomenon and is only one part of a complicated process that also uses experience, political insight, pressure, social technologies, and judgment. In international development, as with other spheres of public policy, decisions are likely to be pragmatic and shaped by their political and institutional circumstances rather than rational and determined by research. While it has been easy to learn the lessons of significant successes, it has proved much harder to institutionalise them. Put simply, the development sector has continued to struggle to repeat the trick of turning research into action.

Through an edited collection of around a dozen longer articles and some accompanying shorter reflective and think pieces, this peer reviewed open access publication will present and explore the critical challenges faced by evidence-based development. It will speak clearly to the challenges and will seek to inform new thinking around how to design, implement and undertake research that makes a difference, drawing on the tacit and first-hand experiences of those who have led such work. In doing so, it will seek to identify deep insights into what it takes to help development research contribute to better development processes and ultimately social and economic progress.

Our primary audience are the donors, researchers and intermediaries that are engaged with research to policy orientated projects and the networks to which they belong. Rather than provide generalizable tool kits and case studies we want the learning arising from this collection to inform the wider debate around how research can be designed to improve development processes in a rapidly shifting development landscape, which has implications for how knowledge is thought about, accessed and used.

The Collection is edited by a team of four editors who are each assigned to the commissioning of several articles in the volume, to providing editorial support to the relevant authors, to overseeing the peer review process and to submitting the final manuscript to the IDS based production team. The production team will provide a copy-editing, formatting and proof reading service and oversee the publication of the collection.

Contributors
Contributors must abide by high standards of rigorous and robust research integrity and good scholarship in writing their article, after being commissioned to do so by the collection’s
Editors. It is the contributor’s responsibility to submit well-written, factually correct articles, to seek advice if English is not their first language (if necessary), to elaborate on unique and new content, and to acknowledge the contributions of others, especially third-party copyrighted material.

Contributors must state whether the article is simultaneously under consideration with a journal. They must agree to be in correspondence with the Editors regarding amendments following peer review. Multiple authors should allocate one spokesperson per article for communication with the Issue Editors. If an article is written jointly by more than one author, the level of authorship credit should be mutually decided at the beginning of the collaboration process, based upon: expectation, specific ability, and specific tasks in the writing. Allow for renegotiation in case the article needs to be revised after the first draft. To be listed as an author the collaborator should provide a creative and intellectual piece that is integral to the article: it should have an overarching perspective on the subject. To decide level of credit, points could be mutually agreed, with the collaborator reaching a certain number to guarantee inclusion. However, these points should be awarded for level of scholarly importance rather than amount of comments made.

If agreement cannot be reached on authorship, the Collection’s Editorial Steering Group will be brought in to arbitrate.

Types of submissions
This volume is intended for both non-academic and academic audiences and articles may vary in tone from technically academic (while retaining clarity of language) to a more concise, accessible style. Each of the longer articles is to be conceived as a contextualised case study rather than a pure academic discussion. The three types of contribution to be included are:

A. **Longer articles** will range between 3000-9000 words – these submissions should explore the author(s)’ first-hand experience in detail, providing a comprehensive but critical and nuanced account of either the process, outcome or impact (or all three).

B. **Short reflective pieces** of between 800-1500 words that share critical and thoughtful reflections on daily professional practice and experiences, bringing out insights and lessons for research uptake. Professionals involved in direct use of research evidence in decision-making, programming, advocacy or media reporting are particularly encouraged to apply under this.

C. **Think pieces** of around 500 words, which present an alternate view to articles submitted. These will be by invitation unless two parties request to submit deliberately opposing views in the applications above.

Please consult your Editor for guidance on the type of submission we are expecting from you and the exact word count required.

Before finalising longer articles the contributor and Collection Editor should consider whether the article partially or fully addresses the following criteria:

1. First hand compelling experiences of either the process, outcome or impact of utilising research results to spur action. This may relate to instrumental impacts on policy and practice, conceptual impacts on attitudes and understandings of development issues or capacity building impacts on evidence use – or a combination of these. Note that we encourage positive as well as negative experiences that provide important lessons.
2. Identifies critical barriers to engagement and uptake in areas like networks and relationships, time and resources, individual capacities and incentives and lack of demand for evidence. What strategies were employed to try and overcome these?

3. Cases where the scientific truth has been hard to distinguish, and where guidelines for validating and verifying evidence are highly contested are particularly encouraged. How was this contestation navigated?

4. Exploration of the micro as well as macro factors (political, economic, social, technological, environmental) that likely facilitated and/or hindered the ultimate result – particularly in the sector concerned.

5. Experiences with the monitoring of progress and the attribution of the impact of research utilisation efforts, highlighting insights and lessons.

6. Reflections (based on the experiences explored) on how to institutionalise best practices and lessons learned for increasing demand as well as supply of rigorous, relevant, and timely research given the contextual nuances of the particular experience.

7. Discussion of what it takes for development-oriented research to contribute to better development processes and ultimately social and economic progress and how this compares to current dominant paradigms for research uptake impact, evidence-based policy-making and knowledge brokerage.

**Peer review process**

Once contributors send their articles to the Collection Editor they have the right to a considered, timely and unbiased peer review through an external review by a reviewer of the Collection Editors’ choosing. Contributors will see anonymised referees’ reports together with an editorial view summarising the decision of the reviewers (reject, or revise and resubmit, or minor revisions, or accept as stands). The Collection Editors have discretion on how they interpret and guide responses to reviews.

**Manuscript preparation for submission**

Manuscripts must be submitted in grammatically correct English; however, authors for whom English is not their first language should be assured that the copy-editing process will assist with smoothing out any queries which may arise from technical differences in tone or accuracy.

Final article files must be **Word documents in A4 size** (not US Letter), in **Times New Roman** with **12 point** font size. All headings and sub-headings should be in bold with levels clearly distinguished. No other formatting is required.

Ensure that all elements of the article are included within one document:

- **Title** of article (no longer than 10 words)
- List of **authors’ names** in publication order
- **Abstract** of up to 150 words
- **Keywords** (no more than 10).
• **Text** (introduction, case study, supporting viewpoints, conclusion, endnotes and references – as appropriate and as agreed by contributor and Collection Editor)

• **Literature cited** (ensure that in-text citations match list of references at the end of the article and vice versa)

• **Tables and figures** (and any other graphic elements such as boxes) should have a title and source line.

• Ensure that all **third-party copyright** (i.e. photographs) have written permissions for re-use and appropriate attribution; these written permissions must be supplied along with the submitted article. Also supply a caption, for context with the main text.

• Supply **endnotes**, not footnotes.

• **Acknowledgements** can be supplied as endnotes.

• Adhere to **word count** as advised by the Collection Editor.

---

**Note for Collection Editors: Detailed elements of article submissions**

Please ensure that articles are submitted in accordance with the current IDS house style guidelines and note the following specific details.

• **Check spelling**
  Check both spelling and grammar. (Note that we require ‘British’ rather than ‘US’ spelling conventions.)

• **References**
  Citations within the main text and endnotes should match the reference list at the end of the article, and vice versa. They should be set into IDS house style as detailed on pages 6–11.

• **Tables**
  All tables must be cited in the text. Tables should be positioned within the body text and each one must have a title above and source line below.

• **Figures**
  All figures must be cited in the text. Figures should be positioned within the body text and each one must have a title above and source line below.

• **Boxes**
  All boxes must be cited in the text. Boxes should be positioned within the body text and each one must have a title as the first line of content and a source line as the last; all text to be within the box.

• **Photographs**
  When submitting photographs for publications in an article, include within the text for position guidance and also supply in one of the following formats in full colour: Encapsulated PostScript (EPS) or Tagged Image File Format (TIFF) or Portable Network Graphics (PNG).

• **Biographies**
  Up to 100 words each, should be supplied in a separate Word document

• **Submission forms**
Must be signed by each contributor and submitted alongside the final article. These forms clarify copyright and licensing details before production can begin.