



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 01- 08

HOW TO WRITE A RESEARCH PAPER: AN EDITOR'S PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Rizwan Ahmed Shabbir Shaikh*1

¹ MD Paediatrics (Hom); Post Graduate Diploma in Clinical Research & Regulatory Affairs; Post Graduate Diploma in Nutrition; Associate Professor, Department of Surgery, Ahmednagar Homoeopathic Medical College, A'nagar

Article Received: 02 / 12 / 2024

Article Published: 10 / 01 / 2025

***Corresponding Author: Dr. Rizwan Ahmed Shabbir**

Email: drizwann919@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18919331>

Editorial

Writing a research paper can feel overwhelming, especially when you're staring at a blank page with months of research notes scattered around you. I've been there countless times, and through years of editorial work, I've come to realize that the process doesn't have to be as daunting as it seems. Let me share what I've learned about transforming research into compelling academic papers.

The Foundation: Understanding What Makes Research Worth Sharing

Before you write a single word, ask yourself a simple question: "What keeps me awake at night about this topic?" Your research paper should not just fill a gap in the literature but it should address something that genuinely matters to you and your field. When I review manuscripts, the ones that stand out always have this underlying passion, even beneath the formal academic tone.

The research question forms the backbone of everything that follows. I've seen brilliant studies fail to make an impact simply because the authors couldn't articulate why their work mattered. Your reader needs to understand, within the first few paragraphs, what problem you're solving and why anyone should care about the solution[1].

Think about your research question this way: if you met a colleague at a conference and had just two minutes in an elevator, could you explain what you're investigating and why it's important? That clarity should permeate your entire paper.

Starting with the End in Mind: Choosing Your Journal

Here's something many researchers get wrong—they write the paper first and then look for a journal. I've learned it works better the other way around. Each journal has its own personality, scope, and audience. Publishing in the wrong journal is like having a brilliant conversation with someone who isn't interested in the topic[2].



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 01- 08

Spend time reading recent issues of your target journal. Notice the writing style, the typical structure of articles, and the kinds of questions they prioritize. Some journals prefer concise, data-driven papers, while others welcome more extensive discussions. Understanding these preferences before you write saves enormous time during revision.

Literature Review: Building Your Academic Conversation

The literature review isn't just a summary of what others have done—it's your chance to position your work within an ongoing scholarly conversation. I think of it as setting the stage for a play. You need to introduce the characters (previous researchers), establish the setting (current understanding), and create tension (the gap your research fills)[3].

When writing your literature review, avoid the temptation to cite everything you've read. Instead, focus on studies that directly relate to your research question. Group them thematically rather than chronologically. Show how different perspectives have evolved and where disagreements exist. This demonstrates that you understand the field deeply, not just superficially.

One technique I find helpful is creating a visual map of the literature before writing. Draw connections between different studies, identify clusters of similar findings, and pinpoint where your work fits. This map becomes your outline for the literature review section.

Methodology: The Transparency Test

Your methodology section serves a crucial purpose—it should allow another researcher to replicate your study. I call this the "transparency test." If someone with expertise in your field couldn't reproduce your work based on your methods section, you need more detail[4].

However, detail doesn't mean drowning readers in minutiae. Focus on decisions that affected your results. Why did you choose this particular approach over alternatives? What were the limitations of your choices? Acknowledging these decisions upfront demonstrates intellectual honesty and strengthens your credibility.

For qualitative research, explain your analytical framework clearly. For quantitative studies, justify your statistical approaches. If you used specialized equipment or software, specify versions and settings. These details matter more than you might think, especially as research practices evolve rapidly.

Results: Let Your Data Tell Its Story

The results section often feels mechanical, but it shouldn't read that way. Your job here is to guide readers through your findings without interpreting them yet—that comes later in the discussion. Present results logically, usually moving from general to specific or from primary to secondary outcomes[5].



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 01- 08

Tables and figures serve as visual anchors for your readers. Use them strategically rather than dumping all your data into endless tables. Each visual element should have a clear purpose and should be understandable without requiring readers to dig through paragraphs of text. I often tell authors: if a table or figure doesn't add clarity, cut it.

When describing statistical results, report them completely but concisely. Include the test used, the test statistic, degrees of freedom, p-value, and effect size. Yes, this seems technical, but it's the language of scientific rigor.

Discussion: Where Your Voice Emerges

The discussion section is where you finally get to interpret your findings and explain what they mean. This is also where your unique perspective shines through. Start by restating your main findings in the context of your research question. Did you confirm your hypothesis? Were there surprises?

Connect your results back to the literature you reviewed earlier. Do your findings support previous work or challenge it? Either way, explain why these patterns might exist. This is where you demonstrate not just what you found, but what you think it means for the field[6].

Don't shy away from limitations. Every study has them. Acknowledging yours doesn't weaken your paper—it shows you understand the boundaries of what your research can claim. Discuss how these limitations might be addressed in future studies.

One common mistake I see is authors making claims that exceed their data. If your study examined a specific population in a particular context, be cautious about generalizing to all populations everywhere. Let your conclusions match the scope of your evidence.

The Abstract: Your Paper's Ambassador

Although the abstract appears first, I always recommend writing it last. It's essentially a condensed version of your entire paper, and you can't condense what you haven't fully written yet. Think of your abstract as your paper's ambassador—it represents your work to busy researchers deciding what to read[7].

A strong abstract follows a clear structure: background (one or two sentences), objectives (one sentence), methods (two to three sentences), key results (two to three sentences), and conclusions (one or two sentences). Stay within the word limit, typically 200-250 words, and make every word count.

Avoid citations in your abstract unless absolutely necessary. The abstract should stand alone, comprehensible without reference to your full paper or other sources.

Title and Keywords: Making Your Work Discoverable



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 01- 08

Your title needs to be specific enough to accurately represent your study but concise enough to be readable. I've reviewed papers with titles so long they require a breath in the middle. Aim for 10-15 words that capture your key variables and relationships.

Keywords help researchers find your work through database searches. Choose terms that others in your field actually use when searching. Mix specific terms related to your particular study with broader terms related to your general field. This casts both a narrow and wide net for potential readers.

Writing Style: Clarity Over Complexity

Academic writing has an undeserved reputation for being dry and convoluted. While you need to maintain professional standards, clarity should always trump complexity. Use active voice when possible—it makes your writing more direct and engaging[8].

Consider these two sentences:

- Passive: "The experiment was conducted by the research team over six months."
- Active: "The research team conducted the experiment over six months."

The second sentence is clearer and more vigorous. It tells us who did what.

Avoid unnecessary jargon. Technical terms have their place when they convey precise meaning, but don't use specialized vocabulary just to sound academic. If a simpler word works, use it. Your goal is communication, not obfuscation.

Vary your sentence length to maintain rhythm. A steady diet of long, complex sentences exhausts readers. Short sentences provide emphasis and let readers breathe. Mix them together for engaging prose.

The Revision Process: Where Good Papers Become Great

Your first draft will not be your best draft. Accept this reality and give yourself permission to write imperfectly at first. The goal of drafting is getting your ideas onto the page; the goal of revision is refining those ideas into their best form.

I recommend a staged revision approach. First, look at structure. Does each section flow logically to the next? Are your arguments properly supported? This is big-picture revision focused on content and organization[9].

Next, examine paragraphs. Each should focus on a single idea and connect clearly to surrounding paragraphs. Use transition sentences to guide readers from one thought to the next.

Finally, edit at the sentence level. Look for wordiness, awkward constructions, and grammatical errors. Read your paper aloud—you'll catch problems your eyes missed when reading silently.



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 01- 08

Citations and References: Giving Credit Where Due

Proper citation serves two purposes: it gives credit to original authors and allows readers to locate your sources. Choose your citation style based on journal requirements—APA, MLA, Chicago, or others—and apply it consistently throughout your paper[10].

- Cite when you use someone else's ideas, even if you paraphrase them
- Cite specific data, statistics, or findings from other studies
- Cite direct quotations (though use these sparingly in scientific writing)
- Cite theoretical frameworks or methodological approaches you adopted from others

Don't cite common knowledge in your field. If something is found in standard textbooks and widely accepted, you don't need a citation. Use your judgment—when in doubt, cite.

Ethical Considerations: Maintaining Research Integrity

Research ethics extend beyond getting institutional review board approval. They encompass how you present your work. Never manipulate data to fit your hypothesis. Report negative results honestly—they're often as valuable as positive findings[11].

If your research had industry funding or potential conflicts of interest, disclose them. Transparency builds trust. Similarly, acknowledge everyone who contributed substantively to your work, whether through ideas, data collection, or analysis.

Plagiarism, even unintentional, can destroy your reputation. This includes self-plagiarism—republishing your own previously published work without disclosure. Use reference management software to keep track of sources and ensure proper attribution.

Common Pitfalls to Avoid

Through years of editorial work, I've noticed patterns in manuscripts that get rejected or require extensive revision. Here are pitfalls to avoid:

1. Mismatch between research question and methods: Your methodology should logically address your research question. If they don't align, revise one or the other.
2. Overstatement of findings: Be precise about what your data actually shows. Speculation is fine in the discussion section, but label it clearly as such.
3. Insufficient contextualization: Readers need to understand why your work matters. Don't assume significance is obvious.
4. Poor organization: If readers can't follow your argument, they'll stop reading. Use clear headings and logical progression.



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 01- 08

-
5. Neglecting the writing quality: Brilliant research presented poorly still fails to communicate effectively. Invest time in clear writing.

The Submission Process: Final Steps Before Publication

Before you click submit, create a pre-submission checklist. Have you followed all formatting guidelines? Are your figures high resolution? Does your manuscript include all required elements—cover letter, conflict of interest statement, author contributions, etc.?

The cover letter matters more than many authors realize. Use it to introduce your work, explain its significance, and suggest appropriate reviewers. This is your chance to frame how editors and reviewers perceive your manuscript.

After submission, prepare for the waiting game. Peer review takes time, often several months. Use this period to start your next project rather than obsessively checking submission portals.

Responding to Reviewer Comments: The Art of Revision

Unless you're extraordinarily fortunate, you'll receive reviewer comments requesting changes. Read these comments carefully, and resist the urge to respond defensively. Reviewers volunteer their time to improve your work; their feedback, even when it stings, usually strengthens your paper.

Address each comment systematically. Create a response document where you list each reviewer comment, explain how you addressed it, and note the page numbers where changes appear. If you disagree with a suggestion, explain your reasoning respectfully and provide evidence for your position.

Some comments may be contradictory—Reviewer 2 wants more detail while Reviewer 1 wants less. In these cases, use your judgment and explain your decision in your response letter. Editors understand that reviewers sometimes disagree.

Building Your Research Writing Practice

Writing research papers is a skill that develops with practice. Don't wait until you have complete data to start writing. Draft your introduction and methods sections while data collection is ongoing. This parallel processing makes the final writing stage less overwhelming.

Develop a regular writing routine. Many successful academic writers dedicate specific times for writing, treating these blocks as non-negotiable appointments. Whether it's two hours every morning or all day Friday, consistency matters more than total time invested.

Join or create a writing group. Having colleagues review your drafts provides valuable feedback and accountability. Peer review at this informal stage catches problems before anonymous reviewers see them.



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 01- 08

Read widely in your field and beyond. Notice how effective writers construct arguments, present data, and engage readers. Analyze papers you find particularly clear or compelling—what makes them work? Incorporate those strategies into your own writing.

Final Thoughts: The Bigger Picture

Research papers are more than academic exercises or resume builders. They're contributions to human knowledge, pieces of a larger conversation that spans disciplines and generations. When you publish research, you're adding your voice to this conversation, potentially influencing how others think about important questions.

This responsibility should inspire rather than intimidate. Yes, research writing involves following conventions and meeting standards, but it also offers opportunities for creativity and insight. Your unique perspective, shaped by your particular experiences and training, gives you something valuable to contribute.

Remember that even the most prestigious journals publish papers written by humans who once struggled with the same challenges you face. Every experienced researcher was once a novice uncertain about structure, style, and substance. The difference between them and beginners isn't innate talent—it's practice, persistence, and willingness to learn from feedback.

As you develop your research writing skills, be patient with yourself. Each paper you write teaches you something about both your subject matter and the craft of scientific communication. Embrace this learning process. Celebrate improvements, learn from rejections, and keep refining your approach.

Your research matters. The world needs your findings, your insights, and your contributions. Write with that confidence, supported by rigor and clarity. The journey from research question to published paper may be long, but it's one of the most rewarding aspects of academic life.

References

- [1] Pubrica Academy. (2026, February 19). How to write a research paper for journal publication in 2026. <https://pubrica.com/academy/publication-support/how-to-write-research-paper-for-journal-publication-2026/>
- [2] San Francisco Edit. (2026, March 5). 11 key steps to write a scientific paper in 2026. <https://www.sfedit.net/11-key-steps-to-write-a-scientific-paper-in-2026/>
- [3] Cambridge Research. (2025, November 23). How to write a research paper: A comprehensive guide. <https://cambridge-research.org/blogs/how-to-write-a-research-paper/>
- [4] University of Minnesota Libraries. (2020). Structure of a research paper: IMRAD format. <https://libguides.umn.edu/StructureResearchPaper>



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 01- 08

- [5] UCSD Psychology Department. Research paper structure in APA style. <https://psychology.ucsd.edu/undergraduate-program/undergraduate-resources/academic-writing-resources/writing-research-papers/research-paper-structure.html>
- [6] Paperguide. (2025, March 11). How to write a research paper: Step-by-step guide for 2026. <https://paperguide.ai/blog/how-to-write-a-research-paper/>
- [7] Aleem, N. (2026, January 8). How to write comprehensive research paper in 2026: Step-by-step guide. *LinkedIn*. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/how-write-comprehensive-research-paper-2026-guide-dr-naureen-aleem-myyef>
- [8] Blue Leaf Editing. (2025, October 22). From a pro: 5 academic writing tips I wish every writer knew. <https://blueleafediting.com/academic-writing-tips/>
- [9] University of Reading Library. (2016). Writing in an academic style. <https://libguides.reading.ac.uk/writing/style>
- [10] Jain University. (2025, May 15). Research paper format guide: Tips and templates. <https://www.jainuniversity.ac.in/blogs/research-paper-format-guide>
- [11] Valdosta State University. Best practices in academic writing. <https://www.valdosta.edu/colleges/arts/art/documents/best-practices-in-academic-writing-.pdf>