Abstract analysis

Note that this document shows an analysis of an abstract, but this is very possible with other sections of a manuscript. You couild, for example, analyze an introduction or a conclusion.

An easy method for this type of analysis is to color-code the manuscript with the different sections (sometimes called “moves”; Swales, 2005). Below you’ll see that the purpose is in red, the scope in green, and so forth. Note, too, that the purpose can be a single sentence, a part of a sentence, or multiple sentences.

Purpose abs1

Scope abs2

Method abs3

Results abs4

Conclusion abs5

*http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2*

**Capturing Lessons Learned from Evidence-To-Policy Initiatives
through Structured Reflection**

**Abstract**

Knowledge translation platforms (KTPs), which are partnerships between policymakers, stakeholders, and researchers, ***are being established in*** low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) ***to enhance*** evidence-informed health policymaking (EIHP). ***This study aims to gain a better understanding of*** the i) activities conducted by KTPs, ii) the way in which KTP leaders, policymakers, and stakeholders perceive these activities and their outputs, iii) facilitators that support KTP work and challenges, and the lessons learned for overcoming such challenges, and iv) factors that can help to ensure the sustainability of KTPs. ***This paper triangulated qualitative data from***: i) 17 semi-structured interviews with 47 key informants including KTP leaders, policymakers, and stakeholders from 10 KTPs; ii) document reviews, and iii) observation of deliberations at the International Forum on EIHP in LMICs held in Addis Ababa in August 2012. Purposive sampling ***was used and data were analyzed using*** thematic analysis. Deliberative dialogues informed by evidence briefs ***were identified as*** the most commendable tools by interviewees for enhancing EIHP. KTPs ***reported that*** they have contributed to increased awareness of the importance of EIHP and strengthened relationships among policymakers, stakeholders, and researchers. Support from policymakers and international funders ***facilitated*** KTP activities, while the lack of skilled human resources to conduct EIHP activities impeded KTPs. Ensuring the sustainability of EIHP initiatives after the end of funding ***was a major challenge for*** KTPs. KTPs ***reported that*** institutionalization within the government has helped to retain human resources and secure funding, whereas KTPs hosted by universities highlighted the advantage of autonomy from political interests. ***The establishment of*** KTPs ***is a promising development in supporting*** EIHP. Real-time lesson drawing from the experiences of KTPs ***can support improvements in*** the functioning of KTPs in the short term, while making the case for sustaining their work in the long term. Lessons learned ***can help to promote similar*** EIHP ***initiatives in other countries***.

Of course, you could separate the various sections as shown below.

**Abstract**

**Background**

Knowledge translation platforms (KTPs), which are partnerships between policymakers, stakeholders, and researchers, ***are being established in*** low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) ***to enhance*** evidence-informed health policymaking (EIHP). ***This study aims to gain a better understanding of*** the i) activities conducted by KTPs, ii) the way in which KTP leaders, policymakers, and stakeholders perceive these activities and their outputs, iii) facilitators that support KTP work and challenges, and the lessons learned for overcoming such challenges, and iv) factors that can help to ensure the sustainability of KTPs.

**Methods**

***This paper triangulated qualitative data from***: i) 17 semi-structured interviews with 47 key informants including KTP leaders, policymakers, and stakeholders from 10 KTPs; ii) document reviews, and iii) observation of deliberations at the International Forum on EIHP in LMICs held in Addis Ababa in August 2012. Purposive sampling ***was used and data were analyzed using*** thematic analysis.

**Results**

Deliberative dialogues informed by evidence briefs ***were identified as*** the most commendable tools by interviewees for enhancing EIHP. KTPs ***reported that*** they have contributed to increased awareness of the importance of EIHP and strengthened relationships among policymakers, stakeholders, and researchers. Support from policymakers and international funders ***facilitated*** KTP activities, while the lack of skilled human resources to conduct EIHP activities impeded KTPs. Ensuring the sustainability of EIHP initiatives after the end of funding ***was a major challenge for*** KTPs. KTPs ***reported that*** institutionalization within the government has helped to retain human resources and secure funding, whereas KTPs hosted by universities highlighted the advantage of autonomy from political interests.

**Conclusions**

***The establishment of*** KTPs ***is a promising development in supporting*** EIHP. Real-time lesson drawing from the experiences of KTPs ***can support improvements in*** the functioning of KTPs in the short term, while making the case for sustaining their work in the long term. Lessons learned ***can help to promote similar*** EIHP ***initiatives in other countries***.

You likely have noticed that some words and phrases are underlined and in boldface. Why, you ask? Well, much as we have been examining and focusing on words (lexemes), you can also focus on phrases. The underlined phrases you might find particularly useful in your own work. Notice, for example, the basic structure of the phrases in the conclusion:

**Conclusions**

***The establishment of*** KTPs ***is a promising development in supporting*** EIHP. Real-time lesson drawing from the experiences of KTPs ***can support improvements in*** the functioning of KTPs in the short term, while making the case for sustaining their work in the long term. Lessons learned ***can help to promote similar*** EIHP ***initiatives in other countries***.

**Conclusions**

***The establishment of*** A ***is a promising development in supporting*** B. C ***can support improvements in*** D, while E. F ***can help to promote similar*** G ***initiatives in other countries***.

As noted earlier, you could analyze any section of a manuscript in that manner. Following is an introduction marked in colors.

**Introduction analysis**

**int1 Importance of this research area**

**int2 Previous research relevant to your research**

**int3 Necessity for further research (gap or next step)**

**int4 Your research**

*http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2*

**Capturing Lessons Learned from Evidence-To-Policy Initiatives**

**through Structured Reflection**

**Background**

***In recent years, there has been an increase in*** global calls to ensure health policymaking is informed by research evidence to improve health systems and population health [[1](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B1),[2](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B2)]. ***Most recently,*** the Beijing Statement from the Second Global Symposium on Health Systems Research called for promoting knowledge translation (KT) by developing communities of practice and enhancing trust between researchers, policymakers, and stakeholders [[3](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B3)].

In response to these calls, ***efforts have been directed towards*** strengthening evidence-informed health policymaking (EIHP) in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) where major health challenges exist and there are limited resources to address these challenges. ***Particularly,*** KT platforms (KTPs), which are partnerships between policymakers, researchers, civil society groups, and other key health system stakeholders, are being established worldwide by the World Health Organization Evidence-Informed Policy Networks (WHO EVIPNet) in order to facilitate the process of translating research evidence into policy and action [[4](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B4)]. ***Some of the activities supported by*** these KTPs include the synthesis of research to address health policy priorities (e.g., evidence briefs for policy), as well as convening deliberative dialogues (sometimes called policy dialogues) that bring different health actors together to deliberate about a problem, the options for addressing it, and key implementation considerations [[5](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B5)-[7](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B7)].

With KTPs at various stages of implementation, ***little is known about*** their activities for enhancing EIHP [[7](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B7),[8](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B8)]. ***A recent review of*** the experience of the Zambia Forum for Health Research (ZAMFOHR) highlighted key lessons learned during the organizational development of the KTP including the importance of organizational issues to achieve buy-in among the community and the necessity of investing in building the capacity of the wider community and KTP staff to undertake KT activities [[7](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B7)]. ***Few studies exist on*** KT in LMICs ***and there are inconsistencies among the available studies on*** the factors identified as influencing the use of evidence [[9](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B9),[10](http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/12/1/2#B10)]. ***As such, there is a need to understand the factors that enable or hinder*** KTP work in LMICs ***in order to improve*** the ongoing activities of KTPs ***and inform*** the experience of other growing KTPs.

***This paper seeks to gain a better understanding of*** i) the activities conducted by KTPs from LMICs to link research evidence to policy, ii) the way in which KTP leaders, policymakers, and stakeholders perceive these activities and their outputs, iii) key facilitators for supporting KTP work, as well as the challenges encountered and the lessons learned that can assist in overcoming these challenges, and iv) factors that can help to ensure the sustainability of KTPs. ***This paper solicits*** the views of KTP leaders, policymakers, and stakeholders from 10 KTPs in LMICs. ***It also draws on*** a document review and observation of deliberations at the International Forum on EIHP in LMICs held in Addis Ababa from August 28th to 30th 2012, which was hosted by the Ethiopian Health and Nutrition Research Institute (EHNRI), and organized by EVIPNet. The International Forum brought together more than 137 KTP team members, policymakers, stakeholders, and researchers from 25 countries to share their experiences on EIHP and identify opportunities for improving EIHP in LMICs.

Finally, note that these organizational schemes are not universal. In some areas, fields, and disciplines you’ll find different styles (e.g., the purpose might follow the background in a typical abstract). This should emphasize to us the importance of checking your specific area carefully!

(Following are details from the original handout—ask us for details if you’re curious.)

「理系たまごシリーズ３　理系英語のライティング」 p. 35-48

 **A目的: Purpose abs1**

 **Ａ範囲: Scope abs2**

 **Ａ方法: Method abs3**

 **Ａ結果: Results abs4**

 **Ａ結論: Conclusion abs5**

(In biosciences, the order is usually Scope (Background) then Purpose. In medical sciences, structured abstracts are often used.)

「理系たまごシリーズ３　理系英語のライティング」 p. 50-79

I背景 Background int1 自分の研究分野の重要性を証明するムーブ

I先研 Previous research int2 自分の研究分野の先行研究を紹介するムーブ

I隙間 Gap int3 更に研究を進める必要性を明らかにするムーブ

I自研 Current research int4 自分の研究で行ったことを示すムーブ

「理系たまごシリーズ３　理系英語のライティング」 p. 82-93

M準備 Preparation　exp1 研究用サンプルをどのように準備したかを示すムーブ

M行動 Action　 exp2 研究のために行った作業や行動を説明するムーブ

M方法 Method　 exp3 論文がフォーカスしている新しい方法・モデルを説

明するムーブ

M提示 Description　exp4 論文自体に取り上げられたことを提示する

「理系たまごシリーズ３　理系英語のライティング」 p. 96-108

R図表 Figure, table res1 結果を伝えるための図表を引用したり

説明するムーブ

R動作　Method res2 実験に関する動作を記述するムーブ

R発見 Finding res3 観察結果、新たに発見したことを提 するムーブ

R関連　Related information res4 一般化されている関連事項を説明すムーブ

R注釈　Comment res5 結果に対する語句簡潔なコメントを

述べるムーブ

「理系たまごシリーズ３　理系英語のライティング」 p. 110-129

D要点　Importance of research dis1 研究の重要性を論じるムーブ

D今研 Current findings dis2 この研究で発見したことを論じる

ムーブ

D比較 Comparison dis3 この研究での発見と、先行研究や分野

の知識を比較するムーブ

D問題 Issue dis4 この研究の問題点を示すムーブ

D結論 Conclusion dis5 結論を示すムーブ