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“Publish or Perish: how to write a research manuscript”, 3 July 2013, 14h30-17h30

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

“Well done and very beneficial for us. Thank you” (Participant’s voice)

The workshop was very well attended; the room capacity of 150 was fully utilized as was the overflow area that was opened up adjacent to the main room. We received 91 evaluation sheets for this workshop from respondents. The evaluation is based on the correct responses by the respondents; incorrect responses were disregarded.

Participants:

Out of 89 respondents who indicated their main occupation, 27% identified themselves as researchers, 24% as healthcare workers, 15% as students and 5% as educator and/or mentor. Advocacy, policy, funding, media and social service provider representatives were also present in smaller numbers.

Asia was the most represented continent and was indicated as the main area of residence by 42% of the 89 respondents, with a large proportion residing in Malaysia. Participants also originated from Africa (35%), Europe (8%), Middle East (4%), North America (5%), South America (2%) and Australia (1%).

Of the 91 respondents, 43% were male and 56% were female. One participant indicated transgender in response to this question. The majority (69%) of respondents had heard of the Journal of the International AIDS Society (JIAS) prior to attending the workshop. Of these, most had previous knowledge either from direct contact with the journal or from
JIAS publications. Other common means included through an internet search, a previous IAS conference or through a recommendation from a colleague.

The two most popular reasons provided by the 91 respondents for attending the workshop were to “Develop and strengthen skills” (69% of respondents) and also because of the “Workshop title and description” (63% of respondents). The “Opportunity to network and share experiences”, “Recommendation by friend/colleague” and “Facilitators” were also indicated as reasons by 14%, 13% and 9% of respondents, respectively.

**Content:**

The workshop was divided into four sessions, including time for short exercises and questions and answers. The majority of the 87 respondents (91%) indicated that the “Writing a manuscript” session was either “very useful” or “useful”. Eighty-five percent of respondents found the “Submission and revision” session “very useful” or “useful”.

Of 83 respondents, 46% found the editorial process session “very useful”, another 31% as “useful” and 13% as “somewhat useful”. Workshop participants also appreciated the “Publication ethics” session, where 91% found it either “very useful” or “useful”. Eighty-three percent of 75 respondents found the exercises and Q&A “very useful” and “useful”. None indicated that these parts of the workshop were “not useful”. The majority of the respondents thought that the facilitation of the workshop was “excellent”, “very well” or “well” facilitated (33%, 46% and 16%, respectively).

Based on all responses received regarding on how to improve the workshop the answers most often given were to “have a bigger room”, to “provide hard copies of the PowerPoint slides” and to “allocate more time”. Some specified that more time would be beneficial to allow for more practical exercises and for the assessment of a specific manuscript, either provided by the organizers or brought along by one of the participants.
In addition, there was a desire among attendees to have more detailed information, where some specified that a different setup would allow for more focus by discipline and type of study (e.g., basic sciences, qualitative, programmatic) but would also allow customized material for different level of experience. A few respondents also suggested that, instead of scheduling at the end of the conference, the workshop would be most beneficial towards the start of the conference or broken up to span the entire conference.