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Relevant

- Novel (i.e., significant move beyond existing knowledge)
- Important research gap
- Theory-building, generalizable
- Applied value

Robust

- Definite evidence
- Quality of arguments and evidence (e.g., sample; proof of causality, rejection of alternative explanations)
- Replication

Groundbreaking, spectacular new insights

Beautiful and clean story and significant findings
Reading: Know everything in your line of research

Writing: Write every day, rewrite every day

You stop reading books or chapters.
You stop reading full articles.
You skim through articles.
You fall behind, stop staying up-to-date.

Plan your journey: Team up, target a journal

Start with a review case

Have a vision: A leading expert in what? Theory?

"Piecemeal toward the theory"
You know how a good article looks like...
(else read a lot and volunteer as a reviewer)

Contribution is compelling
- **Intro**: *Must be spot-on!* *Contribution clearly stressed!*
- Discussion: Impact on the field? Why does it matter?

Evidence is compelling
- Conclusive and definite evidence
- Strong proof of causality and ruling out of alternative explanations
- High generalizability

Procedure is compelling
- How did you do things and why was this good?
- Be honest, disclose what you actually did

Form and style are compelling
- “Good appearance”
- Good story
- Simple
- Coercive text that “flows”
- Intuitive structure, titles
- Crisp and short
A special trick?
(see also Choi, 2002)

- **Action letter**
  - RnR is a success!
  - Action letter may be just as important as actual revision
  - Editor > reviewers
  - Recall comments in your own words
Action letter example

First, I address the editor’s feedback, then Rev#1, then Rev#2, etc.

I recall the major issues in order of importance, emphasizing what I felt was the essence of the comment.

I first reply by sharing my own thoughts, then say how I revised the paper, accordingly.

I stay polite and thankful.

Reviewer 2 provided us with helpful and challenging feedback. The reviewer’s main criticism is that our review of parasocial interactions does not capture the ongoing conversation that has taken place since Horton and Wohl’s (1956) seminal article on the topic. In addition, Reviewer 2 also sees differences between Horton and Wohl’s (1956) explication of parasocial interactions and our conceptualization: “You do make a good point about an immediate parasocial experience during viewing, but it substantively different than Horton & Wohl’s conception.”

We like to thank Reviewer 2 for these thoughtful remarks. In general, we think that Horton and Wohl (1956) provided a visionary essay on parasocial interactions and relationships. Their essay, however, is partly ambiguous and open to different interpretations. Accordingly, their approach has been interpreted in different ways. Reviewer 2 for his hope that our length we included a couple of paragraphs.

Reviewer 2 states that their format and a better format. These remarks were very helpful, and we changed the wording and layout of all hypotheses accordingly.

With respect to H3, Reviewer 2 asks if cognitive involvement wouldn’t take a viewer out of the narrative’s imaginary world?
Conclusion: Long-term strategy matters...
...and, after all, you know... ;)

“Success is 99% attitude and 1% aptitude.”  
~ Celestine Chua
Thank you very much for your attention!
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