

HOW TO WRITE AN ESSAY

Professional Essay Writing

Complete chapters, worked models, and companion guidance

1st Edition

Published 2026

AuthZ · Banana Bytes Publishing Inc.

AI assisted with development and verification of this instructional edition. Fictional examples are explicitly identified.
Assignment and venue requirements govern your own work.

PUBLICATION AND COPYRIGHT

HOW TO WRITE AN ESSAY

A Professional Guide to Publication, Evidence, and Editorial Practice

Published by Banana Bytes Publishing Inc.

Copyright © 2026 Banana Bytes Publishing Inc. All rights reserved except as expressly stated below.

First edition, 2026

PERSONAL-USE LICENCE

This edition is licensed to the purchaser, or to one person for whom it was purchased, for personal, non-commercial educational use. That person may download, store, and print copies solely for that use. Except as permitted by law, do not share, resell, redistribute, publicly post, publish, sublicense, remove rights notices, or use this guide commercially without prior written permission from Banana Bytes Publishing Inc. This licence does not limit fair dealing or other uses permitted by law.

EDUCATIONAL USE; NO GUARANTEED RESULTS

This guide provides general educational information and writing tools, not individualized advice from a teacher, instructor, academic adviser, admissions counsellor, editor, publisher, lawyer, financial adviser, or other professional. It supplements, and does not replace or override, current assignment, rubric, course, institutional, admissions, venue, editorial, or workplace requirements. Users must verify current requirements and sources and remain responsible for their work, submissions, decisions, compliance, and results. Grades, admissions, scholarships, publication, employment, and similar decisions are made by independent third parties using factors outside Banana Bytes Publishing Inc.'s control. Results vary; purchase or use of this guide does not guarantee any outcome.

NO WARRANTIES AND LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

Information is current only as of the publication date and may contain errors or become outdated. This guide is provided "as is". To the maximum extent permitted by applicable law, Banana Bytes Publishing Inc. disclaims all warranties and conditions that may lawfully be excluded, including those concerning accuracy, completeness, currency, usability, fitness for a particular purpose, and non-infringement.

To the maximum extent permitted by applicable law, Banana Bytes Publishing Inc. and its authors, editors, contributors, and distributors are not liable for indirect, incidental, special, consequential, exemplary, or punitive damages, or for loss of opportunity, revenue, data, or reputation, arising from use of, inability to use, or reliance on this guide. If liability cannot be excluded, their total aggregate liability relating to this guide will not exceed the amount paid for it or the minimum amount required by law, whichever is greater. These exclusions and limits do not apply to fraud, wilful misconduct, or any liability that cannot lawfully be excluded or limited. Any unenforceable provision will be limited or severed only to the minimum extent necessary; the remainder will continue in effect.

AI ASSISTANCE DISCLOSURE

AI tools assisted with organization, editing suggestions, quality review, and accessibility testing. The publisher is responsible for human review and approval of the final content, including its examples, sources, wording, design, and release decisions.

APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS

The applicable venue, editor, publisher, commissioning organization, employer, or institutional requirements take priority over this guide.

Contents and Starting Routes

Use the PDF bookmarks to move between chapters. Begin with chapter 1, or use the workbook to plan, record sources, and revise an existing draft.

Chapter 1: The Publishable Essay

Chapter 2: Choosing a Venue and Readership

Chapter 3: Reading Submission and Editorial Guidelines

Chapter 4: Defining the Essay's Contribution

Chapter 5: Developing a Publication-Ready Thesis

Chapter 6: Designing a Research and Evidence Strategy

Chapter 7: Building a Durable Source and Provenance Trail

Chapter 8: Attribution, Authorship, and Publication Ethics

Chapter 9: Structuring the Manuscript

Chapter 10: Writing Openings That Establish Value

Chapter 11: Developing Paragraphs for Argument and Momentum

Chapter 12: Voice, Style, and Disciplinary Language

Chapter 13: Drafting and Managing the Manuscript

Chapter 14: Developmental and Substantive Revision

Chapter 15: Copyediting, Fact-Checking, and Rights Review

Chapter 16: Similarity Review and Authorship Defence

Chapter 17: Preparing the Submission Package

Chapter 18: Submission, Peer Review, and Professional Continuation

Models, Audits, and Troubleshooting

Downloads, Worksheets, and Trackers

Appendix: Word and Google Docs Setup

Why We Write Essays

Essay writing is a continuing journey: it begins by building critical thinking in high school, deepens through academic inquiry at college or university, and reaches outward in professional practice to help readers develop their own ideas.

High school: building critical thinking

Essays help students think through a question rather than simply repeat information. They practise asking better questions, choosing useful evidence, explaining their reasoning, and considering other points of view.

College and university: improving understanding

Writing makes gaps visible. It can show where evidence is missing, a claim is too broad, an assumption needs examination, or more research is needed. Revision becomes part of developing a more accurate and defensible argument.

Professional practice: supporting the reader's thinking

A professional essay gives readers enough context, evidence, and reasoning to develop their own informed ideas. It can clarify complexity, challenge assumptions fairly, and contribute something useful to an ongoing conversation.

The process at every level

Ask a meaningful question. Explore evidence. Develop a focused claim. Organize and explain the reasoning. Revise when gaps or better ideas appear. As audiences and expectations grow, the process moves from building your own thinking to improving it and helping others think more deeply.

This guide focuses on that outward contribution. It helps you develop writing that is clear, credible, ethical, and useful to a defined audience while inviting readers to think more deeply about a question that matters.

How to Use This Guide

This guide teaches a publication workflow, not a universal house style. The journal, magazine, publisher, editor, or commissioning organization's guidelines take priority. Requirements may differ even between publications in the same field.

Follow the venue's requirements first. Check scope, readership, length, structure, citation, anonymization, file format, permissions, disclosures, deadlines, and submission method before drafting the final manuscript.

Learning Outcomes

- Choose a viable venue and define a meaningful contribution.
- Develop a publication-ready thesis and evidence strategy.
- Build a durable source, provenance, permissions, and revision trail.

- Write for a defined professional or public audience.
- Revise through developmental, substantive, copyediting, and editorial or peer-review stages where applicable.
- Handle attribution, authorship, text reuse, AI assistance, rights, and disclosure responsibly.
- Prepare a complete submission package and respond professionally to editorial decisions.

Chapter 1: The Publishable Essay

Begin With Reader Value

A professional essay needs a reason for its intended readers to spend time with it. That reason might be a new interpretation, a carefully documented public explanation, or a useful challenge to an established position. A polished course paper may still need a different question, structure, and evidence base to serve that purpose.

Start with three sentences: who the reader is, what the essay helps that reader understand, and what evidence makes the contribution credible. Treat these as working decisions that research and editorial feedback can change.

The Teaching Case

This guide uses **invented campus-transit records**, reproduced from the [university guide's teaching dossier](#):

- **Record A:** weekday boardings rose from 1,000 to 1,200 across two comparable four-week teaching periods before and after a service change. These are trips, not unique riders; there is no comparison route.
- **Record B:** the last weekday campus departure remained 20:10. Reliability was not measured.
- **Record C:** in an open, voluntary survey after the change, eight of twenty respondents reported a class ending at 20:30, after that last departure. There was no before survey or random sample.

Two **fictional outlet briefs** create different writing tasks. Outlet A requests a pitch for a 900-word public explainer, with links and an annotated source list. Outlet B requests a complete scholarly manuscript and abstract, with a separate title page and anonymous review file. These are teaching constraints, not actual publishers' rules.

Distinguish the Two Routes

For Outlet A, a useful angle is that increased use does not establish improved access for late classes. A real version would need authenticated records and reporting; the invented dossier cannot supply those.

For Outlet B, that observation is only a starting point. The manuscript would also need a defined scholarly conversation, an appropriate method, and evidence adequate to its contribution. Renaming an explainer a research article does not provide them. Professional publication does not always involve academic peer review.

Try It Yourself

Draft a contribution sentence for each outlet. For A, name a public misunderstanding the essay would clarify. For B, name a research question and the missing literature or evidence needed to investigate it. Do not invent a literature gap.

Check Your Work

Can a reader tell what your essay adds? Does the proposed form match the brief? Have you distinguished an interesting angle from a supported finding? Keep unanswered evidence questions visible before drafting.

Put This Chapter to Work

Write a one-sentence contribution for each of the two fictional outlet briefs, then identify the evidence each would need.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 2: Choosing a Venue and Readership

Choose a Reader Before a Destination

A venue's reputation is not a sufficient reason to send it a manuscript. Examine who it addresses, what forms it publishes, and how comparable pieces use evidence. Read several recent examples, including their openings, lengths, source treatment, and endings. Record observations separately from explicit requirements: a pattern in three articles is not necessarily a submission rule.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in [Chapter 1](#) are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Compare Fit in Concrete Terms

Outlet A's public explainer could address a reader who sees "boardings increased" and wonders whether a service problem has been solved. The essay would explain the distinction between more trips and later departures without assuming expertise in transport research.

Outlet B's scholarly reader would need to know the study's research setting, its relation to existing work, and how the method supports its conclusions. The small teaching dossier cannot establish that contribution. A writer choosing B must plan additional research rather than simply lengthening the public explanation.

Write a fit note with four fields: intended reader, article form, contribution, and evidence needed. Add a fifth field for a concrete mismatch. For A, the mismatch might be a manuscript dominated by unexplained methods terminology. For B, it might be a broad claim based only on a convenience sample.

Keep a Shortlist That Can Change

Choose a primary destination and one alternative. Save the guideline address and access date, then check them again before submission. Record practical constraints such as format, timing, fees if stated, and rules about simultaneous submissions. An absent rule is a question to resolve, not permission to assume.

Do not rewrite the whole manuscript for every possible reader at once. Choose one route, make its requirements visible, and retain a separate note describing what another route would require.

Try It Yourself

Write a 100-word fit note for Outlet A and a second for Outlet B. Identify one passage that could serve both audiences and one that would need substantial redevelopment. For a real project, replace the fictional briefs with current source notes from the actual venues.

Check Your Work

Have you identified readers more precisely than “everyone”? Are your requirements traceable to guidelines rather than guesses? Does your preferred venue accept the form you intend to offer? If its evidence expectations exceed your material, revise the project or change the destination.

Put This Chapter to Work

Compare two plausible venues using their actual guidelines and recent comparable articles; record one reason to rule each in or out.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 3: Reading Submission and Editorial Guidelines

Separate Requirements From Preferences

Read the complete instructions for the relevant article type. A journal may have different rules for research articles, reviews, and commentaries; a magazine may accept pitches for one section but completed pieces for another. Build your checklist from the route you will actually use.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in **Chapter 1** are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Translate the Brief Into Actions

For Outlet A, “pitch for a 900-word public explainer” means prepare a proposal for that length. It does not mean send a finished manuscript or claim that an editor has commissioned one. Include the proposed angle, reader value, evidence plan, and the material requested by the brief.

For Outlet B, the teaching brief requires a complete manuscript and abstract, a separate title page, and an anonymous review file. Create separate files, then inspect the review copy for author names, identifying acknowledgements, and document properties where relevant. Follow the actual venue’s approach to self-citation rather than deleting useful references automatically.

The briefs do not specify every detail. Whether A wants an attachment, whether B has an abstract limit, and whether either allows simultaneous submission remain unanswered. Mark those items “check current instructions.” Do not fill gaps with invented policies.

Build a Checklist You Can Verify

Use one line per requirement: instruction, source location, action, and status. “Prepare abstract” is an action; “abstract checked against the stated limit in the final file” is evidence of completion. Keep mandatory declarations separate from optional presentation preferences so that a formatting preference does not conceal a missing disclosure.

Recheck the instructions when the package is ready. If two official pages conflict, retain both references and seek clarification through the venue’s stated contact route before relying on either interpretation.

Try It Yourself

Convert the two fictional briefs into separate checklists. Add at least three unanswered questions to each. Then inspect a real venue’s instructions and replace questions only when you locate an answer. This exercise requires reading, not sending a submission.

Check Your Work

Does each checked item correspond to a file or verified decision? Have you distinguished pitch from manuscript, author file from review file, and explicit instructions from your preferences? An attractive package is incomplete if it omits a required component.

Put This Chapter to Work

Make a requirement checklist, recording the source and date for each item and leaving unanswered requirements marked as questions.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 4: Defining the Essay's Contribution

Name the Change in Understanding

A topic names the territory; a contribution says what the reader gains. “Campus transit” is a topic. “An increase in boardings does not answer whether students can leave after late classes” identifies a distinction worth explaining. Its value still depends on the intended readership and what that readership already knows.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in [Chapter 1](#) are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Test a Proposed Contribution

Consider this weak proposal: “Nobody has examined whether buses help students.” It asserts an unverified gap and offers no specific intervention. A more defensible public proposal is: “This explainer will separate three measures often blurred in this case: trips taken, scheduled departure times, and the experiences of survey respondents.”

For scholarly work, identifying that distinction is not proof of novelty. Search and read the relevant literature, record comparable arguments, and explain how your question, evidence, or interpretation differs. If another author has already made your point, cite that work and refine your contribution. Do not preserve a novelty claim merely because it makes the pitch sound stronger.

Write the Boundary Beside the Promise

Pair the contribution with a boundary: “The dossier can compare these measures, but it cannot estimate campus-wide unmet demand or isolate the service change’s causal effect.” This is part of defining the project, not a disclaimer to add after making a larger claim.

Also write an editorial objection: “The distinction is useful, but the proposed story needs authenticated evidence and a clearer reason for this audience to read it now.” That objection suggests research and audience work rather than decorative rewriting. A contribution can be worthwhile while a particular manuscript remains unready.

Try It Yourself

Complete three sentences: “Readers may currently assume...,” “My essay will establish or clarify...,” and “My evidence cannot establish...” Then write the strongest plausible editorial objection. Identify whether answering it requires research, a narrower claim, a different form, or a different venue.

Check Your Work

Have you claimed novelty without searching? Is the contribution more specific than the subject? Can every promised outcome be matched to planned evidence or analysis? Keep claims about what “no one” has done provisional until a suitable literature review supports them.

Put This Chapter to Work

Write a contribution sentence, a boundary sentence, and the strongest reason an editor might find the proposal insufficient.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 5: Developing a Publication-Ready Thesis

Give the Claim an Evidence Boundary

A publication-ready thesis is ready for scrutiny, not immune to change. Write the claim beside the evidence that supports it and the reasoning that connects them. If that connection depends on an unstated assumption, make the assumption explicit and test it.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in [Chapter 1](#) are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Revise an Overclaim

An overstated thesis says: “The service change solved students’ transport problems.” Record A shows a rise from 1,000 to 1,200 boardings, but boardings count trips. Record B shows an unchanged last departure. Record C describes only twenty volunteers, eight of whom reported a late class. None establishes that all transport problems were solved.

A more defensible controlling claim is: “The records show increased use alongside an unresolved scheduling mismatch for eight survey respondents; boardings alone are therefore an inadequate measure of late-class access in this case.” The claim names the comparison and limits the reported experience to the respondents.

This thesis does not establish how many students across campus face the mismatch, whether the change caused the increase in trips, or which remedy would work best. Those would require additional evidence. A strong sentence cannot supply a missing study.

Take the Best Objection Seriously

An editor might object that more boardings still indicate a benefit. That is compatible with the revised thesis: increased use and incomplete late-class access can coexist. Acknowledge the observed increase rather than dismissing it to protect the argument.

For a public explainer, express the distinction in ordinary language early. For a scholarly manuscript, situate the same claim within a defined research question and method. The underlying evidentiary boundary should survive either change of style.

Try It Yourself

Draft a thesis in no more than two sentences. Underline its consequential terms: words such as “caused,” “all,” “effective,” or “failed” need particular attention. Match each to evidence, then write an objection that a fair-minded reader could raise. Revise the thesis if the objection exposes a real weakness.

Check Your Work

Does the thesis distinguish observation from explanation? Does it identify the population and measure being discussed? Can the manuscript’s planned sections support it? Remove claims that the available material cannot responsibly carry.

Source Guidance

A thesis needs a scope and interpretation that the evidence can support. (**Harvard College Writing Center**)

Put This Chapter to Work

Revise an overstated thesis and identify the strongest evidence-based objection to your replacement.

Sources

Harvard College Writing Center. “Thesis.” *Harvard University*. Accessed 6 Sept. 2026.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 6: Designing a Research and Evidence Strategy

Research the Claim, Not Just the Topic

Begin with the claims your manuscript proposes to make. For each, identify the evidence required, where it could be obtained, how it would be checked, and what finding would weaken your position. This keeps research from becoming a collection of material that happens to agree with the pitch.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in **Chapter 1** are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Match Each Question to a Method

To establish a change in recorded trips, inspect the counting method and comparable periods behind Record A. To describe scheduled late-class access, compare timetable departures with relevant class ending times. To understand lived experience, a real project might require interviews or a suitably designed study; the twenty voluntary responses cannot represent the whole campus by assertion.

To claim that the service change caused increased use, the simple before-and-after count is insufficient on its own. The plan must address alternative explanations and the design needed to distinguish them. If that work is outside the project's scope, narrow the claim instead of labelling the existing count "proof."

Plan Verification and Access

A public reporting plan can list records to authenticate, people to approach, questions to ask, and assertions to put to relevant parties. Do not describe an interview as completed until it has happened. A scholarly plan also needs the appropriate method, data handling, and any institutional or research-ethics requirements that apply to the actual work. Resolve those with the relevant institution before collecting material that depends on them.

Keep a stopping rule tied to the question. "I have ten sources" says little about adequacy. "Each central claim has suitable evidence, relevant alternatives have been examined, and remaining limits are explicit" is a more useful draft-readiness test. It does not replace independent review.

Try It Yourself

Make three evidence-plan entries: the boarding increase, the scheduling mismatch, and the scale of unmet demand. For each, name the current evidence, missing information, verification task, and decision if that information cannot be obtained. The last claim should remain unresolved with this dossier.

Check Your Work

Are your methods capable of answering your questions? Have you planned to seek contrary evidence? Does your schedule include verification and revision? Mark unavailable evidence as missing rather than substituting a confident sentence.

Put This Chapter to Work

Create an evidence plan for three claims, recording what you have, what is missing, and what would change your view.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 7: Building a Durable Source and Provenance Trail

Make the Evidence Retrievable

A source trail should let another reader reconstruct how an important sentence was written. A browser bookmark alone may not identify the relevant passage, version, or limitation. Record enough information to find the material again and understand how you used it.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in [Chapter 1](#) are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Build One Complete Record

For the sentence “weekday boardings rose from 1,000 to 1,200,” a practice record might contain:

- **Source:** fictional Record A in this guide’s teaching dossier; not a real dataset.
- **Locator:** count-table description, two comparable four-week teaching periods.
- **Material used:** the two totals; no direct quotation.
- **Meaning and limit:** recorded trips increased; unique riders and causation are not established.
- **Manuscript use:** evidence paragraph comparing usage with scheduling.
- **Verification status:** checked against the teaching dossier; real publication evidence still required.

For actual research, also record author or organisation, title, date or version when available, URL or repository identifier, access date, and a precise page, section, item, or timestamp. Preserve an appropriate copy or extract when permitted and useful. Do not invent missing bibliographic details.

Keep Notes in Distinct Categories

Mark exact wording as a quotation immediately. Put paraphrase in a separate field and your interpretation in another. “The timetable’s final departure is 20:10” and “the operator ignored students” are different kinds of statement; the second attributes a motive that the timetable does not establish.

Keep a short decision log when evidence changes the thesis. Here, the working idea shifts from general service success to a comparison of usage and late-class scheduling. Record what changed and why. Document substantive AI assistance, including suggested research directions or wording retained, while checking every source independently.

Try It Yourself

Create a source record for Record C. Include its twenty volunteers, eight late-class reports, lack of a before survey, and limited sampling. Then trace one sentence in your draft back to the record. Ask a reader whether the record permits them to check the sentence without guessing.

Check Your Work

Can you distinguish borrowed language from your own notes? Are consequential claims linked to locators? Have you recorded limitations alongside useful findings? A complete-looking bibliography cannot compensate for an untraceable claim.

Source Guidance

Paraphrased ideas still require attribution; exact borrowed wording needs quotation treatment. (**University of Toronto**)

Put This Chapter to Work

Build a source record for one consequential claim, including a locator, access date, limitation, and manuscript location.

Sources

University of Toronto. "Citations, Quoting and Paraphrasing." *Academic Integrity*. Accessed 6 Sept. 2026.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 8: Attribution, Authorship, and Publication Ethics

Credit the Actual Contribution

Attribution tells readers where material came from; authorship identifies responsibility and contribution under the relevant publication's rules. Do not treat either as a courtesy to add at the end. Discuss contributor roles early and revisit them when the work changes.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in **Chapter 1** are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Separate Four Decisions

First, trace borrowed wording, ideas, data, images, and translations. Exact wording needs appropriate quotation treatment; a paraphrase still needs attribution. Second, determine author credit and acknowledgement using the actual venue's criteria and the contributors' documented work. Third, record any licence or permission conditions that need review. Fourth, prepare required declarations about relevant interests, funding, assistance, or prior dissemination.

These decisions are related but not interchangeable. A citation does not resolve every reuse condition. An acknowledgement does not settle whether a person should be an author. A disclosure does not make otherwise prohibited assistance acceptable. Resolve uncertainties with the appropriate editor, institution, or rights adviser for the real project.

Practise an Accurate Disclosure

Suppose a writer used an AI tool to propose three outlines, selected and changed one, and retained two edited sentences. A statement saying "AI was used only for spelling" would be inaccurate. A working record should describe the actual structural and wording assistance, the writer's checks, and where the venue requires disclosure. Do not include private or restricted material in a tool without the required authority.

In this teaching guide, the examples and lesson wording were developed with AI assistance. That is different from a real author having conducted interviews or collected transit data. Never convert a generated example into a claimed reporting event.

Try It Yourself

Take one paragraph and mark every borrowed element. List the people and tools that materially contributed to it. Write a factual process note, then compare it with the current requirements for your intended venue. Flag unresolved authorship or reuse questions rather than deciding them by convenience.

Check Your Work

Is credit complete and proportionate? Does each proposed author understand and accept the relevant responsibilities? Does the disclosure match what actually happened? Keep the manuscript at a draft stage while a material credit, policy, or permissions question remains unresolved.

Source Guidance

Paraphrased ideas still require attribution; exact borrowed wording needs quotation treatment. (**University of Toronto**)

Put This Chapter to Work

Audit one manuscript passage for borrowed material, contributor credit, permissions questions, and accurate AI disclosure.

Sources

University of Toronto. "Citations, Quoting and Paraphrasing." *Academic Integrity*. Accessed 6 Sept. 2026.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 9: Structuring the Manuscript

Give Each Section a Job

An outline is a sequence of decisions, not a collection of subject labels. "Background" is vague until you explain what the reader needs from it. Write each section's purpose as a sentence and connect it to the manuscript's contribution.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in **Chapter 1** are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Plan the Public Explainer

For Outlet A's proposed 900-word piece, a working allocation might be 100 words establishing the question, 180 explaining the boarding count, 220 comparing the timetable and late-class reports, 200 examining what remains unknown, and 200 explaining the implications. These add to 900; the allocation is a planning tool, not a rule imposed by the fictional outlet.

The reader's path is deliberate: what appears to have improved, what that measure captures, what another measure reveals, and what can responsibly be concluded. A history of every campus bus route would interrupt that path unless it supplies necessary context.

Plan the Scholarly Route Separately

Outlet B's manuscript needs the structure appropriate to its actual article type and method. Do not assume that every scholarly essay requires identical empirical-report sections. For a research article using collected data, readers would need sufficient account of the question, relevant literature, method, findings, and interpretation to assess the work. The teaching dossier is not a completed study from which those sections can be invented.

Place a serious objection where readers need it. The boarding increase may be valuable even though it does not resolve late-class scheduling. Addressing that point during the comparison is more useful than appending a token counterargument after the conclusion.

Try It Yourself

Outline the public explainer in five sections using the allocation above or your own. For each, add a reader question and evidence label. Then sketch a scholarly route and mark every section that would require work beyond the dossier. Explain one change in order between the two routes.

Check Your Work

Does the sequence develop the controlling claim? Are any sections repeating the same job? Have you reserved space for limitations and alternatives? After drafting, reverse-outline the actual paragraphs and compare that structure with your plan; revise whichever no longer serves the argument.

Source Guidance

A reverse outline lists existing paragraph points so their order and gaps can be examined. **(Harvard College Writing Center)**

Put This Chapter to Work

Create a section outline in which every section has a reader question, a claim, and an evidence requirement.

Sources

Harvard College Writing Center. "Tips for Organizing Your Essay." *Harvard University*. Accessed 6 Sept. 2026.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 10: Writing Openings That Establish Value

Establish the Question Early

An opening should orient its intended reader and give a reason to continue. That does not require a dramatic anecdote. Use a scene only when you have evidence for its details and a reason to include it. A compelling invention remains an invention, even when it resembles something that might have happened.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in **Chapter 1** are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Compare Two Public Leads

A flawed lead says: "Stranded students shivered in the rain as the last bus vanished." The dossier contains no observed scene, weather report, or account of students watching a bus leave. Presenting this as reporting would fabricate evidence.

A supportable **teaching-model lead** says: "Campus bus boardings rose from 1,000 to 1,200 after a service change. The last weekday departure, however, stayed at 20:10. For eight survey respondents with a class ending at 20:30, more trips on the route did not remove that scheduling mismatch."

The model introduces a tension using the available records. It does not claim that all students were stranded or that the change caused the increase. A real published lead would need verified records and the venue's

preferred source treatment; this fictional paragraph is for analysis only.

Establish Scholarly Value Without Inventing a Gap

A provisional scholarly opening could introduce the distinction between service usage and schedule compatibility, then state the question being investigated. Its next task would be to position that question within verified literature. Do not write “researchers have overlooked this distinction” unless the relevant review supports that assessment.

Draft the opening after the argument has taken shape, then revise it again near completion. If it promises a causal evaluation while the body provides a descriptive comparison, change the promise or obtain the necessary evidence.

Try It Yourself

Write a 75-word public lead using only A-C. Then write a provisional scholarly opening that identifies the question and clearly marks the literature work still needed. Underline each claim and identify its evidence or unresolved status. Remove any imagined sensory detail presented as observation.

Check Your Work

Does the opening make the essay’s value clear? Can the body deliver its promise? Have you distinguished a fictional teaching scene from reporting? Read the opening beside the conclusion: their scope should agree even if their wording differs.

Put This Chapter to Work

Write a public opening and a scholarly opening, then identify what each promises the manuscript will deliver.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 11: Developing Paragraphs for Argument and Momentum

Build Movement Through Reasoning

A paragraph advances the manuscript when it answers a question raised by the argument and prepares the reader for the next one. Evidence needs interpretation, but interpretation must stay within what that evidence can support. A polished transition cannot repair a missing connection.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in **Chapter 1** are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Compare a List With an Argument

A weak paragraph reads: “Boardings increased. The last bus left at 20:10. Eight respondents had a late class. Transit is important.” The facts are adjacent, but the reader must supply the relationship and decide what “important” means.

A **teaching-model revision** reads: “The rise in boardings measures increased use, not the removal of every scheduling barrier. Record A counts 1,200 weekday boardings after the change, compared with 1,000 before it. Record B nevertheless keeps the last departure at 20:10. That departure precedes the 20:30 class ending reported by eight of the twenty volunteers in Record C. The records therefore support a narrower conclusion: use increased while this reported timing mismatch remained.”

The first sentence identifies the distinction. The middle supplies the relevant measures. The ending explains their combined significance without treating volunteers as a representative sample. In a real manuscript, source treatment would follow the venue’s requirements and use actual verified evidence.

Make the Next Step Necessary

A following paragraph could ask how widespread the mismatch is. Its transition might read: “These reports identify a problem to investigate, but they do not establish its campus-wide scale.” That sentence develops a limitation already present in the evidence. “Furthermore, transport matters” merely announces another generality.

Paragraph length should follow the reasoning and reading context. Split when the paragraph takes on a genuinely new task, not whenever it reaches a fixed sentence count.

Try It Yourself

Revise the weak paragraph in your own words. Label its claim, evidence, interpretation, and next question. Then remove one sentence and explain what is lost. If nothing changes, the sentence may be redundant or the argument may still be too vague.

Check Your Work

Does each detail contribute to the paragraph’s point? Is the inference justified? Does the final sentence advance understanding rather than simply repeat the first? Check that the transition leads to work the next paragraph actually performs.

Source Guidance

A paragraph can connect its main point, evidence, and analysis without following a fixed formula. (**Harvard College Writing Center**)

Put This Chapter to Work

Revise a paragraph so that its evidence, interpretation, and transition each perform a distinct job.

Sources

Harvard College Writing Center. "Anatomy of a Body Paragraph." *Harvard University*. Accessed 6 Sept. 2026.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 12: Voice, Style, and Disciplinary Language

Make Authority Depend on Precision

An authoritative voice lets readers see what is known, how it is known, and where the argument stops. Inflated wording and certainty can obscure those distinctions. Choose terms that do useful work for your intended audience and define them when their meaning could be contested.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in [Chapter 1](#) are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Revise for Meaning Before Elegance

Consider: "The implementation effectuated a comprehensive optimisation of student mobility." The sentence sounds formal, but "comprehensive" exceeds the dossier, "mobility" is undefined, and the causal claim is unsupported.

A clearer revision is: "Recorded weekday boardings increased, while the final scheduled departure remained unchanged." This states two observations. If the next sentence interprets access, define the measure: "Here, late-class access means a scheduled departure after the reported class ending." That narrow definition does not mean affordability, reliability, or disability access is unimportant; those dimensions are not measured by this comparison.

Adapt Without Distorting

For public readers, "the survey was open to volunteers" may communicate the sampling issue more directly than an unexplained technical label. For specialists, an appropriate sampling term can save space, but it still needs enough methodological detail to be assessable. Neither audience benefits from calling twenty volunteers "the student population."

Use active voice when it clarifies responsibility: "The research team compared the two periods" identifies an actor, if such a team actually did the work. Passive voice can be appropriate when the action or material matters more, but do not use it to imply that an unperformed check "was verified."

Try It Yourself

Rewrite the inflated sentence for Outlet A. Then write a specialist version that defines the outcome being assessed and preserves the same limits. Compare both against A-C. Highlight any word that adds causation, representativeness, motive, or certainty not present in the records.

Check Your Work

Can you explain each technical term in ordinary language? Have you removed necessary qualifications in pursuit of brevity? Does the voice suit the venue without imitating another writer's distinctive phrasing? Read aloud for friction, then return to the evidence: a smooth sentence can still be wrong.

Put This Chapter to Work

Revise one paragraph for a public audience and one for a specialist audience without changing its evidentiary meaning.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 13: Drafting and Managing the Manuscript

Draft in Deliberate Passes

Separate the work that requires different kinds of attention. A useful sequence is argument draft, evidence check, structural revision, sentence edit, and submission preparation. You may move back and forth, but naming the current task helps prevent a polished introduction from consuming the time needed to verify a central claim.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in [Chapter 1](#) are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Make Gaps Visible

Suppose the draft contains: “The service change caused the increase in boardings.” Add an explicit working note: “[Causal evidence missing: narrow to observed change unless a suitable analysis supports causation.]” Do not replace the note with a plausible mechanism and treat the problem as solved.

For the public route, draft the central comparison before refining the lead. For the scholarly route, develop the method and evidence account from work actually performed. Do not fill conventional headings with invented procedures merely to make a manuscript look complete.

Working notes belong in the drafting system, not the submitted file. Give each unresolved item an owner or next action and a clear status. “Check source” is less useful than “confirm Record A counts trips rather than

individual riders.”

Keep Versions Understandable

Use filenames or version history that distinguish the current working manuscript, the reviewed copy, and the submitted package. Preserve a dated submission snapshot so later feedback can be matched to what the editor received. For collaborative work, agree on where changes are made and how conflicting edits are resolved.

Record decisions that affect meaning. If the thesis changes from general service success to a narrower comparison, update the abstract, title, opening, conclusion, and pitch as necessary. A new filename alone does not keep those elements aligned.

Try It Yourself

Plan five work sessions for a short manuscript. Give each a concrete output, such as “all central claims mapped to sources,” rather than “work on essay.” Include time to respond to a failed check. Then create a version note explaining the transit thesis change and which parts of the package must follow it.

Check Your Work

Can a collaborator identify the authoritative draft? Are unresolved evidence questions visible and assigned? Does the schedule leave time for substantive revision? Before export, search for working markers and verify each was resolved, not merely deleted.

Put This Chapter to Work

Create a drafting schedule with distinct checkpoints for argument, source verification, and package preparation.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 14: Developmental and Substantive Revision

Reassess the Manuscript's Promise

Developmental revision asks whether the manuscript's contribution, scope, structure, and evidence work together. Read the draft once without polishing sentences. Write its actual claim in one sentence, then compare it with the title, opening, abstract or pitch, and conclusion. Disagreement among them often points to unfinished reasoning.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in [Chapter 1](#) are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Diagnose Before Rewriting

Imagine a draft titled "A Transit Problem Solved." Its opening celebrates the boarding increase, its middle describes the unchanged departure, and its conclusion recommends a later service. The manuscript has not reconciled its success claim with the scheduling problem, and it has not evaluated the proposed remedy.

A revision plan might begin by narrowing the thesis to the distinction between use and late-class access. Next, move the timetable comparison beside the boarding count. Then explain the survey's limits and replace the unsupported remedy claim with a question that further evidence would need to answer. Only after these changes should the title and sentences be polished.

Respond to the Strongest Alternative

Do not remove the boarding increase because it complicates the argument. Explain that it may show a valuable change in use while answering a different question from schedule compatibility. Fair treatment of this alternative makes the comparison more precise.

Create a reverse outline with one sentence per existing paragraph. Mark repetition, unsupported claims, missing steps, and material that does not serve the contribution. Decide whether each problem calls for moving, cutting, adding evidence, narrowing, or rewriting. Adding a transition is appropriate only when the underlying connection exists.

Try It Yourself

Write a six-paragraph outline for the flawed "problem solved" manuscript. Reverse-outline its likely argument, then propose three revisions in order of consequence. Explain why correcting the title alone would leave the deeper problem intact. For your own work, complete the most consequential revision before editing punctuation.

Check Your Work

Does the revised structure support the final claim? Have you retained relevant contrary evidence? Does every recommendation follow from analysis actually present? Ask a reader to describe the argument without seeing your outline; a mismatch is useful revision evidence, not a verdict on the project.

Source Guidance

A reverse outline lists existing paragraph points so their order and gaps can be examined. (**Harvard College Writing Center**)

Put This Chapter to Work

Reverse-outline a draft, identify its largest evidentiary weakness, and make a revision plan in order of consequence.

Sources

Harvard College Writing Center. "Tips for Organizing Your Essay." *Harvard University*. Accessed 6 Sept. 2026.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 15: Copyediting, Fact-Checking, and Rights Review

Keep Three Checks Distinct

Copyediting improves consistency and expression. Fact-checking compares claims with evidence. Rights review examines the conditions attached to material you propose to reuse. Completing one does not establish that the others are complete. Work from a stable manuscript and record changes that affect meaning.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in **Chapter 1** are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Check Numbers and Their Meaning

The increase from 1,000 to 1,200 is 200 boardings, or 20 per cent of the starting total. It is not evidence of 200 additional individual students. Eight of twenty is 40 per cent of the respondents, not 40 per cent of all students. Recheck both arithmetic and the nouns attached to it.

The timetable comparison is equally specific: 20:10 precedes 20:30 by twenty minutes. That establishes a scheduling mismatch for the reported class ending; it does not establish what alternative transport respondents used or whether every relevant class ended then.

For real work, verify quotations against the source, names and roles at the relevant date, dates and chronology, units, denominators, and the fit between citations and sentences. A source containing similar words may still fail to support the claim you wrote.

Review Reused Material Deliberately

For each external image, substantial extract, table, or other reused item, record its source, intended use, available licence or permission information, and any unresolved conditions. Attribution alone does not answer every reuse question. Avoid making a universal legal conclusion from the material's online availability; seek appropriate review where the answer is unclear.

This guide's fictional text and figures are teaching material, not a substitute for acquiring real research evidence. If you replace them with actual material, repeat the source and reuse checks for that material.

Try It Yourself

Correct these two sentences: "The change attracted 200 new students" and "Forty per cent of students could not get home." Explain which parts are unsupported and write replacements using A-C. Then create a reuse record for an image you might include, leaving unknown conditions unresolved.

Check Your Work

Are quantities paired with the right population and unit? Are quotations exact and interpretations labelled? Have factual corrections reached the title, abstract, and captions? A manuscript with a material unresolved evidence or reuse issue is not ready for release.

Put This Chapter to Work

Audit five consequential statements and one reused item, documenting the evidence or unresolved question for each.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 16: Similarity Review and Authorship Defence

Examine the Passage Behind the Flag

A similarity report can direct attention to overlapping text; the editorial task is to compare the actual passages and their attribution. Do not substitute a target percentage for that examination. A bibliography entry and an uncredited borrowed paragraph raise different questions even if both appear as matches.

Use the same care with claims about AI authorship. A tool output is not a substitute for examining the work, its sources, applicable rules, and available process evidence. Do not accuse someone on the basis of a score alone or treat a favourable score as an originality certificate.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in [Chapter 1](#) are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Practise a Contextual Review

Suppose a draft repeats the teaching model’s sentence, “Recorded weekday boardings increased, while the final scheduled departure remained unchanged.” If you borrowed that exact wording for discussion, identify its source and use appropriate quotation treatment. If you intend to explain the evidence independently, return to A-C and write your own analysis with attribution to the material you used.

Swapping “rose” for “increased” does not by itself resolve borrowed phrasing or reasoning. Nor should you distort a technical term merely to reduce overlap. The goal is accurate credit and independent, supportable work.

Preserve a Useful Process Record

Keep dated drafts, source notes, consequential revision decisions, and an accurate record of permitted assistance. These can help explain how a manuscript developed. They do not automatically prove that every sentence is original or that every requirement was followed.

If an editor raises a concern, identify the exact passage and rule involved, compare the evidence, correct verified problems, and respond through the stated process. Avoid unsupported counter-allegations. For sensitive records, share only what is appropriate and required through an authorised channel.

Try It Yourself

Compare one paragraph with its closest source. Mark exact language, paraphrased ideas, citations, and your own interpretation. Write a short review note explaining the overlap and any repair. If a report is available, use it to locate passages rather than to decide the outcome.

Check Your Work

Does your conclusion follow from the comparison? Are quotation and paraphrase properly credited? Have you recorded uncertainty rather than declaring guilt or innocence beyond the evidence? Keep the review focused on the material and the applicable requirements.

Source Guidance

Paraphrased ideas still require attribution; exact borrowed wording needs quotation treatment. (**University of Toronto**)

Put This Chapter to Work

Review an overlapping passage against its source, repair any attribution problem, and record what the comparison establishes.

Sources

University of Toronto. "Citations, Quoting and Paraphrasing." *Academic Integrity*. Accessed 6 Sept. 2026.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 17: Preparing the Submission Package

Package the Work You Actually Have

The submission package should accurately represent the manuscript's contribution, evidence, and status. Prepare it from the final argument, not from an early pitch that research has overtaken. Follow the current instructions for the specific venue and article type.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in **Chapter 1** are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Draft the Public Pitch

An **exercise-only pitch** for Outlet A might read: "I propose a 900-word explainer about why increased bus use does not necessarily resolve late-class scheduling. The piece would compare boarding counts, departure times, and the limits of student survey evidence. For a real commission, I would need to authenticate the records and complete the reporting before making factual claims."

This model states an angle and an evidence plan. It does not claim interviews have occurred, promise access you do not have, or present the invented case as news. A real pitch should replace the classroom scenario with a supportable project and include the specific materials the editor requests.

Prepare the Scholarly Package

Outlet B's fictional brief calls for a complete manuscript, abstract, separate title page, and anonymous review file. The dossier is insufficient to produce an actual research submission. In a real project, write the abstract from the completed work: question, approach, principal finding or argument, and significance, within the venue's stated requirements.

Check that identifying material appears only where the review instructions allow it. Reconcile author information, acknowledgements, declarations, references, supplementary files, and any cover letter. Do not add a declaration that is untrue merely because a form appears to expect it; resolve the underlying question first.

Inspect the Final Files

Open each exported file and check its title, revision, headings, notes, figures, links, and ending. Remove unresolved drafting comments only after addressing them. Confirm that every attachment is the intended version and that the package agrees with the submission checklist.

Try It Yourself

Create an unsent pitch for A and a file inventory for B. Mark invented material and missing research explicitly. Compare each promise in the pitch or proposed abstract with the evidence available. Revise promises that the work cannot fulfil.

Check Your Work

Is the package complete for this route? Does it describe completed work and planned work accurately? Have all contributors approved the relevant final materials? Keep a dated copy of the exact package once it is actually submitted.

Put This Chapter to Work

Prepare an unsent package checklist and compare every claim in the pitch or abstract with the manuscript.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Chapter 18: Submission, Peer Review, and Professional Continuation

Record What Happens After Sending

Once you actually submit, save the package, date, destination, and any confirmation or manuscript identifier. Follow the venue's stated timetable and contact process for queries. Do not infer acceptance from an upload receipt or assume that every professional submission receives scholarly peer review.

Fictional teaching case: The campus-transit records and outlet briefs in **Chapter 1** are invented practice material. They are not publishable evidence or real submission policies.

Distinguish Editorial Routes

Outlet A may respond to the pitch with interest, questions, a request for changes, or a decline. Clarify the actual commissioning terms before treating an expression of interest as a settled assignment. Outlet B may make an editorial decision or seek peer review under its process. The fictional brief does not guarantee either an external review or acceptance.

If the work is declined, distinguish a fit problem from a substantive criticism. A new destination may require a different opening, evidence base, or form. Check its policies before sending, including any conditions relevant to an existing submission.

Build a Traceable Revision Response

Consider two **fictional reviewer comments**. First: "The manuscript treats boardings as individual riders." A useful response is: "Agreed. I revised the opening and evidence paragraph to say 'boardings' and removed the claim about additional students." Identify the final section or page using the submitted revision's actual numbering.

Second: "Delete the boarding increase because it weakens the scheduling argument." A reasoned response could be: "I retained the verified increase because it is relevant evidence. I revised the comparison to explain that increased use and a late-class scheduling mismatch can coexist." Respectful disagreement needs a substantive explanation, not a claim that the reviewer failed to understand.

Respond to each comment, distinguish completed changes from proposed work, and check that the response accurately describes the revised manuscript. Do not promise a new analysis unless it has been performed and assessed.

Try It Yourself

Write responses to both comments and revise the affected sentences. Add one further comment that would require new evidence. Explain whether you would obtain that evidence, narrow the claim, or discuss a scope change with the editor.

Check Your Work

Can the editor locate every claimed change? Have new edits introduced inconsistent statements elsewhere? After acceptance, check proofs and follow the publisher's correction process if an error emerges. Preserve the final record and reflect on what the evidence and review changed in your approach.

Put This Chapter to Work

Draft a response to two substantive editorial comments, showing the change made or the evidence-based reason for a different response.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with developing this lesson, its fictional teaching examples, exercises, and review checks. Human editors remain responsible for source verification, educational suitability, and publication approval.

Models, Audits, and Troubleshooting

Choose the Correct Publication Route

The **fictional outlet briefs** in [Chapter 1](#) define two practice routes. Outlet A asks for a pitch for a 900-word public explainer with links and an annotated source list. Outlet B asks for a complete scholarly manuscript and abstract, separate title page, and anonymous review file. These are invented constraints, not real venue policies.

Pitch route: venue research > angle and reporting plan > pitch > editorial decision > agreed commission where offered > verified manuscript > editorial revision.

Completed-manuscript route: contribution > evidence and rights trail > draft > substantive revision > final checks > submission package > editorial assessment and peer review where applicable > decision and any requested revision.

Follow the actual venue's instructions. An expression of interest is not automatically a commission, and an upload receipt is not acceptance.

Contribution and Pitch Model

Exercise-only proposal: "I propose a 900-word explainer distinguishing increased campus-bus use from late-class schedule compatibility. The piece would compare boarding counts, departure times, and survey limits. A real version would require authenticated records and completed reporting."

This model uses the fictional transit case. It does not claim interviews, a completed study, or access to records that the writer does not have. For a real pitch, state what you can support and what remains planned.

Manuscript Audit Example

- **Claim:** Boardings increased while the last departure stayed unchanged.
- **Sources and locators:** fictional Record A, count table; Record B, timetable row.

- **Verification:** compared with the chapter 1 teaching dossier only; not real-world evidence.
- **Limit:** Trips are not unique riders, and the comparison alone does not establish causation.
- **Rights and disclosure:** Record actual conditions for real reused material; do not prefill “permission checked.”
- **Action:** Retain the narrow descriptive comparison and seek real evidence for any publication proposal.

Submission-Package Prompts

Draft a cover letter or pitch from facts you have checked: manuscript title, contribution, audience fit, completed work, planned work where appropriate, and requested declarations. Do not copy claims that a manuscript is exclusive, fully verified, or assisted only by proofreading unless those statements are true. For anonymous review, follow the venue’s file and self-citation instructions.

The workbook supplies writable package checks. The separate tracker records one submission and its decisions; save another copy for another venue, subject to the applicable submission rules.

Reviewer-Response Model

Fictional comment: “The manuscript treats boardings as individual riders.”

Model response: “Agreed. I changed the opening and evidence paragraph to identify boardings as trips and removed the claim about additional students.” Add actual page or section locators after revising.

Fictional comment: “Remove the boarding increase because it weakens the scheduling argument.”

Model response: “I retained the increase as relevant evidence and explained that increased use and a scheduling mismatch can coexist.” A reasoned disagreement needs evidence and a concrete response to the concern.

Professional Integrity Audit

- Central claims have sources, locators, and calibrated support.
- Borrowed wording, ideas, data, images, methods, and code receive appropriate credit.
- Rights, licences, restrictions, and unresolved questions are recorded.
- Authorship, assistance, reuse, funding, and conflicts are handled under the actual requirements.
- The package matches the final manuscript and the venue’s current instructions.
- Every claimed revision is present in the revised file.
- The submission copy, confirmation, decision, and next action are preserved.

Troubleshooting

Treat a similarity report as a lead for contextual comparison, not an originality certificate. When a source changes, identify the version actually consulted. When a reviewer identifies a real gap, obtain evidence or narrow the claim. When the destination is a poor fit, reassess the contribution and form before resubmitting elsewhere.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with drafting and reconciling the teaching models, exercises, and companion guidance. AuthZ retains editorial responsibility.

Downloads, Worksheets, and Trackers

Start Where You Are

If you are beginning a project, read [Chapter 1](#) and complete the workbook's planning pages. If your draft already exists, begin with the revision and final-check pages. If you need help with sources, use the completed teaching example, then write in a blank source record.

Choose the Format You Need

The complete guide PDF contains the revised chapters, reference models, and document-setup notes. The printable workbook uses white pages and outlined writing areas. The fillable workbook has the same prompts with interactive fields. Use the separate submission tracker to record venue, version, decision, reviewer response, and next action.

Save, Type, and Check

Download a blank copy and save a project-specific filename before typing. Use a PDF reader that supports form fields. Save, close, and reopen your copy to confirm that entries persist. Response areas have deliberate character limits so printed entries remain visible; continue on a labelled page when necessary. The blank downloadable master contains no personal entries and no reset script.

Read Source Examples Correctly

Only the completed example is labelled fictional teaching material. Blank records and continuation pages are yours to complete. Record the actual source, precise locator, exact wording or paraphrase, your analysis, and the limits of the evidence. Never use an invented source from an exercise as real research.

Edition and Requirements

1st Edition

Published 2026

The guide, workbooks, and trackers contain matching material. The institution's or venue's requirements remain authoritative for your own work.

Editorial disclosure: AI assisted with revising the workbook instructions and checking consistency across formats.

Companion Download Links

[Complete guide](#)

[Printable workbook](#)

[Fillable workbook](#)

[Printable tracker](#)

[Fillable tracker](#)

Word and Google Docs Setup

Language Coverage

The AuthZ essay guides and worksheets use Canadian English as their default editorial convention (en-CA), but their principles apply equally to US English, UK English, and other English-language settings. Follow the assignment, instructor, institution, publisher, journal, or venue requirements first. When a local requirement differs, use that requirement consistently and record the choice in your working notes.

Preparing a Word or Google Docs Working File

Before writing

Set the document language and dictionary to the required variety of English. Confirm the assignment or venue's spelling, citation, heading, and file-format requirements.

While drafting

Use built-in spell check and grammar check as review aids, not as final authorities. Check names, quotations, citations, terminology, and regional spellings yourself.

Page setup

Set margins, page size, font, line spacing, paragraph spacing, headings, and page breaks to the governing instructions. Add a footer and page numbers when required; keep them clear of the text and worksheet writing areas.

Review and export

Accept or reject tracked changes, resolve comments, check accessibility and reading order, and confirm links and tables. Then export to PDF and inspect the PDF itself. Keep versioned source files and use a clear name such as AUTHOR_Title_Submission_v01.docx.

Instructor, professor, editor, and publisher requirements

Instructors may adapt examples, spacing, deadlines, citation guidance, and submission instructions for their course or institution. Editors and publishers may impose their own house style, file, accessibility, and submission requirements. Their current directions take priority over this general-purpose material.

Future Language Editions

Future editions may be offered in Spanish, French, German, and other languages. A translated edition should be treated as its own localized release: follow its language conventions while still following the governing assignment or publication requirements.

This note is practical guidance, not a replacement for a style guide, accessibility standard, institutional policy, or publication's current instructions.