Journal of Language and Linguistics in Society
ISSN: 2815-0961
Vol : 03, No.05, Aug -Sept 2023
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JLLS
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jlls.35.7.10

How Can I write a Discussion that is Effective?

Maha A. Sayal*

[*]Computer Science Department, College of Computers Sciences and Mathematics
University of Thi-Qar Iraq

Corresponding Email: [*]maha .A.Sayal@utq.edu.iq

Received: 02 April 2023 **Accepted:** 18 June 2023 **Published:** 01 August 2023

Abstract: Writing scientific papers needs a high level of ability, scientific understanding, and adherence to accepted scientific practices. Every article should fundamentally adhere to the IMRAD format, which is virtually reflected, with slight variations, throughout the entirety of contemporary scientific publishing. Writing articles requires staying on topic, having a clear beginning and finish, and drawing from every aspect of the context. Additionally, it highlights the paper's strengths and weaknesses by highlighting any confusing issues that may require additional investigation in some future research by the same or a different set of authors. Therefore, the Discussion chapter serves as the core of any scientific work. The discussion itself must make reference to the particular of the work's outcomes. When scientists prepare their papers by presenting their own results and comparing them with those of other authors with comparable topics, the author aims to emphasize the relevance of a high-quality chapter discussion.

Keywords: Discussion, Imrad, Topic, Result, Context, Reference.

1. INTRODUCTION

The guidelines in preparing and Editing for Biomedical Publication: When preparing articles for publication in biomedical journals, Vancouver's Rules and Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publication (1, 2) should be adhered to. Writing a scientific article needs a high level of ability, scientific understanding, and adherence to accepted scientific practices. Every manuscript should fundamentally follow the IMRAD format, which is widely represented, with slight variations, across the entirety of contemporary scientific publishing.
The idea of emphasizing that the acronym "IMRAD" has the standard arrangement of components is as follows:

- I - Introduction,
- M - Methods (or Methods and Materials),
- R - Results,

Copyright The Author(s) 2023.This is an Open Access Article distributed under the CC BY license. (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Journal of Language and Linguistics in Society
ISSN: 2815-0961
Vol : 03, No.05, Aug -Sept 2023
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JLLS
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jlls.35.7.10

• A - and
• D - Discussion and Conclusion.

There is no conversation in the abstract. Editors might note that nowadays is one thing that is not so uncommon, despite the fact that it is a frequent reality. In scientific writing, the concept, outlining specific objectives, formulating the hypothesis, and carrying out the study are all crucial phases. However, it takes talent and great experience in a certain sector to analyze the data acquired, point out these results, and compare them with those of other studies that deal with the same or a related issue.

It is crucial that the author's writing style, which varies from person to person and fundamentally represents the way the author thinks, be used when actually writing the paper. A scientific style must always be clear, straightforward, succinct, exact, and cohesive, and its language must be more precise (3). The choice of verb relies on the consequences being stated.

With the exception of the summary, where the use of passive language is advised, If known, their own results should be discussed in the past (Material and techniques) and what has previously been published in the present (Introduction and Discussion) (3). Writing must be cohesive, have a distinct beginning and end, and consider every relevant context element, indicate the paper's merits and shortcomings while defining any ambiguous points that may require further investigation in some future studies by the same or a different group of authors (1).

Whether the research's findings will align with previously published publications or are entirely new, the commentary must make particular reference to their specificity. If anything is different, call out the specifics of the statistical processing, or draw attention to how significant something has become, or in certain situations, the strength and importance of the processed approach.

It is crucial that authors only mention the instances that defy the generalization rather than repeating the findings that have already been reported. Because they influence how powerful an article is, it is crucial to expound on significant results.

Results that cannot be statistically supported should not be the main topic of discussion (1, 2). The discussion should largely center on the theoretical and practical implications of the results, with the conclusions themselves presented as concisely and clearly as feasible, supported by specific arguments. The debate should center on how the facts and the obvious outcomes relate to one another (3).

The discussion shouldn't repeat information that is well known or that isn't of a sufficient academic caliber, nor should it provide historical details regarding a phenomena or writing topic (those that are unimportant to the survey itself).

It is important to compare the research's findings to credible studies found in reference index databases. It is very hard to obtain a satisfactory result when comparing one's own results with those from predatory or low-quality journals, especially those that publish papers without peer review (2).

Copyright The Author(s) 2023.This is an Open Access Article distributed under the CC BY license. (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Journal of Language and Linguistics in Society
ISSN: 2815-0961
Vol : 03, No.05, Aug -Sept 2023
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JLLS
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jlls.35.7.10

It must be shown whether only the research has, or may have, a significant bias selection since every original scientific work is an article that might be used in a meta-analysis or systematic review for the second day. This is necessary so that the bias repetition, or inability to draw conclusions that could be very significant in practice tomorrow, can be re-established. The conversation shouldn't last too long or too little.
The conversation must be helpful and directly tied to the topic at hand. It also cannot stray from it. It must be written in six to seven paragraphs and cannot be longer than the total of the other components (Introduction, Material and techniques, Results). There shouldn't be more than 200 words in a paragraph. In general, there are three categories of paragraphs (4, 5, 6):
a) Introductory paragraph,
b) Intermediate paragraphs,
c) Concluding paragraph

Clear sentences should contain no ambiguous words or phrases that may accidently mean anything different. In terms of quantity, each phrase shouldn't have more than 25–30 words (4). Due to extensive experience, it is advised against using terms that are closely related to a particular spatiality or subspecialty when writing the discussion. However, this does not preclude the use of academic writing techniques. The work itself must be interesting and understandable to the general public.

Young researchers must first acquire the fundamentals of the writing technique since without it, there will undoubtedly be many flaws in the work, according to many writers who have addressed the suggestions for writing a certain section of the work (7). Even the most seasoned researchers suffer the flaws (2). A checklist (CONSORT checklist or STROBE checklist) has been established that the author may find useful when writing the piece (1).
It is essential that writers who are not native English speakers take part in the translation of the Discussion when the work has been translated by a less qualified individual from their native tongue.

Because a translation of a scientific work may occasionally be aware that it is flawed, inferior to the original, and does not present what should be displayed, that is, does not draw attention to unimportant details. The peer review talks must be really well created because even though many underestimates, the primary reviewers give the most attention to the study methods and outcomes. As a matter of fact, the Discussion serves as the article's main body rather than the conclusion.

2. REFERENCES

1. Masic I and Kujundzic E., "Science Editing in Biomedicine and Humanities", Tikrit Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences , VOL. 4 ,NO. 40 ,2013.
2. Masic I., "How to Search, Write, Prepare and Publish the Scientific Papers", the Biomedical Journals, Acta Inform Med, Vol.19, No.2, pp: 68-79, 2011.
3. Silobrcic V. et al, "How to write papers", Turkish journal of urology ,Vol.34, No.12 , pp:19-22, 2008.

Copyright The Author(s) 2023.This is an Open Access Article distributed under the CC BY license. (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Journal of Language and Linguistics in Society
ISSN: 2815-0961
Vol : 03, No.05, Aug -Sept 2023
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JLLS
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jlls.35.7.10

4. Şanlı O, Erdem S, Tefik T.," How to write a discussion section? ",Turkish journal of urology, Vol.39,No.1, pp: 20-24, doi: 10.5152/tud.2013.049, 2013.
5. Tompson A..," How to write an English medical manuscript that will be published and have impact", Surg Today, Vol . 36, No. 3 , pp: : 404-409, 2006.
6. Neill US.," How to write a scientific masterpiece", The Journal of Clinical Investigation., Vol.117, No. 12, pp:3599-3602, doi: 10.1172/JCI34288, 2007.
7. Masic I, Begic E, Donev DM, et al.," Sarajevo Declaration on Integrity and Visibility of Scholarly Publications", Croat Med J, Vol. 57, No. 6,pp: 527-529,doi:10.3325/cmj, 2016.

Copyright The Author(s) 2023.This is an Open Access Article distributed under the CC BY license. (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)