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Guidelines & agreement with originating authors

We hope Curbing Corruption will become a leading resource centre for practitioners in the field. Writing for the site offers an opportunity to showcase your expertise on a topic, contribute analysis which will have a real practical value for practitioners working to address corruption problems and have your work reviewed by well-established professionals in the field.

This document lays out what CurbingCorruption is expecting from you as one of our originating authors when you agree to author a sector review.

**Basics**

1. Sector reviews are written to be read and updated on the web. This determines the style of writing. It also means that the website version at any point in time is the ‘authoritative’ version of the review.
2. The website version will be periodically exported (usually to WORD), tidied up, and then re-uploaded to the website as a free, downloadable pdf. This pdf serves as a useful stand-alone version at any point in time but is never the ‘authoritative’ version.
3. The review should be written in an easy, accessible style, and not in an ‘academic’ style or format. It should be written from the start as a web text. For example, you should tell the reader the main points in the first paragraph of each section or sub-section, allowing further detail and examples to sit within expandable/collapsible paragraphs. You should use photos, videos, diagrams, examples, short paragraphs and other such means to break up chunks of text.
4. The focus should be constructive, to help the reader design and implement an a-c programme: the target audience is a public official charged with establishing an anti-corruption programme in their Ministry.
5. The text should not dwell on the ‘problems’ of corruption.
6. Lots of examples should be used. It may take a lot of digging to find good examples; that’s one of the points of this website!
7. We hope that originating authors will stay involved to curate their review in response to feedback, their party contributions and additional experience, at least initially. Over time, our strategic direction is to get to readers taking control of at least some of the editing and updating process, so do expect to ‘lose control’ of the review content over time.

**Structure of the sector review**

1. There are four main sections to each review: 1. Corruption types in the sector and context; 2. Reforms and reform approaches; 3. Developing a strategy; 4. Transnational initiatives. Plus one paragraph at the front that sets the scene of the sector, plus an introduction if you want one.
2. Occasionally the main four-section structure will not fit nicely with a particular sector (there are three current cases: construction, private sector, local government). We’ll consider this together on a case by case basis if it seems to apply.
3. Within each of the four sections, the standard sub-section format is as follows:
   * 1. *Corruption types and context*: Sector typology; other typologies; doing your diagnosis; context aspects
   * 2. *Reforms and reform approaches*: follow the ‘Ten approaches’. Leave them out if you don't have anything to write about a particular one.
   * 3. *Developing a strategy*: (1). desired objectives & impact; (2). Strategic choices, entry points and opposites; (3). Flexibility; (4). Politics, skill and support building; (5). Implementation experience; (6). Use of support structures across government; (7). Choices in high corruption environments
   * 4. *Transnational approaches*: briefly discuss each of the transnational initiatives in the sector. No particular format

You can omit individual sub-sections if you have nothing to say on it. The sub section structure can be more flexible in Sections 1,3, and 4.

**Style**

1. No footnotes
2. Full bibliography, format as per existing sector reviews. All references to be noted within the text in the form of ‘(Smith and Jones 2018)’, which should be hyperlinked. The full article title and other reference details should be noted in the bibliography
3. Example are of two kinds:
   * Important ones that really illustrate your point. These ones should be fully in the main text, not in the collapsible paragraphs
   * ‘Ordinary’ ones get a few lines of description, then the rest of the example will get put into collapsible text

Both types should begin with Example: xxxxx

1. Indexing. The contents page will appear to the left of the review, organised by 1, 1.1, 1.2,..2, 2.1,2.2…, 3..etc. We activate the index using ‘anchors’ that we embed into the text.
2. You may have annexes if you need them. They will appear ‘collapsed’ in the website

**Editing and third-party contributions**

1. You should expect quite intrusive editing by the editorial team, because we intend to have a constant, identifiable style across the whole website. Please don’t be offended! If that editing is extensive, we may request joint authorship of the review, although we normally don't want to be doing this.
2. We are likely also to send your draft to others in the sector for critical comment. This is not as thorough a process as academic peer review, as the editors are the judge of the material. But otherwise it is similar.
3. We will welcome contributions to the text from third parties, and we will acknowledge them publicly (unless they have some reason not to). This is one of the deliberate intents of the website. Either we will edit these in, or we will come back to you and ask you to do this.

**Effort and timescale**

1. The reviews vary from 15 pages to 50 pages of print equivalent (A4 single spaced 11 Calibri font), depending on the size of the sector and the availability of knowledge. As an ‘average’ we expect a review to be the equivalent 30 A4 pages long.
2. Our experience so far is that it takes 20-30 days of work to write a review.
3. In elapsed time, we plan on the author about three months to produce the first draft. The editing and back-and-forth to finalise it tends to take place over the subsequent two months.

**Authorship**

1. We encourage originating authors to reference the sector review as one of their publications.
2. We are happy if they want to parallel publish a similar version as a separate document (e.g. for the organisation that they work for).
3. We like to have additional contributors and always explicitly acknowledge them; it is part of the core purpose of the site to have such contributions. We expect you to be similarly acknowledging of them.
4. There may be sectors where the editors think it would be best to have more than one author, and/or to make early invitations to other also to be contributors. We’ll discuss this together on a case by case basis.

**If things go wrong**

1. We are well aware that we are asking people to do serious work on a pro-bono basis. We will accordingly be reasonable in deadlines, turnaround times and the depth of the review. However, if the progress is too slow and/or we have concerns about the material, we may ask you to cease being an author. In this case, options are that you remain as a co-author, or depart. In the latter case we will discuss together with you whether we can still use your material as the basis for a new originating author.