

## **SAPPO RESEARCH PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE**

### **CALL FOR REVIEW ARTICLES**

The Research Portfolio Committee of SAPPO has been disappointed by the paucity of project proposals that have been submitted for funding, as well as the apparent lack of knowledge of the research that has been, and is currently being, conducted in all aspects of pig science. In an effort to remedy this situation, and as a means of obtaining information about research that has already been conducted, the Committee is offering the sum of R7000 for reviews on approved subjects pertaining to pig science.

Generally, the purpose of a review is to provide a critical, analytical summary and synthesis of the current knowledge of a topic in a relatively narrow subject area. Thus it should compare and relate different theories, findings, etc, rather than just summarise them individually. It does not have to be an exhaustive account of everything published on the topic, but it should discuss all the significant academic literature relevant to the topic.

We would expect the review to consist of an Introduction, a Body of literature, and a Conclusion. The general topic, issue, or area of concern should be defined or identified in the Introduction, thus providing an appropriate context for reviewing the literature. A brief summary should then follow of overall trends in what has been published about the topic, conflicts in theory, methodology, evidence, and conclusions, or gaps in research and learning; or a single problem or new perspective of immediate interest. Finally in the Introduction the reason (point of view) for reviewing the literature should be established; the criteria to be used in analysing and comparing literature and the organisation of the review (sequence) should be explained; and, when necessary, the reason why certain literature is or is not included (scope) should be stated.

In the body, research studies and other types of literature (reviews, theoretical articles, case studies, etc.) should be grouped according to common denominators such as qualitative versus quantitative approaches, conclusions of authors, specific purpose or objective, chronology, etc. Individual studies or articles should then be summarised with as much or as little detail as each merits according to its comparative importance in the literature.

In the conclusion, major contributions of significant studies and articles to the body of knowledge under review should be summarised, maintaining the focus established in the introduction; and the current status for the body of knowledge reviewed should be evaluated, pointing out major methodological flaws or gaps in research, inconsistencies in theory and findings, and areas or issues pertinent to future study.

Before any research project is initiated, a comprehensive literature review should be made: from such a review a theory or hypothesis should emerge, and any experiments on the subject are far more effectively designed if such a theory forms the basis of what is to be tested. It would be particularly useful if the review formed the basis of a future useful and successful research project.

If you would like to write a review article, and be paid R7000 for your efforts, please send a brief title and outline of the proposed review in an email to Mr Simon Streicher at [info@sapork.com](mailto:info@sapork.com)