

THE COMPLETE REFERENCE MANUAL

The Research Student's Field Guide.

From topic selection, sampling, and SPSS data analysis to thesis writing and viva defense — step by step.

STRICT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROTOCOL

We teach, edit, and coach. The student remains the sole author. We never ghostwrite assignments or theses, and we never assist in evading plagiarism or AI-detection systems.

M. Yousaf

Lead Academic Consultant • MS English (BZU) • 3 Years Exp (60+ Projects)

WhatsApp: +92 329 6646824 • quickservices489@gmail.com

Free Complete Edition
quickservices.pk

WELCOME

Why I wrote this guide for you

**M. Yousaf**

Lead Academic Consultant • MS English (BZU) • 3 Years Experience • 60+ Projects Completed

Every academic year, I review hundreds of dissertation drafts, proposal papers, and statistical datasets. Most struggling students are not lacking intelligence; they are simply trapped in avoidable methodological traps.

I wrote **The Research Student's Field Guide** to demystify every phase of the research cycle. Too many supervisors hand students an outdated university template and expect them to independently master Crossref Boolean syntax, G*Power calculations, SPSS variance assumptions, and APA 7th style conventions without guidance.

My core philosophy: You must understand and own every sentence and statistical coefficient you submit. When you defend your viva, your supervisor cannot sit next to you. My mission is to make sure you never have to panic or guess during your defense.

What this guide provides

- **Zero fluff:** Concrete formulas, verifiable database search strings, and tested alignment matrices.
- **Click-by-click SPSS paths:** No mysterious scripts; straightforward menu paths and reporting patterns.
- **Real problem frameworks:** Battle-tested worksheets for topic feasibility, alignment, and viva rehearsals.
- **Direct access:** When you hit a roadblock on your own project, I am personally available on WhatsApp to assist.

Discuss your research with M. Yousaf

Send your working topic or draft for an honest evaluation and free consultation.

Message on WhatsApp →

FOUNDATIONS

How to use this guide & our promise

OUR UNCOMPROMISING COMMITMENT

We teach and coach. You remain the author.

Quick Services operates under strict academic ethics. We do not write assignments, proposals, or theses for submission under your name. We do not fabricate data, invent artificial survey responses, or assist in bypassing Turnitin, Copyleaks, or AI-detection filters. Honest scholarship reported with clarity is the fastest and only reliable path to a degree you can stand behind with pride.

Table of Contents & Guide Roadmap

Chapter	Topic & Core Learning Objective	Page
Chapter 01	Topic Selection: The 3-question feasibility filter and 1-page supervisor pitch.	4 – 5
Chapter 02	Research Questions & Objectives: Comparison, relationship, and alignment matrix.	6 – 7
Chapter 03	Literature Search: Crossref, OpenAlex, PubMed, Boolean operators, and log sheets.	8 – 9
Chapter 04	Design & Sampling: Quantitative vs qualitative, G*Power calculation, survey formulas.	10 – 11
Chapter 05	SPSS & SmartPLS Analysis: Data cleaning, outlier screening, and menu paths.	12 – 13
Chapter 06	Writing & Formatting: IMRaD, honest paraphrasing, APA/IEEE citations, abstract rules.	14 – 15
Chapter 07	Viva Defense Preparation: Examiner psychology, A-R-E framework, and question bank.	16 – 17
Specialities	Field by Field Services: Detailed breakdown of M. Yousaf's six consulting domains.	18 – 23
Process & FAQ	Workflow & Answers: 4-step process, pricing, payment methods, and ethics FAQ.	24 – 26

Navigation advice: Read Chapters 1 through 4 before collecting your first questionnaire or instrument. If you are already at the data stage, proceed directly to Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 01

Choose a topic you can actually finish

The Real-World Problem: Most delayed theses stall at month three because the student chose a grand, philosophical topic without checking whether participants, medical records, or data files actually exist.

The 3-Question Feasibility Filter

Test every candidate topic idea against these three ruthless criteria before submitting a proposal:

- **1. Answerable:** Can empirical data or concrete evidence settle the question, rather than subjective debate?
- **2. Measurable:** Can you explicitly name the variables, scales, or qualitative themes you will gather?
- **3. Doable:** Can you complete collection within your timeline, physical geographic access, and budget?

The Narrowing Funnel (Step-by-Step Walkthrough)

Broad topics invite harsh committee criticism. Narrow your focus across three distinct levels:

STAGE 1: TOO BROAD

× "Hospital Waste Management and Environmental Health"

STAGE 2: NARROWER BUT VAGUE

~ "Clinical Waste Practices in Operating Theatres of Private Hospitals"

STAGE 3: ACTIONABLE & DEFENDABLE

✓ "Waste Segregation Protocol Compliance Among Scrub Nurses in Tertiary Private Hospitals of Lahore"

M. Yousaf's Advice: Notice how Stage 3 names the specific population (scrub nurses), the specific behavior (segregation protocol compliance), the exact facility tier (tertiary private hospitals), and the geographic boundary.

CHAPTER 01 • TOOLS

Scoring worksheet & supervisor pitch

Score up to three candidate topics from 1 (weak) to 5 (strong). Choose the highest overall score, but reject any topic that receives a 1 on participant access or ethics feasibility:

Evaluation Criterion	Topic A	Topic B	Topic C
Personal interest (will I still care in 6 months?)	/ 5	/ 5	/ 5
Answerable with empirical data / documents	/ 5	/ 5	/ 5
Variables or themes are clearly defined	/ 5	/ 5	/ 5
Guaranteed access to sample or organizational data	/ 5	/ 5	/ 5
Fits current budget and semester timeline	/ 5	/ 5	/ 5
Supervisor has proven expertise in this sub-domain	/ 5	/ 5	/ 5
Total Feasibility Score (Max 30)	/ 30	/ 30	/ 30

The 1-Page Pitch for Your Supervisor

1. **Working Title:** Single concise line stating variables and target population.
2. **The Gap:** Exactly what remains unmeasured or unsolved in two sentences.
3. **Research Question:** The core comparison or relationship to be examined.
4. **Methodology Outline:** Proposed design, sample size estimate, and tool source.
5. **Feasibility Evidence:** How consent, data access, and ethics will be secured.
6. **The Specific Ask:** The exact approval or guidance requested during the meeting.

Common Mistake: Walking into your supervisor's office asking "What topic should I do?" Supervisors respect candidates who present two evaluated options with feasibility metrics.

Where M. Yousaf Helps • Topic Review Session

Get a 1-on-1 assessment of your proposed topic and a drafted supervisor pitch.

[Message on WhatsApp →](#)

CHAPTER 02

Turn your topic into clear questions

The Real-World Problem: Students often write poetic or philosophical questions ("How can hospital culture be improved?") that cannot be answered with statistical tests or qualitative coding frames.

The Three Standard Question Frames

A rigorous empirical question explicitly identifies the independent variable, dependent variable, and target population. Fill in these proven frames:

FRAME 1: COMPARISON (BETWEEN 2 OR MORE GROUPS)

"Does [Dependent Variable] differ significantly between [Group A] and [Group B] among [Population]?"

FRAME 2: RELATIONSHIP / ASSOCIATION (CONTINUOUS OR CATEGORICAL)

"Is there a significant relationship between [Variable 1] and [Variable 2] among [Population]?"

FRAME 3: PREVALENCE / DESCRIPTION

"What is the prevalence / distribution of [Phenomenon/Condition] among [Population] across [Setting]?"

Writing Cohesive SMART Objectives

Every research question must map directly to one operational objective starting with an active, measurable research verb:

- ✓ **Measure:** "To measure the mean burnout score using the Maslach Burnout Inventory..."
- ✓ **Compare:** "To compare infection rates between pre-operative protocol A and B..."
- ✓ **Determine:** "To determine whether baseline serum ferritin predicts 30-day outcomes..."
- × **Avoid:** "To explore", "to understand", "to learn" (too vague for empirical validation).

Rule of Thumb: If an objective does not generate its own dedicated table or chart in your Results chapter, it should not exist in Chapter 1.

CHAPTER 02 • TOOLS

The Research Alignment Matrix

The single most common reason examiners fail proposals is **methodological drift** — when Chapter 3 uses tests that do not answer the questions in Chapter 1. Fill one row per objective:

Objective	Hypothesis	Variable & Scale	Statistical Test	Target Table
1. Compare test scores between groups	H1: Group A will score higher than B	Score (Continuous ratio scale)	Independent samples t-test	Table 4.1
2. Determine link between stress & sleep	H2: Significant negative correlation	Stress (Scale), Sleep (Hours)	Pearson r correlation	Table 4.2
3. Assess compliance association by shift	H3: Association between shift & compliance	Shift (Nominal), Compliance (Binary)	Chi-square test of independence	Table 4.3

Final Validation Checklist

- Every directional hypothesis (H1) is grounded in cited theoretical literature.
- Measurement scales (nominal, ordinal, interval, ratio) are established before tool deployment.
- Statistical tests are chosen based on data distribution assumptions, not personal convenience.

Common Mistake: Stating five objectives in Chapter 1, but only presenting three tables in Chapter 4. Examiners cross-reference these page numbers immediately.

Where M. Yousaf Helps • Question & Matrix Audit

Review your objectives, hypotheses, and alignment matrix before proposal submission.

Message on WhatsApp →

CHAPTER 03

Search the literature properly

The Real-World Problem: Relying solely on Google Scholar page one, citing predatory journals, or copying citations from third-party bibliographies without reading the primary source.

Where to Search: The Core Scientific Databases

Repository	Discipline Focus	Best For
Crossref	All disciplines (140M+ DOI records)	Verifying exact digital object identifiers & metadata.
OpenAlex	Multidisciplinary global database	Citation networks, institutional tracing, modern open science.
PubMed	Medicine, nursing, health sciences	Peer-reviewed clinical trials, MeSH terminology indexing.
arXiv	Physics, mathematics, computer science	Cutting-edge preprints, computational algorithms.

Constructing Professional Boolean Search Strings

Never type conversational questions into academic databases. Combine concepts using Boolean logic:

- AND: Narrows the search (both concepts must appear in the record).
- OR: Broadens the search by including known synonyms and spelling variations.
- " " (Quotes): Forces exact phrase matching (e.g., "operating theatre").
- * (Wildcard): Captures suffixes (e.g., complian* finds compliance, compliant).

Search String Example:
("clinical waste" OR "biomedical waste" OR "hospital waste") AND (segregat* OR handl* OR management) AND ("operating room" OR "operating theatre" OR "surgical suite")

CHAPTER 03 • TOOLS

Search log & reference management

To defend your literature review as rigorous and reproducible, keep a systematic search log:

Date	Database	Exact Query String	Filters (Years/Types)	Hits	Kept
12/10/26	PubMed	("clinical waste") AND (segregat*)	2020-2026, English, Free Full Text	142	18
14/10/26	OpenAlex	("hospital waste") AND ("operating theatre")	2021-2026, Peer-reviewed articles	89	12
16/10/26	Crossref	"surgical waste management"	2019-2026	45	7

Configuring Your Reference Manager (Zotero / Mendeley / EndNote)

- 1. Commit to One Tool:** Do not switch managers midway through thesis writing.
- 2. Import via DOI / PMID:** Avoid manual citation entry; direct metadata imports prevent typographical errors.
- 3. Organize by Chapter Collections:** Tag references by chapter (e.g., Ch2_Prevalence, Ch2_MethodReview).
- 4. Verify Real PDFs:** Attach the full PDF to every record. Never cite an abstract alone.
- 5. Audit Authors in Manager:** Correct accented names or corporate authors inside the manager, not by editing Word text.

Common Mistake: Copy-pasting citations generated by AI chatbots. These frequently invent fictitious authors and non-existent DOIs. Always verify the DOI on Crossref.

Where M. Yousaf Helps • Literature Search Training

Master database search strings, Zotero reference library setup, and citation audit.

Message on WhatsApp →

CHAPTER 04

Pick a design and sample size

The Real-World Problem: Students pulling random numbers like "100 participants" out of nowhere without mathematical justification or statistical power analysis.

Selecting the Methodological Design

Design Type	When to Use	Data Collected	Typical Tools
Quantitative Descriptive	Measuring prevalence, baseline characteristics, attitudes.	Numerical survey scores, demographic data.	Validated Likert scales, questionnaires.
Quantitative Quasi-Experimental	Testing pre-post interventions without random allocation.	Pre-test and post-test scores across cohorts.	Paired measurements, standardized tests.
Qualitative Phenomenological	Understanding lived experiences and perspectives.	Audio transcripts, reflective field notes.	Semi-structured interview guides.
Mixed Methods Explanatory	Using qualitative interviews to explain surprising statistical results.	Initial quantitative survey followed by focused interviews.	Questionnaire + purposive sub-sample interviews.

Sampling Strategies: Probability vs. Non-Probability

- **Simple Random / Stratified Sampling:** Gold standard for generalizability; requires complete sampling frame.
- **Purposive Sampling:** Essential for qualitative research where specific expertise or clinical diagnosis is mandatory.
- **Convenience Sampling:** Acceptable for student pilot studies, provided limitations are honestly declared in Chapter 3.

Rule: Your research question mandates the design. Never pick "quantitative" just because you want to avoid transcription, or "qualitative" because you fear SPSS.

CHAPTER 04 • FORMULAS

Sample size formulas & ethics approval

1. Survey Proportion Sample Size (Cochran's Formula)

For estimating prevalence or proportions in large or unknown populations:

$$n = (Z^2 * p * (1 - p)) / d^2$$

- $Z = 1.96$ (for a standard 95% Confidence Interval)
- $p = 0.50$ (assumed proportion for maximum variability)
- $d = 0.05$ (margin of error at 5%)
- **Calculation:** $(1.96^2 * 0.5 * 0.5) / 0.05^2 = 384.16 \rightarrow$ **Minimum 385 participants.**

2. Statistical Power Analysis via G*Power

For hypothesis testing (e.g. comparing two independent means with a t-test):

- **Test family:** t tests $\rightarrow$ Means: Difference between two independent means
- **Type of power analysis:** A priori: Compute required sample size
- **Input Parameters:** Effect size $d = 0.50$ (medium effect), α err prob = 0.05, Power $(1-\beta) = 0.80$, Allocation ratio $N2/N1 = 1$
- **Output Result:** Sample size group 1 = 64, Sample size group 2 = 64 $\rightarrow$ **Total sample size = 128.**

Institutional Ethics Clearance Checklist

- Participant Information Sheet (PIS) written in plain, accessible language.
- Written Informed Consent Form with voluntary withdrawal clause.
- Data de-identification plan (storing survey keys separately from responses).
- Secure encrypted storage declaration and institutional approval letter.

Where M. Yousaf Helps • Methodology Coaching

Calculate exact G*Power inputs and structure your research ethics application.

[Message on WhatsApp \$\rightarrow\$](#)

CHAPTER 05

Analyse your data without panic

The Real-World Problem: Jumping directly to running t-tests and regressions in SPSS on raw survey imports without checking missing values, reverse coding, or normality assumptions.

The 4-Step Pre-Analysis Cleaning Protocol

- 1. Variable View Definition:** Open Variable View in SPSS. Verify every item has explicit *Values* defined (e.g. 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), appropriate *Measure* setting (Nominal, Ordinal, Scale), and clean Variable Names without illegal spaces.
- 2. Missing Value Audit:** Run Analyze > Descriptive Statistics > Frequencies. Screen for missing entries. Decide transparently: exclude pairwise or impute mean only if missing rate is below 5%. Never hide missing data.
- 3. Outlier Detection:** Generate boxplots: Analyze > Descriptive Statistics > Explore. Inspect extreme values (marked with asterisks). Check for data-entry typos (e.g. typing "55" instead of "5" on a 5-point scale).
- 4. Assumption Checking:**
 - **Normality:** Inspect Shapiro-Wilk ($p > .05$) and Skewness/Kurtosis between -1.5 and +1.5.
 - **Homogeneity of Variance:** Verify Levene's Test ($p > .05$) before interpreting standard ANOVA.

Parametric vs. Non-Parametric Match Guide

Research Objective	Normal / Scale (Parametric)	Skewed / Ordinal (Non-Parametric)
Compare 2 independent groups	Independent samples t-test	Mann-Whitney U test
Compare same group twice (pre/post)	Paired samples t-test	Wilcoxon signed-rank test
Compare 3 or more groups	One-way ANOVA	Kruskal-Wallis H test
Relationship between 2 continuous items	Pearson correlation (r)	Spearman rank correlation (rho)
Association between 2 categorical items	Chi-square test of independence	Fisher's exact test (if cell < 5)

CHAPTER 05 • EXECUTION

SPSS navigation paths & reporting templates

Menu-by-Menu SPSS Execution Paths

- **Independent t-test:** Analyze > Compare Means > Independent-Samples T Test. Move outcome to *Test Variable(s)*, grouping factor to *Grouping Variable* → *Define Groups* (1, 2).
- **One-Way ANOVA:** Analyze > Compare Means > One-Way ANOVA. Select *Post Hoc* > *Tukey*, and *Options* > *Homogeneity of variance test*.
- **Pearson Correlation:** Analyze > Correlate > Bivariate. Select *Pearson*, *Two-tailed*, *Flag significant correlations*.
- **Chi-Square:** Analyze > Descriptive Statistics > Crosstabs. Under *Statistics* check *Chi-square* and *Phi and Cramer's V*; under *Cells* check *Observed* and *Expected*.

Ready-to-Adapt APA Result Reporting Templates

Independent t-test:

"An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare scores between Group A ($M = [M1]$, $SD = [SD1]$) and Group B ($M = [M2]$, $SD = [SD2]$). There was a significant difference in scores; $t(df) = [t-val]$, $p = .024$, $d = 0.52$."

One-Way ANOVA:

"A one-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of [Factor] on [Outcome] across conditions [A, B, C]. There was a significant effect; $F(df1, df2) = [F-val]$, $p = .008$, $\eta^2 = .14$. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Condition A was significantly different from Condition B."

Chi-Square Test:

"A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relation between shift timing and protocol compliance. The relation between these variables was significant, $\chi^2(df, N = [N]) = [val]$, $p = .031$, Cramer's $V = .22$."

Reporting Rule: Report exact p-values (e.g., $p = .032$), unless SPSS shows $.000$, which you must write as $p < .001$. Always report the effect size alongside significance.

Where M. Yousaf Helps • SPSS & SmartPLS Support

Complete data screening, test execution, APA tables, and interpretation coaching (from PKR 8,000).

[Message on WhatsApp →](#)

CHAPTER 06

Write, cite and format cleanly

The Real-World Problem: Treating the literature review like an annotated shopping list ("Author A said X. Author B said Y."), or mixing personal interpretations into the Results chapter before reaching the Discussion.

The IMRaD Dissertation Blueprint

Section	What You Must Deliver	Common Student Mistake
Introduction	Problem statement, identified research gap, objectives, significance.	Starting with overly broad generalities; failing to clearly articulate the specific gap.
Literature Review	Thematic synthesis across themes; conceptual framework.	Summarizing one isolated study per paragraph with no synthesis between authors.
Methodology	Design, sample justification, instruments, validity/reliability, analysis plan.	Too brief to allow another researcher to replicate the study.
Results	Objective-by-objective presentation of statistical tables & findings.	Introducing opinions or discussing broader literature findings here.
Discussion	Comparing findings with prior studies; theoretical/practical implications; limits.	Merely re-listing percentages from the results chapter without explaining why.
Conclusion	Direct answers to research questions; concrete recommendations for practice.	Introducing brand-new data or references not presented in earlier chapters.

Write the Abstract Last

Your abstract is a micro-summary of what you *actually discovered*, not what you *hoped to do*. Structure it with 4 strict blocks: Background & Aim (2 sentences), Methods & Sample (2 sentences), Core Findings with numbers (3 sentences), and Primary Conclusion (1 sentence). Word limit: typically 200–250 words.

CHAPTER 06 • PRECISION

Citation styles & the paraphrasing test

Core Citation Style Patterns (Journal Article Example)

Style	Reference List Pattern
APA 7th	Author, A. A., & Author, B. B. (2024). Title of journal article. <i>Journal of Healthcare Management</i> , 18(2), 112–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhm.2024.01.005
Vancouver	Author AA, Author BB. Title of journal article. <i>J Healthc Manag.</i> 2024;18(2):112-24.
IEEE	[1] A. A. Author and B. B. Author, "Title of journal article," <i>J. Healthc. Manag.</i> , vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 112–124, 2024.
Harvard	Author, A.A. and Author, B.B. (2024) 'Title of journal article', <i>Journal of Healthcare Management</i> , 18(2), pp. 112–124.

The Honest Paraphrasing Test

- How to Paraphrase Legally & Honestly:**
1. Read the source paragraph twice until you understand its underlying argument.
 2. Close the browser tab or paper completely.
 3. Explain the finding in your own words onto a blank screen as if teaching a classmate.
 4. Open the source and compare sentence structures. If your draft mimics the original word order, discard it and start over.
 5. Add the parenthetical in-text citation immediately. *Paraphrased ideas still belong to the original author.*

Pre-Submission Formatting Checklist

- Consistent heading hierarchy (H1, H2, H3) throughout using Word Styles.
- Every table and figure is numbered, captioned, and explicitly referenced in paragraph text ("As shown in Table 4.2...").
- 100% two-way match: every citation in text appears in the reference list; every list item is cited.

Where M. Yousaf Helps • Proofreading & Formatting

Thorough line edits, citation audits, and university template compliance on your own draft.

Message on WhatsApp →

CHAPTER 07

Prepare for your viva defense

The Real-World Problem: Students viewing examiners as hostile adversaries trying to "catch them out", leading to defensive arguments, ungrounded justifications, and verbal rambling.

Understanding Examiner Psychology

Examiners rarely expect a flawless study. They evaluate whether you comprehend the boundaries of what you did. They test three core fundamentals:

- **Methodological Justification:** Why did you select this specific approach over available alternatives?
- **Intellectual Honesty:** Can you candidly identify your study's limitations before the committee points them out?
- **Core Contribution:** Can you summarize what your data adds to the literature in two precise sentences?

The A-R-E Answering Framework

When an examiner asks a probing question, structure your oral response in three disciplined stages:

STAGE 1: ANSWER (A) • One Direct Sentence

Directly answer the question without hedging or apologizing. ("I chose an independent samples t-test because the dependent variable was measured on a continuous scale and satisfied normality assumptions.")

STAGE 2: REASON (R) • The Academic / Methodological Logic

Provide the cited rationale. ("According to Field (2018), when skewness and kurtosis fall between ± 1.0 , parametric tests provide superior statistical power.")

STAGE 3: EXAMPLE (E) • Concrete Evidence From Your Dataset

Anchor the answer in your actual thesis findings. ("In my dataset, the Shapiro-Wilk test yielded $p = .18$ for Group A and $p = .24$ for Group B, confirming acceptable normality.")

→ **STOP TALKING: Close your mouth and allow the committee to ask their next question.**

CHAPTER 07 • REHEARSAL

Committee question bank & 7-day countdown

Domain	Questions You Must Prepare and Rehearse Out Loud
Purpose & Gap	Why did you choose this topic? What exact gap does it fill? What is your primary contribution?
Methodology	Why this design? Why this specific sampling frame? How did you control for confounding variables?
Instruments	How was validity and reliability established? Did you pilot test the tool? How was consent recorded?
Analysis	Why did you choose this test over non-parametric alternatives? How did you treat missing data?
Results & Limits	Which finding surprised you? Which result do you trust least, and why? What are your limitations?
Future Impact	If you had six more months, what would you do differently? Who should act on these findings?

The 7-Day Pre-Viva Countdown

- **Day 7 to 5:** Re-read your Abstract, Objectives, and Conclusions until you can recite them without slides.
- **Day 4 to 3:** Review every single table: know the sample size, test statistic, p-value, and effect size by heart.
- **Day 2:** Conduct a full timed slide rehearsal with an academic friend or coach who interrupts with questions.
- **Day 1:** Prepare your bound copy with colored adhesive tabs for instant chapter and table navigation. Rest.

Where M. Yousaf Helps • Mock Viva Defense Session

Experience an intensive 1-on-1 mock defense with direct feedback on your slides, delivery, and answers.

[Message on WhatsApp →](#)

SPECIALITY PROFILE 01

Proofreading & Academic Editing

Who It Is For: Postgraduate candidates (BS, Master's, MPhil, PhD) and early-career faculty who have written their own draft but struggle with academic tone, paragraph transitions, grammar, or supervisory feedback regarding clarity.

Specific Concrete Problems Fixed

- Inconsistent terminology across chapters (e.g. switching between "respondents", "subjects", and "participants").
- Overly colloquial expressions replaced with formal academic phrasing.
- Run-on sentences, awkward syntax, passive-voice ambiguities, and punctuation errors.
- Restructuring disjointed paragraphs so each carries one clear claim, evidence, and transition.

What the Student Receives & How It Works

- **Two Word Documents:** One with tracked changes and marginal explanatory notes; one clean finalized copy.
- **Line-by-Line Annotations:** Every major edit includes an explanatory comment teaching you *why* it was altered.
- **Turnaround:** Agreed before commencement based on your exact deadline.

What M. Yousaf Will Never Do: I will never write chapters from scratch, fabricate arguments, or alter your raw data findings. The intellectual arguments remain 100% yours.

Illustrative Scenario:

A Master's student in Public Health had her Results chapter returned twice because of informal phrasing ("A lot of nurses didn't bother following protocols"). Through line editing, this was refined to: "A notable proportion of nursing personnel exhibited non-compliance with institutional segregation guidelines (34.2%, n = 48)." The draft passed review on the subsequent submission.

Get a Quote for Editing Your Draft

Send your draft, word count, and university guidelines on WhatsApp for an immediate quote.

[Message on WhatsApp →](#)

SPECIALITY PROFILE 02

SPSS & SmartPLS Analysis Support

Who It Is For: Researchers who have gathered survey, experimental, or clinical data but need guidance cleaning datasets, selecting correct statistical tests, interpreting outputs, and drafting APA tables.

Pricing & Scope

From PKR 8,000+ (Approximately \$45 USD, based on dataset dimensions, sample size, and model complexity)

Specific Concrete Problems Fixed

- Correcting statistical mismatch (e.g. reporting independent t-tests on severely skewed non-normal data).
- Constructing structural equation models in SmartPLS (measurement model, convergent validity, AVE, CR, HTMT).
- Handling missing values, outlier screening, recoding reverse-scored items, and computing composite indices.
- Generating camera-ready APA 7th style summary tables with exact p-values and effect sizes.

What the Student Receives

- Cleaned SPSS (.sav) or SmartPLS (.splsm) file with fully configured labels and measurement levels.
- Formatted Word document with APA results tables and paragraph-by-paragraph interpretation.
- **1-on-1 Voice/Screen Coaching:** A walkthrough session ensuring you understand every number for your defense.

What M. Yousaf Will Never Do: I will never invent survey responses, manipulate significance levels, or fabricate data to force hypotheses to be supported. Real data honestly reported is mandatory.

Illustrative Scenario:

An MPhil Business candidate had 280 survey responses but could not establish discriminant validity in SmartPLS due to cross-loading items. M. Yousaf guided the candidate through HTMT matrix screening, identifying two redundant items, re-calculating the model, and coaching the student to defend the final outer loadings during the defense.

Book Statistical Analysis Support

Send your dataset and objectives for an immediate scope evaluation and quotation.

[Message on WhatsApp →](#)

SPECIALITY PROFILE 03

Research Methodology Coaching

Who It Is For: Candidates drafting their thesis proposals (Chapter 3), developing data collection questionnaires, applying for institutional ethics approval, or facing supervisor objections regarding study design.

Specific Concrete Problems Fixed

- Resolving methodological mismatch between the conceptual framework and operational research design.
- Calculating mathematical sample size justifications using G*Power or Cochran formulas.
- Structuring questionnaire tools with validated Likert scales, content validity checks, and reliability protocols.
- Writing institutional review board (IRB) ethics protocols, participant consent forms, and risk mitigations.

What the Student Receives

- Complete, defensible Chapter 3 methodology framework tailored to your departmental guidelines.
- A validated Research Alignment Matrix mapping every research question to its specific tool and test.
- Step-by-step coaching on how to explain sampling bias and study limitations calmly in front of committee members.

What M. Yousaf Will Never Do: I will never recommend a complex, flashy design when a simple, clean design answers the question with greater rigor and lower risk of student failure.

Illustrative Scenario:

A Nursing scholar proposed a clinical quasi-experimental trial across 6 hospitals without calculating power or securing multi-center access. Through two coaching sessions, M. Yousaf helped refine the study into a single-center prospective cohort design with an achievable sample of 120 patients, enabling the student to secure ethics committee approval on first review.

Get Methodology & Design Coaching

Message M. Yousaf to review your proposal design, sampling plan, or questionnaire.

[Message on WhatsApp →](#)

SPECIALITY PROFILE 04

Literature Search Training

Who It Is For: Researchers preparing Chapter 2 (Literature Review) or systematic reviews who struggle to locate high-impact peer-reviewed studies, build Boolean search strings, or organize reference libraries.

Specific Concrete Problems Fixed

- Moving beyond generic search engine results to query Crossref, OpenAlex, PubMed, and arXiv effectively.
- Designing structured Boolean strings combining Medical Subject Headings (MeSH), synonyms, and wildcards.
- Eliminating predatory journal citations and identifying seminal foundational papers in your specific niche.
- Setting up Zotero, Mendeley, or EndNote with automated cloud sync, tags, and DOI deduplication.

What the Student Receives

- Personalized search string dossier formulated specifically for your exact research topic.
- Structured literature synthesis matrix template organizing papers by themes, samples, and gaps.
- Live 1-on-1 coaching session demonstrating database querying, screening protocols, and citation exports.

What M. Yousaf Will Never Do: I will never deliver unverified bibliography lists generated by AI tools. Every single cited paper must be cross-checked against its legitimate Crossref DOI.

Illustrative Scenario:

A PhD Education scholar spent two months finding only 14 relevant papers on blended learning assessment in secondary schools. M. Yousaf trained the candidate in Boolean synonym clustering and OpenAlex citation chaining, uncovering 84 peer-reviewed empirical studies within 3 hours and transforming the literature review chapter.

Book Literature Search Training

Learn to search databases properly and organize your reference library with M. Yousaf.

[Message on WhatsApp →](#)

SPECIALITY PROFILE 05

Formatting & Citation Checks

Who It Is For: Candidates submitting finished theses or journal manuscripts that must strictly comply with university formatting manuals (margins, pagination, preliminary pages) or style guides (APA 7th, Harvard, Vancouver, IEEE).

Specific Concrete Problems Fixed

- Resolving citation mismatches (sources cited in text missing from reference list; entries in list never cited in text).
- Fixing broken heading numbering, runaway page numbering, and mismatched preliminary Roman numerals.
- Standardizing table formatting, notes, abbreviations, and figure captions to departmental specifications.
- Correcting punctuation, italics, volume/issue notations, and DOI links across the entire bibliography.

What the Student Receives

- A fully formatted master Word (.docx) file configured to your exact university template guidelines.
- Comprehensive discrepancy report detailing every citation that was reconciled or updated.
- Automated Table of Contents, List of Tables, and List of Figures configured with native Word fields.

What M. Yousaf Will Never Do: I will never guess citation metadata. If a paper has an ambiguous publication date or missing page range, I locate the primary publisher record to verify.

Illustrative Scenario:

An Engineering researcher preparing a submission for an IEEE journal had his draft rejected at the editorial desk due to non-compliant references and non-standard figure widths. Quick Services audited all 46 citations to IEEE numeric standards and formatted layout tables, leading to immediate progression into peer review.

Book Citation & Formatting Audit

Send your thesis draft and guidelines to M. Yousaf for a complete structural and citation review.

[Message on WhatsApp →](#)

SPECIALITY PROFILE 06

Viva & Presentation Coaching

Who It Is For: Candidates scheduled for their defense who experience severe presentation anxiety, struggle to articulate their research contribution, or fear critical questions from committee members.

Specific Concrete Problems Fixed

- Eliminating slide overcrowding (turning 60-word bullet walls into clean, punchy visual presentation slides).
- Practicing the A-R-E framework out loud so answers remain succinct, structured, and methodologically grounded.
- Neutralizing aggressive committee critique by mastering calm, non-defensive acknowledgment of study limitations.
- Mastering the 10-minute thesis elevator pitch: Problem → Method → Key Results → Practical Implication.

What the Student Receives

- Slide deck review with line-by-line notes on pacing, readability, and visual hierarchy.
- Personalized 25-question committee prediction sheet drafted specifically from your thesis text.
- **60-Minute Mock Viva Simulation:** Realistic defense simulation with verbal critique and answer sharpening.

What M. Yousaf Will Never Do: I will never teach you to memorize scripts. True confidence comes from understanding your dataset so thoroughly that you can discuss it casually from memory.

Illustrative Scenario:

A Clinical Psychology scholar was terrified that external examiners would fail her thesis due to a small qualitative sample ($n = 12$). During coaching, M. Yousaf trained her to defend data saturation principles using Guest et al.'s criteria. During the actual viva, the examiner asked that exact question; she delivered her prepared rationale calmly and passed with no major corrections.

Book a Mock Viva Coaching Session

Send your slide draft and thesis abstract to schedule your personalized mock defense rehearsal.

[Message on WhatsApp →](#)

CLIENT EXPERIENCE

Four steps. Transparent. No surprises.

1

Brief & Review

Send your topic, guidelines, current draft, or dataset via WhatsApp or email. State your target deadline.

2

Upfront Fixed Quote

Receive an honest evaluation of feasibility, turnaround timeline, and clear fixed pricing agreed before work begins.

3

1-on-1 Working Session

Receive your edited documents, data outputs, or live coaching walkthrough directly with M. Yousaf.

4

Follow-Up Support

Any follow-up questions on the completed deliverables are addressed until you feel completely confident.

Accepted Payment Channels

For your convenience, Quick Services accepts domestic and international payments through all standard banking and mobile channels:

JazzCash

EasyPaisa

SadaPay

NayaPay

Bank Transfer (IBFT)

Western Union

Free Consultation Guarantee: You are never charged for initial scoping messages or feasibility reviews. Send your material, get a clear proposal, and decide with no obligation.

ANSWERS

Frequently Asked Questions • Part 1

Will you write my thesis or assignment for me?

No. We never ghostwrite. Quick Services exists to coach you, edit your own written sentences, and explain statistical logic so that you understand every word. The thesis you submit to your university must be your own authentic scholarship.

Do you help reduce Turnitin or AI-detection similarity scores?

No. We do not use automated synonym spinners or evasion tricks. We teach you how to read sources, synthesize ideas, paraphrase legitimately in your own voice, and cite accurately. That is the only honest way to a clean similarity report.

Is my research data and draft kept confidential?

Yes, 100%. All research datasets, questionnaire instruments, and dissertation manuscripts are handled under strict confidentiality. Your work is never shared, published, or repurposed for any other student or third party.

Do you guarantee specific university grades or journal publication?

No. Academic grades and journal acceptances depend on the independent evaluation of university committees and peer reviewers. What we guarantee is rigorous editing, correct statistical procedures, and clear explanations.

ANSWERS

Frequently Asked Questions • Part 2

I only have a few days before my submission deadline. Can you help?

Often yes, provided the scope is focused (such as reviewing an analysis chapter, auditing citations, or proofreading a completed draft). Send your deadline and draft on WhatsApp, and M. Yousaf will confirm realistically before you commit.

Which statistical tools and citation formats do you support?

We specialize in **SPSS** and **SmartPLS** for quantitative models, and support APA (6th & 7th), Harvard, Vancouver, and IEEE citation conventions. If your university uses another specific departmental template, message us to confirm.

Can you assist with peer-reviewed journal papers and reviewer comments?

Yes. We help early-career researchers structure journal submissions, format statistical tables according to journal instructions, and formulate professional, respectful rebuttal letters addressing peer reviewer comments.

Will I speak directly with M. Yousaf or an assistant?

You work directly with **M. Yousaf**. You communicate with him on WhatsApp for quotes, working sessions, and feedback, ensuring continuity and academic accountability without middleman ticketing queues.

READY WHEN YOU ARE

Make your research **make sense.**

Send your topic, guidelines or current draft to M. Yousaf for an honest review, clear quote, and personal academic consultation.



SCAN TO CHAT ON WHATSAPP

WhatsApp: +92 329 6646824 →