

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

EASE smjernice za autore i prevoditelje znanstvenih članaka koji se objavljuju na engleskom jeziku

Sažetak

Ovaj koncizni i lako čitljiv skup vodilja za urednike je prvi put objavljan od strane Europske Asocijacije Naučnih Urednik (European Association of Science Editors - EASE) 2010 godine dopunjava se svake godine. Besplatno je dostupan preveden na više od 20 jezika na <http://ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines>. Ovaj dokument ima za cilj da pomogne naučnicima širom svijeta u uspješnoj prezentaciji rezultata njihovih istraživanja i adekvatnom prevodu rukopisa na Engleski jezik. On ukratko pojašnjava kako pisati kompletne, koncizne i jasne rukopise, te skreće pažnju na etička pitanja: kriteriji autorstva, plagijarizam, sukob interesa, itd. Osam priloga pruža primjere ili detaljnije informacije o odabranim temama (*Abstracts, Ambiguity, Cohesion, Ethics, Plurals, Simplicity, Spelling* i *Text-tables*). Raširena upotreba *EASE Guidelines* bi trebala povećati efikasnost internacionalne znanstvene komunikacije.

Da bi međunarodna znanstvena komunikacija bila efikasnija, istraživački članci i druge znanstvene publikacije bi trebale biti POTPUNE, SAŽETE i JASNE, na način kako je to kasnije objašnjeno. Ove opće, ali ne i univerzalne smjernice imaju za cilj pomoći autorima, prevoditeljima i urednicima. Treba slijediti zdrav razum prilikom primjene ovih pravila, jer je savršenstvo nemoguće postići.

Prije svega:

- **Pažljivo planirajte i provedite svoje istraživanje** (npr. [Hengl et al 2011](#)). Nemojte početi izradu cijelog rada dok ne budete sigurni da su vaši rezultati prilično čvrsti i potpuni (O'Connor 1991), što će vam omogućiti pisanje **pouzdanog zaključka**.
- Prije nego što počnete pisati, **po mogućnosti odaberite časopis** u koji ćete poslati vaš pisani rad. Provjerite da li čitateljstvo časopisa odgovara vašoj ciljanoj publici ([Chipperfield et al 2010](#)).

Nabavite primjerak časopisa, upute autorima i plan članka kako bi odgovarao časopisu po dužini, broju potrebnih/dozvoljenih tabelarnih, te grafičkih ili slikovnih priloga, itd.

Radovi trebaju biti POTPUNI, niti jedna potrebna informacija ne smije biti izostavljena. **Informacije se lakše tumače ako su postavljene na mjesto gdje čitatelji očekuju da će ga pronaći** ([Gopen & Swan 1990](#)). Naprimjer, sljedeće informacije trebaju biti uključene u eksperimentalnim istraživačkim člancima:

- **Naslov:** treba biti jednoznačan, razumljiv specijalistima u drugim područjima, te mora odražavati sadržaj članka. Budite određeni, ne općenito ili neodređeni (O'Connor 1991). Ako je relevantno, u naslovu treba spomenuti razdoblja u kojima je istraživanje realizirano i mjesto gdje je obavljeno istraživanje, međunarodni znanstveni naziv istraživačkog entiteta ili eksperimentalni dizajn (npr. studije slučaja i randomizirana kontrolirana). Ako vaše istraživanje uključuje ispitanike samo jednog spola, isto treba navesti u naslovu. Informacije navedene u naslovu ne treba ponavljati u sažetku (kao što su uvijek objavljeni zajedno), iako je preklapanje neizbježno.
- **Popis autora**, odnosno svih ljudi koji su znatno pridonijeli planiranju istraživanja, prikupljanju podataka ili tumačenju rezultata i napisali ili kritički revidirali rad i odobrili konačnu verziju i složili se da su odgovorni za sve aspekte rada. Svakoj osobi koja ispunjava prvi kriterij treba biti dozvoljeno da učestvuje u izradi i odobrenju finalne verzije ([ICMJE 2014](#)). Autori koji su prvi na popisu bi trebali biti oni koji su najviše uradili. Redoslijed autora bi trebalo utvrditi prije slanja rukopisa. Bilo kakve promjene nakon podnošenja članka trebaju biti odobrene od strane svih autora i objašnjene uredniku časopisa ([Battisti et al 2015](#), vidi [COPE flowcharts](#)). Imena autora moraju biti nadopunjena svojim **vezama** (tokom studija) i

sadašnjim adresama autora za korespondenciju. E-mail adrese svih autora bi trebale biti napisane tako da je lakše kontaktirati sa njima.

- **Sažetak:** Kratko objasnite zašto ste proveli istraživanje/studiju (BACKGROUND), na koja pitanja ste htjeli odgovoriti (OBJECTIVES), kako ste izveli istraživanje (METHODS), šta ste našli (RESULTS: glavni podaci, odnosi i vaše tumačenje i glavne posljedice svojih pronalazaka (CONCLUSIONS). Sažetak mora **odražavati sadržaj članka**, kao i za većinu čitatelja to će biti glavni izvor informacija o vašem istraživanju. Morate koristiti **ključne riječi** unutar sažetka, kako bi se olakšala on-line potraga vašeg rada od strane onih koji mogu biti zainteresirani za vaše rezultate (mnoge baze podataka uključuju samo naslove i sažetke). U izvještaju o **rezultatima istraživanja**, sažetak bi trebao biti **informativan**, uključujući stvarne rezultate. (*Vidi Appendix: Abstracts* o strukturiranim apstraktima.) Samo u **mišljenjima**, meta-analizama i drugim člancima širokog opsega, sažetak treba biti **indikativan**, tj. prisutan je popis glavnih tema, ali nema rezultata (CSE 2014). Sažetak se ne odnosi na tabele ili slike, jer se one kao i sažeci također objavljuju zasebno. Reference iz literature također nisu dopuštene, osim ako su apsolutno neophodne (ali onda morate dati detaljne informacije u zagradama: autor, naslov, godina, itd.). Pobrinite se da se sve informacije navedene u sažetku također pojavljuju u glavnom dijelu članka.
- **U popis ključnih riječi:** uključiti sve relevantne znanstvene pojmove ili samo dodatne ključne riječi koji su izostavljeni iz naslova (ako to zahtijevaju urednici). Potrebno je navesti ključne riječi koje odražavaju sadržaj članka. Dodajte više općih uvjeta ako je vaše istraživanje od interdisciplinarnog značaja (O'Connor 1991). U medicinskim tekstovima, koristite vokabular koji možete pronaći na [MeSH Browser](#). Kada arhivirate svoj članak u archive, itd. (Cerejo 2013), navedite sve ključne riječi i druge meta podatke u datoteku (vidi npr. [Inderscience 2013](#)).
- **Popis kratica/skraćenica** (po potrebi od strane urednika): definirati **sve kratice** koje se koriste u članku, osim onih očitih i za one koji su bliski temi istraživanja.
- **Uvod:** objasniti zašto je istraživanje bilo potrebno i navesti ciljeve istraživanja ili pitanja na koja ste htjeli dati odgovore. **Počnite od više općih pitanja i postupno se usredotočite na vaše istraživačko pitanje(a).**
- **Metode:** detaljno opisati kako je istraživanje provedeno (npr. istraživana područja, prikupljanje podataka, kriteriji, porijekla analiziranih materijala, veličina uzorka, broj mjerenja, dob i spol sudionika ili donora tkiva/stanica, oprema, analiza podataka, statistički testovi i korišteni softveri). **Sve faktore koji mogu utjecati na rezultate treba uzeti u obzir.** Izvore eksperimentalnih materijala dobivenih iz biobanaka treba navesti, ako je moguće, sa punim imenima i identifikatorima, ako je moguće ([Bravo et al 2015](#)). Ako metode nisu opisane na engleskom jeziku, metodu detaljno objasnite u radu. Provjerite jesu li u skladu s etičkim standardima (npr. [WMA 2013](#)) u odnosu na prava pacijenata, testiranja na životinjama, zaštitu okoliša, itd.
- **Rezultati:** predstavite **nove rezultate svojih istraživanja** (obično, objavljeni podaci ne bi trebali biti uključeni u ovom odjeljku). Sve tabele i slike moraju biti navedene u glavnom dijelu teksta i numerirane redom kojim se pojavljuju u tekstu. Uvjerite se da je statistička analiza priladna (npr. [Lang 2004](#)). Podaci o ljudima, životinjama ili bilo kakvom materijalu koji potiče od ljudi ili životinja treba rasčlaniti prema spolu (vidi [SAGER guideline](#)). Nemojte izmišljati ili narušavati bilo kakve podatke koji će isključiti druge važne načine, ne manipulirati slikama kako čitatelj ne bi stekao krivi dojam. Ti podaci mogu predstavljati manipulacije, znanstvene prevare. (vidi [COPE flowcharts](#)).
- **Diskusija:** ovaj dio rukopisa **nije mjesto za prezentiranje novih rezultata**, uključujući statističke podatke. **Odgovorite na vaša istraživačka pitanja** (navedeno na kraju uvoda) i **usporedite svoje glavne rezultate s objavljenim podacima**, što je objektivnije moguće. Raspravljajte o njihovim ograničenjima i objavite vaš glavni pronalazak. Ako vaše istraživanje uključuje ispitanike samo jednog spola, razmotrite implikacije i mogućnost generalizacije vaših rezultata na oba spola. Treba uzeti u obzir i one reference koje govore vašem gledištu. Da bi potkrijepili svoj stav koristite samo reference koje **imaju metodološki ispravno donesene zaključke** ([Roig 2009](#)). Na kraju diskusije/rasprave ili u zasebnom odjeljku, trebate istaknuti glavne zaključke i praktično značenje za svoj studij.
- **Zahvale:** spomenuti sve ljude koji su značajno pridonijeli istraživanju, ali koji nisu koautori, kao i one koji su financijski pomogli istraživanje. Preporučeni oblik je: "This work was supported by the Medical Research Council [grant number xxxx]". Ako nema posebnih osiguranih sredstava, koristite sljedeću rečenicu: "This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors" ([RIN 2008](#)). Ako smatrate relevantnim, obavijestite urednika o o drugim sukobima interesa, npr. finansijska ili lična povezanost sa

proizvođačem ili sa organizacijom koja ima interes od priloženog rukopisa (Goozner *et al* 2009). Ako ste reproducirali prethodno objavljene materijale (npr. slike), pitajte vlasnika autorskih prava za dopuštenje, te ih spomenite u opisu ili zahvali. Ako ste koristili profesionalnu pomoć za jezik (npr. autor urednik ili prevoditelj), prikupljači podataka, lektor itd., trebali biste se zahvaliti za njihovu pomoć radi transparentnosti. (ICMJE 2014, Battisti *et al* 2015). Mora biti jasno da oni nisu odgovorni za konačnu verziju članka. Morate osigurati da imate pristanak svih ljudi u ovom odjeljku. (*Vidi Appendix: Ethics*).

- **Reference:** pobrinite se da navedete reference za sve informacije koje su izdvojene iz drugih publikacija. U popisu literature pridržavati se pravila navođenja referenci, te navesti sve podatke potrebne kako bi ih bilo lakše pronaći u biblioteci ili na Internetu. Za publikacije koje nisu na engleskom jeziku, dati **izvorni naslov** (transliteraciju prema engleskim pravilima ako je potrebno), a zatim, gdje je moguće, prevedeni naslov na negleski jezik napisati u zagradi (CSE 2014). Izbjegavajte citiranje nedostupnih, iznuđene i nevažne reference. Gdje god je to primjereno, citirajte primarne originalne istraživačke radove umjesto osvrtu ili revijalnih članaka (DORA 2013). Ne uključujte neobjavljene podatke u popisu literature – ako ih morate spomenuti, opišite njihov izvor u glavnom dijelu teksta i osigurajte dopuštenje od izdavača podataka za njihovo citiranje.
- **Različite strukture članaka** mogu biti više prikladane za teoretske publikacije, pregledne članke, studije slučaja, i sl. (npr. Gasparyan *et al* 2011).
- Neke publikacije, uključuju i sažetak ili duži **sažetak na drugom jeziku**. To je vrlo korisno u mnogim područjima istraživanja.
- Praćenje **vodilja za izvještavanje** će vam pomoći da pružite minimum neophodnih informacija o vašem istraživanju/studiji (vidi npr. EQUATOR Network).
- Ne zaboravite se pridržavati uputa iz **određenog časopisa** vezano za dužinu sažetka, stil, reference, itd.

Napišite SAŽETO kako biste oduzeli što manje vremena recenzentima i ocjenjivačima članka.

- **Nemojte navoditi reference koje se ne odnose na vaše istraživačko pitanje(a)** navedeno(a) u uvodu.
- **Nemojte kopirati** dio svoje prijašnje publikacije i ne postavljajte isti rad u više od jednog časopisa u isto vrijeme. Inače, vi možete biti odgovorni za **objavljivanje viška** (vidi COPE flowcharts). To

se ne odnosi na preliminarne publikacije, kao što su konferencijski skupovi (O'Connor 1991, see also BioMed Central policy). Štaviše, **sekundarne publikacije** su prihvatljive ako su namijenjene za sasvim drugačije skupine čitalaca (npr. na drugi jezik ili za stručnjake i širu javnost), a vi ste dobili odobrenje od urednika oba časopisa (ICMJE 2014). Osvrt na primarnu publikaciju mora biti dat u fusnoti na naslovnoj stranici sekundarne publikacije.

- Informacije navedene u jednom dijelu, po mogućnosti, **ne treba ponavljati** u drugim dijelovima. Očite iznimke uključuju sažetak, opis legende, te zaključak.
- Razmotriti da li su potrebne sve slike i tabele. Podatke prikazane u tabelama ne treba ponavljati u brojkama (ili obratno). Duge liste podataka ne treba ponavljati u tekstu.
- Naslovi tabela i slika moraju biti **informativni, ali ne previše dugi**. Ako su slični podaci prikazani u nekoliko tabela ili više grafičkih prikaza, onda format njihovog opisa također bi trebao biti sličan.
- Po mogućnosti, **brisanje očitih izjava** (npr. "Šume su vrlo važni ekosustavi.") i drugih suvišnih dijelova (npr. "Dobro je poznato da ...").
- Ako se **duži znanstveni pojam** često ponavlja, definirati svoje kratice na prvom i koristiti u glavnom dijelu teksta, a kasnije ga dosljedno primjenjivati.
- Izrazite svoje sumnje, ako je potrebno, ali **izbjegavajte pretjerano ograđivanje od rezultata** (npr. pisati "potencijalni", nego "može, eventualno, biti potencijalni"). Međutim, **nemojte suviše generalizirati** svoje zaključke.
- Osim ako urednik ne zahtjeva dugačije, **koristite numerale za navođenje svih brojeva**, npr. i za nevođenje jednocifrenih cijelih brojeva, **osim za nulu, jedinicu** (ako se navodi bez mjerne jedinice), **te u drugim slučajevima gdje je moguće da dođe do zabune**, npr. na početku rečenice prije skraćenice koja sadrži brojeve (CSE 2014).

Pišite JASNO kako bi se olakšalo razumijevanje – i da bi tekst bio čitljiv.

Znanstveni sadržaj

- **Jasno razlikovati izvorne podatke i ideje** od drugih ljudi i iz ranijih publikacija - pružanje relevantnih citata. **Moguće je sumirati ili parafrazirati** tekstove iz drugih izvora. To se odnosi i na prijevode. Kada kopirate tekst doslovno (npr. cijeli rečenicu ili više teksta), stavite ga u navodnike (npr. Roig 2009, Kerans & de Jager 2010). Inače biste mogli napraviti **plagijat** (vidi COPE flowcharts) ili samoplagijat.

- Provjerite koristite li **odgovarajuće engleske znanstvene termine**, po mogućnosti na temelju tekstova koje pišu izvorni engleski govornici. Doslovni prijevodi su često pogrešni (npr. riječi koje ne postoje u datom jeziku a koje je izmislio prevodilac). Ako ste u nedoumici, **provjerite definiciju** u rječniku engleskog jezika kao i mnoge druge riječi koje koristite na pogrešan način (*Vidi Appendix: Ambiguity*). Također možete tražiti riječ ili frazu u Wikipediji, naprimjer, onda usporediti rezultate na vašem maternjem jeziku i na engleskom, te vidjeti da li je ekvivalent riječi ili fraze u uobičajenom/narodnom jeziku zaista isti. Međutim, Wikipedija nije uvijek pouzdan izvor informacija.
- Ako se riječ koristi uglavnom u prijevodima i samo rijetko u zemljama engleskog govornog područja, razmislite o zamjeni sa poznatijim engleskim terminom koji ima slično značenje (npr. "plant community" umjesto "phytocoenosis"). Ako znanstveni pojam nema sinonim na engleskom jeziku, precizno ga definirajte i predložite prihvatljiv prijevod na engleski jezik.
- **Definirati svaki neuobičajeni ili dvosmisleni znanstveni pojam** prilikom prve upotrebe. Možete popisati njegove sinonime, ako postoje (za pomoć u potrazi), ali kasnije koristite samo jedan od njih dosljedno (kako bi se spriječila zbunjenost). Formalno osnovana nomenklatura znanstvene organizacije bi trebala biti korištena (npr. [EASE 2013](#)).
- **Izbjegavajte nejasne izjave**, koje zahtijevaju od čitatelja da pogodi njihovo značenje. (*Vidi Appendix: Ambiguity*).
- Kada izvještavate o postotku, jasno je ono **što se smatra 100%**. Ako pišete o povezanosti, odnosima, itd., jasno je koje vrijednosti se uspoređuju s kojima.
- **Sistem internacionalnih (SI) jedinica i Celzijevih stupnjeva** se najviše koristi.
- Za razliku od mnogih drugih jezika u engleskom jeziku se koristi **decimalna tačka** (a ne zarez). Osim ako urednik ne zahtjeva dugačije, u brojevima sa više od tri broja ispred ili iza decimalne tačke koristite **jedan razmak** (ne zareze) između grupa od 3 broja od decimalne tačke ([EASE 2013](#)).
- Za označavanje stoljeća, mjeseci, i sl., **ne koristite se rimskim brojevima**, jer su oni rijetki u engleskom jeziku. Zbog razlike između britanskih i američkih pisanja datuma (vidi dolje), po mogućnosti, označavajte mjesece kao cijele riječi ili njihova prva 3 slova ([CSE 2014](#)).
- Ako su manje poznati **geografski nazivi**, izvorni naziv također treba spomenuti, ako je moguće, npr. "in the Kampinos Forest (Puszcza

Kampinoska)". Neke dodatne informacije o lokaciji, klimi, itd., mogu također biti korisne za čitatelje.

- Ne zaboravite da će tekst **čitati uglavnom stranci**, kojima lokalni izrazi odnosno značenja klasifikacija ili pojmova koji su široko poznati u vašoj zemlji nisu bliski, te će zbog toga biti potrebno dopuniti objašnjenje ([Ufnalska 2008](#)). Naprimjer, porodica korova *Erigeron annuus* se zove *Stenactis annua* u nekim zemljama, pa u engleskim tekstovima međunarodno odobreno ime treba biti korišteno, dok sinonim(e) treba dodati u zagradama.

Struktura teksta

- **Rečenice općenito ne bi trebale biti duge. Njihova struktura mora biti relativno jednostavna**, sa predmetom u neposrednoj blizini njegovog glagola ([Gopen & Swan 1990](#)). Naprimjer, izbjegavajte sažetak imenice i napisati "X mjeren je ..." umjesto "Mjerenja su provedena X ...". (*Vidi Appendix: Simplicity*). Nemojte pretjerano koristiti pasivne konstrukcije (npr. [Norris 2011](#)). Pri prevodenju, mijenjati strukturu rečenica, ako je potrebno prenijeti poruku ispravno ili jasnije ([Burrough-Boenisch 2013](#)).
- **Tekst mora biti jasan, logično organiziran**, a time i lagan za praćenje. (*Vidi Appendix: Cohesion*)
- Svaka stavka trebala bi početi sa suštinom teme, a sljedeća rečenica u potpunosti razviti temu.
- Za razliku od nekih drugih jezika, engleski omogućuje paralelne konstrukcije, koje olakšavaju razumijevanje. Naprimjer, kada se uspoređuju slični podaci, možete pisati "It was high in A, medium in B, and low in C", umjesto "It was high in A, medium for B, and low in the case of C".
- **Provjerite jesu li slike i tabele razumljive** bez pozivanja na glavni dio članka. Izostaviti podatke koji nisu informativni (npr. brisanje stupca ako sadrži iste vrijednosti u svim redovima - možete pisati o tome u bilješci). Primijenite kratice samo ako je to potrebno radi dosljednosti ili ako nema dovoljno prostora za cijelu riječ. U opise ili fusnote, definirati sve kratice i simbole koji nisu očiti (npr. stupce pogreške može označavati standardna devijacija, standardna pogreška ili interval pouzdanosti). **Ne zaboravite da koristite decimalne tačke** (ne decimalni zarez), te **osigurati oznaku osa i jedinica gdje je potrebno**.
- Razmislite o korištenju **tekstualnih tabela** kada predstavljaju mali skup podataka ([Kozak 2009](#)). (*Vidi Appendix: Text-tables*).

- U dugim popisima (kratica, itd.), po mogućnosti odvojite **pojedine stavke** (:), koji su posrednik među zarezima i tačkama.

O jeziku

- Gdje god znanstveni termini nisu potrebni, po mogućnosti koristite **poznatije riječi**. Međutim, izbjegavajte kolokvijalne izraze i korištenje idiomatskih izraza, kao i složenih glagola (npr. "find out", "pay off"), koji je često teško shvatiti od strane neizvornih govornika engleskog jezika (Geercken 2006).
- **Definirajte kratice** kada se prvi put pojavljuju u glavnom dijelu članka (jer mogu biti nejasni čitateljima). **Ne koristite previše različitih kratica**, jer će biti teško razumjeti tekst. Ne skraćujte pojmove koji se koriste rijetko u radu. **Izbjegavajte skraćenice u sažetku**.
- Općenito, pišite u **prošlom vremenu** kada opisujete kako ste obavili svoje istraživanje i što ste našli ili šta su drugi istraživači učinili. Po mogućnosti, koristite **sadašnje vrijeme** za opće izjave i tumačenja (npr. statističku značajnost, zaključke) ili prilikom pisanja o sadržaju svog članka, a osobito tabela i slika (Day & Gastel, 2006).
- Osim ako urednik ne zahtjeva dugačije, **nemojte pisati o sebi**, "the author(s)", jer to je dvosmisleno. Umjesto toga, pišite "we" ili "I" ako je potrebno ili koristite izraze kao što je "in this study", "our results" ili "in our opinion" (npr. Hartley 2010, Norris 2011). Imajte na umu da biste trebali napisati "this study" samo ako mislite na svoje nove rezultate. Ako ste mislili na publikacije navedene u prethodnoj rečenici, pišite "that study". Ako ste mislili na autore navedene publikacije, pišite "those authors".
- Ne zaboravite da bi u naučnim tekstovima riječ "**which**" trebala biti korištena u rečenicama koje ne definiraju zaključke, dok se riječi "**that**" u rečenicama koje ddefiniraju zaključke (tj. što znači "samo oni koji").
- Kada koristite **dvosmislene riječi**, pobrinite se da je njihovo značenje očito iz konteksta teksta. Provjerite da li se **svi glagoli slažu u broju s njihovim temama** i jesu li **reference za sve zamjenice jasne** (to je presudno u prevedenim tekstovima). Imajte na umu da neke imenice imaju **nepravilne množinu** (*Vidi Appendix: Plurals*).
- Pročitajte tekst naglas i provjerite interpunkcije. Sve **intonacijske pauze** su potrebne za pravilno razumijevanje i trebaju biti označene zarezom ili drugim znakovima interpunkcije (npr. naglasiti razliku između "ne više podataka je potrebno" i "ne, više podataka je potrebno").

- Budite **dosljedni u pravopisu**. Slijedite britanska ili američka pravila za pravopis i bilježenja datuma (npr. "21 Jan 2009" na britanskom, ili "Jan 21, 2009" na američkom engleskom). (*Vidi Appendix: Spelling*). Provjerite je li cilj časopisa korištenje američkog ili britanskog pravopisa, a zatim koristite pravila za vaše riječi i gramatiku.
- Pitajte kolegu da pročita cijeli tekst, kako biste uvidjeli postoje li dvosmisleni dijelovi.

Prijevod/Translation: Izet Mašić (imasic@lol.ba),
updated by Dubravko Vaniček
 (dvaniček@hotmail.com)

SARADNICI U IZRADI VODIČA SU (hronološkim redom): Sylwia Ufnalska (initiator and editor, sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com), Paola De Castro, Liz Wager, Carol Norris, James Hartley, Françoise Salager-Meyer, Marcin Kozak, Ed Hull, Mary Ellen Kerans, Angela Turner, Will Hughes, Peter Hovenkamp, Thomas Babor, Eric Lichtfouse, Richard Hurley, Mercè Piqueras, Maria Persson, Elisabetta Poltronieri, Suzanne Lapstun, Mare-Anne Laane, David Vaux, Arjan Polderman, Ana Marusic, Elisabeth Heseltine, Joy Burrough-Boenisch, Eva Baranyiová, Tom Lang, Arie Manten, Pippa Smart, Armen Gasparyan, John Miescher, Shirin Heidari, Ksenija Baždarić

Reference i daljnje čitanje

- AuthorAID Resource Library.
<http://www.authoraid.info/resource-library>
- Baranyiová E. 2013. Correct terminology in science: the role of editors. *Science Editor* 36 (2): 63. <http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/wp-content/uploads/v36n2p63.pdf>
- Battisti WP, Wager E, Baltzer L, Bridges D, Cairns A, Carswell CI, et al 2015. Good publication practice for communicating company-sponsored medical research: GPP3. *Ann Intern Med*. 163(6):461-464. doi:10.7326/M15-0288
- Beverly P. 2015. *Word macros for writers and editors*. <http://www.archivepub.co.uk/TheBook>
- BioMed Central policy on duplicate publication.
<http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#duplicate+publication>
- Bless A, Hull E. 2008. *Reader-friendly biomedical articles: how to write them!* 3rd ed. Alphen a/d Rijn: Van Zuiden Communication.
- Bravo E, Calzolari A, De Castro P, Mabile L, Napolitani F, Rossi AM, Cambon-Thomsen A. 2015. Developing a guideline to standardize the citation of bioresources in journal articles (CoBRA). *BMC Medicine* 13:33.doi:10.1186/s12916-015-0266-y
- Burrough-Boenisch J. 2013. Editing texts by non-native speakers of English. In: European Association of Science Editors. *Science editors' handbook*. Smart P, Maisonneuve H, Polderman A, editors.
<http://www.ease.org.uk/handbook/index.shtml>
- Cerejo C. 2013. How to make your paper more accessible through self-archiving. *Editage Insights*. <http://www.editage.com>

- com/insights/how-to-make-your-paper-more-accessible-through-self-archiving
- Chipperfield L, Citrome L, Clark J, David FS, Enck R, Evangelista M, *et al* 2010. Authors' Submission Toolkit: a practical guide to getting your research published. *Current Medical Research & Opinion* 26(8):1967-1982. doi:10.1185/03007995.2010.499344
- [COPE flowcharts] Committee on Publication Ethics flowcharts. <http://www.publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts>
- [CSE] Council of Science Editors, Style Manual Committee. 2014. *Scientific style and format: the CSE manual for authors, editors, and publishers*. 8th ed. Univeristy of Chicago Press. <http://www.scientificstyleandformat.org/Home.html>
- Day RA, Gastel B. 2006. *How to write and publish a scientific paper*. 6th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [DORA] San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. 2013. <http://www.ascb.org/files/SFDeclarationFINAL.pdf>
- [EASE] European Association of Science Editors. 2012. EASE Toolkit for Authors. <http://www.ease.org.uk/publications/ease-toolkit-authors>
- [EASE] European Association of Science Editors. 2013. *Science editors' handbook*. 2nd ed. Smart P, Maisonneuve H, Polderman A, editors. <http://www.ease.org.uk/handbook/index.shtml>
- EQUATOR Network. <http://www.equator-network.org/>
- Gasparyan AY, Ayzvazyan L, Blackmore H, Kitas GD. 2011. Writing a narrative biomedical review: considerations for authors, peer reviewers, and editors. *Rheumatology International* 31(11):1409-1417. doi: 10.1007/s00296-011-1999-3
- Geercken S. 2006. Challenges of (medical) writing for the multilingual audience. *Write Stuff* 15(2):45-46. <http://www.emwa.org/documents/journal/TWS/TWS%202006%202%2015.pdf>
- Goozner M, Caplan A, Moreno J, Kramer BS, Babor TF, Husser WC. 2009. A common standard for conflict of interest disclosure in addiction journals. *Addiction* 104:1779-1784. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02594.x
- Gopen GD, Swan JA. 1990. The science of scientific writing: if the reader is to grasp what the writer means, the writer must understand what the reader needs. *American Scientist* 78(6):550-558. <http://www-stat.wharton.upenn.edu/~bujaj/sci.html>
- Hartley J. 2010. Citing oneself. *European Science Editing* 36(2):35-37. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/may_2010_362.pdf
- Hengl T, Gould M, Gerritsma W. 2012. *The unofficial guide for authors: from research design to publication*. Wageningen, Arnhem. http://www.lulu.com/spotlight/t_hengl
- Hull E. 2015. Health-related scientific articles in the 21st century: give readers nuggets! Vught, Netherlands: Professional English. <http://www.professionaenglish.nl/giveemnuggets.html>
- [ICMJE] International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. 2014. *Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals*. http://www.icmje.org/urm_main.html
- [Inderscience] Inderscience Publishers. 2013. Keyword requirements. http://www.inderscience.com/www/id31_keywords.pdf
- Kerans ME, de Jager M. 2010. Handling plagiarism at the editor's desk. *European Science Editing* 36(3): 62-66. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/ese_aug10.pdf
- Kozak M. 2009. Text-table: an underused and undervalued tool for communicating information. *European Science Editing* 35(4):103. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/november_2009_354.pdf
- Lang T. 2004. Twenty statistical errors even YOU can find in biomedical research articles. *Croatian Medical Journal* 45(4):361-370. <http://www.cmj.hr/2004/45/4/15311405.htm>
- Marusic M. 2014. Gender and sex in medical research. *European Science Editing* 40(2):56. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/corresp_2.pdf
- [MeSH Browser] Medical Subject Headings Browser. <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html>
- Norris CB. 2009. *Academic writing in English*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. <http://www.helsinki.fi/kksc/language.services/AcadWrit.pdf>
- Norris C. 2011. The passive voice revisited. *European Science Editing* 37(1):6-7. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/february_2011_371.pdf
- O'Connor M. 1991. *Writing successfully in science*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Research Methods Supercourse. <http://www.pitt.edu/~super1/ResearchMethods/index.htm>
- [RIN] Research Information Network. 2008. Acknowledgement of funders in journal articles. <http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/research-funding-policy-and-guidance/acknowledgement-funders-journal-articles>
- Roig M. 2011. *Avoiding plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and other questionable writing practices: a guide to ethical writing*. Office of Research Integrity <http://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/plagiarism/0.shtml>
- [SAGER guideline] Sex and Gender Equity in Research guideline. <http://www.equator-network.org/library/reporting-guidelines-under-development/#45>
- Seifert KA, Crous PW, Frisvad JC. 2008. Correcting the impact factors of taxonomic journals by Appropriate Citation of Taxonomy (ACT). *Persoonia* 20:105. doi: 10.3767/003158508X324236
- Strunk WJr, White EB. 2000. *The elements of style*. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Tufte ER. 2001. *The visual display of quantitative information*, 2nd ed. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- Ufnalska S. 2008. Abstracts of research articles: readers' expectations and guidelines for authors. *European Science Editing* 34(3):63-65. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/august_2008343.pdf
- [WMA] World Medical Association. 2013. *Declaration of Helsinki – ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects*. <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/>
- World Conference on Research Integrity. 2010. Singapore Statement. <http://www.singaporestatement.org/statement.html>

Appendix: Abstracts

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Key elements of abstracts

Researchers are quite often in a “box” of technical details – the “important” things they focus on day in and day out. As a result, they frequently lose sight of 4 items essential for any readable, credible, and relevant IMRaD¹ article: the point of the research, the research question, its answer, and the consequences of the study.

To help researchers to get out of the box, I ask them to include 5 key elements in their research report and in their abstract. I describe briefly the elements below and illustrate them with a fictitious abstract.

Key element 1 (BACKGROUND): the point of the research – why should we care about the study? This is usually a statement of the BIG problem that the research helps to solve and the strategy for helping to solve it. It prepares the reader to understand the specific research question.

Key element 2 (OBJECTIVES): the specific research question – the basis of credible science. To be clear, complete and concise, research questions are stated in terms of relationships between the variables that were investigated. Such specific research questions tie the story together – they focus on credible science.

Key element 3 (METHODS): a precise description of the methods used to collect data and determine the relationships between the variables.

Key element 4 (RESULTS): the major findings – not only data, but the RELATIONSHIPS found that lead to the answer. Results should generally be reported in the past tense but the authors’ interpretation of the factual findings is in the present tense – it reports the authors’ belief of how the world IS. Of course, in a pilot study such as the following example, the authors cannot yet present definitive answers, which they indicate by using the words “suggest” and “may”.

Key element 5 (CONCLUSIONS): the consequences of the answers – the value of the work. This element relates directly back to the big problem: how the study helps to solve the problem, and it also points to the next step in research.

Here is a fictitious structured abstract, using these headings.

Predicting malaria epidemics in Ethiopia

Abstract

BACKGROUND: Most deaths from malaria could be prevented if malaria epidemics could be predicted in local areas, allowing medical facilities to be mobilized early. **OBJECTIVES:** As a first step toward constructing a predictive model, we determined correlations between meteorological factors and malaria epidemics in Ethiopia. **METHODS:** In a retrospective study, we collected meteorological and epidemic data for 10 local areas, covering the years 1963-2006. Poisson regression was used to compare the data. **RESULTS:** Factors AAA, BBB, and CCC correlated significantly ($P < 0.05$) with subsequent epidemics in all 10 areas. A model based on these correlations would have a predictive power of about 30%. **CONCLUSIONS:** Meteorological factors can be used to predict malaria epidemics. However, the predictive power of our model needs to be improved and validated in other areas.

This understandable and concise abstract forms the “skeleton” for the entire article. A final comment: This example is based on an actual research project and, at first, the author was in a “box” full of the mathematics, statistics, and computer algorithms of his predicting model. This was reflected in his first version of the abstract, where the word “malaria” never appeared.

Written by Ed Hull

edhull@home.nl

(for more information, see [Hull 2015](#))

¹ IMRaD stands for Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion.

Appendix: Ambiguity

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Empty words and sentences

Many English words are empty – they do not add information but require the reader to fill in information or context to be understood. The reader is forced to supply his or her own interpretation, which could be different from what you, the writer, mean.

Empty words seem to give information and uncritical readers do not notice them – that is why they work so well for marketing texts. However, empty words do not belong in articles reporting scientific research. Empty words require the reader to supply the meaning – very dangerous. Concise and clear communication requires words that convey specific meaning.

Examples

It is important that patients take their medicine.

- Note that to a physician the meaning is probably entirely different than to the sales manager of a pharmaceutical company. “Important” is one of our best-loved, but empty, words – it fits every situation.

The patient was treated for XXX.

- “Treated” is empty; we do not know what was done. One reader could assume that the patient was given a certain medicine, while another reader could assume that the patient was given a different medicine. Perhaps the patient was operated on, or sent to Switzerland for a rest cure.

The patient reacted well to the medicine.

- “Reacted well” gives us a positive piece of information, but otherwise it is empty; we do not know how the patient reacted.

The patient’s blood pressure was low.

- We interpret “high/low blood pressure” to mean “higher/lower than normal”, but we, the readers, have to supply that reference standard. A more concise statement is: *The patient’s blood pressure was 90/60.*

Empty words and phrases not only require the reader to supply the meaning, they also contribute to a wordy blah-blah text. In scientific articles they destroy credibility. Here are some examples.

It has been found that the secondary effects of this drug include...

- Better: *The secondary effects of this drug include...(ref).*
Or, if these are your new results: *Our results show that the secondary effects of this drug include...*

We performed a retrospective evaluation study on XXX.

- “Performed a study” is a much overused and rather empty phrase. Better: *We retrospectively evaluated XXX.*

More examples that require the reader to supply information if it is not evident from the context:

- *quality*
- *good/bad*
- *high/low*
- *large/small*
- *long/short*
- *proper/properly* (eg “...a proper question on the questionnaire...”)
- *As soon as possible...*

Written by Ed Hull
edhull@home.nl

Incorrect use of scientific terms

Scientific language should be exact and based on unequivocal terms. However, some terms are not always used properly. For example, *trimester* means 3 months (usually with reference to 1/3 of human pregnancy) but is often wrongly used to describe 1/3 of mostly shorter pregnancy in many animal species (Baranyiová 2013). Another nowadays frequently misused word in both human and veterinary medicine is *gender* (eg “examined dogs of both genders”), as it is not equivalent to biological sex. The word *gender* applies

primarily to social and linguistic contexts. By contrast, in medicine and biology, the term *sex* is usually correct, because biological sex (not gender) is linked with major physiological differences (Marušić 2014). Wrong use of scientific terms can lead not only to confusion but also to serious consequences, so special care should be taken to avoid it.

Written by Eva Baranyiová
ebaryani@seznam.cz

Appendix: Cohesion

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Cohesion – the glue

The word “cohesion” means “unity”, “consistency”, and “solidity”. Building cohesion into your text makes life easier for your readers – they will be much more likely to read the text. Cohesion “glues” your text together, focusing the readers’ attention on your main message and thereby adding credibility to your work.

Think of your text as a motorcycle chain made up of separate links, where each sentence is one link. A pile of unconnected links is worthless – it will never drive your motorcycle. Similarly, a pile of unconnected sentences is worthless – it will never drive your message home.

To build a cohesive text, you have to connect your sentences together to make longer segments we call paragraphs. A cohesive paragraph clearly focuses on its topic. You then need to connect each paragraph with the previous paragraph, thereby linking the paragraph topics. Linking paragraphs results in building cohesive sections of your article, where each section focuses on its main topic. Then, link the sections to each other and, finally, connect the end of your article to the beginning, closing the loop – now the chain will drive our motorcycle. Let’s look at linking techniques.

Basic guidelines for building a cohesive story:

1. Link each sentence to the previous sentence.
2. Link each paragraph to the previous paragraph.
3. Link each section to the previous section.
4. Link the end to the beginning.

Linking techniques

Whether you want to link sentences, paragraphs, sections or the beginning to the end, use 2 basic linking techniques:

- Use linking words and phrases, such as: *however, although, those, since then...* An example: *Our research results conflict with those of Smith and Jones. To resolve those differences we measured ...*
- Repeat key words and phrases – do not use synonyms. In scientific writing, repetition sharpens the focus. Repetition especially helps the reader to connect ideas that are physically separated in your text. For example: *Other investigators have shown that microbial activity can cause immobilization of labile soil phosphorus. Our results suggest that, indeed, microbial activity immobilizes the labile soil phosphorus.*

The example below illustrates how to link your answer to your research question, thus linking the Discussion with the Introduction.

In the Introduction, the research hypothesis is stated. For example: *The decremental theory of aging led us to hypothesize that older workers in “speed” jobs perform less well and have more absences and more accidents than other workers have.*

In the Discussion, the answer is linked to the hypothesis: *Our findings do not support the hypothesis that older workers in speed jobs perform less well and have more absences and more accidents than other workers have. The older workers generally earned more, were absent less often, and had fewer accidents than younger workers had. Furthermore, we found no significant difference between...*

Written by Ed Hull
edhull@home.nl

Appendix: Ethics

European
Association of
Science
Editors



EASE Ethics Checklist for Authors

EXPLANATION: obligatory declarations applying to all manuscripts are printed in bold.

Original or acceptable secondary publication

- No part of this manuscript (MS) has been published, except for passages that are properly cited.
- An abstract/summary of this MS has been published in.....
- This MS has already been published in but in language. A full citation to the primary publication is included, and the copyright owner has agreed to its publication in English.
- No part of this MS is currently being considered for publication elsewhere.**
- In this MS, original data are clearly distinguished from published data. All information extracted from other publications is provided with citations.**

Authorship

- All people listed as authors of this MS meet the authorship criteria, ie they contributed substantially to study planning, data collection or interpretation of results *and* wrote or critically revised the MS *and* approved its final submitted version *and* agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work (ICMJE 2014).
- All people listed as authors of this MS are aware of it and have agreed to be listed.
- No person who meets the authorship criteria has been omitted.

Ethical experimentation and interpretation

- The study reported in this MS involved human participants and it meets the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki (WMA 2013). Data have been disaggregated by sex (and, whenever possible, by race) and sex and gender considerations are properly addressed (see [Sex and Gender Questions](#)²).
- The study reported in this MS meets the Consensus Author Guidelines on Animal Ethics and Welfare for Veterinary Journals³ about humane treatment of animals and has been approved by an ethical review committee.
- The study reported in this MS meets other ethical principles, namely
- I and all the other authors of this MS did our best to avoid errors in experimental design, data**

presentation, interpretation, etc. However, if we discover any serious error in the MS (before or after publication), we will alert the editor promptly.

- None of our data presented in this MS has been fabricated or distorted, and no valid data have been excluded. Images shown in figures have not been manipulated to make a false impression on readers.
- Results of this study have been interpreted objectively. Any findings that run contrary to our point of view are discussed in the MS.
- The article does not, to the best of our knowledge, contain anything that is libellous, illegal, infringes anyone's copyright or other rights, or poses a threat to public safety.

Acknowledgements

- All sources of funding for the study reported in this MS are stated.
- All people who are not listed as authors but contributed considerably to the study reported in this MS or assisted in its writing (eg author's editors, translators, medical writers) are mentioned in the Acknowledgements.
- All people named in the Acknowledgements have agreed to this. However, they are not responsible for the final version of this MS.
- Consent has been obtained from the author(s) of unpublished data cited in the MS.
- Copyright owners of previously published figures or tables have agreed to their inclusion in this MS.

Conflict of interest

- All authors of this study have signed the EASE Form for Authors' Contributions and Conflict of Interest Disclosure⁴.

Date:.....

Corresponding author:.....

MS title:.....

.....

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska
sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com

² <http://www.ease.org.uk/publications/sex-and-gender>

³ <http://www.veteditors.org/consensus-author-guidelines-on-animal-ethics-and-welfare-for-editors/>

⁴ www.ease.org.uk/publications/ease-form

Appendix: Plurals

European
Association of
Science
Editors



Examples of irregular plurals deriving from Latin or Greek

Singular	Plural	Examples
-a	-ae rarely -ata	<i>alga – algae, larva – larvae</i> <i>stoma – stomata</i>
-ex	-ices	<i>index – indices (or indexes*)</i> <i>apex – apices (or apexes*)</i>
-ies	-ies	<i>species, series, facies</i>
-is	-es	<i>axis – axes, hypothesis – hypotheses</i>
-ix	-ices	<i>appendix – appendices (or appendixes*)</i> <i>matrix – matrices (or matrixes*)</i>
-on	-a	<i>phenomenon – phenomena</i> <i>criterion – criteria</i>
-um	-a	<i>datum – data**, bacterium – bacteria</i>
-us	-i rarely -uses or -era	<i>locus – loci, fungus – fungi (or funguses*)</i> <i>sinus – sinuses</i> <i>genus – genera</i>

* Acceptable anglicized plurals that are also listed in dictionaries.

** In non-scientific use, usually treated as a mass noun (like *information*, etc.)

It must be remembered that some nouns used in everyday English also have irregular plural forms (e.g. *woman – women, foot – feet, tooth – teeth, mouse – mice, leaf – leaves, life – lives, tomato – tomatoes*) or have no plural form (e.g. *equipment, information, news*). For more examples, see [CSE \(2014\)](#). If in doubt, consult a dictionary.

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska
sylvia.ufnalska@gmail.com

Appendix: Simplicity

European
Association of
Science
Editors



Examples of expressions that can be simplified or deleted (∅)

Long or (sometimes) wrong	Better choice (often)
<i>accounted for by the fact that</i>	<i>because</i>
<i>as can be seen from Figure 1, substance Z reduces twitching</i>	<i>substance Z reduces twitching (Fig. 1)</i>
<i>at the present moment</i>	<i>now</i>
<i>bright yellow in colour</i>	<i>bright yellow</i>
<i>conducted inoculation experiments on</i>	<i>inoculated</i>
<i>considerable amount of</i>	<i>much</i>
<i>despite the fact that</i>	<i>although</i>
<i>due to the fact that</i>	<i>because</i>
<i>for the reason that</i>	<i>because</i>
<i>if conditions are such that</i>	<i>if</i>
<i>in a considerable number of cases</i>	<i>often</i>
<i>in view of the fact that</i>	<i>because</i>
<i>it is of interest to note that</i>	∅
<i>it may, however, be noted that</i>	<i>but</i>
<i>large numbers of</i>	<i>many</i>
<i>lazy in character</i>	<i>lazy</i>
<i>methodology</i>	<i>methods</i>
<i>owing to the fact that</i>	<i>because</i>
<i>oval in shape</i>	<i>oval</i>
<i>prior to</i>	<i>before</i>
<i>taken into consideration</i>	<i>considered</i>
<i>terminate</i>	<i>end</i>
<i>the test in question</i>	<i>this test</i>
<i>there can be little doubt that this is</i>	<i>this is probably</i>
<i>to an extent equal to that of X</i>	<i>as much as X</i>
<i>utilize</i>	<i>use</i>
<i>whether or not</i>	<i>whether</i>

Based on O'Connor (1991)

Appendix: Spelling

European
Association of
Science
Editors

Examples of differences between British and American spelling



British English	American English
-ae- eg <i>aetiology, faeces, haematology</i>	-e- eg <i>etiology, feces, hematology</i>
-ce in nouns, -se in verbs eg <i>defence, licence/license, practice/practise</i>	-se in nouns and verbs eg <i>defense, license</i> (but <i>practice</i> as both noun and verb)
-ise or -ize * eg <i>organise/organize</i>	-ize eg <i>organize</i>
-isation or -ization * eg <i>organisation/organization</i>	-ization eg <i>organization</i>
-lled, -lling, -llor , etc. eg <i>labelled, travelling, councillor</i> (but <i>fulfil, skilful</i>)	-led, -ling, -lor , etc. eg <i>labeled, traveling, councilor</i> (but <i>fulfill, skillful</i>)
-oe- eg <i>diarrhoea, foetus, oestrogen</i>	-e- eg <i>diarrhea, fetus, estrogen</i>
-ogue eg <i>analogue, catalogue</i>	-og or -ogue eg <i>analog/analogue, catalog/catalogue</i>
-our eg <i>colour, behaviour, favour</i>	-or eg <i>color, behavior, favor</i>
-re eg <i>centre, fibre, metre, litre</i> (but <i>meter</i> for a measuring instrument)	-er eg <i>center, fiber, meter, liter</i>
-yse eg <i>analyse, dialyse</i>	-yze eg <i>analyze, dialyze</i>
aluminium	aluminum or aluminium **
grey	gray
mould	mold
programme (general) or program (computer)	program
sulphur or sulfur **	sulfur

*One ending should be used consistently.

**Recommended by the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry and the Royal Society of Chemistry.

For more examples, see [CSE \(2014\)](#). If in doubt, consult a dictionary. Obviously, American and British English slightly differ not only in spelling but also in word use, grammar,

punctuation, etc. However, those differences are outside the scope of this document.

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska
sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com

Appendix: Text-tables

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Text-tables – effective tools for presentation of small data sets

Arranging statistical information in a classic table and referring to it elsewhere means that readers do not access the information as immediately as they would when reading about it within the sentence. They have to find the table in the document (which may be on another page), losing some time. This slightly decreases the strength of the information. Quicker access to the information can be achieved within a sentence, but this is not an effective structure if more than 2 numbers are to be compared. In such situations, a “text-table” appears to be ideal for communicating information to the reader quickly and comprehensibly (Tufte 2001). The text-table is a simple table with no graphic elements, such as grid lines, rules, shading, or boxes. The text-table is embedded within a sentence, so no reference to it is needed. Keeping the power of tabular arrangements, text-tables immediately convey the message. Look at the following examples.

Original sentence:

Iron concentration means (\pm standard deviation) were as follows: 11.2 \pm 0.3 mg/dm³ in sample A, 12.3 \pm 0.2 mg/dm³ in sample B, and 11.4 \pm 0.9 mg/dm³ in sample C.

Modified:

Iron concentration means (\pm standard deviation, in mg/dm³) were as follows:

sample B	12.3 \pm 0.2
sample C	11.4 \pm 0.9
sample A	11.2 \pm 0.3

Original sentence

After the treatment was introduced, mortality tended to decline among patients aged 20-39 y (relative reduction [RR] = 0.86/y; 95% CI 0.81–0.92; $P < 0.001$), 40 to 59 y of

age (RR = 0.97/y; 95% CI 0.92–1.03; $P = 0.24$) and 60 to 79 y of age (RR = 0.92/y; 95% CI 0.86–0.99; $P = 0.06$).

Modified:

After the treatment was introduced, mortality tended to decline among patients in all age groups (RR stands for relative reduction per year):

20-39 y	RR = 0.86	(95% CI 0.81–0.92; $P < 0.001$)
40-59 y	RR = 0.97	(95% CI 0.92–1.03; $P = 0.24$)
60-79 y	RR = 0.92	(95% CI 0.86–0.99; $P = 0.06$)

Some rules for arranging text-tables

1. The larger a text-table is, the less power it has.
2. The sentence that precedes the text-table acts as a heading that introduces the information the text-table represents, and usually ends with a colon. Text-tables should have neither headings nor footnotes.
3. Indentation of text-tables should fit the document's layout.
4. Occasional changes in font (such as italics, bold, a different typeface) may be used, but with caution. They can, however, put some emphasis on the tabular part.
5. Do not use too many text-tables in one document or on one page.
6. In addition to the above rules, apply rules for formatting regular tables. For example, numbers should be given in 2-3 effective digits; ordering rows by size and their correct alignment will facilitate reading and comparison of values; space between columns should be neither too wide nor too narrow.

Written by Marcin Kozak

nyggus@gmail.com

(for more information, see [Kozak 2009](#))

Practical tips for junior researchers

- Consider publishing a review article once you have completed the first year of your PhD studies because: (1) you should already have a clear picture of the field and an up-to-date stock of references in your computer; (2) research results sometimes take a long time to get (in agronomy: 3 years of field experiments...); (3) journals love review articles (they tend to improve the impact factor); (4) the rejection rate of review articles is low (although some journals publish solicited reviews only, so you might want to contact the Editor first); (5) the non-specialist reader - such as a future employer - will understand a review article more easily than an original article with detailed results.
- Alternatively, publish meta-analyses or other database-based research articles.
- Each part/item of an article should preferably be “almost” understandable (and citable) without reading other parts. The average time spent reading an article is falling, so virtually no one reads from Title to References. This phenomenon is amplified by the “digital explosion”, whereby search engines identify individual items, such as abstracts or figures, rather than intact articles.

Written by Eric Lichtfouse

eric.lichtfouse@dijon.inra.fr

For more advice, see [EASE Toolkit for Authors](#) (www.ease.org.uk/publications/ease-toolkit-authors)

About EASE

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Background information about EASE and the *EASE Guidelines*

The European Association of Science Editors (EASE) was formed in May 1982 at Pau, France, from the European Life Science Editors' Association (ELSE) and the European Association of Earth Science Editors (Editerra). Thus in 2012 we celebrated the 30th anniversary of our Association.

EASE is affiliated to the International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS), the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS), the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). Through its affiliation to IUBS and IUGS, our Association is also affiliated to the International Council for Science (ICSU) and is thereby in formal associate relations with UNESCO.

EASE cooperates with the International Society for Addiction Journal Editors (ISAJE), International Association of Veterinary Editors (IAVE), International Society of Managing and Technical Editors (ISMTE), the Council of Science Editors (CSE), and the Association of Earth Science Editors (AESE) in North America. Our other links include the African Association of Science Editors (AASE), the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP), the European Medical Writers Association (EMWA), Mediterranean Editors and Translators (MET), the Society of English-Native-Speaking Editors (Netherlands) (SENSE), and the Society for Editors and Proofreaders (SfEP).

We have major conferences every 2-3 years in various countries. EASE also organizes occasional seminars, courses, and other events between the conferences.

Since 1986, we publish a journal, now entitled *European Science Editing*. It is distributed to all members 4 times a year. It covers all aspects of editing and includes original articles and meeting reports, announces new developments and forthcoming events, reviews books, software and online resources, and highlights publications of interest to members. To facilitate the exchange of ideas between members, we also use an electronic EASE Forum, the EASE Journal Blog, and our website (www.ease.org.uk).

In 2007, we issued the *EASE statement on inappropriate use of impact factors*. Its major objective was to recommend that "journal impact factors are used only – and cautiously – for measuring and comparing the influence of entire journals, but not for the assessment of single papers, and certainly not for the assessment of researchers or research programmes either directly or as a surrogate".

In 2010, we published *EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators of Scientific Articles*. Our goal was to make international scientific communication more efficient and

help prevent scientific misconduct. This document is a set of generalized editorial recommendations concerning scientific articles to be published in English. We believe that if authors and translators follow these recommendations before submission, their manuscripts will be more likely to be accepted for publication. Moreover, the editorial process will probably be faster, so authors, translators, reviewers and editors will then save time.

EASE Guidelines are a result of long discussions on the EASE Forum and during our 2009 conference in Pisa, followed by consultations within the Council. The document is updated annually and is already available in 24 languages: Arabic, Bangla, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Croatian, Czech, English, Estonian, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Persian, Polish, Portuguese (Brazilian), Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Spanish, Turkish, and Vietnamese. The English original and its translations can be freely downloaded as PDFs from our website. We invite volunteers to translate the document into other languages.

Many institutions promote *EASE Guidelines* (eg see the European Commission Research & Innovation website), and many articles about this document have been published. Scientific journals also help in its popularization, by adding at the beginning of their instructions for authors a formula like:

Before submission, follow *EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators*, freely available at www.ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines in many languages. Adherence should increase the chances of acceptance of submitted manuscripts.

In 2012 we launched the *EASE Toolkit for Authors*, freely available on our website. The *Toolkit* supplements *EASE Guidelines* and includes more detailed recommendations and resources on scientific writing and publishing for less experienced researchers. In the same year, the EASE Gender Policy Committee was established to develop a set of guidelines for reporting of Sex and Gender Equity in Research (SAGER). Besides, EASE participated in the sTANDEM project (www.standem.eu), concerning standardized tests of professional English for healthcare professionals worldwide. Our Association also supports the campaign AllTrials (www.alltrials.net).

For more information about our Association, member's benefits, and major conferences, see the next page and our website.

**European
Association of
Science
Editors**

EASE

Skills - communication - fellowship

EASE is an internationally oriented community of individuals from **diverse backgrounds**, linguistic traditions, and professional experience, who share an interest in science communication and editing. Our Association offers the opportunity to **stay abreast** of trends in the rapidly changing environment of scientific publishing, whether traditional or electronic. As an EASE member, you can sharpen your editing, writing and thinking skills; **broaden your outlook** through encounters with people of different backgrounds and experience, or **deepen your understanding** of significant issues and specific working tools. Finally, in EASE we **have fun and enjoy learning** from each other while upholding the highest standards

EASE membership offers the following benefits

- A quarterly journal, **European Science Editing**, featuring articles related to science and editing, book and web reviews, regional and country news, and resources
- A major **conference every 2 years**
- **Seminars and workshops** on topics in science editing
- **Science Editors' Handbook** (free online access, discount on printed version), covering all aspects of journal editing from on-screen editing to office management, peer review, and dealing with the media
- **Advertising of your courses or services** free of charge on the EASE website
- Discounts on **job advertisements** on the EASE website
- Opportunities to share problems and solutions with **international colleagues** from many disciplines (also on the **EASE forum** and **ESE journal blog**)
- Good networking and **contacts for freelancers**
- **Discounts** on editorial software, courses, etc.

Our members

EASE welcomes members **from every corner of the world**. They can be found in 50 countries: from Australia to Venezuela by way of China, Russia and many more. EASE membership cuts across **many disciplines and professions**. Members work as commissioning editors, academics, translators, publishers, web and multi-media staff, indexers, graphic designers, statistical editors, science and technical writers, author's editors, journalists, proofreaders, and production personnel.

Major conferences

2016 Strasbourg , France	1997 Helsinki , Finland
2014 Split , Croatia	1994 Budapest , Hungary
2012 Tallinn , Estonia (30th Anniversary)	1991 Oxford , UK
2009 Pisa , Italy	1989 Ottawa , Canada (joint meeting with CBE and AESE)
2006 Kraków , Poland	1988 Basel , Switzerland
2003 Bath , UK	1985 Holmenkollen , Norway
2003 Halifax , Nova Scotia, Canada (joint meeting with AESE)	1984 Cambridge , UK
2000 Tours , France	1982 Pau , France
1998 Washington , DC, USA (joint meeting with CBE and AESE)	

Disclaimer: Only the English version of EASE Guidelines has been fully approved by the EASE Council. Translations into other languages are provided as a service to our readers and have not been validated by EASE or any other organisation. EASE therefore accepts no legal responsibility for the consequences of the use of the translations. Recommended citation format of the English version:

[EASE] European Association of Science Editors. 2015. EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators of Scientific Articles to be Published in English. <http://www.ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines>