

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Upute EASE (European Association of Science Editors) za autore i prevoditelje koji objavljaju znanstvene članake na engleskom jeziku

Sažetak

Ove jezgrovite i čitljive upute objavila je Europska udruga znanstvenih urednika (EASE) 2010. godine, a svake se godine se dodatno unaprjeđuju. Besplatno su dostupne u više od 20 jezika na <http://ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines>

Cilj je ovih uputa pomoći znanstvenicima iz cijelog svijeta u uspješnom predstavljanju rezultata njihovih istraživanja te pravilnom prevodenju rukopisa na engleski jezik. Ukratko objašnjavaju kako napisati potpun, jezgrovit i jasan rukopis, te skreću pozornost na etička pitanja: kriterij autorstva, plagijate, sukobe interesa, itd. Osam dodatnih priloga nudi primjere i detaljnije podatke o izabranim temama (*Abstracts, Ambiguity, Cohesion, Ethics, Plurals, Simplicity, Spelling i Text-tables*). Rasprostranjena upotreba *EASE Guidelines* trebala bi povećati djelotvornost međunarodne znanstvene komunikacije.

Kako bi međunarodna znanstvena komunikacija bila što učinkovitija, važno je da znanstveni članci, kao i ostale znanstvene publikacije, budu POTPUNI, JEZGROVITI i JASNI, o čemu će još biti riječi. Ovo su opće, ali ne i općevažeće upute namijenjene kao pomoć autorima, prevoditeljima i urednicima. Primjena zdravog razuma nužna je kod korištenja ovih pravila, jer postići savršenstvo nije moguće.

Kao prvo:

- **Pažljivo planirajte i izvedite svoje istraživanje** (npr. [Hengl et al 2011.](#)) Ne započinite s pisanjem cijeloga članka dok niste sigurni da su vam rezultati prilično potpuni i kvalitetni (O'Connor 1991), te da iz njih možete izvući **pouzdanu zaključku**.
- Prije no što počnete pisati, **po mogućnosti izaberite časopis** u koji ćete poslati Vaš članak. Provjerite poklapa li se čitateljstvo tog časopisa s Vašom ciljnom publikom ([Chipperfield et al](#)

2010). Nabavite primjerak uputa za autore toga časopisa te isplanirajte svoj rad prema tim zahtjevima glede ukupne duljine članka, broja dopuštenih/obveznih slika itd.

Rukopisi trebaju biti POTPUNI, što znači da u njima ne smiju nedostajati nikakve neophodne informacije. Držite na umu da je **podatke lakše interpretirati ako su smješteni tamo gdje ih čitatelji očekuju** ([Gopen & Swan 1990](#)). Primjerice, članak o pokusnom istraživačkom radu trebao bi sadržavati slijedeće:

- **Naslov:** treba biti nedvosmislen, razumljiv stručnjacima iz drugih područja te odražavati sadržaj rada. Pri pisanju naslova budite precizni, a ne općeniti ili neodređeni (O'Connor 1991). Ukoliko je bitno, u naslovu spomenite vrijeme i mjesto istraživanja i međunarodni znanstveni naziv za organizam ili vrstu pokusa o kojoj govorite (primjerice „studija slučaja“ ili „randomizirani kontrolirani pokus“). **Ako Vaša studija uključuje ispitanike jednoga spola, to treba navesti u naslovu.** Podatke dane u naslovu nije nužno ponavljati u sažetku (pošto ih se uvijek objavljuje zajedno), iako je određeno preklapanje neizbježno.
- **Popis autora,** tj. svih ljudi koji su značajno pridonijeli planiranju studije, prikupljanju podataka ili interpretaciji rezultata **te** su također pisali ili izmijenili rukopis i odobrili njegovu završnu verziju i prihvaća odgovornost za sve aspekte rada. Svakoj osobi koja zadovoljava prvi kriteriji trebalo bi omogućiti sudjelovanje u pisanju rukopisa i odobravanju krajnje verzije ([ICMJE 2014](#)). Prvo se navode autori koji su napravili najviše posla. Redoslijed imena autora trebalo bi odrediti prije slanja rukopisa. Sve bi kasnije promjene trebali odobriti svi autori te ih treba objasniti uredniku časopisa ([Battisti et al 2015](#), primjerice [COPE flowcharts](#)). Imena autora treba nadopuniti imenima **njihovih ustanova** (u

kojima su bili tijekom istraživanja) te **trenutnom adresom** autora. Također treba navesti i elektroničke adrese autora kako bi ih se moglo lako kontaktirati.

- **Sažetak (Abstract):** kratko objasniti zašto je istraživanje provedeno (BACKGROUND), na koja pitanja pokušavate odgovoriti (OBJECTIVES), kako ste obavljali istraživanje (METHODS), što ste pronašli (RESULTS: bitni podaci i odnosi), te Vašu interpretaciju rezultata i njihove glavne posljedice (CONCLUSIONS). Sažetak mora **odražavati sadržaj** rada, jer će za većinu čitatelja biti glavni izvor informacija o Vašem istraživanju. Unutar sažetka moraju biti **spomenute ključne riječi**, kako bi se onima koji su zainteresirani za Vaše rezultate omogućilo da elektroničkim pretraživanjem pronađu Vaš članak (mnoge bibliografske baze podataka pretražuju samo naslove i sažetke). U istraživačkom izvješću sažetak mora **uključivati rezultate** istraživanja. (*Vidi Appendix: Abstracts* o strukturiranim sažetcima.) Samo u preglednim člancima i sličnim člancima širokog opsega sažetak treba samo **upućivati** na glavne teme rasprave bez navođenja ishoda (CSE 2014). U sažetku se ne pozivajte na tablice i slike, jer se sažetke često tiska odvojeno. Navođenje literature također nije dopušteno osim ako je to doista nužno (no tada treba navesti detaljne podatke u zagradi: autor, naslov, godina, itd.). Svi podaci koji se pojavljuju u sažetku moraju biti prisutni i u članku.
- **Popis ključnih riječi:** uključite sve relevantne znanstvene pojmove ili samo dodatne ključne riječi kojih nema u naslovu (ako to urednici traže). Ključne riječi trebaju biti što preciznije, no ako Vaše istraživanje ima interdisciplinarni značaj, koristite i općenitije izraze (O'Connor 1991). U medicinskim tekstovima koristite vokabular koji koristi Medline (MeSH Browser). Kad arhivirate Vaš članak u repozitorijima (Cerejo 2013), uključite sve ključne riječi ili druge meta-podatke u dokument (primjerice Inderscience 2013).
- **Popis skraćenica** (ako ga urednici zahtijevaju): objasnite sve skraćenice korištene u članku, osim onih koje su razumljive i onima koji nisu stručnjaci u tom području.
- **Uvod:** Objasnite zašto je Vaše istraživanje bilo potrebno te navedite **cilj istraživanja** ili pitanja na koja ste pokušali odgovoriti. **Počnite s općenitijim temama te se postepeno usredotočite na Vaše istraživanje.**
- **Metode:** detaljno objasnite kako ste proveli istraživanje (mjesto istraživanja, prikupljanje podataka, kriteriji, izvor analiziranog materijala, veličina uzorka, broj mjerenja, dob i spol sudionika tj. donatora stanica ili tkiva, oprema, obrada podataka, statistička obrada, i software koji ste koristili). **Morate navesti sve čimbenike koji su mogli utjecati na ishod istraživanja.** Izvori pokusnih materijala iz biobanki moraju se navesti punim nazivom i označivačima, ako su dostupni (Bravo *et al* 2015). Ako koristite metodu čiji opis nije objavljen ili nije raspoloživ na engleskom jeziku, detaljno je objasnite u Vašem rukopisu. Provjerite ispunjavate li etičke uvjete (primjerice WMA 2013) s obzirom na prava pacijenata, vršenje pokusa na životinjama, zaštitu okoliša itd.
- **Rezultati: predstavite sve rezultate Vašeg istraživanja** (obično, već objavljene podatke u ovom odjeljku ne treba iznositi). Sve tablice i slike moraju biti spomenute u glavnom dijelu članka, a brojeve im treba dodijeliti prema redu kojim se pojavljuju u tekstu. Provjerite je li statistička analiza ispravna (primjerice Lang 2004). Podatci i ljudima, životinjama ili bilo kojem materijalu koji se dobiva od ljudi ili životinja, trebaju biti podijeljeni prema spolu (vidi SAGER guideline). Podatke se ne smije mijenjati ili izmišljati; nemojte isključiti važne podatke. Također nemojte manipulirati slikama kako biste ostavili krivi dojam na čitatelja. Takvo manipuliranje podacima može predstavljati **znanstvenu prjevaru** (vidi COPE flowcharts).
- **Rasprava:** u ovom odjeljku **ne treba uvoditi nove rezultate**, uključujući i statističke podatke. **Odgovorite na pitanja postavljena u uvodu** te dajte najobjektivniju moguću **usporedbu Vaših rezultata s drugim već objavljenim podacima**. Raspravite o ograničenjima Vašeg istraživanja te naglasite Vaša glavna otkrića. Ako Vaša studija uključuje jedine jednoga spola, raspravite posljedice i poopćivost Vaših rezultata na oba spola. Spomenite i rezultate koji govore protiv Vaše hipoteze. Za potkrjepu Vaše hipoteze koristite samo **metodološki valjane dokaze** (Roig 2011). Na kraju rasprave ili u novom odjeljku naglasite Vaše glavne zaključke i praktični značaj Vašeg istraživanja.
- **Zahvale:** spomenite sve ljude koje se ne može smatrati koautorima, no koji su pridonijeli istraživanju, te navedite sve izvore novčane potpore. Preporučeni način pisanja je: „This work was supported by the Medical Research Council [grant number xxxx].“ Ako niste primili nikakvu izravnu novčanu potporu, napišite slijedeće: „This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.“ (RIN 2008) Obavijestite urednike o svim ostalim bitnim sukobima interesa, tj. financijskim ili osobnim vezama s proizvođačima ili organizacijama koje bi mogle biti zainteresirane za Vaš rukopis (Goozner *et al* 2009). Ako u radu koristite neke već objavljene

materijale (primjerice slike), zatražite prava od vlasnika, te ih spomenite u opisu slike ili u zahvalama. Ukoliko su vam pri pisanju pomagali stručnjak za jezik (primjerice urednik ili prevoditelj), statističar, prikupljač podataka itd., spomenite njihovu pomoć zbog transparentnosti (ICMJE 2014, Battisti *et al* 2015). No mora biti jasno naglašeno da oni nisu odgovorni za završnu verziju članka. Također morate osigurati suglasnost svih ljudi spomenutih u ovom odjeljku. (*Vidi Appendix: Ethics*)

- **Referencije:** provjerite jeste li naveli izvore za sve podatke preuzete iz drugih publikacija. U opisu referencija valja uključiti sve podatke koju su nužni za pronalazak dane publikacije u knjižnici ili na Internetu. Kod publikacija koje nisu na engleskom jeziku, uz **izvorni naslov** (po potrebi transliteriran prema engleskim pravilima) kad god je moguće navedite i engleski prijevod naslova u uglatim zagrada (CSE 2014). Izbjegavajte nedostupne, prisilne i nepotrebne reference. Gdje god je moguće, citirajte izvorne znanstvene članke umjesto preglednih radova (DORA 2013). Ne uključujte još neobjavljene podatke u popis referencija – ako ih morate spomenuti, opišite njihov izvor u članku, te od autora podataka nabavite dopuštenje da ih citirate.
- Za teoretske publikacije, pregledne članke, studije slučaja itd., može biti prikladnija drukčija građa članka (npr. Gasparyan *et al* 2011).
- Neke publikacije sadrže **sažetak na drugom jeziku**. To je vrlo korisno u mnogim istraživačkim područjima.
- Slijeđenje **smjernica za prikaz rezultata** pomoći će vam da navedete minimalne potrebne podatke o vašoj studiji (primjerice vidi EQUATOR Network).
- Ne zaboravite uskladiti svoj rukopis s **uputama za autore** danog časopisa, u odnosu na duljinu sažetka, način pisanja referencija itd.

Pišite JEZGROVITO kako bi uštedjeli vrijeme recenzentima i čitateljima.

- **Ne spominjite podatke koji nisu bitni za pitanja** koja ste naveli u uvodu.
- **Ne prepisujte** dijelove svojih ranijih publikacija; ne šalžite rukopis u više časopisa istovremeno. Ukoliko to učinite, bit ćete odgovorini za **zalihosno publiciranje** (eng., redundant publication, vidi COPE flowcharts). No to se ne odnosi na preliminarne publikacije kao što su primjerice sažetci s konferencija (O'Connor 1991, vidi također BioMed Central policy). Nadalje, **sekundarne publikacije** prihvatljive su kada su namijenjene sasvim drugoj skupini čitatelja (primjernice govornicima različitih jezika ili

stručnjacima i široj javnosti) te ako ste dobili suglasnost urednika oba časopisa (ICMJE 2014). U tom slučaju valja u bilješki na dnu naslovne stranice sekundarne publikacije navesti ime primarne publikacije.

- Podatke dane u jednom odjeljku **ne treba ponavljati** u drugim odjeljcima ako se to može izbjeći. Ovo se naravno ne odnosi na sažetak, opise slika i zaključak.
- Razmislite jesu li sve tablice i slike koje imate doista nužne. Podatci prikazani u tablicama ne bi se trebali ponavljati u slikama (ili obrnuto). Dugačke popise podataka ne bi trebalo ponavljati u tekstu.
- Objašnjenja tablica i slika moraju biti **kratka, ali što iscrpnija**. Ako nekoliko tablica ili slika prikazuje slične podatke, način na koji su opisani također treba biti sličan.
- Po mogućnosti treba **izbrisati očigledne tvrdnje** (primjerice „Šume su veoma bitni ekosustavi“) te slične nepotrebne izraze (primjerice „Dobro je poznato da...“).
- Ako se u tekstu često ponavlja **dugačak znanstveni izraz**, odredite mu kraticu pri prvom pojavljivanju u tekstu te zatim dosljedno koristite tu kraticu.
- Izrazite svoje sumnje, no **izbjegavajte pretjerano ograđivanje od mogućih pogrešaka** (primjerice, napišite „moguće su“ umjesto „mogle bi biti moguće“). No također nemojte ni **pretjerano poopćavati** Vaše zaključke.
- Osim ukoliko urednici imaju drugačije zahtjeve, **koristite brojke pri pisanju brojeva**, čak i kod jednoznamenastih cijelih brojeva, **osim nula i jedan** (ukoliko se koriste bez mjernih jedinica) **te u drugim slučajevima gdje su mogući nesporazumi**, primjerice na početku rečenice ili prije kratica koje sadrže brojke (CSE 2014).

Pišite JASNO kako biste olakšali razumijevanje i učinili Vaš tekst čitljivim.

Znanstveni sadržaj

- Važno je moći **jasno razlikovati Vaše vlastite podatke i ideje** od tuđih i od onih iz Vaših ranijih publikacija – koristite referencije gdje god je to potrebno. **Po mogućnosti sažmite ili prepričajte** tekst iz drugih izvora. To vrijedi i za prijevode. Pri doslovnom prepisivanju teksta (cijele rečenice ili više), stavite citirani dio u navodnike (Roig 2011, Kerans & de Jager 2010). U protivnom se Vaš tekst može smatrati **plagijatom** (vidi COPE flowcharts) ili samo-plagijatom.
- Koristite samo **ispravno englesko znanstveno nazivlje**, po mogućnosti na osnovu tekstova koje su pisali izvorni govornici engleskog jezika. Doslovni su prijevodi često netočni (primjerice

takozvani „lažni prijatelji“ (engl., *false friends*) ili druge nepostojeće riječi koje su izmislili prevoditelji). Ako niste sigurni, **provjerite definiciju** riječi u engleskom rječniku jer se mnoge riječi krivo koriste. (*Vidi Appendix: Ambiguity*). Značenje riječi možete također provjeriti na Wikipediji uspoređivanjem članaka za tu riječ na engleskom i na Vašem materinjem jeziku te time vidjeti znače li riječi doista isto. No valja naglasiti da Wikipedija nije uvijek pouzdan izvor informacija.

- Ako se neka riječ najčešće koristi samo u prijevodima, a vrlo rijetko u engleskim govornim područjima, razmotrite biste li tu riječ mogli zamijeniti poznatijom engleskom riječi sa sličnim značenjem (primjerice *plant community* umjesto *phytocoenosis*). Ako neki znanstveni izraz nema sinonim u engleskom jeziku, točno ga definirajte te sami predložite prihvatljiv engleski prijevod.
- **Definirajte svaki rjeđi ili višeznačni znanstveni izraz** kad se prvi put pojavi u tekstu. Ako postoje, možete također dati i popis njegovih sinonima, kako biste olakšali pretragu ljudima koje zanima Vaš članak. No kasnije dosljedno koristite samo jedan izraz kako biste izbjegli nejasnoće. Gdje god moguće preporučljivo je koristiti službeno nazivlje koje je uspostavila znanstvena zajednica (npr. *EASE 2013*).
- **Izbjegavajte nejasne izjave**, koje traže od čitatelja da pogađa na što ste mislili. (*Vidi Appendix: Ambiguity*)
- Pri korištenju postotaka, objasnite **što predstavlja 100%**. Pišući o međusobnim odnosima vrijednosti, pripazite da bude jasno što s čim uspoređujete.
- Preporučljivo je koristiti **mjerne jedinice Système International (SI) i Celzijeve stupnjeve**.
- Za razliku od mnogih jezika, engleski koristi **decimalnu točku** (ne zarez). Osim ukoliko urednici imaju drugačije zahtjeve, kod brojeva sa više od 4 znamenke lijevo ili desno od decimalne točke treba rabiti **tanke razmake** (ne zareze) između svake 3 znamenke u oba smjera od decimalne točke (*EASE 2013*).
- **Ne rabite rimske brojke** za označavanje stoljeća, mjeseci itd. – u engleskom se jeziku one rijetko koriste. Zbog razlika u britanskom i američkom načinu pisanja datuma (vidjeti dolje), preporučljivo je mjesece pisati punim imenom ili pomoću prva 3 slova (*CSE 2014*).
- Ako koristite rjeđi **geografski naziv** koji je preveden, valja spomenuti i izvorno ime ako je to moguće, primjerice „in the Kampinos Forest (Puszcza Kampinowska)“. Čitateljima također mogu biti korisni dodatni podatci o lokaciji, klimi, itd.

- Ne zaboravite da će Vaš tekst **prvenstveno čitati stranci**, koji možda nisu upoznati s posebnim uvjetima, podjelama ili pojmovima koji su općepoznati u Vašoj zemlji; stoga je ponekad nužno dati dodatna objašnjenja (*Ufnalska 2008*). Primjerice, široko rasprostranjeni cvijet *Erigeron annuus* u nekim se zemljama naziva *Stenactis annua*, pa stoga u engleskim tekstovima treba koristiti međunarodno prihvaćeno ime, a njegove sinonime navesti u zagradama.

Građa teksta

- **Rečenice uglavnom ne bi trebale biti preduge. Njihova bi građa trebala biti relativno jednostavna**, a subjekt bi trebao biti smješten blizu predikata (*Gopen & Swan 1990*). Primjerice, izbjegavajte apstraktne imenice te pišite „X je izmjeren...“ umjesto „mjerenja na X-u su provedena...“. (*Vidi Appendix: Simplicity*) Ne pretjerujte s uporabom pasivnih glagolskih oblika (*Norris 2011*). Ako je potrebno, pri prevođenju promijenite građu rečenice kako biste poruku prenijeli točnije ili jasnije (*Burrough-Boenisch 2013*).
- **Tekst treba biti povezan i smisleno ustrojen**, te stoga pregledan i lak za čitanje. (*Vidi Appendix: Cohesion*)
- Svaki bi odlomak trebalo započeti tematskom rečenicom a sljedeće rečenice odlomka trebaju razraditi tu temu.
- Za razliku od nekih drugih jezika, engleski dopušta usporedne konstrukcije jer one olakšavaju razumijevanje. Primjerice, pri uspoređivanju sličnih podataka 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”.
- **Napravite slike i tablice koje su razumljive bez pozivanja na ostatak teksta**. Izbacite podatke koji nisu bitni (primjerice stupac u tablici koji ima iste vrijednosti u svim redovima – umjesto da ga prikazete u tablici, možete te vrijednosti spomenuti u bilješki). Upotrijebite skraćenice samo ako su nužne radi dosljednosti ili zbog nedostatka prostora. U objašnjenjima slika i u bilješkama treba objasniti sve skraćenice i simbole čije značenje nije očigledno (primjerice, stupac pogreške može označavati standardnu devijaciju, interval pouzdanosti ili drugo). **Ne zaboravite koristiti decimalne točke** (ne decimalne zareze) i **naznačiti kojim se jedinicama koristite te što označavaju osi na grafovima**.
- Razmislite o uporabi tekstualnih tablica kad predstavljate male skupove podataka (*Kozak 2009*). (*Vidi Appendix: Text-tables*)

- U dugim popisima (kratica itd.) preporučljivo je razdvajati pojedine predmete pomoću **točke-zareza (;)**, koja je između zarez a i točke.

Jezična pitanja

- Bolje je koristiti **općepoznate riječi** kad znanstveni izrazi nisu nužni. No treba izbjegavati kolokvijalne i idiomatske izraze te frazne glagole (primjerice *find out, pay off*) koje čitatelji koji nisu izvorni govornici engleskog jezika teško razumiju (Geercken 2006).
- **Objasnite skraćenice** kada se prvi put pojave u članku (ako bi mogle biti nejasne čitateljima). **Ne koristite previše različitih skraćenica**, jer to čini tekst teško razumljivim. Ne koristite skraćenice za izraze koji se rijetko pojavljuju u Vašem rukopisu. **Izbjegavajte skraćenice u sažetku.**
- **Prošlo vrijeme** valja koristiti pri opisivanju istraživanja koje ste proveli, rezultata koje ste dobili i istraživanja koja su radili drugi istraživači, dok korištenju **sadašnjeg vremena** valja težiti pri općenitim tvrdnjama i interpretacijama (primjerice kod opisivanja statističkog značaja ili u zaključku) te pri opisivanju sadržaja Vašeg članka, pogotovo tablica i slika (Day & Gastel 2006).
- Osim ukoliko urednici imaju drugačije zahtjeve, **pri pisanju članka ne nazivajte sami sebe „the author(s)“**, jer je to nejasno. Umjesto toga pišite „we“ ili „I“ ako je potrebno, ili pak koristite izraze kao što su „in this study“, „our results“ ili „in our opinion“ (Hartley 2010, Norris 2011). Važno je primijetiti da izraz „this study“ treba koristiti samo kad mislite na Vaše nove rezultate. Ako govorite o nekom istraživanju spomenutom u tekstu, pišite „that study“. Ako mislite na autore neke publikacije koju ste naveli, napišite „those authors“.
- Ne zaboravite da se u znanstvenim tekstovima riječ **„which“** koristi kod opisa koji nisu nužni za određivanje danog predmeta, dok se riječ **„that“** koristi kod zavisnih rečenica koje su nužne za određivanje onog na što se odnose (tj. koje znače „samo oni koji“).
- Pri korištenju **homonima**, pripazite da njihovo značenje bude jasno iz konteksta. Provjerite **slažu li se svi glagoli sa subjektom** i je li **jasno na što se sve pojedine zamjenice odnose** (ovo je osobito bitno kod prevedenih tekstova). Ne zaboravite da neke imenice imaju **nepravilnu množinu**. (*Vidi Appendix: Plurals*)
- Pročitajte svoj tekst naglas kako biste provjerili interpunkciju. Svako mjesto na kojem pri čitanju treba **zastati** mora odgovarati zarezu ili nekom drugom interpunkcijskom znaku (uočite razliku između „ne treba dalje istraživati“ i „ne, treba dalje istraživati“).

- Budite **dosljedni u pravopisu**. Izaberite ili britanski ili američki pravopis i način pisanja datuma (npr. "21 Jan 2009" na britanskom, ili "Jan 21, 2009" na američkom engleskom). (*Vidi Appendix: Spelling*) Provjerite koji pravopis koristi časopis u koji šaljete rukopis, te koristite te postavke i pri računalnom pregledu teksta.
- Zamolite suradnika, za kojeg znate da je pažljiv i pouzdan, da Vaš rad pročita kako biste vidjeli ima li u tekstu nejasnih dijelova.

Prijevod/Translation: Stjepan L. Marušić
(stjepan.marusic@gmail.com), reviewed by
Ana Marušić (ana.marusic@mefst.hr)

UPUTAMA PRIDONIJELI (kronološim redosljedom): Sylwia Ufnalska (pokretač i urednik, 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

Referencije i preporučena literature

- 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, Husserl 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.professionalenglish.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



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>