

European  
Association of  
Science  
Editors

EASE

## EASE (European Association of Science Editors) juhised inglise keeles publitseeritavate teadusartiklite autoritele ja tõlkijatele

### Annotatsioon

Need toimetajajuhised, mis on koostatud kokkusurutud ja hästiloetavas stiilis, avaldati Euroopa Teadustoimetajate Assotsiatsiooni (EASE) poolt esmakordselt 2010.a. ja kuuluvad uuendamisele igal aastal. Juhised on vabalt kättesaadavad rohkem kui 20s keeles aadressil: <http://ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines>.

Eesmärk on aidata teadlasi üle maailma oma teadustulemuste esitamisel ja käsikirjade tõlkimisel korrektsesse inglise keelde. Juhistes on lühidalt selgitatud, kuidas kirjutada sisutäiuslikke, kokkusurutud ja selgesõnalises stiilis käsikirju. Samuti on pööratud tähelepanu eetikaküsimustele: autorluse kriteeriumidele, plagiaatlusele, huvide konfliktidele jne. Kaheksa lisa toovad näiteid või detailset informatsiooni valitud teemadel (*Abstracts, Ambiguity, Cohesion, Ethics, Plurals, Simplicity, Spelling* ja *Text-tables*). Laialdane EASE Guidelines kasutamine täidab rahvusvahelise teaduskommunikatsiooni efektiivistamise funktsiooni.

Efektiivsema teaduskommunikatsiooni tarvis peavad teadusartiklid ja teised teaduspublikatsioonid kandma TÄIELIKKU, KOKKUSURUTUD ja SELGET esitusstiili, vastavalt allpool järgnevatele selgitustele. Käesolevad juhtnöörid on üldised, ehkki mitte universaalsed, eesmärgiga aidata autoreid, tõlkijaid ja toimetajaid. Loomulikult tuleb nende reeglite järgimisel lähtuda tervest mõistusest, kuivõrd täiuslikkus on saavutamatu.

Esmatähtis:

- **Uurimust tuleb hoolikalt planeerida ja läbi viia** (näit. [Hengl et al 2011](#)). Täisartikli kirjutamist ei alustata enne kui olete kindel, et saadud tulemused on põhjendatud, kindlad ja täielikud (O'Connor 1991) selleks, et saaksite teha **tõepäraseid järeldusi**.
- **Eelistatavalt valige väljaanne** enne kirjutamisele asumist. Veenduge, et vastava väljaande

lugejaskond vastab teie sihtlugejale ([Chipperfield et al 2010](#)). Hankige vastava väljaande instruksioon autorile ja planeerige artikkel selliselt, et ta oleks kohandatav väljaande eelistatavale formaadile, mis puudutab kogupikkust, vajalikku/lubatavat jooniste arvu jne.

Käsikirjad peavad olema TÄIELIKUD, st. et vajalik informatsioon peab olema esitatud. Pidage meeles, et **informatsiooni on kergem tõlgendada, kui see on esitatud seal, kus lugeja eeldab seda leida** ([Gopen & Swan 1990](#)). Näiteks eksperimentaalse uurimistöö artiklid peavad sisaldama järgmist informatsiooni:

- **Pealkiri:** peab olema selge, arusaadav teiste erialade spetsialistidele ja peab peegeldama artikli sisu. Väljendus peab olema spetsiifiline, mitte üldine ja laialivalgus (O'Connor 1991). Kui see on asjakohane, mainige pealkirjas uurimuse perioodi ja kohta, uuritava objekti rahvusvahelist teaduslikku nimetust või eksperimentaalset ülesehitust (näit. *case*-uurimus või juhukontrolliga katse). Kui uurimus hõlmas ühest soost inimsubjekte, siis tuleb pealkirjas see ära näidata. Pealkirjas toodud informatsiooni pole vaja korrata annotatsioonis (kuna need avaldatakse paralleelselt), kuigi osaline kattumine on vältimatu.
- **Autorite nimed**, st. kõik, kes aitasid oluliselt kaasa uurimuse planeerimisele, andmete kogumisele või tulemuste tõlgendamisele **ja** kirjutasid või redigeerisid käsikirja **ja** kiitsid heaks lõppversiooni **ning** nõustusid võtma vastutuse töö kõigi aspektide osas. Kõigile isikutele, kes vastavad esimesele kriteeriumile, tuleb võimaldada osavõttu artikli kirjutamisel ja lõppversiooni heakskiitmisel ([ICMJE 2014](#)). Esimestena tuleb nimetada autorid, kelle panus oli suurem. Autorite nimede järjekord tuleb kindlaks määrata enne käsikirja esitamist publitseerimiseks. Kõik muutused, mis tehakse pärast artikli esitamist, peavad olema heaks kiidetud kõigi autorite poolt ja selgitatud ajakirja toimetajale ([Battisti et al 2015](#), vaata [COPE flowcharts](#)). Autorite nimedele tuleb lisada nende

**asutused** (uurimuse perioodil) ja korrespondeeriva autori käesolev aadress. Tuleb ära näidata kõigi autorite e-postiaadressid, et lihtsustada nendega kontakteerumist.

- **Annotatsioon:** selgitage lühidalt uurimuse tegemise põhjus (BACKGROUND), missugus(t)ele küsimus(t)ele seadsite eesmärgiks vastata (OBJECTIVES), uurimuse teostamise viisi (METHODS), mida leidsite (RESULTS: põhiandmed, seosed) ja teie tõlgendused ja põhijäreldused saavutatud tulemuste põhjal (CONCLUSIONS). Annotatsioon peab **peegeldama artikli sisu**, kuna enamusele lugejatest on see teie uurimuse põhiliseks infoallikaks. Annotatsioonis tuleb **kasutada võtmesõnu**, et võimaldada artikli elektroonset otsingut neile, kes tunnevad huvi teie tulemuste vastu (paljud andmebaasid sisaldavad ainult pealkirju ja annotatsioone). **Teadusaruandes** peab annotatsioon olema **informatiivne**, sh. sisaldama tegelikke tulemusi. (*Vaata Appendix: Abstracts* struktureeritud annotatsioonide kohta) Ainult **ülevaadetes** ja teistes laiahaardelistes artiklites peab annotatsioon olema **osutav**, st. loetlema arutluse all olevad põhiteemad väljundeid esitamata (CSE 2014). Annotatsioonis ei viidata tabelitele ja joonistele, kuna annotatsioone avaldatakse ka eraldi. Kirjanduse viited ei ole lubatud, väljaarvatud kui need on absoluutselt hädavajalikud (kuid siis tuleb üksikasjalik informatsioon esitada sulgudes: autor, pealkiri, aasta jne.). Tuleb tagada, et kogu informatsioon, mis on esitatud annotatsioonis, sisaldub samuti artikli põhitekstis.
- **Võtmesõnade loetelu:** lisage kõik vastavad teadusterminid või ainult lisavõtmesõnad, mis ei sisaldu pealkirjas, vastavuses toimetajate nõudmistele. Võtmesõnad peavad olema spetsiifilised. Lisage üldisemaid termineid, kui uurimisel on interdistsiplinaarne väärtus (O'Connor 1991). Meditsiinalastes tekstides kasutage **MeSH Browser** sõnavara. Artikli arhiveerimisel hoidlas või mujal (Cerejo 2013) paigutage kõik võtmesõnad ja muud metaandmed faili (vaata näit. [Inderscience 2013](#)).
- **Lühendite loetelu** (kui toimetajad vajavad): defineerige kõik artiklis kasutatud lühendid, väljaarvatud need, mis on mittespetsialistidele ilmselged.
- **Sissejuhatus:** selgitage uurimuse vajalikkust ja iseloomustage lähemalt uurimuse eesmärgi või spetsiifilisi küsimusi, millele kavatsete vastata. **Alustage üldisematest küsimustest ja keskenduge järk-järgult oma uurimuse küsimustele.**
- **Meetodid:** kirjeldage üksikasjalikult, kuidas uuring toimus (näit. uurimisala, andmete

kogumine, kriteeriumid, analüüsitud materjali allikas, proovi suurus, mõõdistuste arv, osavõtjate või koe/rakudoonorite vanus ja sugu, seadmed, andmete analüüs, statistilised testid ja kasutatud tarkvara). **Tuleb käsitleda kõiki faktoreid, mis võinuks mõjutada tulemusi.** Biopankadest saadud eksperimentaalsete allikmaterjalide täielikud nimetused ja identifikaatorid tuleb kättesaadavuse korral ära märkida ([Bravo et al 2015](#)). Kui tsiteerite meetodit, mis on kirjeldatud mitte-ingliskeelses või juurdepääsuta trükises, tuleb seda käsikirjas üksikasjalikult kirjeldada. Tagage vastavus eetikastandarditega (näit. [WMA 2013](#)), mis puudutab patendiõigust, teste loomadega, keskkonnakaitset jne.

- **Tulemused:** esitage enda uurimuse **uued tulemused** (tavaliselt ei lisata avaldatud andmeid sellesse ossa). Kõiki tabeleid ja jooniseid tuleb mainida artikli põhitekstis ja numereerida selles järjekorras, millises nad tekstis on esitatud. Tagage asjakohane statistiline analüüs (näit. [Lang 2004](#)). Inim- ja loomandmed või mistahes materjal, mis lähtub inimestest või loomadest, tuleb sooliselt eristada (vaata [SAGER guideline](#)). Igasugune andmete fabritseerimine või moonutamine on lubamatu ja tähtsaid andmeid ei tohi välja jätta; analoogselt ärge manipuleerige kujunditega ega jätke võltsmuljet lugejatele. Selline andmetega manipuleerimine võib kujutada endast **teadusalast pettust** (vaata [COPE flowcharts](#)).
- **Diskussioon:** see artikli osa ei ole mõeldud uute tulemuste esitamiseks, statistilised tulemused kaasa arvatud. **Vastake oma uurimuse küsimustele** (toodud sissejuhatus lõpus) **ja võrrelge enda uusi tulemusi trükis avaldatud tulemustega** nii objektiivselt kui võimalik. Arutage tulemustega seotud kitsendusi ja tooge välja põhitulemused. Kui uurimus hõlmas ühest soost subjekte, arutage implikatsioone ja tulemuste üldistamise võimalusi mõlema soo suhtes. Arvestage igasuguseid tulemusi, mis on vasturääkivuses teie seisukohtadega. Oma seisukohtade toetuseks kasutage **ainult metodoloogiliselt kehtivat kindlat tõendusmaterjali** ([Roig 2011](#)). Diskussiooni lõpus või eraldi osas rõhutage põhijäreldusi ja uurimuse praktilist väärust.
- **Tunnustused:** mainige ära kõik inimesed, kes aitasid uurimusele oluliselt kaasa, kuid kes ei ole kaasautorid ja tunnustage kõiki rahastamisallikaid. Soovitav on järgmine sõnastuse vorm: "This work was supported by the Medical Research Council [grant number xxxx]". Kui uurimus ei ole ühtki eritoetust saanud, öelge järgmist: "This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors." ([RIN 2008](#)). Vajaduse korral avaldage toimetajatele kõik teised huvide konfliktid, näiteks

finants- või isiklikud sidemed tootjaga või organisatsiooniga, kes on huvitatud esitatud käsikirjast (Goozner *et al* 2009). Kui taasesitate varemavaldatud materjale (näit. jooniseid), küsige luba autorluse omanikelt ja mainige neid joonise alltekstis või tunnustuste osas. Kui kasutate keeletespialisti (näit. autoritoimetaja või tõlkija), statistiku, andmekogujate jt. abi, tuleb neid tänada nende abi eest, et rakendada läbipaistvuse printsiipi (ICMJE 2014, Battisti *et al* 2015). Ühtlasi peab olema selgus selles, et nad ei vastuta artikli lõppversiooni eest. Tuleb tagada, et teil on kõigi nende inimeste nõusolek, keda selles osas mainite. (Vaata *Appendix: Ethics*)

- **Kasutatud kirjandus:** kindlustage, et oleks nimetatud kõik kasutatud teiste väljaannete tähtsad informatsiooniallikad. Viidete loetelu peab sisaldama kõiki andmeid, mis on vajalikud nende leidmiseks raamatukogus või Internetis. Mitteenglisekeelsete väljaannete puhul tooge ära **pealkiri originaalis** (vajaduse korral translitereerituna vastavalt inglise keele reeglitele), millele järgneb nurksulgudes tõlge inglise keelde, kus võimalik (CSE 2014). Vältige kättesaamatute, kohustuslike või ebaoluliste allikate viitamist. Kus võimalik, viidake vastava uurimissuuna alusuuringutele, mitte ülevaateartiklitele (DORA 2013). Kasutatud kirjanduse loetellu ei lülitata trükist ilmutata andmeid – kui neid tuleb mainida, kirjeldage nende allikat artikli põhitekstis ja nende tsiteerimiseks taotlege luba andmete produtseerijalt.
- **Artikli erinev ülesehitus** võib rohkem sobida teoreetilistele väljaannetele, ülevaateartiklitele, *case*-uurimustele jne. (näit. Gasparyan *et al* 2011).
- Mõned väljaanded lisavad ka annotatsiooni või laiendatud **kokkuvõtte teises keeles**. See on paljudel uurimisaladel on väga kasulik.
- Alljärgnevad **teksti esitamise juhised** aitavad teid minimaalselt vajaliku informatsiooni edasiandmisel teie uurimuse kohta (vaata näit. EQUATOR Network).
- Jälgi, et annotatsiooni pikkus, viidete stiil jms. oleks koosõlas ajakirja **instruktsiooniga autoritele**.

Kirjutage KOKKUSURUTUD stiilis, et säästa retsensentide ja lugejate aega.

- **Ärge lülitage informatsiooni, mis ei kuulu teie sissejuhatuses toodud uurimisküsimus(tes)se.**
- **Ärge kopeerige** oma eelnevate publikatsioonide osi ja ärge esitage sama käsikirja rohkem kui ühele ajakirjale üheaegselt. Vastasel korral tuleb teil vastutada **liigväljaande** eest (vaata COPE flowcharts). See ei kehti ettevalmistatavate publikatsioonide kohta nagu konverentsiannota-

tsioonid (O'Connor 1991, vaata ka BioMed Central policy). Pealegi on **sekundaarsed publikatsioonid** vastuvõetavad, kui nad on mõeldud täiesti erinevale lugejate grupile (näit. teises keeles või spetsialistidele ja tavalugejale) ja olete saanud mõlema ajakirja toimetaja kinnituse (ICMJE 2014). Emapublikatsioonile tuleb sel juhul viidata sekundaarse publikatsiooni tiitellehe joonealuses.

- Ühes osas esitatud informatsiooni **ei korrata** teistes tekstiosades. Erandiks on annotatsioon, jooniste allkirjad ja kokkuvõtlik lõpulõik.
- Kaaluge kõigi tabelite ja jooniste vajalikkust. Tabelis esitatud andmeid ei korrata joonistel (või vastupidi). Pikki andmeloeetelusid ei korrata tekstis.
- Tabelite ja jooniste alltekstid peavad olema **informatiivsed, kuid mitte väga pikad**. Kui esitatakse sarnaseid andmeid mitmes tabelis või mitmel joonisel, siis peavad alltekstide formaadid ka olema sarnased.
- **Eemaldage** eelistatavalt **ilmselged väited** (näit. "Forests are very important ecosystems.") ja teised liigsed lausefragmendid (näit. "It is well known that...").
- **Pika teadustermi** sagedase kordamise korral defineerige esmalt selle lühendvorm artikli põhitekstis ja hiljem kasutage seda järjekindlalt.
- Väljendage kahtlusi, kui see on vajalik, kuid **vältige liigset ähmasust** (näit. kirjutage "are potential", aga mitte "may possibly be potential"). Siiski, **ärge** oma järeldusi **ülemääraselt üldistage**.
- Kui toimetajad ei nõua teisiti, **kasutage kõigi arvude puhul numbreid**, st. ka ühekohaliste täisarvude puhul, **väljaarvatud null, üks** (juhul kui ilma mõõtühikuta) ja **teistel juhtudel, kui võib tekkida arusaamatusi**, näit. lause alguses või lühendites, mis sisaldavad numbreid (CSE 2014).

Kirjutage SELGELT, et soodustada arusaamist – kirjutage hästiloetavat teksti.

#### Teaduslik sisu

- **Eristage selgelt oma originaalsed andmed ja ideed** teiste omadest ja varem avaldatuist – esitage tsiteeringud, kui see on asjakohane. **Eelistatud on teha kokkuvõtte või parafraseerida** tekst, mis pärineb teistest allikatest. See kehtib ka tõlgete puhul. Teksti sõna-sõnalisel kopeerimisel (näit. terve lause või pikema teksti puhul) kasutage jutumärke (näit. Roig 2011, Kerans & de Jager 2010). Vastasel korral võib see osutada **plagiaadiks** (vaata COPE flowcharts) või eneseplagiaadiks.
- Veenduge, et kasutate **õigeid ingliskeelseid teadustermineid**, mis eelistatult pärinevad tekstidest, mille autoriteks on inglise keelt emakeelena kõnelejad. Sõnasõnalisel tõlkel on



tihti väärad (nn. “false friends“ või tõlkija poolt leiutatud sõnad, mis keeles ei eksisteeri). Kahtluste korral **kontrollige definitsiooni** inglise keele sõnaraamatus, kuna paljusid sõnu kasutatakse väärtalt (*Vaata Appendix: Ambiguity*). Sõnu või fraase võib näiteks otsida ka Wikipedia’st, seejärel võrrelda saadud tulemusi eesti ja inglise keeles ja veenduge tegeliku tähenduse säilumises.

- Kui sõna kasutatakse põhiliselt tõlgetes ja ainult harva inglise keelt kõnelevates maades, mõelge selle asendamisele hästituntud samatähendusliku ingliskeelse terminiga (näit. “phytocoenosis“ asemel “plant community“). Kui teadustermiinil ei ole sünonüümi inglise keeles, siis defineerige see täpselt ja pakkuge välja vastuvõetav ingliskeelne tõlge.
- **Defineerige kõik harvaesinevad või kahemõttelised teadustermid** nende esmakasutamisel. Võite tuua ära sünonüümid nende olemasolul otsingu abistamiseks, kuid hiljem kasutage neist ainult üht järjekindlalt segaduse ärahoidmiseks. Kui teadusorganisatsioonide poolt on kehtestatud formaalne nomenklatuur, tuleb seda eelistada (näit. [EASE 2013](#)).
- **Vältige ebaselgeid väiteid**, mille puhul lugeja peab ära aimama, mida mõtlesite. (*Vaata Appendix: Ambiguity*)
- Kui on tegemist protsentidega, selgitage **mida vaatlete 100%na**. Kui on tegemist korrelatsioonide, suhete jms., selgitage, missuguseid väärtusi võrdlete omavahel.
- **Système International (SI) ühikud and Celsiuse kraadid** on üldiselt eelistatavad.
- Erinevalt paljudest teistest keeltest on inglise keeles kasutusel **kümnendpunkt** (mitte koma). Kui toimetajate nõudmised ei erine alltoodust, siis tuleb numbritel, millel on üle 4 koha paremale või vasakule kümnendpunktist, kasutada **kitsaid vahesid** (mitte komasid) 3-kohaliste gruppide vahel mõlemas suunas kümnendkohast ([EASE 2013](#)).
- **Ärge kasutage suuri Rooma numbreid** sajandite, kuude jne. tähistamiseks, kuna seda esineb inglise keeles harva. Kuna Briti ja Ameerika kuupäevade tähistamine on erinev (*Vaata allpool*), eelistage kuude tähistamisel tervete sõnade või nende kolme esimese tähe väljakirjutamist ([CSE 2014](#)).
- Kui on tõlgitud vähemtuntud **geograafilisi nimetusi**, tuleb võimaluse korral mainida ka originaalnimetust, näit. “Kampinosi metsas (Puszcza Kampinowska)“. Teatud lisainformatsioon asukoha, kliima jms. kohta võib samuti olla lugejale kasulik.
- Pidage meeles, et teksti **loevad põhiliselt võõramaalased**, kes ei ole teadlikud spetsiifilistest tingimustest, klassifikatsioonidest või

kontseptsioonidest, mis on laialdaselt tuntud teie maal; selletõttu võib mõningate selgituste lisamine olla vajalik ([Ufnalska 2008](#)). Näiteks, mõnedes maades nimetatakse tavalist umbrohtu *Erigeron annuus* *Stenactis annua*, seega ingliskeelsetes tekstides tuleb kasutada rahvusvaheliselt heakskiidetud nimetusi, kusjuures nende sünonüüm(id) tuleb lisada sulgudes.

#### Teksti ülesehitus

- **Üldiselt tuleb vältida liiga pikki lauseid ja nende ülesehitus peab olema suhteliselt lihtne**, kusjuures alus tuleb paigutada tegusõna lähedusse ([Gopen & Swan 1990](#)). Näiteks vältige abstraktseid nimisõnu ja kirjutage “X was measured...” “Measurements of X were carried out ...” asemel. (*Vaata Appendix: Simplicity*) Ärge liialdage *passive* konstruktsioonidega (näit. [Norris 2011](#)). Tõlkimisel modifitseerige lause ülesehitust vajaduse korral, et kindlustada sõnumi täpsus ja selgus ([Burrough-Boenisch 2013](#)).
- **Tekst peab olema hästi seostatud, loogiliselt üles ehitatud** ja seega kergesti jälgitav. (*Vaata Appendix: Cohesion*)
- Eelistatav on alustada iga tekstilõiku teemalausega, mida järgnevad laused edasi arendavad.
- Erinevalt mõnest teisest keelest, paralleelsed konstruktsioonid on inglise keeles lubatud, kuna nad võimaldavad tekstist arusaamist. Näiteks kui võrdlete sarnaseid andmeid, võite kirjutada: “It was high in A, medium in B, and low in C“, mitte aga “It was high in A, medium for B, and low in the case of C“.
- **Joonised ja tabelid peavad olema kergesti arusaadavad** ilma viitamata artikli põhitekstile. Jätke välja andmed, mis ei ole informatiivsed (näit. kustutage veerg, kui kõigis ridades on ühed ja samad väärtused – selle võite asendada joonealuse tekstiga). Kasutage lühendeid ainult juhul, kui see on vajalik järjepidevuse mõttes või kui puudub piisav ruum täissõnade paigutamiseks. Joonise alltekstis või joonealuses tekstis tuleb defineerida kõik lühendid ja sümbolid, mis ei ole ilmselged (näit. veapiirid võivad tähistada standardset kõrvalekallet, standardset viga või usaldatavuse intervalle). **Pidage meeles, et tuleb kasutada kümnendpunkte** (mitte kümnendkomasid) ja **esitage teljenimetused ja mõõtühikud**, kus vajalik.
- Püüdke kasutada **tekst-tabeleid**, kui esitate väikesi andmehulki ([Kozak 2009](#)). (*Vaata Appendix: Text-tables*)
- Pikkades (lühendite jms.) loeteludes eelistage üksiknimetuste **semikooloniga** (;) eraldamist, kui on tegemist komade ja punktide vaheliste nimetustega.

## Keeleprobleemid

- Kui teadustermid pole vajalikud, eelistage **üldkasutatavaid sõnu**. Siiski vältige kõnekeelseid ja idiomaatilisi väljendeid, samuti ka ingliskeelseid verb + prepositsioon (*phrasal verbs*, näit. *find out*, *pay off*) kasutamist, mis on tihti raskesti arusaadavad inglise keelt mitte emakeelena kõnelejatele (Geercken 2006).
- **Defineerige lühendid** nende esmakasutamisel artikli põhitekstis (kui nad võivad olla ebaselged lugejale). **Ärge kasutage liiga palju erinevaid lühendeid**, kuna sel juhul on tekstist arusaamine raskendatud. Ärge lühendage termineid, mida tekstis harva kasutatakse. **Vältige lühendeid annotatsioonis**.
- Üldiselt kasutage **minevikku** (*past tense*), kui kirjeldate, kuidas uurimus toimus ja mida leidsite või mida teised uurijad tegid. Eelistage **olevikku** (*present tense*) üldistes väidetes ja tõlgendustes (näit. statistilistes hinnangutes, järeldustes) või oma artikli sisu väljendamisel, eriti tabelite ja jooniste kirjeldamisel (Day & Gastel 2006).
- Kui toimetajad ei nõua teisiti, **viidetes endale vältige "the author(s)"** kasutamist, kuna see on ebaselge. Selle asemel öelge "we" või "I", kui on vajalik või kasutage selliseid väljendeid nagu "in this study", "our results" või "in our opinion" (näit. Hartley 2010, Norris 2011). Pidage meeles, et väljendust "this study" saab kasutada üksnes enda uute tulemuste tähenduses. Kui mõtlete väljaannet, mida mainiste eelmises lauses, kirjutage "that study". Kui mõtlete viidatud väljaande autoreid, kirjutage "those authors".
- Pidage meeles, et teadustekstides võib sõna **"which"** kasutada kõrvallausetes, mis ei ole defineerivad, samal ajal kui **"that"** kasutatakse defineerivates kõrvallausetes (st. tähenduses "ainult need, mis").
- Kui kasutate **kahemõttelise tähendusega sõnu**, kindlustage, et tähendus oleks selge konteksti abil. Kontrollige kas kõik **tegusõnad (öeldised) ühilduvad lause alustega** (ainsus, mitmus) ja kas **viited asesõnadele on selged** (see on olulisim tõlgitud tekstides). Pidage meeles, et mõnel nimisõnal on **ebareeglipärane mitmus**. (*Vaata Appendix: Plurals*)
- Lugege teksti valjusti, et kontrollida kirjavahemärkide õigsust. Kõik **intonatsiooni pausid**, mis on vajalikud õigeaks arusaamiseks, tuleb märgistada komade või teiste kirjavahemärkidega (näit. vaadelge erinevust nende kahe väljenduse vahel: "no more data are needed" ja "no, more data are needed").
- Vajalik on **järjekindlus kirjaõiguses**. Järgige kas Briti või Ameerika kirjaõiguse reegleid ja kuupäeva kirjutamist (näit. "21 Jan 2009" Briti või "Jan 21,

2009" Ameerika inglise keeles). (*Vaata Appendix: Spelling*) Kontrollige kas sihtajakiri kasutab Ameerika või Briti kirjaõigust ja kasutage siis vastavat arvutiabi ortograafia- ja grammatika-kontrolliks.

- Paluge arutleval kolleegil lugeda läbi kogu tekst, et veenduda, kas tekst sisaldab ebaselgeid fragmente.

**Tõlge/Translation: Mare-Anne Laane**  
([mareanne.laane@ttu.ee](mailto:mareanne.laane@ttu.ee)), updated by  
**Riina Klais** ([riina.klais@ut.ee](mailto:riina.klais@ut.ee))

**JUHISTE KOOSTAMISELE AITASID KAASA** (kronoloogilises järjestuses): Sylwia Ufnalska (initiator and editor, [sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com](mailto: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

### Kirjanduse loetelu ja allikad täiendavaks lugemiseks

- 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, Ayzvayan 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](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](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](http://www.icmje.org/urm_main.html)
- [Inderscience] Inderscience Publishers. 2013. Keyword requirements. [http://www.inderscience.com/www/id31\\_keywords.pdf](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](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](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](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](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*. 4<sup>th</sup> 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](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 IMRaD<sup>1</sup> 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](mailto:edhull@home.nl)

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

<sup>1</sup> 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](mailto:edhull@home.nl)

## Appendix: Ethics

European  
Association of  
Science  
Editors

**EASE**

### 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](#)<sup>2</sup>).
- The study reported in this MS meets the Consensus Author Guidelines on Animal Ethics and Welfare for Veterinary Journals<sup>3</sup> 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 Disclosure<sup>4</sup>.

Date:.....

Corresponding author:.....

MS title:.....

.....

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska  
sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com

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

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

<sup>4</sup> [www.ease.org.uk/publications/ease-form](http://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
<b>-a</b>	<b>-ae</b> rarely <b>-ata</b>	<i>alga – algae, larva – larvae</i> <i>stoma – stomata</i>
<b>-ex</b>	<b>-ices</b>	<i>index – indices (or indexes*)</i> <i>apex – apices (or apexes*)</i>
<b>-ies</b>	<b>-ies</b>	<i>species, series, facies</i>
<b>-is</b>	<b>-es</b>	<i>axis – axes, hypothesis – hypotheses</i>
<b>-ix</b>	<b>-ices</b>	<i>appendix – appendices (or appendixes*)</i> <i>matrix – matrices (or matrixes*)</i>
<b>-on</b>	<b>-a</b>	<i>phenomenon – phenomena</i> <i>criterion – criteria</i>
<b>-um</b>	<b>-a</b>	<i>datum – data**, bacterium – bacteria</i>
<b>-us</b>	<b>-i</b> rarely <b>-uses</b> or <b>-era</b>	<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
<b>-ae-</b> eg <i>aetiology, faeces, haematology</i>	<b>-e-</b> eg <i>etiology, feces, hematology</i>
<b>-ce</b> in nouns, <b>-se</b> in verbs eg <i>defence, licence/license, practice/practise</i>	<b>-se</b> in nouns and verbs eg <i>defense, license</i> (but <i>practice</i> as both noun and verb)
<b>-ise</b> or <b>-ize</b> * eg <i>organise/organize</i>	<b>-ize</b> eg <i>organize</i>
<b>-isation</b> or <b>-ization</b> * eg <i>organisation/organization</i>	<b>-ization</b> eg <i>organization</i>
<b>-lled, -lling, -llor</b> , etc. eg <i>labelled, travelling, councillor</i> (but <i>fulfil, skilful</i> )	<b>-led, -ling, -lor</b> , etc. eg <i>labeled, traveling, councilor</i> (but <i>fulfill, skillful</i> )
<b>-oe-</b> eg <i>diarrhoea, foetus, oestrogen</i>	<b>-e-</b> eg <i>diarrhea, fetus, estrogen</i>
<b>-ogue</b> eg <i>analogue, catalogue</i>	<b>-og</b> or <b>-ogue</b> eg <i>analog/analogue, catalog/catalogue</i>
<b>-our</b> eg <i>colour, behaviour, favour</i>	<b>-or</b> eg <i>color, behavior, favor</i>
<b>-re</b> eg <i>centre, fibre, metre, litre</i> (but <i>meter</i> for a measuring instrument)	<b>-er</b> eg <i>center, fiber, meter, liter</i>
<b>-yse</b> eg <i>analyse, dialyse</i>	<b>-yze</b> eg <i>analyze, dialyze</i>
<b>aluminium</b>	<b>aluminum</b> or <b>aluminium</b> **
<b>grey</b>	<b>gray</b>
<b>mould</b>	<b>mold</b>
<b>programme</b> (general) or <b>program</b> (computer)	<b>program</b>
<b>sulphur</b> or <b>sulfur</b> **	<b>sulfur</b>

\*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/dm<sup>3</sup> in sample A,  $12.3 \pm 0.2$  mg/dm<sup>3</sup> in sample B, and  $11.4 \pm 0.9$  mg/dm<sup>3</sup> in sample C.

#### Modified:

Iron concentration means ( $\pm$ standard deviation, in mg/dm<sup>3</sup>) 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](mailto: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](mailto:eric.lichtfouse@dijon.inra.fr)

For more advice, see **EASE Toolkit for Authors**  
([www.ease.org.uk/publications/ease-toolkit-authors](http://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 30<sup>th</sup> 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](http://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](http://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](http://www.standem.eu)), concerning standardized tests of professional English for healthcare professionals worldwide. Our Association also supports the campaign AllTrials ([www.alltrials.net](http://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 <b>Strasbourg</b> , France	1997 <b>Helsinki</b> , Finland
2014 <b>Split</b> , Croatia	1994 <b>Budapest</b> , Hungary
2012 <b>Tallinn</b> , Estonia ( <b>30th Anniversary</b> )	1991 <b>Oxford</b> , UK
2009 <b>Pisa</b> , Italy	1989 <b>Ottawa</b> , Canada (joint meeting with CBE and AESE)
2006 <b>Kraków</b> , Poland	1988 <b>Basel</b> , Switzerland
2003 <b>Bath</b> , UK	1985 <b>Holmenkollen</b> , Norway
2003 <b>Halifax</b> , Nova Scotia, Canada (joint meeting with AESE)	1984 <b>Cambridge</b> , UK
2000 <b>Tours</b> , France	1982 <b>Pau</b> , France
1998 <b>Washington</b> , 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>