DOI:10.20316/ESE.2018.44.e1.ser

Smernice EASE (European Association of Science Editors) za autore i prevodioce naučnih radova koji se publikuju na engleskom jeziku

Sažetak

Evropsko udruženje urednika naučnih časopisa (EASE) je 2010. godine prvi put objavilo sažete i čitke uredničke smernice i od tada se ažuriraju svake godine. Slobodno su dostupne na preko 20 jezika (http://ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines). Cilj smernica je da pomogne naučnicima širom sveta da uspešno prezentuju rezultate svojih istraživanja i tačno prevedu rukopise na engleski jezik. Smernice ukratko objašnjavaju kako treba pisati potpune, sažete i jasne rukopise, i naglašavaju etička pitanja: kriterijume za autorstvo, plagijat, konflikt interesa i sl. Kroz osam dodataka dati su primeri ili detaljnije informacije o određenim temama (*Abstracts*, *Ambiguity*, *Cohesion*, *Ethics*, *Plurals*, *Simplicity*, *Spelling* i *Text-tables*). Šira upotreba *EASE Guidelines* bi trebalo da poveća efikasnost međunarodne naučne komunikacije.

Da bi međunarodna naučna komunikacija bila efikasnija, naučni članci i druge naučne publikacije moraju biti POTPUNE, SAŽETE i JASNE, na način kako je to ispod objašnjeno. Ovo su opšte ali ne i univerzalne smernice sa ciljem da pomognu autorima, prevodiocima i urednicima. Neophodno je pratiti zdrav razum prilikom primene ovih pravila, jer je nemoguće postići savršenstvo.

Pre svega:

- **Pažljivo planirajte i izvedite svoje istraživanje** (e.g. Hengl *et al* 2011). Ne započinjite pisanje celog članka ukoliko niste sigurni da su vam rezultati kvalitetni i potpuni (O'Connor 1991), što bi omogućilo donošenje **pouzdanih zaključaka**.
- Pre nego što započnete pisanje, po mogućstvu **izaberite časopis** u koji ćete poslati svoj rukopis. Uverite se da čitalačka publika časopisa odgovara vašoj ciljanoj publici (Chipperfield *et al* 2010). Nabavite kopiju uputstava za autore časopisa i osmislite članak tako da odgovara željenom formatu časopisa u pogledu dužine, obaveznih ili dozvoljenih broja slika i dr.

Rukopisi moraju biti POTPUNI, tj. ne sme izostati nijedna neophodna informacija. Setite se da se informacije lakše tumače ako se nalaze na mestu na kom to čitaoci očekuju (Gopen & Swan 1990). Na primer, eksperimentalni naučni članci moraju sadržati sledeće informacije:

- **Naslov**: mora biti nedvosmislen, odslikavati sadržaj članka i biti razumljiv i stručnjacima iz drugih oblasti. Pri pisanju naslova budite specifični, a ne opšti ili neodređeni (O'Connor 1991). Ukoliko je to značajno, u naslovu spomenite dužinu studije ili lokaciju, međunarodno naučno ime ispitivanog organizma ili dizajn eksperimenta (npr. studija slučaja ili randomizirana kontrolisana studija). Ukoliko vaša studija uključuje osobe jednog pola, navedite to u naslovu. Informacije iz naslova ne treba ponavljati u sažetku (jer se uvek publikuju zajedno), iako je određeno preklapanje neizbežno.
- **Lista autora**, tj. svih ljudi koji su značajno doprineli planiranju studije, prikupljanju podataka ili tumačenju rezultata **i** koji su napisali ili kritički revidirali rukopis **i** odobrili konačnu verziju **i** prihvatili odgovornost za sve aspekte rada. Svakome ko ispunjava ovaj uslov mora biti dozvoljeno učešće u pripremi i odobravanju konačne verzije (ICMJE 2017). Prvi na listi su oni autori koji su najviše uradili. Raspored autorstva odrediti pre slanja rukopisa. Svi autori moraju odobriti bilo kakve izmene nastale nakon slanja i obrazložiti ih uredniku časopisa (Battisti *et al* 2015, videti COPE flowcharts). Imena autora treba dopuniti **njihovim afilijacijama (ustanovama autora)** (tokom trajanja studije) i **sadašnjom adresom** autora za prepisku. Navesti adrese elektronske pošte svih autora tako da se mogu lako kontaktirati. Podstičemo sve autore da

registruju ORCID iD – unikatni identifikacioni broj autora koji vas povezuje sa vašim radovima (http://www.orcid.org).

- **Sažetak (apstrakt)**: ukratko objasniti zašto se sprovodi studija (BACKGROUND), na koja pitanja se želi odgovoriti (OBJECTIVES), kako je izvedena studija (METHODS), šta je pronađeno (RESULTS: bitni podaci, odnosi), vaše tumačenje i glavne posledice vaših otkrića (CONCLUSIONS). Sažetak bi trebalo da **odslikava sadržaj članka** jer će za većinu čitaoca to biti jedini izvor informacija o vašoj studiji. Kroz sažetak treba koristiti ključne reči, kako bi se zainteresovanima za vaše rezultate olakšala eletronska pretraga (mnoge baze podataka uključuju jedino naslove i sažetke). U **istraživačkom izveštaju** sažetak mora **uključivati** stvarne rezultate (za strukuirane sažetke ***videti Appendix: Abstracts***). Jedino u **preglednim** i sličnim **člancima** širokog opsega sažetak treba **upućivati** na glavne teme rasprave ali ne navodeći ishod (CSE 2014). U sažetku se ne pozivajte na tabele ili slike, jer se sažetak objavljuje odvojeno. Takođe nije dozvoljeno navođenje literature osim ako to nije apsolutno neophodno (u tom slučaju navesti detaljne informacije u zagradi: autor, naslov, godina i dr.) Uverite se da se sve informacije date u sažetku takođe navode u glavnom delu teksta.
- **Lista ključnih reči**: uvrstiti sve bitne naučne izraze ili jedino dodatne ključne reči koje se ne pojavljuju u naslovu (na zahtev urednika). Treba birati što preciznije ključne reči, ali možete koristite i opštije izraze ukoliko vaše istraživanje ima interdisciplinarni značaj. (O'Connor 1991). U medicinskim tekstovima upotrebljavati pojmove navedene u rečniku MeSH Browser. Pri sladištenju vašeg članka (Cerejo 2013) uvrstiti sve ključne reči i druge metapodatke u rad (videti npr. Inderscience 2013).
- **Lista skraćenica** (na zahtev urednika): definisati sve skraćenice u članku sem skraćenica očiglednih i onima koji nisu stručnjaci u oblasti.
- **Uvod**: objasniti zašto je studija bila neophodna i naznačiti **ciljeve istraživanja** ili pitanje(a) na koje(a) ste želili odgovoriti. **Počnite sa opštijim temama i postepeno se usredsredite na vaše istraživanje.** Ukoliko je to moguće, formulišite **hipotezu** koju ste testirali.
- **Metode**: detaljno opišite kako je studija izvedena (npr. područje istraživanja, prikupljanje podataka, kriterijumi, poreklo analiziranog materijala, veličina uzorka, broj merenja, starost i pol učesnika ili donora organa/ćelija, oprema, analiza podataka, statistički testovi, i korišćeni programi). **Treba uzeti u razmatranje sve faktore koji su mogli uticati na rezultate.** Izvore eksperimentalnog materijala iz biobanaka treba navesti punim imenom i identifikatorima, ukoliko su dostupni (Bravo *et al* 2015). Ukoliko navodite metodu čiji opis nije objavljen ili nije raspoloživ na engleskom jeziku, opisati je detaljno u vašem rukopisu. Uverite se da ispunjavate etičke standarde (npr. WMA 2013) u pogledu prava pacijenata, upotrebe životinja, zaštite životne sredine itd.
- **Rezultati**: **predstavite nove rezultate vašeg istraživanja** (objavljene podatke obično ne treba uključivati u ovo poglavlje). Sve tabele i slike bi trebalo spomenuti u glavnom delu teksta, numerisane redosledom kojim se pojavljuju u tekstu. Uverite se da koristite odgovarajuću statističku analizu (npr. Habibzadeh 2013). Podatke o ljudima, životinjama ili bilo kom materijalu humanog ili životnjskog porekla bi trebalo razvrstati na osnovu pola (see Heidari *et al* 2016). Ne izmišljati i ne izvrtati podatke, i ne izbacivati važne podatke; slično, ne manipulisati slikama i tako čitaocima stvarati lažan utisak. Takve manipulacije podacima mogu predstavljati **naučne prevare** (videti COPE flowcharts).
- **Diskusija**: ovo poglavlje nije mesto predstavljanja novih rezultata niti statističkih izveštaja. **Odgovorite na postavljena pitanja istraživanja** (navedena pri kraju Uvoda) **i, što je objektivnije moguće, uporedite vaša glavna otkrića sa već objavljenim**. Diskutujte ograničenja rezultata i naglasite glavna otkrića. Ukoliko je vaša studija obuhvatala subjekte jednog pola, diskutujte uticaj i uopštavanje otkrića na osobe oba pola. Uzmite u obzir one nalaze suprotne vašem gledištu. Potkrepite vašu hipotezu **isključivo sa metodološki ispravnim dokazima** (Roig 2015). Na kraju ovog ili u posebnom poglavlju naglasite najznačajnije zaključke i praktični značaj vašeg istraživanja.
- **Zahvalnica:** spomenite sve one koji su značajno doprineli istraživanju ali nisu ko-autori, i zahvalite se onima koji su pružili finansijsku pomoć. Preporučeni oblik za to je: „This work was supported by the Medical Research Council [grant number xxxx]". Ukoliko nije bilo određene finansijske pomoći, upotrebite sledeću rečenicu: „This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors." (RIN 2008). Ukoliko smatrate značajnim, obavestite urednika o bilo kakvim sukobima interesa, npr. finansijske ili lične veze sa proizvođačima ili sa organizacijama

koje imaju svoje interese u predatom rukopisu (Goozner *et al* 2009). Zatražite dozvolu od nosioca autorskih prava ako reprodukujete prethodno objavljene podatke (npr. slike) i spomenite ih u objašnjenju slike ili u zahvalnici. Ukoliko vam je pomogao stručnjak za jezike (npr. urednik ili prevodilac), statističar, sakupljač podataka itd. zahvalite im za pomoć zbog transparentnosti (ICMJE 2017, Battisti *et al* 2015). Mora biti jasno naglašeno da oni nisu odgovorini za konačnu verziju članka. Uverite se da imate saglasnost od svih ljudi spomenutih u ovom poglavlju. (***Videti*** Appendix: Ethics)

- **Reference:** pobrinite se da navedete izvore svih informacija preuzetih iz drugih publikacija. Uključite u listu referenci sve podatke neophodne za pronalazak publikacije u biblioteci ili na internetu. Za publikacije koje nisu objavljene na engleskom jeziku, navedite **izvorni naslov** (uz transliteraciju prema engleskim pravilima ako je neophodno) a zatim, gde god je moguće, navedite u zagradi prevod na engleski jezik (CSE 2014). Izbegavajte upućivanje na nedostupne, prisilne i nevažne reference. Citirajte originalne istraživačke članke umesto preglednih članaka kad god je to odgovarajuće (DORA 2013). Ne uključujte neobjavljene podatke u listu referenci - ukoliko ih morate spomenuti, opišite njihov izvor u glavnom delu teksta i osigurajte dozvolu autora za citiranje.
- **Drugačija struktura članka** može biti prikladnija za teoretske publikacije, pregledne radove, studije slučaja itd. (npr. Gasparyan *et al* 2011).
- Neke publikacije uključuju takođe i sažetak ili duži **rezime na drugom** jeziku, što je veoma korisno u mnogim sferama istraživanja.
- Praćenje **smernica za izveštavanje** će vam pomoći da prikažete minimum neophodnih informacija o vašem istraživanju (videti npr. EQUATOR Network).
- Ne zaboravite da uskladite svoj rukopis sa **uputstvima za autore** časopisa u pogledu dužine sažetka, stila referenci itd.

Pišite SAŽETO kako biste uštedeli vreme recenzentima i čitaocima.

- **Ne spominjite podatke koji nisu bitni za vaše istraživačko pitanje(a)** navedeno(a) u Uvodu.
- **Ne kopirajte** delove vaših prethodnih publikacija i ne šaljite isti rukopis u više časopisa istovremeno. U suprotnom, možete biti odgovorni za **prekomernu publikaciju** (videti COPE flowcharts). Ovo se ne odnosi na preliminarne publikacije kao što su sažeci sa konferencija (O'Connor 1991, videti takođe BioMed Central policy). Štaviše, **sekundarne publikacije** su prihvatljive ako su namenjene u potpunosti drugačijoj grupi čitalaca (npr. na drugom jeziku ili za stručnjake i širu javnost) i za to ste dobili odobrenje od urednika oba časopisa (ICMJE 2017). U tom slučaju, referenca ka primarnoj publikaciji bi trebala stajati u fusnoti na naslovnoj strani sekundarne publikacije.
- Podatke date u jednom poglavlju **ne treba ponavljati** u drugim poglavljima. Očigledni izuzeci uključuju sažetak, objašnjenja slika i zaključak.
- Razmotrite da li su sve tabele i slike neophodne. Podatke predstavljene u tabelama ne treba ponavljati u slikama (i obratno). Duge liste sa podacima ne treba ponavljati u tekstu.
- Objašnjenja tabela i slika trebaju biti **informativna ali ne preduga**. Ako su slični podaci dati u nekoliko tabela ili slika, njihovi opisi trebaju biti slični.
- Po mogućstvu izbrišite očigledne izjave (npr. „Šume su veoma važni ekosistemi") i ostale suvišne delove (npr. „Poznato je da…").
- Ako se **dug naučni izraz** često ponavlja, definišite njegovu skraćenicu pri prvom pomenu u tekstu članka i dalje je koristite dosledno.
- Izrazite sumnju ukoliko je neophodno ali izbegavajte **preterano ograđivanje u vezi sa podacima** (npr. radije napišite „su mogući" nego „mogu eventualno biti mogući"). **Ne uopštavajte** međutim **preterano** vaše zaključke.
- Osim ako urednik nije zahtevao suprotno, koristite **brojke za prikazivanje svih brojeva,** tj. takođe za navođenje jednocifrenih celih brojeva **osim za nulu, jedinicu** (ako je bez jedinice mere), **i u drugim slučajevima gde može doći do zabune**, npr. na početku rečenice ili ispred skraćenice koja sadrži brojeve (CSE 2014).

Pišite JASNO kako biste olakšali razumevanje i učinili vaš tekst čitljivim.

Naučni sadržaj

- **Jasno razlikujte sopstvene originalne podatke i ideje** od tuđih podataka i ideja i od svojih ranijih publikacija - citirajte kad god je potrebno. **Po mogućstvu sumirajte ili prepričajte** tekst iz drugih izvora. Ovo se takođe odnosi na prevode. Ako se tekst kopira doslovce (npr. cela rečenica ili duži tekst), staviti ga pod znake navoda (e.g. Roig 2015, Kerans & de Jager 2010). U

suprotnom, to će predstavljati **plagijat** ili **recikliranje sadržaja** (neopravdano, prekomerno recikliranje teksta, podataka, ilustracija i dr. ili čak suvišna publikacija, videti COPE flowcharts i COPE guidelines).

- Uverite se da koristite **odgovarajuće naučne izraze na engleskom jeziku**, po mogućstvu iz tekstova koji su napisali izvorni govornici engleskog jezika. Doslovni prevodi su često pogrešni (npr. takozvani *false friends* ili nepostojeće reči koje su izmislili prevodioci). Ako imate nedoumicu, **proverite definiciju reči** u rečniku engleskog jezika s obzirom da se mnoge reči pogrešno koriste (npr. *gender* i *trimester*, ***videti Appendix: Ambiguity***). Možete recimo potražiti reč ili izraz na Wikipediji; zatim uporedite rezultat na sopstvenom i na engleskom jeziku, i vidite da li je značenje navodnih ekvivalenata zaista identično. Međutim, Wikipedija nije uvek pouzdan izvor podataka.
-
- Ukoliko se reč koristi uglavnom u prevodima i veoma retko u zemljama engleskog govornog područja, razmislite o njenoj zameni sa poznatijim engleskim terminom koji ima slično značenje (npr. *plant community* umjesto *phytocoenosis*). Ako za naučni izraz nema sinonim u engleskom jeziku, definišite ga precizno i predložite prihvatljiv prevod na engleski jezik.
- **Definišite svaki redak ili dvosmislen naučni izraz** pri prvom pominjanju. Možete popisati njegove sinonime ukoliko postoje (da pomognu u pretrazi), ali kasnije koristite dosledno samo jedan od njih (da se izbegne konfuzija). Upotrebljavajte radije zvaničnu nomenklaturu naučnih organizacija (npr. EASE 2013).
- **Izbegavajte nejasne izjave** čije značenje čitalac mora da nagađa. (***Videti Appendix: Ambiguity***).
- Kada se izveštavaju procenti, jasno naglasite **šta je 100%**. Kada pišete o korelaciji, odnosima i sl., jasno navedite sa čim upoređujete vrednosti.
- **Jedinice međunarodnog sistema jedinica (SI) i stepeni celzijusovi** se radije koriste.
- Za razliku od mnogih drugih, engleski jezik koristi **decimalnu tačku** (a ne zarez). Osim ako urednici ne zahtevaju suprotno, kod brojeva sa više od tri brojke ispred ili iza decimalne tačke koristite **tanak razmak** (ne zareze) između grupa od 3 broja u oba smera od decimalne tačke (EASE 2013).
- Za označavanje vekova, meseci itd. **ne koristite rimske brojeve** jer se oni retko upotrebljavaju u engleskom jeziku. Zbog razlika u britanskom i američkom načinu pisanja datuma (videti ispod), preporučljivo je mesece pisati punim imenom ili pomoću prva 3 slova (CSE 2014).
- Ukoliko su prevedena manje poznata **geografska imena**, njihova originalna imena bi trebalo spomenuti ukoliko je moguće, npr. „in the Kampinos Forest (Puszcza Kampinoska)". Dodatne informacije o lokaciji, klimi itd. takođe mogu biti korisne čitaocima.
- Setite se da će tekst **uglavnom čitati stranci** koji možda nisu svesni uslova, klasifikacija ili pojmova koji su opštepoznati u vašoj zemlji; zato je nekad neophodno dati dodatna objašnjenja (Ufnalska 2008). Na primer, korovna biljka *Erigeron annuus* se u nekim zemljama zove *Stenactis annua*, pa u engleskim tekstovima treba koristiti međunarodno odobreno ime, dok sinonim(e) treba dodati u zagradama.

Struktura teksta

- **Rečenice ne bi trebalo da su preduge. Njihova struktura bi trebalo da je relativno jednostavna**, a subjekt smešten u blizini predikta (Gopen & Swan 1990). Na primer, izbegavati apstraktne imenice i pisati „X je izmeren…" umesto „Merenja X su izvršena…". (***Videti Appendix: Simplicity***) Ne koristite previše pasivni glagolski oblik (e.g. Norris 2011). Kad prevodite, izmenite strukturu rečenice ukoliko je to neophodno za tačnije i jasnije prenošenje poruke (Burrough-Boenisch 2013).
- **Tekst treba biti povezan i logički organizovan,** stoga lak za praćenje. (***Videti Appendix: Cohesion***)
- Svako poglavlje je preporučljivo započeti tematskom rečenicom a sledeće rečenice poglavlja trebaju razraditi tu temu.
- Engleski jezik, nasuprot drugim jezicima, dozvoljava paralelne konstrukcije jer one olakšavaju razumevanje. Na primer, pri poređenju sličnih podataka, možete radije pisati „It was high in A, medium in B, and low in C", nego „It was high in A, medium for B, and low in the case of C".
- **Napravite slike i tabele koje su lako razumljive** bez pozivanja na ostatak teksta. Izostavite podatke koji nisu informativni (npr. izbrišite kolonu ukoliko sadrži iste vrednosti u svim redovima – možete napisati o tome u fusnoti). Primenite skraćenice samo ako je to potrebno radi doslednosti ili ako nema dovoljno prostora za celu reč. U objašnjenjima slika i u fusnotama treba objasniti sve skraćenice i simbole čije značenje nije očigledno (npr. linija greške može označavati standardnu devijaciju, standardnu grešku ili

interval pouzdanosti). **Ne zaboravite da koristite decimalnu tačku** (a ne decimalni zarez) i **označite ose na graficima i jedinice** kad god je to potrebno.
- Razmotrite upotrebu tabela u tekstu kad prikazujete mali skup podataka (Kozak 2009). (***Videti Appendix: Text-tables***)
- U dugim listama (skraćenica itd.) preporučljivo je razdvajati pojedine predmete pomoću **tačke-zareza (;)**, znak između zareza i tačke.

Jezička pitanja

- Radije koristite **opštepoznate reči** kad god naučni izrazi nisu neophodni. Izbegavajte ipak kolokvijalne i idiomatske izraze kao i frazne glagole (npr. *find out*, *pay off*) koje oni čitaoci koji nisu izvorni govornici engleskog jezika teško razumeju (Geercken 2006).
- Objasnite **skraćenice** pri prvom pominjanju u članku (ako bi mogle biti nejasne čitaocima). **Ne koristite previše različitih skraćenica**, jer to čini tekst teško razumljivim. Ne koristite skraćenice za one izraze koji se retko pojavljuju u vašem rukopisu. **Izbegavajte skraćenice u sažetku**.
- Generalno, **prošlo vreme** treba koristiti pri opisivanju istraživanja koje ste sproveli i rezultata koje ste dobili, ili istraživanja koja su radili drugi istraživači. **Sadašnje vreme** treba koristiti u opštim tvrdnjama i tumačenjima (npr. statističkoj značajnosti, zaključcima) ili pri opisivanju sadržaja članka, naročito tabela i slika (Gastel & Day 2016).
- Osim ako urednici ne zahtevaju suprotno, ne pišite o sebi „**the author(s)**”, jer je dvosmisleno. Umesto toga, pišite „we” ili „I” ako je neophodno, ili koristite izraze kao „in this study”, „our results” ili „in our opinion” (e.g. Hartley 2010, Norris 2011). Imajte na umu da biste trebali napisati "this study" samo ako mislite na svoje nove rezultate. Ako ste mislili na publikacije navedene u prethodnoj rečenici, pišite "that study". Ako ste mislili na autore navedene publikacije, pišite "those authors".
- Ne zaboravite da bi u naučnim tekstovima reč „**which**” u rečenicama trebalo koristiti onda kada nije neophodno nešto precizno opisati, dok reč „**that**” treba koristiti onda kad se želi nešto bliže definisati (tj. ovim se precizno definišu „samo oni koji”).
- Pri korištenju **dvosmislenih reči**, pripazite da njihovo značenje bude jasno iz konteksta teksta. Proverite da li se **slažu svi glagoli sa subjektom u broju** i da li **jasno na šta se zamenice odnose** (ovo je naročito bitno kod prevedenih tekstova). Ne zaboravite da neke imenice imaju nepravilnu množinu. (***Videti Appendix: Plurals***)
- Pročitajte tekst naglas kako biste proverili interpunkciju. Sve **intonacijske pauze** moraju odgovarati zarezu ili nekom drugom interpunkcijskom znaku (uočite razliku između „ne treba dalje istraživati” i „ne, treba dalje istraživati”).
- Budite **dosledni 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; ***videti Appendix: Spelling***). Proverite koji pravopis koristi časopis u koji šaljete rukopis, pa ta podešavanja koristite pri pregledu teksta.
- Zamolite kolegu koji je pažljiv i pouzdan da pročita vaš rad da biste videli da li sadrži neke nejasnoće.

Prevod/Translation: Milica Maksimovic
(milicazmaksimovic@gmail.com)

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

Reference i preporučena literatura

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. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 163(6):461-464. https://doi.org/10.7326/M15-0288

Beverley 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

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. https://doi.org/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. http://www.ease.org.uk/publications/science-editors-handbook/

Cerejo C. 2013. How to make your paper more accessible through self-archiving. Editage Insights. http://www.editage.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. https://doi.org/10.1185/03007995.2010.499344

[COPE flowcharts] Committee on Publication Ethics flowcharts. http://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts

[COPE guidelines] Committee on Publication Ethics. Text recycling guidelines for editors https://publicationethics.org/files/Web_A29298_COPE_Text_Recycling.pdf

[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

[DORA] San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. 2013. http://www.ascb.org/dora/

[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/publications/science-editors-handbook/

EQUATOR Network. http://www.equator-network.org/

Gasparyan AY, Ayvazyan L, Blackmore H, Kitas GD. 2011. Writing a narrative biomedical review: considerations for authors, peer reviewers, and editors. *Rheumatology International* 31(11):1409-1417. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00296-011-1999-3

Gastel B, Day RA. 2016. How to write and publish a scientific paper, 8th edition. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO

Geercken S. 2006. Challenges of (medical) writing for the multilingual audience. *Write Stuff* 15(2):45-46. http://journal.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. https://doi.org/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. https://www.americanscientist.org/blog/the-long-view/the-science-of-scientific-writing

Habibzadeh F. 2013. Common statistical mistakes in manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals. *European Science Editing* 39(4):92-94. http://europeanscienceediting.eu/issues/394/

Hartley J. 2010. Citing oneself. *European Science Editing* 36(2):35-37. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/may_2010_362.pdf

Heidari S, Babor TF, De Castro P, Tort S, Curno M. 2016. Sex and Gender Equity in Research: rationale for the SAGER guidelines and recommended use. Research Integrity and Peer Review 1:2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-016-0007-6

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. https://www.givereadersnuggets.nl/

[ICMJE] International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. 2017. *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/info/insitemap.php

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

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 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/system/files/attachments/Acknowledgement-funders-guidance.pdf

Roig M. 2015. *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

Seifert KA, Crous PW, Frisvad JC. 2008. Correcting the impact factors of taxonomic journals by Appropriate Citation of Taxonomy (ACT). *Persoonia* 20:105. https://doi.org/10.3767/003158508X324236

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.* https://www.wma.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/DoH-Oct2013-JAMA.pdf

Appendix: Abstracts

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[1] 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

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
ebaranyi@seznam.cz

Appendix: Cohesion

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

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 2017).**

☐ **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 Journals[3] 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[4].**

Date:……

Corresponding author:……...

MS title:……..…….

……

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska
sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com

[2] www.ease.org.uk/publications/sex-and-gender
[3] www.veteditors.org/consensus-author-guidelines-on-animal-ethics-and-welfare-for-editors/
[4] www.ease.org.uk/publications/ease-form

Appendix: Plurals

Examples of irregular plurals deriving from Latin or Greek

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

* 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 (eg *woman – women*, *foot – feet*, *tooth – teeth*, *mouse – mice*, *leaf – leaves*, *life – lives*, *tomato – tomatoes*) or have no plural form (eg *equipment*, *information*, *news*). For more examples, see CSE (2014). If in doubt, consult a dictionary.

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska
sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com

Appendix: Simplicity

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

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

Based on O'Connor (1991)

Appendix: Spelling

Examples of differences between British and American spelling

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

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 (±standard deviation) were as follows: 11.2±0.3 mg/dm^3 in sample A, 12.3±0.2 mg/dm^3 in sample B, and 11.4±0.9 mg/dm^3 in sample C.

Modified:
Iron concentration means (±standard deviation, in mg/dm^3) were as follows:

sample B	12.3±0.2
sample C	11.4±0.9
sample A	11.2±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

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 28 languages: Arabic, Bangla, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Croatian, Czech, Dutch, English, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Persian, Polish, Portuguese (Brazilian), Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Slovenian, 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 about 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

2018 **Bucharest**, Romania
2016 **Strasbourg**, France
2014 **Split**, Croatia
2012 **Tallinn**, Estonia (**30th Anniversary**)
2009 **Pisa**, Italy
2006 **Kraków**, Poland
2003 **Bath**, UK
2003 **Halifax**, Nova Scotia, Canada (joint meeting with AESE)
2000 **Tours**, France
1998 **Washington**, DC, USA (joint meeting with CBE and AESE)
1997 **Helsinki**, Finland
1994 **Budapest**, Hungary
1991 **Oxford**, UK
1989 **Ottawa**, Canada (joint meeting with CBE and AESE)
1988 **Basel**, Switzerland
1985 **Holmenkollen**, Norway
1984 **Cambridge**, UK
1982 **Pau**, France

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. 2018. EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators of Scientific Articles to be Published in English. European Science Editing 44(4):e1-e16. doi:10.20316/ESE.2018.44.e1

The latest edition and translations can be found at http://www.ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines