DOI:10.20316/ESE.2018.44.e1.si

European Association of Science Editors

EASE

Smernice EASE (European Association of Science Editors) za avtorje in prevajalce znanstvenih člankov, ki so namenjeni objavi v angleškem jeziku

Povzetek

Ta jedrnat in berljiv sklop uredniških smernic je Evropsko združenje znanstvenih urednikov (EASE) prvič objavilo leta 2010 in ga od tedaj posodablja vsako leto. V več kot 20 jezikih je prosto dostopen na http://ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines. Dokument je namenjen znanstvenikom z vsega sveta kot pripomoček pri uspešni predstavitvi svojih raziskovalnih rezultatov ter pravilnemu prevajanju rokopisov v angleški jezik. Na kratko pojasni, kako napisati popoln, jedrnat in jasen rokopis, ter naslovi etična vprašanja: kriterije za avtorstvo, plagiatorstvo, konflikte interesov itd. V osmih prilogah so na voljo primeri ter podrobnejše informacije o izbranih temah (*Abstracts*, *Ambiguity*, *Cohesion*, *Ethics*, *Plurals*, *Simplicity*, *Spelling* in *Text-tables*). Široka uporaba *EASE Guidelines* lahko izboljša učinkovitost mednarodne znanstvene komunikacije.

Da bi bila mednarodna znanstvena komunikacija bolj učinkovita, morajo biti znanstveni članki ter druge znanstvene publikacije POPOLNI, JEDRNATI in JASNI, kot je pojasnjeno v nadaljevanju. To so splošne, a ne univerzalne smernice, ki so namenjene kot pripomoček avtorjem, prevajalcem in urednikom. Pri uporabi teh pravil je potreben zdrav razum, saj je popolnost nemogoče doseči.

Najprej:

- **Skrbno načrtujte in izvedite svojo raziskavo** (npr. Hengl *et al* 2011). Ne pričnite s pisanjem celotnega članka, dokler niste prepričani, da so vaši izsledki razmeroma trdni in popolni (O'Connor 1991) ter da vam omogočajo **zanesljive zaključke**.
- Preden pričnete s pisanjem, **po možnosti izberite revijo**, kamor boste poslali svoj rokopis. Prepričajte se, da bralci te revije spadajo med vaše ciljno občinstvo (Chipperfield et al 2010). Pridobite izvod navodil za avtorje te revije ter zasnujte članek tako, da se bo skladal s predvidenim formatom revije z vidika celokupne dolžine, števila zahtevanih/dovoljenih slik itd.

Rokopisi naj bodo POPOLNI, tj. manjkati ne sme nobena nujna informacija. Ne pozabite, da je informacije lažje interpretirati, če se nahajajo tam, kjer jih bralci pričakujejo (Gopen & Swan 1990). Eksperimentalni znanstveni članki morajo na primer vsebovati sledeče informacije.

- **Naslov**: naj bo nedvoumen, razumljiv specialistom z drugih področij ter naj odraža vsebino članka. Bodite specifični, ne splošni ali nejasni (O'Connor 1991). Če je smiselno, v naslovu omenite čas in kraj raziskave, mednarodno znanstveno ime preučevanega organizma ali eksperimentalni pristop (npr. študija primera, randomizirana kontrolirana klinična raziskava). Če vaša raziskava vključuje osebe le enega spola, mora to biti navedeno v naslovu. Informacij, navedenih v naslovu, ni potrebno ponavljati v povzetku (saj sta vedno objavljena skupaj), čeprav je prekrivanje neizbežno.
- **Seznam avtorjev**, tj. vseh oseb, ki so znatno prispevale k načrtovanju raziskave, zbiranju podatkov ali interpretaciji rezultatov **ter** so napisale ali kritično pregledale rokopis **ter** so odobrile njegovo zadnjo različico **ter** prevzemajo odgovornost za vse vidike dela. Vsaki osebi, ki zadošča prvemu pogoju, bi moralo biti omogočeno sodelovanje pri pisanju in odobritvi končne različice (ICMJE 2017). Na prvih mestih bi morali biti navedeni avtorji, ki so prispevali največ. Vrstni red avtorjev bi moral biti določen pred oddajo rokopisa. Kakršnekoli kasnejše spremembe bi morali odobriti vsi avtorji ter jih pojasniti uredniku revije (Battisti et al. 2015, glejte COPE flowcharts). Imena avtorjev je potrebno dopolniti z njihovimi **afiliacijami** (tekom raziskave) ter **trenutnim naslovom** korespondenčnega avtorja. Da je z avtorji mogoče zlahka stopiti v stik, je potrebno navesti vse njihove e-poštne naslove.

Vsem avtorjem priporočamo, naj si ustvarijo ORCID iD – edinstveni identifikator avtorstva, ki vas poveže z vašimi članki (http://www.orcid.org).

- **Povzetek**: na kratko pojasnite, zakaj ste izvedli raziskavo (BACKGROUND), na katera vprašanja ste iskali odgovore (OBJECTIVES), kako ste izvedli raziskavo (METHODS), kaj ste odkrili (RESULTS: glavni podatki in razmerja), ter vašo interpretacijo in glavne posledice vaših odkritij (CONCLUSIONS). Povzetek mora **odražati vsebino** članka, saj bo za večino bralcev glavni vir informacij o vaši raziskavi. Da bi tistim, ki jih zanimajo vaši rezultati, olajšali spletno iskanje vašega članka, morate v povzetku uporabiti **ključne besede** (mnoge baze podatkov vključujejo zgolj naslove in povzetke). V **raziskovalnem poročilu** mora biti povzetek **informativen** ter vključevati dejanske rezultate (***glejte Appendix: Abstracts*** o strukturiranih povzetkih). Le v preglednih člankih ter podobnih člankih širokega obsega naj povzetek samo **nakazuje** glavne obravnavane teme, vendar naj ne opisuje izidov (CSE 2014). V povzetku se ne sklicujte na tabele ali slike, saj se povzetke objavlja tudi ločeno. Navajanje literature ni dovoljeno, razen kadar je resnično nujno (v tem primeru morajo v oklepaju biti navedene vse potrebne informacije: avtor, naslov, leto objave itd.). Poskrbite, da bodo vse informacije, navedene v povzetku, prisotne tudi v glavnem delu članka.
- **Seznam ključnih besed**: navedite vse relevantne znanstvene pojme ali samo dodatne ključne besede, ki manjkajo v naslovu (če tako zahtevajo uredniki). Ključne besede naj bodo specifične. Če je vaša raziskava interdisciplinarna, dodajte tudi splošnejše pojme (O'Connor 1991). V medicinskih besedilih uporabljajte besedišče iz baze MeSH Browser. Ko svoj članek arhivirate v repozitorijih ipd. (Cerejo 2013), v datoteko vključite vse ključne besede in druge metapodatke (glejte npr. Inderscience 2013).
- **Seznam okrajšav** (če ga zahtevajo uredniki): definirajte vse v članku uporabljene okrajšave, razen tistih, ki so samoumevne tudi nespecialistom.
- **Uvod**: pojasnite, zakaj je bila raziskava potrebna in izrecno navedite svoje **raziskovalne cilje** ali vprašanja, na katera ste želeli odgovoriti. **Začnite z bolj splošnimi temami ter se postopno osredotočite na svoja raziskovalna vprašanja.** Če je mogoče, opredelite **hipotezo**, ki ste jo testirali.
- **Metode**: podrobno opišite, kako ste izvedli raziskavo (tj. raziskovalno območje, nabor podatkov, kriterije, izvor analiziranega materiala, velikost vzorca, število meritev, starost in spol udeležencev oziroma darovalcev tkiva/celic, raziskovalno opremo, analizo podatkov, statistične teste in programsko opremo). **V obzir morate vzeti vse dejavnike, ki bi lahko vplivali na rezultate.** Vse vire eksperimentalnega materiala, pridobljenega iz biobank, morate navesti s polnimi imeni in identifikatorji, v kolikor so na voljo (Bravo et al. 2015). Če se sklicujete na metodo, opisano v nedostopni publikaciji ali publikaciji, ki ni napisana v angleškem jeziku, jo podrobno pojasnite v svojem rokopisu. Poskrbite, da bodo pravice vaših pacientov, poskusi na živalih, varovanje okolja itd. v skladu z etičnimi stadardi (npr. WMA 2013).
- **Rezultati**: **predstavite nove rezultate svoje raziskave** (že objavljenih podatkov v tem poglavju običajno ne navajamo). Vse tabele in slike morajo biti omenjene v glavnem delu članka ter oštevilčene v vrstnem redu, kot se pojavljajo v besedilu. Poskrbite, da boste uporabili ustrezno statistično analizo (npr. Habibzadeh 2013). Podatki o ljudeh, živalih ali kakršnemkoli človeškem ali živalskem materialu bi morali biti ločeni po spolu (glejte Heidari et al. 2016). Ne potvarjajte ali prirejajte podatkov ter ne izpuščajte pomembnih podatkov; prav tako ne manipulirajte s slikovnim gradivom, da bi na bralce ustvarili lažen vtis. Takšne manipulacije s podatki lahko predstavljajo znanstveno goljufijo (glejte COPE flowcharts).
- **Razprava**: to poglavje ni mesto, kjer bi predstavljali nove rezultate, vključno s statističnimi. **Odgovorite na svoja raziskovalna vprašanja** (ki ste jih navedli na koncu uvoda) **ter primerjajte svoje glavne rezultate z že objavljenimi podatki** kolikor je mogoče objektivno. Razpravljajte o njihovih omejitvah ter poudarite svoja glavna odkritja. Če je vaša raziskava vključevala oseb(k)e le enega spola, razpravljajte o posledicah ter možnosti, da se ugotovitve posplošijo na oba spola. Obravnavajte vsa odkritja, ki se ne skladajo z vašim mnenjem. Da bi podprli svoje stališče, uporabite **samo metodološko ustrezne dokaze** (Roig 2015). Na koncu razprave ali v ločenem poglavju poudarite svoje glavne zaključke in praktični pomen svoje raziskave.
- **Zahvala:** omenite vse osebe, ki so znatno prispevale k raziskavi, vendar jih ni mogoče uvrstiti med soavtorje, ter navedite vse vire financiranja. Priporočena oblika je: "This work was supported by the Medical Research Council [grant number xxxx]". Če niste prejeli nobene posebne finančne podpore, uporabite sledeči stavek: "This research received no specific grant from any

funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors." (RIN 2008). Če je smiselno, urednikom razkrijte kakršnekoli konflikte interesov, npr. finančne ali osebne povezave s proizvajalci ali organizacijami, ki jim je vaš rokopis v interesu (Goozner et al. 2009). V kolikor boste uporabili že objavljeno gradivo (npr. slike), pridobite dovoljenje nosilcev avtorskih pravic ter jih omenite v opisu gradiva ali v zahvali. Če so vam pomagali jezikovni strokovnjak (npr. lektor ali prevajalec), statistik, zbiralec podatkov ipd., zavoljo preglednosti navedite njihovo pomoč (ICMJE 2017, Battisti et al. 2015), vendar mora biti jasno, da niso odgovorni za končno različico članka. Zagotoviti morate privoljenja vseh oseb, omenjenih v tem poglavju (***glejte Appendix: Ethics***).

- **Viri:** poskrbite, da boste navedli vire vseh informacij, ki ste jih pridobili iz drugih publikacij. V seznam virov vključite vse podatke, ki so potrebni, da je vire mogoče najti v knjižnici ali na spletu. Pri publikacijah, ki niso v angleškem jeziku, navedite **izvorni naslov** (če je potrebno, prečrkovan v skladu z angleškimi pravili) ter njegov prevod v angleščino v oglatih oklepajih, v kolikor je to mogoče (CSE 2014). Izogibajte se navajanju nedostopnih, zavajajočih in postranskih virov. Kjerkoli je mogoče, navajajte primarne raziskovalne članke namesto preglednih člankov (DORA 2013). V seznam virov ne vključujte neobjavljenih podatkov – če jih že morate omeniti, opišite njihov vir v glavnem delu članka ter pridobite dovoljenje avtorjev teh podatkov za objavo.
- Za teoretične publikacije, pregledne članke, študije primerov ipd. je morda primernejša **drugačna struktura članka** (npr. Gasparyan et al. 2011).
- Nekatere publikacije vključujejo tudi (daljši) **povzetek v drugem jeziku**. To je zelo uporabno na mnogih raziskovalnih področjih.
- Sledenje **smernicam za poročanje** vam bo pomagalo navesti najmanjšo nujno količino informacij o vaši raziskavi (npr. EQUATOR Network).
- Ne pozabite uskladiti dolžine povzetka, sloga navajanja virov ipd. z **navodili za avtorje** dotične revije.

Pišite JEDRNATO, da boste recenzentom in bralcem prihranili čas. **Ne vključujte informacij, ki niso ključnega pomena za vprašanja,** navedena v uvodu vašega članka.

- **Ne prepisujte dobesedno** delov svojih predhodnih publikacij in ne pošiljajte istega rokopisa v več kot eno revijo hkrati; v tem primeru boste odgovorni za **večkratno objavo** (ang. *redundant publication*, glejte COPE flowcharts). To ne velja za preliminarne objave, kot so konferenčni povzetki (O'Connor 1991, glejte tudi BioMed Central policy). Nadalje, **sekundarne objave** so sprejemljive, v kolikor so namenjene popolnoma različnim skupinam bralcev (npr. govorcem drugega jezika ali specialistom in splošnemu občinstvu) ter v kolikor ste pridobili dovoljenje urednikov obeh revij (ICMJE 2017). Na naslovni strani sekundarne publikacije se morate nato v opombi pod črto sklicevati na primarno publikacijo.
- Informacije, navedene v enem poglavju, se načeloma **ne smejo ponoviti** v drugih poglavjih. Očitne izjeme so povzetek, opisi slik ter zaključni odstavek.
- Razmislite, ali so vse tabele in slike resnično potrebne. Podatki, navedeni v tabelah, se ne smejo ponoviti v slikah (in obratno). Dolgi seznami podatkov se v besedilu ne smejo ponavljati.
- Opisi tabel in slik morajo biti **informativni, a ne predolgi**. Če so podobni podatki predstavljeni v več tabelah ali slikah, morajo biti podobni tudi njihovi opisi.
- Po možnosti izbrišite **očitne trditve** (npr. "Gozdovi so zelo pomembni ekosistemi.") in druge odvečne odlomke (npr. "Znano je, da …").
- Če se **dolg znanstveni izraz** pogosto ponavlja, ob prvi omembni v besedilu navedite njegovo okrajšavo in jo kasneje dosledno uporabljajte.
- Če je potrebno, izrazite svoje dvome, vendar se **izogibajte pretiranemu izmikanju** (npr. napišite "so mogoče" namesto "bi lahko bile mogoče"). Kljub temu svojih zaključkov **ne posplošujte pretirano**.
- Razen če uredniki ne zahtevajo drugače, **za vsa števila uporabljajte številke**, tj. **tudi za enomestna cela števila**, razen za nič in ena (kadar nimata enote) ter druge primere, kjer so mogoči nesporazumi, **npr. na začetku stavka ali pred okrajšavami, ki vsebujejo števila** (CSE 2014).

Da bi olajšali razumevanje, pišite JASNO – besedilo naredite berljivo.

Znanstvena vsebina

- **Jasno razločite svoje izvorne podatke in ideje** od tistih, ki pripadajo drugim osebam, ter od svojih predhodnih publikacij – kjerkoli je smiselno, se sklicujte na vire. **Po možnosti povzemite ali parafrazirajte** besedilo iz drugih virov. To velja tudi za prevode. Kadar dobesedno prepisujete

besedilo (npr. celotne stavke ali daljše odlomke), ga postavite v narekovaje (npr. Roig 2015, Kerans & de Jager 2010). V nasprotnem primeru lahko zagrešite **plagiatorstvo** ali recikliranje vsebine (neupravičeno, pretirano recikliranje besedila, podatkov, ilustracij itd. ali celo večkratno objavo, glejte COPE flowcharts in COPE guidelines).

- Poskrbite, da boste uporabili **primerne angleške znanstvene izraze**, po možnosti na podlagi besedil, ki so jih napisali rojeni govorci angleškega jezika. Dobesedni prevodi so pogosto napačni (npr. tako imenovani *lažni prijatelji*, ang. *false friends*, ali neobstoječe besede, ki jih izumijo prevajalci). Če ste v dvomih, **preverite definicijo** v slovarju angleškega jezika, saj se mnoge besede ne uporabljajo pravilno (npr. *gender* in *trimester*; ***glejte Appendix: Ambiguity***). Besedo ali besedno zvezo lahko na primer pošičete tudi na Wikipedii; nato primerjajte rezultate v vašem maternem jeziku in angleščini ter preverite, ali je pomen domnevnih ustreznic dejansko enak. Vendar Wikipedia ni vedno zanesljiv vir informacij.
- Če se beseda večinoma uporablja v prevodih in le redko v angleško govorečih državah, jo poskusite zamenjati s splošno znanim angleškim pojmom s podobnim pomenom (npr. *plant community* namesto *phytocoenosis*). Če znanstveni pojem v angleščini nima sopomenke, ga natančno definirajte ter predlagajte sprejemljiv angleški prevod.
- **Vsak neobičajen ali dvoumen znanstveni pojem definirajte** ob prvi uporabi. Lahko navedete tudi seznam sopomenk, v kolikor obstajajo (da olajšate iskanje), vendar kasneje dosledno uporabljajte le enega izmed njih (da bi preprečili zmedo). Prednost ima formalna nomenklatura, ki so jo vzpostavile znanstvene organizacije (npr. EASE 2013).
- **Izogibajte se nejasnim trditvam**, ki od bralcev zahtevajo, da ugibajo, kaj ste imeli v mislih (***glejte Appendix: Ambiguity***).
- Kadar navajate odstotke, jasno opredelite, **kaj pojmujete kot 100%**. Kadar pišete o korelacijah, razmerjih itd., jasno opredelite, katere vrednosti primerjate med sabo.
- V splošnem je priporočena uporaba **merskih enot Système International (SI) in stopinj Celzija**.
- V nasprotju z mnogimi drugimi jeziki se v angleščini uporablja **decimalna pika** (ne decimalna vejica). Če uredniki ne zahtevajo drugače, v številih, ki imajo na levi ali desni strani decimalne pike več kot štiri številke, uporabljajte **ozki presledek** (ne vejice) med skupinami treh številk na katerikoli strani decimalne pike (EASE 2013).
- Za označevanje stoletij, mesecev itd. **ne uporabljajte velikih tiskanih rimskih številk**, ki so v angleškem jeziku redka. Zaradi razlik med britansko in ameriško obliko datumov (glejte spodaj) po možnosti zapišite imena mesecev s celotno besedo ali njenimi prvimi tremi črkami (CSE 2014).
- Kadar prevajate manj znana **zemljepisna imena**, omenite tudi izvorno ime, v kolikor je mogoče, npr. "in the Kampinos Forest (Puszcza Kampinoska)". Nekatere dodatne informacije o lokaciji, podnebju itd. so za bralce prav tako lahko koristne.
- Ne pozabite, da bodo besedilo **večinoma brali tujci**, ki morda ne vedo za posebne pogoje, klasifikacije ali koncepte, ki so v vaši državi splošno znani; zato je torej morda potrebna kakšna drugačna razlaga (Ufnalska 2008). Na primer, pogost plevel *Erigeron annuus* se v nekaterih državah imenuje *Stenactis annua*, zato je potrebno v angleških besedilih uporabljati mednarodno uveljavljeno ime, medtem ko se njegov(e) sinonim(e) doda v oklepajih.

Zgradba besedila

- **Stavki naj v splošnem ne bodo predolgi. Njihova zgradba naj bo relativno preprosta**, predmet in njegov glagol pa naj se nahajata blizu drug drugega (Gopen & Swan 1990).). Izogibajte se na primer abstraktnim samostalnikom ter zapišite "X was measured…" namesto "Measurements of X were carried out…" (***glejte Appendix: Simplicity***). Ne pretiravajte z uporabo trpnega/pasivnega glagolskega načina (npr. Norris 2011). Ko prevajate, priredite stavčno strukturo, če je potrebno, da sporočilo izrazite bolj pravilno ali bolj jasno (Burrough-Boenisch 2013).
- **Besedilo naj bo povezano, logično organizirano** in zato lahko berljivo (***glejte Appendix: Cohesion***).
- Zaželeno je, da vsak odstavek pričnete s tematskim stavkom, nato pa temo do konca razvijete v sledečih stavkih.
- V nasprotju z nekaterimi drugimi jeziki angleščina omogoča vzporedne stavčne strukture, ki olajšajo razumevanje. Kadar na primer primerjate podobne podatke, lahko zapišete: "It was high in A, medium in B, and low in C", namesto "It was high in A, medium for B, and low in the case of C".
- **Slike in tabele oblikujte tako, da bodo jasno razumljive** tudi brez sklicevanja na glavni del besedila. Izpustite neinformativne podatke (npr. izbrišite stolpec, če vsebuje enake vrednosti v vseh vrsticah – namesto tega ga lahko omenite v opombi pod črto). Okrajšave uporabite samo, če so nujne za doslednost ali če ni dovolj prostora za celotne

besede. V opisih slik/tabel ter v opombah pod črto pojasnite vse okrajšave in simbole, ki niso samoumevni (npr. oznake napak, t.i. "brki", lahko označujejo standardno deviacijo, standardno napako ali intervale zaupanja). **Ne pozabite uporabiti decimalnih pik** (ne decimalnih vejic) ter dodajte **oznake osi in enote**, kjerkoli je potrebno.

- Kadar predstavljate majhen nabor podatkov, razmislite o uporabi **besedilnih tabel** (Kozak 2009). (***Glejte Appendix: Text-tables***)
- V dolgih seznamih (okrajšav ipd.) po možnosti ločite posamezne enote s **podpičji** (**;**), ki predstavljajo vmesno ločilo med vejico in piko.

Jezikovna vprašanja

- Kjerkoli znanstveni izrazi niso nujni, po možnosti uporabite **splošno znane besede**. Vendar se izogibajte pogovornim in idiomatičnim izrazom, prav tako pa fraznim glagolom (npr. *find out*, *pay off*), ki jih govorci angleščine kot tujega jezika pogosto težko razumejo (Geercken 2006).
- **Definirajte okrajšave**, kjer se prvič pojavijo v glavnem delu besedila (če bi bralcem lahko bile nerazumljive). **Ne uporabljajte preveč različnih okrajšav**, saj bo takšno besedilo težko razumljivo. Ne okrajšujte pojmov, ki jih v rokopisu uporabljate le redko. **Izogibajte se uporabi okrajšav v povzetku.**
- V splošnem uporabljajte **preteklik**, kadar opisujete, kako ste izvedli svojo raziskavo ter kaj ste odkrili oziroma kaj so storili drugi raziskovalci. Po možnosti uporabljajte **sedanjik** za splošne trditve in interpretacije (npr. statistično značilnost, zaključke) ali kadar pišete o vsebini svojega članka, še posebej o tabelah in slikah (Gastel & Day 2016).
- Razen na izrecno željo urednikov **ne nazivajte samih sebe "the author(s)"**, ker je to nejasno. Če je potrebno, namesto tega zapišite "we" ali "I" ali uporabite izraze, kot so "in this study", "our results" ali "in our opinion" (npr. Hartley 2010, Norris 2011). Imejte v mislih, da se izraz "this study" uporablja le, kadar govorite o svojih novih rezultatih. Če govorite o publikaciji, omenjeni v predhodnem stavku, zapišite "that study". Če govorite o avtorjih citirane publikacije, zapišite "those authors".
- Zapomnite si, da naj bi se v znanstvenih besedilih beseda "**which**" uporabljala samo v dopolnjevalnih odvisnih stavkih, beseda "**that**" pa v omejevalnih odvisnih stavkih (tj. ki pomenijo "samo tisti, ki").
- Kadar uporabljate **večpomenske besede**, poskrbite, da bo njihov pomen jasno razviden iz konteksta. Preverite, ali se **glagolsko število povsod ujema s predmetnim** ter **ali je jasno, na kaj se nanašajo zaimki** (to je ključno v prevedenih besedilih). Imejte v mislih, da imajo nekateri samostalniki **nepravilno množino** (***glejte Appendix: Plurals***).
- Preberite besedilo na glas, da preverite uporabo ločil. Vse **spremembe intonacije**, nujne za pravilno razumevanje, bi morale biti zaznamovane z vejicami ali drugimi ločili (npr. bodite pozorni na razliko med "no more data are needed" in "no, more data are needed").
- Bodite **dosledni pri črkovanju**. Sledite bodisi britanskim bodisi ameriškim pravilom za črkovanje in obliko datumov (npr. "21 Jan 2009" v britanski ali "Jan 21, 2009" v ameriški angleščini; ***glejte Appendix: Spelling***) Preverite, ali tarčna revija uporablja ameriško ali britansko črkovanje ter ga nato uporabite v nastavitvah računalniškega pregledovanja pravopisa in slovnice.
- Prosite pozornega sodelavca, naj prebere celotno besedilo, da bi videl, ali so kje kakšni nejasni odlomki.

Prevod/Translation:
Tea Romih (romih.tea@gmail.com),
reviewed by Maša Mlakar
(masa.mlakar1312@gmail.com)

PRI PRIPRAVI SMERNIC SO SODELOVALI (v kronološkem vrstem redu): Sylwia Ufnalska (sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com, pobudnica in urednica), 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

Viri in priporočena 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