

# EASE (Euroopa Teadustoimetajate Assotsiatsiooni) juhised inglise keeles publitseeritavate teadusartiklite autoritele ja tõlkijatele

Efektiivsema teaduskommunikatsiooni tarvis peavad teadusartiklid ja teised teaduspublikatsioonid kandma TÄIELIKKU, KOKKUSURUTUD ja SELGET esitusstiili. Need üldistatud juhised teenivad nimetatud eesmärke ja on mõeldud autorite, tõlkijate ja toimetajate abistamiseks.

Esmatähtis:

- Täisartikli kirjutamist ei alustata enne kui olete kindel, et saadud tulemused on põhjendatud, kindlad ja täielikud (O'Connor 1991) selleks, et saaksite teha **mõistlikke ja tõepäraseid järeldusi**.
- Eelistatavalt **valige väljaanne** enne kirjutamisele asumist. Veenduge, et vastava väljaande lugejaskond vastab teie sihtlugejale (Chippierfield et al. 2010). Muretsege vastava väljaande instruksioon autorile ja planeerige artikkel selliselt, et ta oleks kohandatav väljaande eelistatavale formaadile, mis puudutab kogupikkust, vajalikku/lubatavat jooniste arvu jne.

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

- **Pealkiri:** peab olema selge, arusaadav teiste erialade spetsialistidele ja peab peegeldama artikli sisu. Väljendus peab olema spetsiifiline, mitte üldine ja laialivalgus (O'Connor 1991). Kui see on asjakohane, mainige pealkirjas uurimuse perioodi ja kohta, uuritava objekti rahvusvahelist teaduslikku nimetust või eksperimentaalset ülesehitust (näit. *case*-uurimus või juhukontrolliga katse). Pealkirjas toodud informatsiooni pole vaja korrata

annotatsioonis (kuna need avaldatakse paralleelselt), kuigi osaline kattumine on vältimatu.

- **Autorite nimed**, st. kõik, kes aitasid oluliselt kaasa uurimuse planeerimisele, andmete kogumisele või tulemuste tõlgendamisele ja kirjutasid või redigeerisid käsikirja ja kiitsid heaks lõppversiooni (ICMJE 2010). Esimestena tuleb nimetada autorid, kelle panus oli suurem. Autorite nimedele tuleb lisada nende **asutused** (uurimuse perioodil) ja korrespondeeriva autori käesolev aadress. Tuleb ära näidata kõigi autorite e-posti aadressid, et lihtsustada nendega kontakteerumist.
- **Annotatsioon:** selgitage lühidalt uurimuse tegemise põhjus (TAUST), missugus(t)ele küsimus(t)ele seadsite eesmärgiks vastata (EESMÄRGID), uurimuse teostamise viis (MEETOD), mida leidsite (TULEMUSED: põhiandmed, seosed) ja teie tõlgendused ja põhijäreldused saavutatud tulemuste põhjal (JÄRELDUSED). Annotatsioon peab **peegeldama artikli sisu**, kuna enamusele lugejatest on see teie uurimuse põhiliseks infoallikaks. Annotatsioonis tuleb **kasutada kõiki võtmesõnu**, et võimaldada artikli elektroonset otsingut neile, kes tunnevad huvi teie tulemuste vastu (paljud andmebaasid sisaldavad ainult pealkirju ja annotatsioone). **Teadusaruandes** peab annotatsioon olema **informatiivne**, sh. sisaldama tegelikke tulemusi. Ainult **ülevaadetes**, metanalüüsidest ja teistes laiahaardelistes artiklites peab annotatsioon olema **osutav**, st. loetlema arutluse all olevad põhiteemad väljundeid esitamata (CSE 2006). Annotatsioonis ei viidata tabelitele ja joonistele, kuna annotatsioone avaldatakse ka eraldi. Kirjanduse viited ei ole lubatud, väljaarvatud kui need on absoluutselt hädavajalikud (kuid siis tuleb üksikasjalik informatsioon esitada sulgudes: autor, pealkiri, aasta jne.). Tuleb

tagada, et kogu informatsioon, mis on esitatud annotatsioonis, sisaldub samuti artikli põhitekstis. (*Vaata Appendix: Abstracts*)

- **Lisavõtmesõnade loetelu** (vastavalt toimetajate loale): lisage kõik vastavad teadustermid, mis ei sisaldu pealkirjas ja annotatsioonis. Võtmesõnad peavad olema spetsiifilised. Lisage üldisemaid termineid, kui uurimisel on interdistsiplinaarne väärtus (O'Connor 1991). Meditsiinalastes tekstides kasutage [MeSH Browser](#) sõnavara.
- **Lühendite loetelu** (kui toimetajad vajavad): defineerige kõik artiklis kasutatud lühendid, väljaarvatud need, mis on mittespetsialistidele ilmselged.
- **Sissejuhatus:** selgitage uurimuse vajalikkust ja iseloomustage lähemalt uurimuse eesmärgi või spetsiifilisi küsimusi, millele kavatsete vastata. Alustage üldisematest küsimustest ja keskenduge järk-järgult oma uurimuse küsimustele.
- **Meetodid:** kirjeldage üksikasjalikult, kuidas uuring toimus (näit. uurimisala, andmete kogumine, kriteeriumid, analüüsitud materjali allikas, proovi suurus, mõõdistuste arv, osavõtjate vanus ja sugu, seadmed, andmete analüüs, statistilised testid ja kasutatud tarkvara). Tuleb käsitleda kõiki faktoreid, mis võinuks mõjutada tulemusi. Kui tsiteerite meetodit, mis on kirjeldatud mitte-inglisekeelses või juurdepääsuta trükises, tuleb seda käsikirjas üksikasjalikult kirjeldada. Tagage vastavus eetikastandarditega (näit. [WMA 2008](#)), mis puudutab patendiõigust, teste loomadega, keskkonnakaitset jne.
- **Tulemused:** esitage enda uurimuse uued tulemused (avaldatud andmeid ei lisata sellesse ossa). Kõiki tabeleid ja jooniseid tuleb mainida artikli põhitekstis ja numereerida selles järjekorras, millises nad tekstis on esitatud. Tagage asjakohane statistiline analüüs (näit. [Lang 2004](#)). Igasugune andmete fabritseerimine või moonutamine on lubamatu ja tähtsaid andmeid ei tohi välja jätta; analoogselt ärge manipuleerige kujunditega ega jätke võltsmuljet lugejatele. Selline andmetega manipuleerimine võib kujutada endast **teaduslast pettust** (vaata [COPE flowcharts](#)).
- **Diskussioon:** vastake oma uurimuse küsimustele (toodud sissejuhatus lõpus) ja võrrelge enda uusi tulemusi trükis avaldatud tulemustega nii objektiivselt kui võimalik. Arutage tulemustega seotud kitsendusi ja tooge välja põhitulemused. Arvestage igasuguseid tulemusi, mis on vasturääkivuses teie seisukohtadega. Diskussiooni lõpus või eraldi osas rõhutage põhijäreldusi ja uurimuse praktilist väärtust.
- **Tunnustused:** mainige ära kõik inimesed, kes aitasid uurimusele oluliselt kaasa, kuid kes ei ole kaasautorid ja tunnustage kõiki rahastamisallikaid. Soovitav on järgmine sõnastuse vorm: "This work was supported by the Medical Research Council [grant number xxxx]". Kui uurimus ei ole ühtki eritoetust saanud, öelge järgmist: "This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors." ([RIN 2008](#)). Vajaduse korral avaldage toimetajatele kõik teised huvide konfliktid, näiteks finants- või isiklikud sidemed tootjaga või organisatsiooniga, kes on huvitatud esitatud käsikirjast ([Goozner et al. 2009](#)). Kui taasesitate varemavaldatud materjale (näit. jooniseid), küsige luba autorluse omanikelt ja mainige neid joonise alltekstis või tunnustuste osas. Kui kasutasite keeletespetsialisti (näit. autoritoimetaja või tõlkija), statistiku, andmekogujate jt. abi, tuleb neid tänada nende abi eest, et rakendada läbipaistvuse printsiipi ([ICMJE 2010](#), [Graf et al. 2009](#)). Ühtlasi peab olema selge, et nad ei vastuta artikli lõppversiooni eest. Tuleb tagada, et teil on kõigi nende inimeste nõusolek, keda selles osas mainite. (*Vaata Appendix: Ethics*)
- **Kasutatud kirjandus:** kindlustage, et oleks nimetatud kõik kasutatud teiste väljaannete tähtsad informatsiooniallikad. Viidete loetelu peab sisaldama kõiki andmeid, mis on vajalikud nende leidmiseks raamatukogus või Internetis. Mitteengliseelsete väljaannete puhul tooge ära **pealkiri originaalis** (vajaduse korral translitereerituna vastavalt inglise keele reeglitele), millele järgneb nurksulgudes tõlge inglise keelde, kus võimalik ([CSE 2006](#)). Vältige selliste allikate tsiteerimist, mis ei ole kättesaadavad. Kasutatud kirjanduse loetellu ei lülitata trükist ilmumata andmeid – kui neid tuleb mainida, kirjeldage nende allikat artikli põhitekstis ja nende tsiteerimiseks taotlege luba andmete produtseerijalt.
- **Artikli erinev ülesehitus** võib rohkem sobida teoreetilistele väljaannetele, ülevaateartiklitele, *case*-uurimustele jne.
- Mõned väljaanded lisavad ka annotatsiooni või laiendatud **kokkuvõtte teises keeles**. See on paljudel uurimisaladel on väga kasulik.

- Jälgige, et annotatsiooni pikkus, viidete stiil jms. oleks kooskõlas ajakirja **instruktsiooniga autoritele**.

Kirjutage KOKKUSURUTUD stiilis, et säästa retsensentide ja lugejate aega.

- **Ärge lülitage informatsiooni, mis ei kuulu teie sissejuhatuses toodud uurimisküsimus(tes)se. Tsiteeritud tööde arvuga ei tohi liialdada** – ärge esitage palju sarnaseid näiteid.
- **Ärge kopeerige** oma eelnevate publikatsioonide olulisi osi ja ärge esitage sama käsikirja rohkem kui ühele ajakirjale üheaegselt. Vastasel korral tuleb teil vastutada **liigväljaande** eest (vaata [COPE flowcharts](#)). See ei kehti ettevalmistatavate publikatsioonide kohta nagu konverentsiannotatsioonid (O'Connor 1991). Pealegi on **sekundaarsed publikatsioonid** vastuvõetavad, kui nad on mõeldud täiesti erinevale lugejate gruppidele (näit. teises keeles või spetsialistidele ja tavalugejale) ja olete saanud mõlema ajakirja toimetaja kinnituse ([ICMJE 2010](#)). Esmapublikatsioonile tuleb sel juhul viidata sekundaarse publikatsiooni tiitellehe joonealuses.
- Ühes osas esitatud informatsiooni **ei korrata** teistes tekstiosades. Erandiks on annotatsioon, jooniste allkirjad ja kokkuvõtlik lõpulõik.
- Kaaluge kõigi tabelite ja jooniste vajalikkust. Tabelis esitatud andmeid ei korrata joonistel (või vastupidi). Pikki andmeloetelusid ei korrata tekstis.
- Tabelite ja jooniste alltekstid peavad olema **informatiivsed, kuid mitte väga pikad**. Kui esitatakse sarnaseid andmeid mitmes tabelis või mitmel joonisel, siis peavad alltekstide formaadid ka olema sarnased.
- **Eemaldage** eelistatavalt **ilmselged väited** (näit. *"Forests are very important ecosystems."*) ja teised liigsed fragmendid (näit. *"It is wellknown that ..."*).
- **Pika teadustermi**ni sagedase kordamise korral esmalt defineerige selle lühendvorm artikli põhitekstis ja hiljem kasutage seda järjekindlalt.
- Väljendage kahtlusi, kui see on vajalik, kuid **vältige liigset ähmasust** (näit. kirjutage *"are potential"*, aga mitte *"may possibly be potential"*). Siiski, **ärge** oma järeldusi **ülemääraselt üldistage**.
- Kui toimetajad ei nõua teisiti, **kasutage kõigi arvude puhul numbreid**, st. ka ühekohaliste täisarvude puhul, **väljaarvatud null, üks** (juhul kui ilma mõõtühikuta) ja **teistel juhtudel, kui võib tekkida arusaamatusi**, näit. lause alguses

või lühendites, mis sisaldavad numbreid (CSE 2006).

Kirjutage SELGELT, et soodustada arusaamist – kirjutage hästi loetavat teksti.

#### *Teaduslik sisu*

- **Eristage selgelt oma originaalsed andmed ja ideed** teiste omadest ja varem avaldatuist – esitage tsiteeringud, kui see on asjakohane. **Eelistatud on teha kokkuvõtte või parafraseerida** tekst, mis pärineb teistest allikatest. See kehtib ka tõlgete puhul. Teksti sõna-sõnalisel kopeerimisel (näit. terve lause või pikema teksti puhul) kasutage jutumärke (näit. [ORI 2009](#), [Kerans & de Jager 2010](#)). Vastasel korral võib see osutada **plagiaadiks** (vaata [COPE flowcharts](#)) või enese-plagiaadiks.
- Veenduge, et kasutate **õigeid ingliskeelseid teadustermineid**, mis eelistatult pärinevad tekstidest, mille autoriteks on inglise keelt emakeelena kõnelejad. Sõnasõnalisel tõlkel on tihti väärad (nn. *"false friends"*) või tõlkija poolt leiutatud sõnad, mis keeles ei eksisteeri). Kahtluste korral **kontrollige definitsiooni** inglise keele sõnaraamatus, kuna paljusid sõnu kasutatakse vääralt (näit. *trimester* viitega loomade tiinusele, vaata [Baranyiová 1998](#)). Sõnu või fraase võib näiteks otsida ka Wikipedia'st, seejärel võrrelda saadud tulemusi eesti ja inglise keeles ja veenduge tegeliku tähenduse säilumises.
- Kui sõna kasutatakse põhiliselt tõlgetes ja ainult harva inglise keelt kõnelevates maades, mõelge selle asendamisele hästituntud samatähendusliku ingliskeelse terminiga (näit. *phytocoenosis* asemel *plant community*). Kui teadustermiinil ei ole sünonüümi inglise keeles, siis defineerige see täpselt ja pakkuge välja vastuvõetav ingliskeelne tõlge.
- **Defineerige kõik harvaesinevad või kahemõttelised teadustermid** nende esmakasutamisel. Võite tuua ära sünonüümid nende olemasolul otsingu abistamiseks, kuid hiljem kasutage neist ainult üht järjekindlalt segaduse ärahoidmiseks. Kui teadusorganisatsioonide poolt on kehtestatud formaalne nomenklatuur, tuleb seda eelistada.
- **Vältige ebaselgeid väiteid**, mille puhul lugeja peab ära aimama, mida mõtlesite. (**Vaata Appendix: Ambiguity**)
- Kui on tegemist protsentidega, selgitage **mida vaatlete 100%na**. Kui on tegemist

korrelatsioonide, suhete jms., selgitage, missuguseid väärtusi võrdlete omavahel.

- **Système International (SI) ühikud and Celsiuse kraadid** on üldiselt eelistatavad. Vajaduse korral tuleb liitrit lühendada L (CSE 2006), et vältida segiajamist numbriga 1.
- Erinevalt paljudest teistest keeltest on inglise keeles kasutusel **kümnendpunkt** (mitte koma). Numbritel, millel on üle 4 koha paremale või vasakule kümnendpunktist, tuleb kasutada **kitsaid vahesid** (mitte komasid) 3-kohaliste gruppide vahel mõlemas suunas kümnendkohast (CSE 2006).
- **Ärge kasutage suuri Rooma numbreid** sajandite, kuude jne. tähistamiseks, kuna seda esineb inglise keeles harva. Kuna Briti ja Ameerika kuupäevade tähistamine on erinev (vaata allpool), eelistage kuude tähistamisel tervete sõnade või nende 3 esimese tähe väljakirjutamist.
- Kui on tõlgitud vähemtuntud **geograafilisi nimetusi**, tuleb võimaluse korral mainida ka originaalnimetust, näit. “Kampinosi metsas (Puszcza Kampinoska)”. Teatud lisainformatsioon asukoha, kliima jms. kohta võib samuti olla lugejale kasulik.
- Pidage meeles, et teksti **loevad põhiliselt võõramaalased**, kes ei ole teadlikud spetsiifilistest tingimustest, klassifikatsioonidest või kontseptsioonidest, mis on laialdaselt tuntud teie maal; selletõttu võib olla vajalik lisada mõned selgitused (Ufnalska 2008). Näiteks, tavalist umbrohtu *Erigeron annuus* nimetatakse mõnedes maades *Stenactis annua*, seega ingliskeelsetes tekstides tuleb kasutada rahvusvaheliselt heakskiidetud nimetusi, kusjuures nende sünonüüm(id) tuleb lisada sulgudes.

#### Teksti ülesehitus

- **Üldiselt ei tohi laused olla väga pikad ja nende ülesehitus peab olema suhteliselt lihtne**, kusjuures alus tuleb paigutada tegusõna lähedusse (Gopen & Swan 1990). Näiteks vältige abstraktseid nimisõnu ja kirjutage “X was measured...” asemel. (Vaata *Appendix: Simplicity*) Ärge liialdage *passive* konstruktsioonidega (näit. Norris 2011). Vajaduse korral tõlkimisel modifitseerige lause ülesehitust, et sõnumit täpselt ja selgemalt edasi anda (Burrough-Boenisch 2003).

- **Tekst peab olema hästi seostatud, loogiliselt üles ehitatud** ja seega kergesti jälgitav. (Vaata *Appendix: Cohesion*)
- Eelistatav on alustada iga tekstilõiku teemalausega, mida järgnevad laused edasi arendavad.
- Erinevalt mõnest teisest keelest, paralleelsed konstruktsioonid on inglise keeles lubatud, kuna nad võimaldavad tekstist arusaamist. Näiteks kui võrdlete sarnaseid andmeid, võite kirjutada: “It was high in A, medium in B, and low in C”, mitte aga “It was high in A, medium for B, and low in the case of C”.
- **Joonised ja tabelid peavad olema kergesti arusaadavad** ilma viitamata artikli põhitekstile. Jätke välja andmed, mis ei ole informatiivsed (näit. kustutage veerg, kui kõigis ridades on ühed ja samad väärtused – selle võite asendada joonealuse tekstiga). Kasutage lühendeid ainult kui see on vajalik järjepidevuse mõttes või kui ei ole täissõnadele piisavalt ruumi. Joonise alltekstis või joonealuses tekstis tuleb defineerida kõik lühendid ja sümbolid, mis ei ole ilmselged (näit. veapiirid võivad tähistada standardset kõrvalekallet, standardset viga või usaldatavuse intervalle). **Pidage meeles, et tuleb kasutada kümnendpunkte** (mitte kümnendkomasid) ja **esitage teljenimetused ja mõõtühikud**, kus vajalik.
- Püüdke kasutada **tekst-tabeleid**, kui esitate väikesi andmehulki (Kozak 2009). (Vaata *Appendix: Text-tables*)
- Pikkades (lühendite jms.) loeteludes eelistage üksiknimetuste **semikooloniga** (;) eraldamist, kui on tegemist komade ja punktide vaheliste nimetustega.

#### Keeleprobleemid

- Kui teadustermiinid pole vajalikud, eelistage **üldkasutatavaid sõnu**. Siiski vältige kõnekeelseid ja idiomaatilisi väljendeid, samuti ka ingliskeelseid verb + prepositsioon (*phrasal verbs*, näit. *find out, pay off*) kasutamist, mis on tihti raskesti arusaadavad inglise keelt mitte emakeelena kõnelejatele (Geercken 2006).
- **Defineerige lühendid** nende esmakasutamisel artikli põhitekstis (kui nad võivad olla ebaselged lugejale). **Ärge kasutage liiga palju erinevaid lühendeid**, kuna sel juhul on tekstist arusaamine raskendatud. Ärge lühendage termineid, mida tekstis harva kasutatakse. **Vältige lühendeid annotatsioonis**.

- Üldiselt kasutage **minevikku** (*past tense*), kui kirjeldate, kuidas uurimus toimus ja mida leidsite või mida teised uurijad tegid. Eelistage **olevikku** (*present tense*) üldistes väidetes ja tõlgendustes (näit. statistilistes hinnangutes, järeldustes) või oma artikli sisu väljendamisel, eriti tabelite ja jooniste kirjeldamisel (Day & Gastel 2006).
- **Viidetes endale vältige "the author(s)"** kasutamist, kuna see on ebaselge. Selle asemel öelge "we" või "I", kui on vajalik või kasutage selliseid väljendeid nagu "in this study", "our results" või "in our opinion" (näit. [Hartley 2010](#), [Norris 2011](#)). Pidage meeles, et väljendust "this study" saab kasutada üksnes enda uute tulemuste tähenduses. Kui mõtlete väljaannet, mida mainiste eelmises lauses, kirjutage "that study". Kui mõtlete viidatud väljaande autoreid, kirjutage "those authors".
- Pidage meeles, et teadustekstides võib sõna "**which**" kasutada kõrvallausetes, mis ei ole defineerivad, samal ajal kui "**that**" kasutatakse defineerivates kõrvallausetes (st. tähenduses "ainult need, mis").
- Kui kasutate **kahemõttelise tähendusega sõnu**, kindlustage, et tähendus oleks selge konteksti abil. Kontrollige kas kõik **tegusõnad (öeldised) ühilduvad lause alustega** (ainsus, mitmus) ja kas **viited asesõnadele on selged** (see on olulisim tõlgitud tekstides). Pidage meeles, et mõnel nimisõnal on **ebareeglipärane mitmus**. (*Vaata Appendix: Plurals*)
- Lugege teksti valjusti, et kontrollida kirjavahemärkide õigsust. Kõik **intonatsiooni pausid**, mis on vajalikud õigeks arusaamiseks, tuleb märgistada komade või teiste kirjavahemärkidega (näit. vaadeldage erinevust nende kahe väljenduse vahel: "no more data are needed" ja "no, more data are needed").
- Vajalik on **järjekindlus kirjapildis**. Järgige kas Briti või Ameerika kirjapildi reegleid ja kuupäeva kirjutamist (näit. "21 Sep 2009" Briti või "Sep 21, 2009" Ameerika inglise keeles). (*Vaata Appendix: Spelling*) Kontrollige kas sihtajakiri kasutab Ameerika või Briti kirjapilti ja kasutage siis vastavat arvutiabi ortograafia- ja grammatikakontrolliks.
- Paluge arutleval kolleegil lugeda kogu teksti, et näha, kas tekst sisaldab ebaselgeid fragmente.

Translated by Mare-Anne Laane  
([mareanne.laane@ttu.ee](mailto:mareanne.laane@ttu.ee))

**JUHISTE KOOSTAMISELE AITASID KAASA** (kronoloogilises järjestuses): Sylwia Ufnalska, Paola De Castro, Liz Wager, Carol Norris, James Hartley, Françoise Salager-Meyer, Marcin Kozak, Ed Hull, Mary Ellen Kerans, Angela Turner, Will Hughes, Peter Hovenkamp, Thomas Babor, Eric Lichtfouse, Richard Hurley, MercèPiqueras, Maria Persson, Elisabetta Poltronieri, Suzanne Lapstoun, Mare-Anne Laane, David Vaux, Arjan Polderman, Ana Marusic, Elisabeth Heseltine, Joy Burrough-Boenisch, Eva Baranyiová

### Kirjanduse loetelu ja allikad täiendavaks lugemiseks

- Baranyiová E. 1998. Misleading words or nobody is perfect. *European Science Editing* 24(2):46. Available from [http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfguidelines/European\\_Science\\_Editing\\_1998.pdf](http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfguidelines/European_Science_Editing_1998.pdf)
- Beverly P. 2011. Word macros for writers and editors. Available from <http://www.archivepub.co.uk/TheBook>
- Bless A, Hull E. 2008. Reader-friendly biomedical articles: how to write them! 3rd ed. Alphen a/d Rijn: Van Zuiden Communication.
- Burrough-Boenisch J. 2003. Editing texts by non-native speakers of English. In: *European Association of Science Editors. Science editors' handbook*. Maisonneuve H, Enckell PH, Polderman A, Thapa R, Johnson-Vekony M, editors. Available from: <http://www.ease.org.uk/handbook/index.shtml>
- 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. *Curr Med Res Opin* 26(8):1967-1982. Available from <http://www.cmrojournal.com/ipi/th/MPIP-author-toolkit.jsp>
- [COPE flowcharts] Committee of Publication Ethics flowcharts. Available from: <http://www.publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts>
- [CSE] Council of Science Editors, Style Manual Committee. 2006. *Scientific style and format: the CSE manual for authors, editors, and publishers*. 7th ed. Reston, VA: Council of Science Editors.
- Day RA, Gastel B. 2006. *How to write and publish a scientific paper*. 6th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- do Carmo GMI, Yen C, Cortes J, Siqueira AA, de Oliveira WK, Cortez-Escalante JJ, et al. 2011. Decline in diarrhea mortality and admissions after routine childhood rotavirus immunization in Brazil: a time-series analysis. *PLoS Med* 8(4): e1001024. Available from <http://www.plosmedicine.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pmed.1001024>
- [EASE] European Association of Science Editors. 2003-2007. *Science editors' handbook*. Maisonneuve H, Enckell PH, Polderman A, Thapa R, Johnson-Vekony M, editors. Available from: <http://www.ease.org.uk/handbook/index.shtml>
- [EMAME] Eastern Mediterranean Association of Medical Editors. 2006. *Manual for editors of health science journals*. Available in Arabic, English, and French from <http://www.emro.who.int/emame/index.htm>
- EQUATOR Network. Available from: <http://www.equator-network.org/home/>
- Geercken S. 2006. Challenges of (medical) writing for the multilingual audience. *Write Stuff* 15(2):45-46. Available from: [http://www.emwa.org/JournalPDFs/J\\_V15\\_I2.pdf](http://www.emwa.org/JournalPDFs/J_V15_I2.pdf)

- Goodman NW, Edwards MB. 2006. Medical writing: a prescription for clarity, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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. Available from: <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/122637800/abstract>
- 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. Available from: <http://www-stat.wharton.upenn.edu/~bja/sci.html>
- Graf C, Battisti WP, Bridges D, Bruce-Winkle V, Conaty JM, Ellison JM, et al., for the International Society for Medical Publication Professionals. 2009. Good publication practice for communicating company sponsored medical research: the GPP2 guidelines. *BMJ* 339:b4330. Available from: [http://www.bmj.com/cgi/content/full/339/nov27\\_1/b4330](http://www.bmj.com/cgi/content/full/339/nov27_1/b4330)
- Gustavii B. 2008. How to write and illustrate a scientific paper. 2nd ed. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hartley J. 2008. Academic writing and publishing: a practical handbook. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hartley J. 2010. Citing oneself. *European Science Editing* 36(2):35-37. Available from [http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfese/ESE\\_may10.pdf](http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfese/ESE_may10.pdf)
- [ICMJE] International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. 2010. Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals: writing and editing for biomedical publication. Available from [http://www.icmje.org/urm\\_main.html](http://www.icmje.org/urm_main.html)
- Kerans ME, de Jager M. 2010. Handling plagiarism at the editor's desk. *European Science Editing* 36(3): 62-66. Available from [http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfese/ESE\\_aug10.pdf](http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfese/ESE_aug10.pdf)
- Kozak M. 2009. Text-table: an underused and undervalued tool for communicating information. *European Science Editing* 35(4): 103. Available from: <http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfese/articles/nov09/essays%20101-105.pdf>
- Lang T. 2004. Twenty statistical errors even YOU can find in biomedical research articles. *Croatian Medical Journal* 45(4):361-370. Available from <http://www.cmj.hr/2004/45/4/15311405.htm>
- [MeSH Browser] Medical Subject Headings Browser. Available from: <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html>
- NECOBELAC. Topic map scheme for scientific publication. Available from [http://www.necobelac.eu/documents/TopicMapScheme\\_Scientific\\_Publication.pdf](http://www.necobelac.eu/documents/TopicMapScheme_Scientific_Publication.pdf)
- Norris CB. 2009. Academic writing in English. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. Available from <http://www.helsinki.fi/kksc/language.services/AcadWrit.pdf>
- Norris C. 2011. The passive voice revisited. *Science Editing* 37(1):6-7. Available from [http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfese/ESE\\_feb11.pdf](http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfese/ESE_feb11.pdf)
- O'Connor M. 1991. Writing successfully in science. London: Chapman & Hall.
- [ORI] Office of Research Integrity. 2009. Avoiding plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and other questionable writing practices: a guide to ethical writing. Available from <http://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/plagiarism/0.shtml>
- Retraction Watch. Available from <http://retractionwatch.wordpress.com/>
- [RIN] Research Information Network. 2008. Acknowledgement of funders in journal articles. Available from: <http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/research-funding-policy-and-guidance/acknowledgement-funders-journal-articles>
- Scientific Red Cards. Available from <http://www.scientificredcards.org/>
- Seifert KA, Crous PW, Frisvad JC. 2008. Correcting the impact factors of taxonomic journals by Appropriate Citation of Taxonomy (ACT). *Persoonia* 20:105. Available from: <http://www.persoonia.org/Issue/20/08.pdf>
- Strunk W Jr, White EB. 2000. The elements of style. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Tufte ER. 2001. The visual display of quantitative information, 2nd ed. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- Ufnalska S. 2008. Abstracts of research articles: readers' expectations and guidelines for authors. *European Science Editing* 34(3):63-65. Available from: <http://www.ease.org.uk/pdfese/articles/Articlesaug08p63-9.pdf>
- [WMA] World Medical Association. 2008. Declaration of Helsinki – ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. Available in English, Spanish, and French from <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/>

---

## 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<sup>1</sup> article: the point of the research, the research question, its answer, and the consequences of the study.

To help researchers to get out of the box, I ask them to include 6 key elements in their article 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 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. These are historical facts and, therefore, reported in past tense.

**Key element 5 (CONCLUSIONS):** the answers to the research questions – the authors’ INTERPRETATION of the factual findings. An answer to a research question is in the present tense - it reports the authors’ belief of how the world IS. Of course, in a pilot study such as the example below, the authors cannot yet present definitive answers, which they indicate by using the words “suggest” and “may”.

**Key element 6 (final 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.

To save words in an abstract, we can combine several of the elements in a sentence. Here is a fictitious example. I have indicated the beginning of each key element with [..].

### Predicting malaria epidemics in Ethiopia

#### Abstract

[1] Most deaths from malaria could be prevented if malaria epidemics could be predicted in local areas, allowing medical facilities to be mobilized early. Epidemics are known to be related to meteorological factors, but their correlations with subsequent malaria epidemics have never been determined. [2,3] In a retrospective study, we collected meteorological and epidemic data for 10 local areas in Ethiopia, covering the years 1963-2006. Using Poisson regression, we found that [4,5] factors AAA, BBB, and CCC correlated significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) with subsequent epidemics in all 10 areas, and our model has a predictive power of about 30%. [6] We conclude that meteorological factors can be used to predict malaria epidemics. The predictive power of our model needs to be improved, and it needs to be validated in other areas. (126 words)

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

**Written by Ed Hull, [edhull@home.nl](mailto:edhull@home.nl)  
(for more information, see Bless & Hull 2008)**

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

*We do high-quality research.*

- “Quality” is empty. “Cost-effective” or “meets XXX guidelines” would be more specific.

*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 60/45.*

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* (e.g. “...a proper question on the questionnaire...”)
- *As soon as possible...*

Written by Ed Hull, [edhull@home.nl](mailto:edhull@home.nl)

---

## 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 two 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 labial soil phosphorus. Our results suggest that, indeed, microbial activity immobilizes the labial soil phosphorus.*

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

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

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

Written by Ed Hull, [edhull@home.nl](mailto:edhull@home.nl)

---

## Appendix: Ethics

---

### Examples of author's ethical declarations

Please tick and fill in where appropriate below. (Obligatory declarations applying to all manuscripts are printed in bold.)

#### *Originality or acceptable secondary publication*

- No part of this manuscript (MS) has been published, except for an abstract/summary published in.....  
.....  
.....
- This MS was published in .....  
.....  
..... but in another language (i.e. ....), so it could be an acceptable secondary publication in English if editors of both publications agree to it.
- 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. It has been paraphrased or (if cited literally, e.g. a whole sentence or paragraph) placed in inverted commas.**

#### *Authorship*

- All people listed as authors of this MS meet the authorship criteria, i.e. they contributed substantially to study planning, data collection or interpretation of results and wrote or critically revised the MS and will be asked to approve the final version before publication.**
- 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 2008](http://www.wma.net)).

- The study reported in this MS has met 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 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 important data have been excluded.**
- Results of this study have been interpreted objectively. Any findings that run contrary to our point of view are discussed in the MS.**

#### *Acknowledgements*

- All sources of funding for the study reported in this MS are stated.**
- All people who are not listed as authors but contributed substantially to the study reported in this MS or assisted in its writing (e.g. language professionals) 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 a conflict of interest statement and disclosed any financial or personal links with people or organizations that have a financial interest in the submitted manuscript.**

Date:.....

Signature:.....

**Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska**

## Appendix: Plurals

### Examples of irregular plural nouns deriving from Latin or Greek

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

\* Acceptable anglicized plurals that are also listed in dictionaries.

It must be remembered that some nouns used in everyday English also have irregular plural forms (e.g. *woman – women, foot – feet, tooth – teeth, mouse – mice, leaf – leaves, life –*

*lives, tomato – tomatoes*) or have no plural form (e.g. *equipment, information, news*). For more examples, see CSE (2006). If in doubt, consult a dictionary.

**Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska**

## Appendix: Simplicity

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

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

**Based on O'Connor (1991)**

## Appendix: Spelling

### Examples of differences between British and American spelling

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

\* 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 (2006). If in doubt, consult a dictionary.

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska

## 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), at a cost of 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 (Tufté 2001). The text-table is a simple table with no graphic elements, such as grid lines, rules, shading or boxes. The text-table is embedded within a sentence, so no reference to it is needed. Keeping the power of tabular arrangements, text-tables immediately convey the message. Look at the following examples.

#### Original sentence:

Iron concentration means ( $\pm$ standard deviation) were as follows: 11.2 $\pm$ 0.3 mg/dm<sup>3</sup> in sample A, 12.3 $\pm$ 0.2 mg/dm<sup>3</sup> in sample B, and 11.4 $\pm$ 0.9 mg/dm<sup>3</sup> in sample C.

#### Modified:

Iron concentration means ( $\pm$ standard deviation, in mg/dm<sup>3</sup>) were as follows:

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

#### Original sentence (do Carmo et al. 2001):

“Prior to rotavirus vaccine introduction, there was a trend of declining diarrhea-related mortality among children younger than 1 y (relative reduction [RR] =

0.87/y; 95% CI 0.83-0.94; 1 to < 2 y of age (RR = 0.96/y; 95% CI 0.91-1.02;  $p = 0.23$ ) and 2 to 4 y of age (RR = 0.93/y; 95% CI 0.87-1.00;  $p = 0.06$ ).”

#### Modified:

Prior to rotavirus vaccine introduction, there was a trend of declining diarrhea-related mortality among children in all age groups (RR stands for relative reduction per year):

< 1 y	RR = 0.87	(95% CI 0.83-0.94; $p < 0.001$ )
1 to < 2 y	RR = 0.96	(95% CI 0.91-1.02; $p = 0.23$ )
2 to 4 y	RR = 0.93	(95% CI 0.87-1.00; $p = 0.06$ )

#### Some rules for arranging text-tables

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

Written by Marcin Kozak, [nyggus@gmail.com](mailto:nyggus@gmail.com)  
(for more information, see Kozak 2009)

---

## 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). In 2012 we will celebrate the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of our association.

EASE is affiliated to the International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS), the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS), the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), and is represented on committees of the British Standards Institution. 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 European Medical Writers Association (EMWA), the Finnish Association of Science Editors and Journalists (FASEJ), the Society of English-Native-Speaking Editors (Netherlands) (SENSE), the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP), and the Society for Editors and Proofreaders (SfEP).

We have major conferences every 3 years. The next one, entitled *Editing in the Digital World*, will be held in Tallinn in 2012. We also organize occasional seminars and other events between the conferences.

Since 1986, we publish the journal *European Science Editing*, 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 and the EASE Journal Blog.

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 the *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 major 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 save time.

Our 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 present, updated version is enriched with new appendices and we plan to review all the recommendations annually.

This document has already been translated into more than 10 languages, e.g. Arabic, Bangla, Chinese, Estonian, French, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Persian, Polish, Portuguese (Brazilian), Romanian, Russian, Spanish, and Turkish. The translations are available as PDFs on our website. Translations into several languages are in progress and we invite volunteers to translate the guidelines into other languages.

Our guidelines are promoted on many websites, including the European Commission Research & Innovation website. Scientific journals also help in their popularization, by including in their instructions to authors a standard formula:

Before submission, authors are encouraged to follow the "EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators", which are freely available as PDFs in many languages at <http://www.ease.org.uk/guidelines/index.shtml>.

For more details 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
- An **electronic forum** and **EASE journal blog** for exchanging ideas
- A major **conference every 3 years**, in different countries
- **Seminars and workshops** on hot topics
- The *Science Editors' Handbook*, covering everything from on-screen editing to office management, peer review, and dealing with the media
- **Advertise your courses** or services free of charge on the EASE website
- You or your employer may **advertise jobs** free of charge on the EASE website
- An opportunity to share problems and solutions with kindred spirits
- Good networking and **contacts for freelancers**
- The chance to meet **international colleagues** from a range of disciplines
- A unique learning community and supportive environment
- Leads for jobs, training, and employment options
- **Discounts** on editorial software, courses, etc.

### Our Members

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

### Major conferences

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