

EASE 英文科研论文 写作和翻译指南

摘要

这组简明易读的编辑指南最初是由欧洲科学编辑学会 (European Association of Science Editors, EASE) 于 2010 年发布并每年更新。

<http://ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines> 提供了 20 多种语言版本的免费下载。该文档旨在帮助世界各地的科研人员更好地展示他们的研究成果并正确地将稿件翻译成英文。它简要介绍了如何撰写一篇完整、简明的稿件，并提请注意伦理问题：作者的标准、抄袭、利益冲突等。8 个附录提供了所选主题 (*Abstracts, Ambiguity, Cohesion, Ethics, Plurals, Simplicity, Spelling, Text-tables*) 的范例及详细信息。广泛使用 *EASE Guidelines* 指南能提高国际学术交流的效率。

为促进国际科研的有效交流、研究论文和其他科学出版物应符合**完整** (COMPLETE)、**简洁** (CONCISE) 和**清晰** (CLEAR) 的标准。这是一个旨在帮助作者、译者和编辑的广义指南，但不是普遍的指导方针。因为完美是不可能达到的，所以在运用这些规则时需要具备一些基本的常识。

动笔之前：

- **认真制订研究计划并组织实施** (如, [Hengl et al 2011](#))。在动笔起草论文稿件之前、你必须确保你的研究发现是确凿、完整的 (O'Connor 1991)、从而可以据之得出**可靠的结论**。
- 在动笔写作之前、**最好先选定目标期刊**。应明确该期刊的读者群体是否就是你的目标受众 ([Chipperfield et al 2010](#))。认真阅读期刊《稿约》、努力使稿件的格式符合期

刊要求、包括论文总长度、图表数量限制等。

稿件应做到**完整**、即、所有必要的信息均未遗漏。切记、如果作者拟传递的信息正位于读者所预期的位置、其涵义/意义就更容易阐释 ([Gopen & Swan 1990](#))。例如、一篇实验性研究论文应该包含以下信息。

- **题目**：题目应明确、无歧义、能被其他领域的专业人员理解、且必须反映论文的内容。题目应较具体、而不要泛泛而谈或含糊不清 (O'Connor 1991)。如有必要、可在题目中提及研究日期和地点、所研究生物体的国际学名或研究设计 (如、病例研究或随机对照试验)。如果你的研究包括一种性别的人类主题，应在标题中注明。题目提供的信息不必在摘要中重复 (因为两者往往共同发表)、不过重复是很难避免的。
- **作者署名**。以下人员可列入作者名单：对研究规划、数据采集或结果解读做出实质性贡献的人员；撰写或大幅度修改稿件的人员；核准稿件最终版本的人员 以及同意负责各方面工作的人员。作者的姓名顺序应在稿件提交前确定 ([ICMJE 2015](#))。第一作者应是对论文贡献最多的人。提交后所做的任何更改需经所有作者同意并向编辑作出解释说明 ([Battisti et al 2015](#), 见 [COPE flowcharts](#))。作者姓名后应附以 (研究开展期间所在) **单位名称** 以及通讯作者的**现址**。应提供所有作者的 e-mail 地址，以便于联系。
- **摘要**：摘要用于简要地介绍你为什么开展本研究 (BACKGROUND)、你力求回答什么 (哪些) 问题 (OBJECTIVES)、你是如何开展研究的 (METHODS)、你发现了什么 (RESULTS: 主要数据、相互关系)、以及你对研究发现的解读和主要结果

(CONCLUSIONS)。摘要必须反映论文的内容、因为对于大多数读者来说、摘要是他们获取你的研究信息的主要来源。摘要必须使用的**关键词**，以便于那些对你的研究结果感兴趣的人在线搜索你的文章（许多检索系统只索引题目和摘要）。**研究报告**必须采用“**报道性摘要**”、其中应包括实际结果。（见 *Appendix Abstracts* 关于**结构化摘要**。）而在**综述**和其他涉及面较广的论文中、应使用**指示性摘要**、即、仅列举论文所讨论的主要课题、但不给出具体结果 (CSE 2014)。在摘要中不要提及图表、因为摘要也会以独立的形式发表。切勿在摘要中提及参考文献、除非是在绝对必要的情况下（此时、应通过加括注的形式提供详细的文献信息：作者、题目、发表年份等）。确保摘要中的所有信息都是正文中会出现的内容。

- **关键词列表**：包括所有相关的科学术语或仅包括标题中不存在的其他关键词（如果编辑有要求）。关键词应具备特异性。如果本研究具有跨学科意义、也可增加一些较为通用的术语 (O'Connor 1991)。医学文献的关键词可使用从 *MeSH Browser* 中查到的词汇。当你的论文归档于存储库时 (Cerejo 2013)，在文件中嵌入所有关键词和其他元数据 (见 *Inderscience* 2013)。
- **缩略语列表**（如编辑要求）：对论文中使用的所有缩略语作出定义；但部分缩略语即使对非本专业人员来说也一目了然、则不必列举。
- **导言**：解释为什么有必要开展此项研究并指出你的**研究目的**或拟回答的具体问题。先从**一般性问题**着手、然后**逐渐重点介绍**本研究涉及的问题。
- **方法**：详细描述研究是如何开展的（如、研究开展的地区、数据采集、标准、所分析材料的来源、样本容量、测量次数、参与者或组织/细胞捐献者的年龄与性别、设备、数据分析、统计学检测和所使用的软件）。**所有可能影响结果的因素均应考虑在内**。“对于从生物资料库获取的实验材料，如有明确来源，应使用其完整名称及标识符 (Bravo *et al* 2015)。如果你引用了在非英语文献或无法获取的出版物中描述的方法、请在文稿中予以详细描述。确保在患

者权利、动物实验、环境保护等方面均遵守了相应的伦理学标准（如，*WMA* 2013）。

- **结果：提供研究的最新成果**（平时 既往已发表过的数据不应出现在本部分）。在正文中应提及所有图表，并按其在文中出现的先后顺序编码。确保所采用的统计学分析是适宜的（如，*Lang* 2004）。有关人类、动物或人类或动物起源的任何材料和数据应当按性别分类 (见 *Heidari et al* 2016)。严禁伪造或扭曲数据、不要排除任何重要数据；类似地、不要刻意地对图像进行“操纵” (manipulation)、以免给读者造成错误印象。对数据的操纵可构成科研欺诈 (见 *COPE flowcharts*)。
- **讨论**：不要在这部分提出新的结果，包括统计结果。**回答研究所涉及的问题**（一般是在导言的最后部分提出的）**将你的主要发现与业已发表的文献进行比较**、并尽可能做到客观。探讨其局限之处、并着重讨论你的主要发现。如果你的研究包括一种性别的人类主题，讨论你发现的意义，并推广到两性。考虑任何与你的观点相悖的结果。为了支持你的观点，**仅使用方法论合理证据** (*Roig* 2011)。在讨论的结束部分、或另辟一个部分、着重强调你的主要结论、并说明本研究的实践意义。
- **致谢**：提及所有对本研究作出实质性贡献、但尚不足以列入作者名单的人员、并按建议的格式对资助来源表达谢意：“This work was supported by the Medical Research Council [grant number xxxx]” (本研究由医学研究委员会支持 (基金编号: xxxx)。如果没有特定的资助来源、则使用以下的句式：“This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.” (本研究未从任何公共部门、商业机构和非营利性组织获得特定的资金支持。)) (*RIN* 2008)。必要时、可向编辑披露其他可能存在的利益冲突、例如、对于与本论文可能存在利益关系的制造商或机构、作者是否从中获得资助或存在个人联系 (*Goozner et al* 2009)。对于既往曾发表过的材料 (如、图表)、应询问版权所有、获得其授权、并在图注或致谢部分表达谢意。如果你在写作过程中曾求助于专业的语文工作者 (如专为作者服务的编辑或翻译)、统计学家、数据收集人

员等、你应在致谢部分提及他们的援助、以保证透明性 (ICMJE 2015, Battisti *et al* 2015)、但必须明确他们不对文章的最终版本承担责任。必须保证已征得所有在这部分列出名字的人员的同意。(见 *Appendix: Ethics*)

- **参考文献**：对于所有从其他出版物中提取的信息、应提供资料来源。参考文献应收录可从图书馆或因特网检索到的所有相关资料。对于非英文出版物、应提供**原始题目** (如有必要、按英文规则进行拼写)、并尽量随后以方括号加注英文译文 (CSE 2014)。避免引用无法获取、强制性及不相关的资料。只要适当，引用主要的研究文章而不是评论 (DORA 2013)。不要在参考文献列表中收录未发表的资料；如确有必要、应在正文中详细说明其来源、在引用时应从数据生成者处获得许可。
- 理论性文章、综述、病例研究等在**行文结构**上可有所不同 (如, Gasparian *et al* 2011)。
- 有些文章还包括一个以**其他语种**撰写的摘要或较长的**内容提要**，这在很多研究领域都是很有用的。
- 以下的**报告指南**将帮助您提供有关您的研究的最低限度的必要信息 (见 EQUATOR Network)。
- 摘要长度、参考文献格式等均应遵守目标期刊《稿约》的要求。

行文**简洁**、节约审稿人和读者的时间。

- 不要在导言部分**罗列与本研究课题无关的信息**。
- 请勿直接复制本人既往出版物、忌一稿多投。否则、一旦出现**重复发表**现象、你应为此承担责任 (见 COPE flowcharts)。不过、这一条不适用于初步文献、如会议摘要 (O'Connor 1991, 参见 BioMed Central policy)。此外、如果**二次发表**或**再次发表** (secondary publication) 面向的是不同的读者群 (如、以另外一种语言发表；或、一种版本面向的是专业人士、另一版本面向的是普通公众)、且同时征得两种目标期刊的编辑的同意、则是可以接受的 (ICMJE

2015)。必须在二次文献的标题页脚注中列出对一次文献的引用。

- 在论文某一部分已给出的信息**不应**在另一部分**重复**。当然、这一条不适用于摘要、图注和结论性段落。
- 应考虑是否所有的图表都是必要的。表中已呈现的资料不应在图中重复、反之亦然。图表中已用较长篇幅列举过的资料不得再在正文中重复。
- 图表的说明性文字 (caption) 应能**提供具体信息、但不要过于冗长**。如果类似的信息在数个表或者数个图中分别提供、则其说明性文字的格式应尽量统一。
- 尽量删除众所周知的空话套话 (如、“森林是非常重要的生态系统。”) 和其他冗言赘句 (如、“It is well known that ...”)。
- 如果文中重复出现某个**较长的科学术语**、则在正文首次使用时可定义其缩略语、然后持续一致地使用该缩略语。
- 必要时可语带保留、但切忌**过度地模棱两可** (如、可使用“are potential”、而不要使用“may possibly be potential”)。但结论部分**切忌泛泛而谈**。
- 除非目标期刊的编辑另有要求、**对所有数字均使用阿拉伯数字**；这一条适用于一位整数、例外情况包括：**零**；**一** (如后面未跟计量单位)；**其他可能引发歧义的情况**、如在句子的开头或者在含数字的缩略语前 (CSE 2014)。

写作时尽量做到**清晰**、使之便于理解 — 提高文章的**可读性**。

学术内容

- 应将你的**原始数据和观点**与他人及你既往发表过的论文中所提出的数据和观点**作出明确区分**；必要时可提供引文。最好对其他来源的内容进行**总结或意译**。这同样适用于翻译文章。直接复制的文本 (如，整个句子或较长的文本) 要放在引号中 (如, Roig 2011, Kerans & de Jager 2010)。否则、你可能会**有剽窃** (见 COPE flowcharts) 或者**自我剽窃**之嫌。
- 确保你使用了**正确的英文术语**、最好是参考一下由英语为母语者撰写的文章。直译往往有很大问题 (如、所谓的“假朋友”、即译

文和原文中两个形式相似但实际意义不同的一对词、或由译者自行发明的根本不存在的单词)。如果不是很肯定、检查单词在英语字典中的定义,因为很多词都使用不当(见 *Appendix Ambiguity*)。你还可以通过 Wikipedia (维基百科) 等查阅一下某个单词或词组。然后、把由你自己的母语和英语撰写的结果进行比较、看两者之间的意思是否真的相同。然而, 维基百科并不总是可靠的信息来源。

- 如果某一单词主要见于译文中、且很少在英语国家使用、则应考虑采用其他意思相近、更为人所知的英文术语(如、使用“plant community”而不要使用“phytocoenosis”。如果某一术语在英文中无对应术语、可对其进行精确定义后、提出一个可接受的英语译文。
- 对于每一个不常用的或含义不明的术语、在首次使用时应予以定义。你可以列举多个同义词(如有的话)、以便于检索;但随后在行文中应仅使用其中的一个、以避免混淆。一旦某个名词术语已由学术组织认定、在学术交流中应优先使用该名词术语(如, *EASE 2013*)。
- 避免陈述不清、以免读者不知所云。(见 *Appendix Ambiguity*)
- 在撰写百分比时、应明确其基数是多少。在叙述相关性、相互关系时、应明确彼此比较的是哪些数值。
- 通常应优先采用国际单位制(SI)单位和摄氏度。
- 与其他语言不同、英文有一个小数点(不是逗号)。除非目标期刊的编辑另有要求、对于小数点左侧或右侧超过4位的数字、每隔3位用窄空格(thin space)(而不用逗号)空开(*EASE 2013*)。
- 在表示世纪、月时、不要使用大写罗马数字、因为英文中罕有这种用法。由于英国和美国的日期表示法不同(见下文),一般宜用月份的完整拼写方式或者前3个字母来表示“月”(CSE 2014)。
- 在翻译知名度较低的地名时、如果可能的话应加注原名、如“in the Kampinos Forest (Puszcza Kampinowska)”。有些相关的信息(如位置、气候等)、对读者可能也有一定帮助。
- 切记、英文论文主要供国外读者阅读、他们一般并不了解本国读者所熟知的特定情况、分类或者概念;因此、有时需要增加一些必要的解释(*Ufnalska 2008*)。例如、一种常见的杂草“一年蓬”*Erigeron annuus*在部分国家也称*Stenactis annua*、因此、在用英文写作时、应使用国际公认的名称、同时以加括注的形式列出其同义词。

文章结构

- 句子通常不应写得太长、其结构应相对简单、主谓语间距离不应太远(*Gopen & Swan 1990*)。例如、避免使用抽象名词;宜写成“X was measured...”、而不宜写成“Measurements of X were carried out...”。(见 *Appendix: Simplicity*) 忌滥用被动结构(如, *Norris 2011*。在翻译过程中、必要时需要调整句子结构、以更准确或更清晰地传递信息(*Burrough-Boenisch 2013*)。
- 行文应前后一致、组织严密、易于阅读。(见 *Appendix Cohesion*)
- 每个段落最好以主题句开头、下一句则全面阐述主题。
- 与其他语种不同、英文中是允许并列结构的、因这种结构有利于读者更好地理解文章内容。例如、在对类似资料进行比较时、你可以这么写:“It was high in A, medium in B, and low in C”、但不要写成:“It was high in A, medium for B, and low in the case of C”。
- 图表应具有自明性、即在不参阅正文的情况下也能读懂。避免使用不传递实质性信息的资料(例如、如果某一系列中的数值在所有行都是相同的、应予以删除、必要时可以加脚注说明)。缩略语的使用应符合以下两个条件之一:为保持一致性;没有足够的空间使用完整用语。所有非显而易见的缩略语和符号均应在图说明或者脚注中进行定义(如、误差条可能是指标准差、标准误或者可信区间)。应使用小数点(而不是小数撇)、必要时提供轴标签和计量单位。
- 在展示一小批数据时、可考虑使用文本-表格相结合的方式(*Kozak 2009*)。(见 *Appendix: Text-tables*)
- 对于较长的列表(如、缩略语)、最好是把各单项用分号(;)进行分隔;分号是居于逗号和句号之间的间隔号。

语言问题

- 如不必使用科学术语、尽量使用**通俗易懂的单词**。不过、应避免使用口语和俚语、也不要使用短语动词 (如、find out, pay off)、因其很难为英语为非母语的人士所理解 (Geercken 2006)。
- 在正文中首词出现**缩略语**时应对其进行定义 (如果读者对其并不熟悉)。切忌滥用缩略语、否则文章会变得不易读懂。不要对文稿中偶尔出现的术语使用缩略语。**避免在摘要中使用缩略语**。
- 一般地、在描述你是如何开展研究时、你发现了什么以及其他研究者所开展的工作时、使用**过去时**。在作一般性陈述或者解读、或在描述本文章的内容 (尤其是图表时)、宜用**现在时** (Day & Gastel 2006)。
- 除非目标期刊的编辑另有要求、**在提及本人或本研究组时不要使用 “the author(s)” 一词**、因其含义较模糊。如有必要、可使用 “we” 或者 “I”、或使用 “in this study”、“our results” 或者 “in our opinion” 等表达方式 (如, Hartley 2010, Norris 2011)。请注意、如果你想提及你 (们) 的新发现时、应使用 “this study”。如果你所指的是上一句中提及的一篇文章、请使用 “that study”。如果你指提是的某篇引文的作者、请使用 “those authors”。
- 切记、在科研论文中、“which” 一词应用于非限定性从句、而 “that” 用于限定性从句 (即、指的是 “only those that”)。
- 如使用**有所保留的表达方式** (equivocal words)、请确保其含义从上下文来看是明确的。请核对所有**动词的单复数形式是否与主语一致**、并核对**所有代词的指代对象是否明确** (这在译文中尤其重要)。请注意、部分名词有**不规则复数**。(见 *Appendix Plurals*)
- 可朗读文本、以核对**标点符号的使用是否存在问题**。如果在朗读过程中、为正确地理解某一处、**语调需要停顿时**、则意味着需要在此处使用逗号或者其他标点符号 (如、由于标点符号的位置不同、以下两个

句子迥异: “no more data are needed”和“no, more data are needed”)。

- 应保持**拼写的一致性**。参照英式或美式的拼写规则和日期格式 (如、英式的日期格式为 “21 Jan 2009”、美式的日期格式为 “Jan 21, 2009”; 见 *Appendix Spelling*) 核对目标期刊使用的是美式或英式拼写方式、然后对你的拼写和语法检查软件作出相应的调整。
- 邀请一位有见地的同事阅读文稿全文、以发现其中是否存在含义模糊的片断。

翻译/ Translation: Gu Liangjun, Edanz Group China (理文编辑, <http://www.liwenbianji.cn/>), thanks to Anianet (<http://www.anianet.com/>), updated by Yue Wang (wangyue81@gmail.com)

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

参考文献和推荐读物

- 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. doi:10.7326/M15-0288
- Beverly P. 2015. *Word macros for writers and editors*. <http://www.archivepub.co.uk/TheBook>
- BioMed Central policy on duplicate publication.
<http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#duplicate+publication>
- Bless A, Hull E. 2008. *Reader-friendly biomedical articles: how to write them!* 3rd ed. Alphen a/d Rijn: Van Zuiden Communication.
- Bravo E, Calzolari A, De Castro P, Mabile L, Napolitani F, Rossi AM, Cambon-Thomsen A. 2015. Developing a guideline to standardize the citation of bioresources in journal articles (CoBRA). *BMC Medicine* 13:33.doi:10.1186/s12916-015-0266-y
- Burrough-Boenisch J. 2013. Editing texts by non-native speakers of English. In: European Association of Science Editors. *Science editors' handbook*. Smart P, Maisonneuve H, Polderman A, editors. <http://www.ease.org.uk/handbook/index.shtml>
- Cerejo C. 2013. How to make your paper more accessible through self-archiving. Editage Insights. <http://www.editage.com>

- [com/insights/how-to-make-your-paper-more-accessible-through-self-archiving](http://www.ease.org.uk/insights/how-to-make-your-paper-more-accessible-through-self-archiving)
- Chipperfield L, Citrome L, Clark J, David FS, Enck R, Evangelista M, et al 2010. Authors' Submission Toolkit: a practical guide to getting your research published. *Current Medical Research & Opinion* 26(8):1967-1982. doi:10.1185/03007995.2010.499344
- [COPE flowcharts] Committee on Publication Ethics flowcharts. <http://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts>
- [CSE] Council of Science Editors, Style Manual Committee. 2014. *Scientific style and format: the CSE manual for authors, editors, and publishers*. 8th ed. Univeristy of Chicago Press. <http://www.scientificstyleandformat.org/Home.html>
- Day RA, Gastel B. 2006. *How to write and publish a scientific paper*. 6th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [DORA] San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. 2013. <http://www.ascb.org/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, Ayzvazyan L, Blackmore H, Kitas GD. 2011. Writing a narrative biomedical review: considerations for authors, peer reviewers, and editors. *Rheumatology International* 31(11):1409-1417. doi: 10.1007/s00296-011-1999-3
- Geercken S. 2006. Challenges of (medical) writing for the multilingual audience. *Write Stuff* 15(2):45-46. <http://www.emwa.org/documents/journal/TWS/TWS%202006%202%2015.pdf>
- Goozner M, Caplan A, Moreno J, Kramer BS, Babor TF, Husser WC. 2009. A common standard for conflict of interest disclosure in addiction journals. *Addiction* 104:1779-1784. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02594.x
- Gopen GD, Swan JA. 1990. The science of scientific writing: if the reader is to grasp what the writer means, the writer must understand what the reader needs. *American Scientist* 78(6):550-558. <http://www-stat.wharton.upenn.edu/~buja/sci.html>
- Hartley J. 2010. Citing oneself. *European Science Editing* 36(2):35-37. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/may_2010_362.pdf
- 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. doi: 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. <http://www.professionalenglish.nl/giveemnuggets.html>
- [ICMJE] International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. 2015. *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
- Lang T. 2004. Twenty statistical errors even YOU can find in biomedical research articles. *Croatian Medical Journal* 45(4):361-370. <http://www.cmj.hr/2004/45/4/15311405.htm>
- Marusic M. 2014. Gender and sex in medical research. *European Science Editing* 40(2):56. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/corresp_2.pdf
- [MeSH Browser] Medical Subject Headings Browser. <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html>
- Norris CB. 2009. *Academic writing in English*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. <http://www.helsinki.fi/kksc/language.services/AcadWrit.pdf>
- Norris C. 2011. The passive voice revisited. *European Science Editing* 37(1):6-7. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/february_2011_371.pdf
- O'Connor M. 1991. *Writing successfully in science*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Research Methods Supercourse. <http://www.pitt.edu/~super1/ResearchMethods/index.htm>
- [RIN] Research Information Network. 2008. Acknowledgement of funders in journal articles. <http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/research-funding-policy-and-guidance/acknowledgement-funders-journal-articles>
- Roig M. 2011. *Avoiding plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and other questionable writing practices: a guide to ethical writing*. Office of Research Integrity <http://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/plagiarism/0.shtml>
- Seifert KA, Crous PW, Frisvad JC. 2008. Correcting the impact factors of taxonomic journals by Appropriate Citation of Taxonomy (ACT). *Persoonia* 20:105. doi: 10.3767/003158508X324236
- Strunk WJr, White EB. 2000. *The elements of style*. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Tufte ER. 2001. *The visual display of quantitative information*, 2nd ed. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- Ufnalska S. 2008. Abstracts of research articles: readers' expectations and guidelines for authors. *European Science Editing* 34(3):63-65. http://www.ease.org.uk/sites/default/files/august_2008343.pdf
- [WMA] World Medical Association. 2013. *Declaration of Helsinki – ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects*. <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/>
- World Conference on Research Integrity. 2010. Singapore Statement. <http://www.singaporestatement.org/statement.html>

Appendix: Abstracts

European
Association of
Science
EditorsA blue diagonal banner with the word "EASE" in red, slanted upwards from left to right.

Key elements of abstracts

Researchers are quite often in a “box” of technical details – the “important” things they focus on day in and day out. As a result, they frequently lose sight of 4 items essential for any readable, credible, and relevant IMRaD¹ article: the point of the research, the research question, its answer, and the consequences of the study.

To help researchers to get out of the box, I ask them to include 5 key elements in their research report and in their abstract. I describe briefly the elements below and illustrate them with a fictitious abstract.

Key element 1 (BACKGROUND): the point of the research – why should we care about the study? This is usually a statement of the BIG problem that the research helps to solve and the strategy for helping to solve it. It prepares the reader to understand the specific research question.

Key element 2 (OBJECTIVES): the specific research question – the basis of credible science. To be clear, complete and concise, research questions are stated in terms of relationships between the variables that were investigated. Such specific research questions tie the story together – they focus on credible science.

Key element 3 (METHODS): a precise description of the methods used to collect data and determine the relationships between the variables.

Key element 4 (RESULTS): the major findings – not only data, but the RELATIONSHIPS found that lead to the answer. Results should generally be reported in the past tense but the authors’ interpretation of the factual findings is in the present tense – it reports the authors’ belief of how the world IS. Of course, in a pilot study such as the following example, the authors cannot yet present definitive answers, which they indicate by using the words “suggest” and “may”.

Key element 5 (CONCLUSIONS): the consequences of the answers – the value of the work. This element relates directly back to the big problem: how the study helps to solve the problem, and it also points to the next step in research.

Here is a fictitious structured abstract, using these headings.

Predicting malaria epidemics in Ethiopia

Abstract

BACKGROUND: Most deaths from malaria could be prevented if malaria epidemics could be predicted in local areas, allowing medical facilities to be mobilized early. **OBJECTIVES:** As a first step toward constructing a predictive model, we determined correlations between meteorological factors and malaria epidemics in Ethiopia. **METHODS:** In a retrospective study, we collected meteorological and epidemic data for 10 local areas, covering the years 1963-2006. Poisson regression was used to compare the data. **RESULTS:** Factors AAA, BBB, and CCC correlated significantly ($P<0.05$) with subsequent epidemics in all 10 areas. A model based on these correlations would have a predictive power of about 30%. **CONCLUSIONS:** Meteorological factors can be used to predict malaria epidemics. However, the predictive power of our model needs to be improved and validated in other areas.

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

Written by Ed Hull

edhull@home.nl

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

¹ IMRaD stands for Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion.

Appendix: Ambiguity

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Empty words and sentences

Many English words are empty – they do not add information but require the reader to fill in information or context to be understood. The reader is forced to supply his or her own interpretation, which could be different from what you, the writer, mean.

Empty words seem to give information and uncritical readers do not notice them – that is why they work so well for marketing texts. However, empty words do not belong in articles reporting scientific research. Empty words require the reader to supply the meaning – very dangerous. Concise and clear communication requires words that convey specific meaning.

Examples

It is important that patients take their medicine.

- Note that to a physician the meaning is probably entirely different than to the sales manager of a pharmaceutical company. “Important” is one of our best-loved, but empty, words – it fits every situation.

The patient was treated for XXX.

- “Treated” is empty; we do not know what was done. One reader could assume that the patient was given a certain medicine, while another reader could assume that the patient was given a different medicine. Perhaps the patient was operated on, or sent to Switzerland for a rest cure.

The patient reacted well to the medicine.

- “Reacted well” gives us a positive piece of information, but otherwise it is empty; we do not know how the patient reacted.

The patient’s blood pressure was low.

- We interpret “high/low blood pressure” to mean “higher/lower than normal”, but we, the readers, have to supply that reference standard. A more concise statement is: *The patient’s blood pressure was 90/60.*

Empty words and phrases not only require the reader to supply the meaning, they also contribute to a wordy blah-blah text. In scientific articles they destroy credibility. Here are some examples.

It has been found that the secondary effects of this drug include...

- Better: *The secondary effects of this drug include...(ref).*
Or, if these are your new results: *Our results show that the secondary effects of this drug include...*

We performed a retrospective evaluation study on XXX.

- “Performed a study” is a much overused and rather empty phrase. Better: *We retrospectively evaluated XXX.*

More examples that require the reader to supply information if it is not evident from the context:

- *quality*
- *good/bad*
- *high/low*
- *large/small*
- *long/short*
- *proper/properly* (eg “...a proper question on the questionnaire...”)
- *As soon as possible...*

Written by Ed Hull
edhull@home.nl

Incorrect use of scientific terms

Scientific language should be exact and based on unequivocal terms. However, some terms are not always used properly. For example, *trimester* means 3 months (usually with reference to 1/3 of human pregnancy) but is often wrongly used to describe 1/3 of mostly shorter pregnancy in many animal species (Baranyiová 2013). Another nowadays frequently misused word in both human and veterinary medicine is *gender* (eg “examined dogs of both genders”), as it is not equivalent to biological sex. The word *gender* applies

primarily to social and linguistic contexts. By contrast, in medicine and biology, the term *sex* is usually correct, because biological sex (not gender) is linked with major physiological differences (Marušić 2014). Wrong use of scientific terms can lead not only to confusion but also to serious consequences, so special care should be taken to avoid it.

Written by Eva Baranyiová
ebaranyi@seznam.cz

Appendix: Cohesion

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Cohesion – the glue

The word “cohesion” means “unity”, “consistency”, and “solidity”. Building cohesion into your text makes life easier for your readers – they will be much more likely to read the text. Cohesion “glues” your text together, focusing the readers’ attention on your main message and thereby adding credibility to your work.

Think of your text as a motorcycle chain made up of separate links, where each sentence is one link. A pile of unconnected links is worthless – it will never drive your motorcycle. Similarly, a pile of unconnected sentences is worthless – it will never drive your message home.

To build a cohesive text, you have to connect your sentences together to make longer segments we call paragraphs. A cohesive paragraph clearly focuses on its topic. You then need to connect each paragraph with the previous paragraph, thereby linking the paragraph topics. Linking paragraphs results in building cohesive sections of your article, where each section focuses on its main topic. Then, link the sections to each other and, finally, connect the end of your article to the beginning, closing the loop – now the chain will drive our motorcycle. Let’s look at linking techniques.

Basic guidelines for building a cohesive story:

1. Link each sentence to the previous sentence.
2. Link each paragraph to the previous paragraph.
3. Link each section to the previous section.
4. Link the end to the beginning.

Linking techniques

Whether you want to link sentences, paragraphs, sections or the beginning to the end, use 2 basic linking techniques:

- Use linking words and phrases, such as: *however, although, those, since then...* An example: *Our research results conflict with those of Smith and Jones. To resolve those differences we measured ...*
- Repeat key words and phrases – do not use synonyms. In scientific writing, repetition sharpens the focus. Repetition especially helps the reader to connect ideas that are physically separated in your text. For example: *Other investigators have shown that microbial activity can cause immobilization of labile soil phosphorus. Our results suggest that, indeed, microbial activity immobilizes the labile soil phosphorus.*

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

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

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

Written by Ed Hull
edhull@home.nl

Appendix: Ethics

European Association of Science Editors



EASE Ethics Checklist for Authors

EXPLANATION: obligatory declarations applying to all manuscripts are printed in bold.

Original or acceptable secondary publication

- No part of this manuscript (MS) has been published, except for passages that are properly cited.
- An abstract/summary of this MS has been published in.....
- This MS has already been published in but in language. A full citation to the primary publication is included, and the copyright owner has agreed to its publication in English.
- No part of this MS is currently being considered for publication elsewhere.**
- In this MS, original data are clearly distinguished from published data. All information extracted from other publications is provided with citations.**

Authorship

- All people listed as authors of this MS meet the authorship criteria, ie they contributed substantially to study planning, data collection or interpretation of results *and* wrote or critically revised the MS *and* approved its final submitted version *and* agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work (ICMJE 2015).
- All people listed as authors of this MS are aware of it and have agreed to be listed.
- No person who meets the authorship criteria has been omitted.

Ethical experimentation and interpretation

- The study reported in this MS involved human participants and it meets the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki (WMA 2013). Data have been disaggregated by sex (and, whenever possible, by race) and sex and gender considerations are properly addressed (see [Sex and Gender Questions](#)²).
- The study reported in this MS meets the Consensus Author Guidelines on Animal Ethics and Welfare for Veterinary Journals³ about humane treatment of animals and has been approved by an ethical review committee.
- The study reported in this MS meets other ethical principles, namely
- I and all the other authors of this MS did our best to avoid errors in experimental design, data**

presentation, interpretation, etc. However, if we discover any serious error in the MS (before or after publication), we will alert the editor promptly.

- None of our data presented in this MS has been fabricated or distorted, and no valid data have been excluded. Images shown in figures have not been manipulated to make a false impression on readers.
- Results of this study have been interpreted objectively. Any findings that run contrary to our point of view are discussed in the MS.
- The article does not, to the best of our knowledge, contain anything that is libellous, illegal, infringes anyone's copyright or other rights, or poses a threat to public safety.

Acknowledgements

- All sources of funding for the study reported in this MS are stated.
- All people who are not listed as authors but contributed considerably to the study reported in this MS or assisted in its writing (eg author's editors, translators, medical writers) are mentioned in the Acknowledgements.
- All people named in the Acknowledgements have agreed to this. However, they are not responsible for the final version of this MS.
- Consent has been obtained from the author(s) of unpublished data cited in the MS.
- Copyright owners of previously published figures or tables have agreed to their inclusion in this MS.

Conflict of interest

- All authors of this study have signed the EASE Form for Authors' Contributions and Conflict of Interest Disclosure⁴.

Date:.....

Corresponding author:.....

MS title:.....

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska
sylvia.ufnalska@gmail.com

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

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

⁴ www.ease.org.uk/publications/ease-form

Appendix: Plurals

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Examples of irregular plurals deriving from Latin or Greek

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

* Acceptable anglicized plurals that are also listed in dictionaries.

** In non-scientific use, usually treated as a mass noun (like *information*, etc.)

It must be remembered that some nouns used in everyday English also have irregular plural forms (e.g. *woman – women, foot – feet, tooth – teeth, mouse – mice, leaf – leaves, life – lives, tomato – tomatoes*) or have no plural form (e.g. *equipment, information, news*). For more examples, see [CSE \(2014\)](#). If in doubt, consult a dictionary.

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska
sylvia.ufnalska@gmail.com

Appendix: Simplicity

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

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

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

Based on O'Connor (1991)

Appendix: Spelling

European
Association of
Science
Editors

Examples of differences between British and American spelling

EASE

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

*One ending should be used consistently.

**Recommended by the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry and the Royal Society of Chemistry.

For more examples, see [CSE \(2014\)](#). If in doubt, consult a dictionary. Obviously, American and British English slightly differ not only in spelling but also in word use, grammar,

punctuation, etc. However, those differences are outside the scope of this document.

Compiled by Sylwia Ufnalska
sylwia.ufnalska@gmail.com

Appendix: Text-tables

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Text-tables – effective tools for presentation of small data sets

Arranging statistical information in a classic table and referring to it elsewhere means that readers do not access the information as immediately as they would when reading about it within the sentence. They have to find the table in the document (which may be on another page), losing some time. This slightly decreases the strength of the information. Quicker access to the information can be achieved within a sentence, but this is not an effective structure if more than 2 numbers are to be compared. In such situations, a “text-table” appears to be ideal for communicating information to the reader quickly and comprehensibly (Tufte 2001). The text-table is a simple table with no graphic elements, such as grid lines, rules, shading, or boxes. The text-table is embedded within a sentence, so no reference to it is needed. Keeping the power of tabular arrangements, text-tables immediately convey the message. Look at the following examples.

Original sentence:

Iron concentration means (\pm standard deviation) were as follows: 11.2 \pm 0.3 mg/dm³ in sample A, 12.3 \pm 0.2 mg/dm³ in sample B, and 11.4 \pm 0.9 mg/dm³ in sample C.

Modified:

Iron concentration means (\pm standard deviation, in mg/dm³) were as follows:

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

Original sentence

After the treatment was introduced, mortality tended to decline among patients aged 20-39 y (relative reduction [RR] = 0.86/y; 95% CI 0.81–0.92; $P < 0.001$), 40 to 59 y of

age (RR = 0.97/y; 95% CI 0.92–1.03; $P = 0.24$) and 60 to 79 y of age (RR = 0.92/y; 95% CI 0.86–0.99; $P = 0.06$).

Modified:

After the treatment was introduced, mortality tended to decline among patients in all age groups (RR stands for relative reduction per year):

20-39 y	RR = 0.86	(95% CI 0.81–0.92; $P < 0.001$)
40-59 y	RR = 0.97	(95% CI 0.92–1.03; $P = 0.24$)
60-79 y	RR = 0.92	(95% CI 0.86–0.99; $P = 0.06$)

Some rules for arranging text-tables

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

Written by Marcin Kozak

nyggus@gmail.com

(for more information, see Kozak 2009)

Practical tips for junior researchers

- Consider publishing a review article once you have completed the first year of your PhD studies because: (1) you should already have a clear picture of the field and an up-to-date stock of references in your computer; (2) research results sometimes take a long time to get (in agronomy: 3 years of field experiments...); (3) journals love review articles (they tend to improve the impact factor); (4) the rejection rate of review articles is low (although some journals publish solicited reviews only, so you might want to contact the Editor first); (5) the non-specialist reader - such as a future employer - will understand a review article more easily than an original article with detailed results.
- Alternatively, publish meta-analyses or other database-based research articles.
- Each part/item of an article should preferably be “almost” understandable (and citable) without reading other parts. The average time spent reading an article is falling, so virtually no one reads from Title to References. This phenomenon is amplified by the “digital explosion”, whereby search engines identify individual items, such as abstracts or figures, rather than intact articles.

Written by Eric Lichtfouse

eric.lichtfouse@dijon.inra.fr

For more advice, see EASE Toolkit for Authors
(www.ease.org.uk/publications/ease-toolkit-authors)

About EASE

European
Association of
Science
Editors

EASE

Background information about EASE and the *EASE Guidelines*

The European Association of Science Editors (EASE) was formed in May 1982 at Pau, France, from the European Life Science Editors' Association (ELSE) and the European Association of Earth Science Editors (Editerra). Thus in 2012 we celebrated the 30th anniversary of our Association.

EASE is affiliated to the International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS), the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS), the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). Through its affiliation to IUBS and IUGS, our Association is also affiliated to the International Council for Science (ICSU) and is thereby in formal associate relations with UNESCO.

EASE cooperates with the International Society for Addiction Journal Editors (ISAJE), International Association of Veterinary Editors (IAVE), International Society of Managing and Technical Editors (ISMTE), the Council of Science Editors (CSE), and the Association of Earth Science Editors (AESE) in North America. Our other links include the African Association of Science Editors (AASE), the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP), the European Medical Writers Association (EMWA), Mediterranean Editors and Translators (MET), the Society of English-Native-Speaking Editors (Netherlands) (SENSE), and the Society for Editors and Proofreaders (SfEP).

We have major conferences every 2-3 years in various countries. EASE also organizes occasional seminars, courses, and other events between the conferences.

Since 1986, we publish a journal, now entitled *European Science Editing*. It is distributed to all members 4 times a year. It covers all aspects of editing and includes original articles and meeting reports, announces new developments and forthcoming events, reviews books, software and online resources, and highlights publications of interest to members. To facilitate the exchange of ideas between members, we also use an electronic EASE Forum, the EASE Journal Blog, and our website (www.ease.org.uk).

In 2007, we issued the *EASE statement on inappropriate use of impact factors*. Its major objective was to recommend that "journal impact factors are used only – and cautiously – for measuring and comparing the influence of entire journals, but not for the assessment of single papers, and certainly not for the assessment of researchers or research programmes either directly or as a surrogate".

In 2010, we published *EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators of Scientific Articles*. Our goal was to make international scientific communication more efficient and

help prevent scientific misconduct. This document is a set of generalized editorial recommendations concerning scientific articles to be published in English. We believe that if authors and translators follow these recommendations before submission, their manuscripts will be more likely to be accepted for publication. Moreover, the editorial process will probably be faster, so authors, translators, reviewers and editors will then save time.

EASE Guidelines are a result of long discussions on the EASE Forum and during our 2009 conference in Pisa, followed by consultations within the Council. The document is updated annually and is already available in 24 languages: Arabic, Bangla, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Croatian, Czech, English, Estonian, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Persian, Polish, Portuguese (Brazilian), Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Spanish, Turkish, and Vietnamese. The English original and its translations can be freely downloaded as PDFs from our website. We invite volunteers to translate the document into other languages.

Many institutions promote *EASE Guidelines* (eg see the European Commission Research & Innovation website), and many articles about this document have been published. Scientific journals also help in its popularization, by adding at the beginning of their instructions for authors a formula like:

Before submission, follow *EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators*, freely available at www.ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines in many languages. Adherence should increase the chances of acceptance of submitted manuscripts.

In 2012 we launched the *EASE Toolkit for Authors*, freely available on our website. The *Toolkit* supplements *EASE Guidelines* and includes more detailed recommendations and resources on scientific writing and publishing for less experienced researchers. In the same year, the EASE Gender Policy Committee was established to develop a set of guidelines for reporting of Sex and Gender Equity in Research (SAGER). Besides, EASE participated in the sTANDEM project (www.standem.eu), concerning standardized tests of professional English for healthcare professionals worldwide. Our Association also supports the campaign AllTrials (www.alltrials.net).

For more information about our Association, member's benefits, and major conferences, see the next page and our website.

European Association of Science Editors



Skills - communication - fellowship

EASE is an internationally oriented community of individuals from **diverse backgrounds**, linguistic traditions, and professional experience, who share an interest in science communication and editing. Our Association offers the opportunity to **stay abreast** of trends in the rapidly changing environment of scientific publishing, whether traditional or electronic. As an EASE member, you can sharpen your editing, writing and thinking skills; **broaden your outlook** through encounters with people of different backgrounds and experience, or **deepen your understanding** of significant issues and specific working tools. Finally, in EASE we **have fun and enjoy learning** from each other while upholding the highest standards

EASE membership offers the following benefits

- A quarterly journal, *European Science Editing*, featuring articles related to science and editing book and web reviews, regional and country news, and resources
- A major **conference every 2 years**
- **Seminars and workshops** on topics in science editing
- **Science Editors' Handbook** (free online access, discount on printed version), covering all aspects of journal editing from on-screen editing to office management, peer review, and dealing with the media
- **Advertising of your courses or services** free of charge on the EASE website
- Discounts on **job advertisements** on the EASE website
- Opportunities to share problems and solutions with **international colleagues** from many disciplines (also on the **EASE forum** and **ESE journal blog**)
- Good networking and **contacts for freelancers**
- **Discounts** on editorial software, courses, etc.

Our members

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

Major conferences

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

Disclaimer: Only the English version of EASE Guidelines has been fully approved by the EASE Council. Translations into other languages are provided as a service to our readers and have not been validated by EASE or any other organisation. EASE therefore accepts no legal responsibility for the consequences of the use of the translations. **Recommended citation format of the English version:**

[EASE] European Association of Science Editors. 2016. EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators of Scientific Articles to be Published in English. *European Science Editing* 42(4):e1-e16. doi:10.20316/ESE.2016.42.e1

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