

than 30 medical journals in various fields, special issues and translated journals. Turkey Citation Index is a large database built on *Türkiye Klinikleri* periodicals, designed to improve the quality and visibility of local publications. Since 2008, the archived issues of these periodicals feature 146 indexed medical journals.

Indicators such as “national impact factor” and “contribution value” are currently available. National impact factor reflects the impact factor in indexed journals. Contribution value evaluates citations of an indexed article to other indexed articles. To join the Turkey Citation Index, journals must be published regularly, i.e. at least twice a year. In addition, keywords and references must be formatted according to the standard regulations. Turkey Citation Index also conducts studies on standardisation; e.g., Turkey Scientific Terms aims to develop a nomenclature of keywords based on the Medical Subject Headings vocabulary of the US National Library of Medicine. Medical journals indexed by Turkey Citation Index each published, on average, 44 articles (range 5-350) in 2010. Nearly half of these were research articles (range 15-100%).

Hacettepe Bulletin of Social Sciences and Humanity was the first journal indexed by the Institute for Scientific Information back in 1970.⁴ but it lasted only two years. Twelve years later, the *Turkish Journal of Pediatrics* was accepted for indexing by SCI-E, and remained the only Turkish journal listed in SCI-E until 1994. From 2006 - 2009 the number of local medical journals indexed by this prestigious database rose from 8 to 69.

Currently, 75 Turkish journals are listed in Thomson Scientific databases,⁵ with *Energy Education Science and Technology* having the highest 2-year JIF (9.333). SCI-E lists 56 medical journals, of which 34 are published in English. Journal Citation Report (JCR®) 2010 listed 49 Turkish journals, of which 23 are medical journals, with *Experimental and Clinical Transplantation* having the highest 2-year JIF (0.873).

The SCOPUS database includes 27 Turkish publishers.⁶ The number of Turkish medical journals in SCImago Journal and Country Rank (SJR) database is 74⁷: the leading ones are shown in the Table. The majority of these journals are published in English.

English is the predominant language in scientific publishing.⁸ Current trends of publishing high-quality and well-edited articles in international journals may adversely affect the prestige and productivity of local journals. At the same time, publishing local journals in Turkish may decrease the chances of their being indexed in international databases and attracting citations. In order to increase a journal's quality, it is recommended to publish in English or in Turkish and English simultaneously. In any case, editors should encourage more submission of articles in either language to local journals.

Publication of articles in international journals is the prerequisite for academic promotion in Turkey unfortunately, it has a devastating impact on local publications. It is hoped that national indexing services will increase the visibility and prestige of Turkish journals. More extensive journal indexing in both national and international databases should be encouraged.

An important factor influencing the rank and quality of local journals is the credentials of the Editors, who are mainly from universities. Strengthening ties with international publishers and professional associations, as well as regularly organising training for editors, may become a powerful tool for improving a journal's quality.

To increase the number and quality of research articles, local learned societies and science editors should cooperate and adopt international standards of scientific writing. More incentives should be offered to Turkish researchers to publish their best articles in local journals. Editors and publishers should also arrange more training. Editors should improve the design and readability of journals. English language editing should be done by native English-speaking experts. Internationalisation of authors, reviewers and editors pool should also be encouraged.⁹ Finally, the criteria for academic promotion need to be revised to credit publications in local journals.

References

- 1 Thomson Reuters Science Global Research Report: Middle East, February 2011. Available at <http://interest.science.thomsonreuters.com/forms/grr-aptime> (accessed 18 September 2011).
- 2 Turkish Academic Network and Information Center. <http://www.ulakbim.gov.tr> (accessed 18 September 2011).
- 3 Turkey Citation Index. <http://www.atifdizini.com/default/tr-index.html> (accessed 18 September 2011).
- 4 Al U, Soydal I. An evaluation on Turkey addressed journals in citation indexes. *Bilgi Dnyasi* 2011;12(1):13-29. Available at <http://www.unak.org.tr/BilgiDnyasi/gorusler/2011/cilt12/sayi1/13-29.pdf> (accessed 18 Sept 2011).
- 5 Turkish Academic Network and Information Center. <http://www.ulakbim.gov.tr/cabim/yayin/tr-dergi.uhtml> (accessed 18 September 2011).
- 6 SCOPUS. <http://www.info.sciverse.com/scopus/scopus-in-detail/facts> (accessed 18 September 2011).
- 7 SCImago Journal and Country Rank. http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php?area=0&category=0&country=TR&year=2010&order=sjr&min=0&min_type=cd (accessed 18 September 2011).
- 8 Joshi Y. Native and non-native speakers of English as copy-editors of research papers. *European Science Editing* 2011;37(2):38-39.
- 9 Gasparyan AY, Ayyvazyan L, Kitas GD. Biomedical journal editing: elements of success. *Croatian Medical Journal* 2011;52(3):423-428. doi: 10.3325/cmj.2011.52.423

Impact factors of the Web of Science-indexed Turkish medical journals

Journal title	2-year JIF	SJR	h-index	Language
Experimental and Clinical Transplantation	0.832	0.099	9	English
Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology	0.712	0.092	14	English
Journal of Sports Science and Medicine	0.676	0.058	16	English
Turkish Journal of Gastroenterology	0.642	0.070	12	English
Turkish Neurosurgery	0.473	0.051	5	English
Anadolu Kardiyoloji Dergisi	0.407	0.042	11	Turkish
Eklemler Hastalıkları ve Cerrahisi	0.404	0.028	3	Turkish
Mikrobiyoloji Bulteni	0.354	0.046	8	Turkish
Turkish Journal of Pediatrics	0.340	0.051	19	English
Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi	0.310	0.028	4	Turkish

SJR: SCImago Journal Rank. SJR and h-index values obtained from the SCImago Journal and Country Rank database

Reports of Meetings

Hot topics in medical journalism: Shiraz University of Medical Sciences hosts another successful seminar

Continuous professional development of researchers and those involved in science writing and editing is of importance, especially for non-anglophone communities striving to advance in medical journalism. Though countries of mainstream research offer numerous academic courses and degree programmes on biomedical writing and editing, these are still not accessible for most novice researchers and editors from developing countries. Besides, there is still lack of scholarly communication between experts in science editing from developed and developing countries. Information on current standards on biomedical writing and successful editing is scarce and is not properly distributed and interpreted. With that in mind, a group of medical editors, supported by Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, arranged a seminar on hot topics in medical journalism.

The seminar took place in the University Education Development Centre on 25 June 2011. It was well attended by academics, researchers from Haematology and Cardiovascular Research Centres, Publication Centre of the University, editors of the *Iranian Cardiovascular Research Journal*, *Iranian Journal of Radiology*, *Archives of Iranian Medicine*, *Journal of Dentistry of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences*, *International Journal of Organ Transplantation Medicine*, and *The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*.



Editors of *The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *European Science Editing* and *Iranian Cardiovascular Research Journal* at the Shiraz seminar (from left: A. Simi, M. Yadollahie, F. Habibzadeh, A.Y. Gasparyan, M. Ghods)

One of the invited lecturers, Prof. Armen Yuri Gasparyan, member of editorial boards of several high-rank Iranian journals and the chief editor of *European Science Editing*, gave a talk “Current Principles of High Impact Science Editing and Indexing Biomedical Journals”, outlining the issues of funding, improving the qualifications of editors, networking with colleagues from the European Association

of Science Editors and other professional associations, and widening visibility of journals. The indexing criteria of different databases and their relevance to the local community of editors were also highlighted. Most issues touched on during the talk were of interest to the editors of small journals, struggling to get indexed by prestigious indexing services and library catalogues. The talk was full of examples from the lecturer's own editorial practice. Many points of the talk are elegantly presented in the recently published essay on journal editing.¹

Dr. Karim Vessal, one of the eminent radiologists, founder of medical journalism in Iran, Editor-in-Chief of *Iranian Journal of Radiology* and member of the Iranian Academy of Medical Sciences, presented a history of medical journalism in Iran and challenges with establishing and indexing journals in the Middle East. He was fascinated by the growth of science publishing and digitization in Iran and quite optimistic over the fate of local journals, some of which were indexed and succeeded under his guidance. Main points of his talk were discussed in an essay in *European Science Editing*.²

Dr. Farrokh Habibzadeh, Vice-President of the World Association of Medical Editors and founding editor of *The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, delivered highly educational lectures on peer review, plagiarism and impact factors. A large part of his lecture was based on his own publications.³⁻¹⁰ He described in detail the main steps in reviewing manuscripts, elements of success in the peer review and reporting the review results. The issue of plagiarism of words and ideas was also thoroughly discussed, and options to avoid this type of scientific misconduct, particularly by improving English language skills, were touched upon. In his final presentation Dr. Habibzadeh explained the meaning, advantages and limitations, uses and misuses of bibliometric parameters, journal and individual impact factors, including the journal weighted impact factor proposed by him and me,⁸ and popular h-index and its variants.

The lecture session of the seminar was followed by a panel discussion on authorship criteria chaired by Dr. Mohammad Javad Zibaenezhad, the Editor-in-Chief of *Iranian Cardiovascular Research Journal* and the seminar moderator. The discussion was interactive. It addressed ethical concerns over “gift” authorship.

The seminar was a real success. Its scientific programme was quite saturated and targeted the needs of Iranian medical editors. It was also a good opportunity for networking with local colleagues and forging friendship with Dr. Armen Gasparyan, who has visited Shiraz before and tasted traditional Persian hospitality.

It should be mentioned that Shiraz University of Medical Sciences (the former Pahlavi University School of Medicine, a sister association to the University of Pennsylvania, USA) is one

of the leading academic centres in the Eastern Mediterranean region. For decades, the University used English as its institutional language and accepted numerous visiting professors from top world universities. Most of its current faculty members are world-renowned specialists, who contributed to medical education and science growth in Iran and in the region.¹¹ The University is also famous for its high standards in education and journal publishing. One of the oldest English-language publications, *Iranian Journal of Medical Sciences* (formerly *Pahlavi Medical Journal*) was launched by the University, edited by Dr. Karim Vessal and was indexed on MedLine.²

After the seminar, Dr. Gasparyan attended a meeting at the editorial office of *The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, where Dr. Habibzadeh and Dr. Vessal presented several newly launched Iranian journals and discussed current trends in digitization, h-index and its variants, indexing and readability of medical journals. Dr. Gasparyan shared his experience of editing *European Science Editing*, *Archives of Medical Science* and several other journals, where he holds editorial posts. The atmosphere of the meeting was informal. The guest was surrounded by old and new friends, who, apart from scientific discussions, taught him a few Persian words and expressions, proudly shared thoughts on Iranian culture and presented brilliant pictures of Iranian nature, landscapes and architecture.

Mahboobeh Yadollahie

Deputy Editor, *The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, NIOC Health Organization Medical Education and Research Centre, PO Box 71955-575, Shiraz 71955, Iran; Mahboobeh.Yadollahie@theijoem.com

References

- Gasparyan AY, Ayyazyan L, Kitas GD. Biomedical journal editing: elements of success. *Croatian Medical Journal* 2011;52(3):423-428. doi: 10.3325/cmj.2011.52.423
- Vessal K. Science editing in the developing world: a personal journey. *European Science Editing* 2011;37(3):84.
- Habibzadeh F. A snapshot of medical journals from the Middle East. *The Lancet* 2006;367(9515):978. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(06)68411-0
- Habibzadeh F. A bird's eye view of science publishing and editing in Iran. *European Science Editing* 2006;32(4):98-100.
- Habibzadeh F, Marcovitch H. Plagiarism: the emperor's new clothes. *European Science Editing* 2011;37(3):67-69.
- Habibzadeh F, Shashok K. Plagiarism in scientific writing: words or ideas? *Croatian Medical Journal* 2011;52(4):576-577. doi: 10.3325/cmj.2011.52.576
- Vessal K, Habibzadeh F. Rules of the game of scientific writing: fair play and plagiarism. *The Lancet* 2007;369(9562):641. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60307-9
- Habibzadeh F, Yadollahie M. Journal weighted impact factor: a proposal. *Journal of Informetrics* 2008;2(2):164-172. doi: 10.1016/j.joi.2008.02.001
- Habibzadeh F. Journal impact factor: uses and misuses. *Archives of Iranian Medicine* 2008;11(4):453-454.
- Habibzadeh F, Yadollahie M. Read the articles; don't count them. *Archives of Iranian Medicine* 2009;12(3):302-303.
- Nasr K. Shiraz University School of Medicine: its foundation and development. *Archives of Iranian Medicine* 2009;12(1):87-92.

Summer School of Scientific Communication: where research is one and not polarised into science or humanities

University of Split, Croatia

When I started editing a small journal in a small country 20 years ago, I soon realized that our authors often had good data but little knowledge and few skills in presenting and writing about them.¹ Our work with authors naturally developed into teaching critical reading and science communication to medical students in a mandatory second year course.¹ Working with students proved to be the most effective way of creating a critical mass of (future) successful researchers and research-minded physicians.² The next move was rather obvious – step outside medicine and teach research methods and writing to a multidisciplinary group, where research is usually performed in contemporary science.

The Croatian National Science Foundation recognized the importance of such training and has so far funded three Summer Schools of Scientific Communication at the University of Split in Croatia. Our main argument for getting the funding, despite comments that scientific writing is a part of every doctoral programme in Croatia, was the finding from a study of our colleagues at the University of Rijeka that only around 30% of all masters theses and 15% of all doctoral theses produced at medical schools in Croatia ended up as publications in journals indexed in PubMed.³

The Summer School of Scientific Communication in Split has developed over the years into an international and multidisciplinary forum for young researchers – not only to improve their writing and publication skills but to understand the specificities of other disciplines and experience collaboration across research fields. We started with an initial teaching team of experienced editors and methodologists and invited colleagues from other research areas to join us. This year from the 22nd to 26th August, three outstanding lecturers joined Professor Elizabeth Wager of SideView, the chair of COPE, UK; Professor Christopher Palmer from the Centre for Applied Medical Statistics at Cambridge University, UK; Dr Darko Hren, researcher in psychology from the Faculty of Humanities, University of Split, and me. They were Professor Les Olson, moving back from Europe to Australia, where he did research in pharmacology and medical humanities; Professor Ida Raffaelli, editor in chief of *Contemporary Linguistics* and professor of linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia; and Professor Dejan Vinković, astrophysicist from the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics at the University of Split.

We worked with 20 exceptional students from all over Europe—from the Ukraine and Sweden to Hungary, the Czech Republic, Montenegro, and, of course, Croatia. Their range of research disciplines was even greater: clinical medicine and public health, psychology, mathematical modelling of chemical reactions, law, phonetics,

information sciences, philosophy, medical publishing, kinesiology, medieval glass archaeology, and pre-Romanesque sculptures. Indeed, Anglo-Saxon colleagues might be surprised by the inclusion of humanities in our science school, but we follow the continental, middle European tradition of not distinguishing between research and science.



Participants and teachers at the 2011 Summer School of Scientific Communication.

Writing in an interdisciplinary team

The focus of the summer school was learning about writing in your own discipline by exploring the differences and similarities with other research fields. Although we may find great differences in the content and form of research presentation between clinical medicine and the history of art, the rigour of scientific thinking, exploration, and presentation of ideas and findings is similar. While we explored the basic structure of the scientific article and data presentation, we also constantly challenged the differences across the disciplines and tried to understand why they were necessary and how they enriched research communication. We learned from our colleagues from the humanities and social sciences about the special way they structured the introduction section (much longer than in biomedicine), how they differentiated between the abstract and the summary, and why their manuscripts were often longer than ours in biomedicine and natural sciences. Professor Vinković described his experience as an astrophysicist collaborating with social science researchers – sharing with us some of his frustrations but also the many benefits in novel research and great publications.

Perhaps the best evidence for the success of the summer school's interdisciplinary approach comes from a comment by one of the participants in the evaluation questionnaire: "The main benefit of the workshop for me was new knowledge about the publication process. The second great benefit was making contacts with other young scientists from different areas. I have made a deal with four participants for future collaboration!"

"Paper clinic" and responsible publishing

After morning sessions, which covered the theoretical and practical aspects of manuscript writing and data presentation, afternoons were reserved for the "paper clinic" – work on manuscripts that participants had been asked to bring to the summer school. Each lecturer had his or her own team of students with manuscripts covering the topics of

their expertise. Here was the opportunity for students to focus on the specific requirements in their research field as they worked individually and in small groups on revising their manuscripts. They also read their colleagues' manuscripts and made comments—similar to journal peer review.

The participants appreciated learning details about peer review and editorial process in journals: knowing what happened to their manuscripts gave them greater confidence in the publication process and increased their hopes for future publication. Liz Wager introduced them to research integrity issues in publishing. Real cases of publication and research misconduct and not so clear-cut misbehaviour in

research and publishing stimulated a very heated discussion, in which the participants shared their own experiences and appreciated expert advice.

Last, but not least, we all had great fun, not only because of the warm Adriatic (for a morning dip before classes) but because of the discussions and activities related to publishing and understanding other disciplines, which continued after formal class work. Topics ranged from open access to the treasures of the Diocletian palace and the city of Split. There was an amusing raffle (with quite difficult entry tests) of writing apps such as superglue to keep IMRAD in order, and a magic ball with ready answers to all questions about publishing.

We hope you will join us next summer. The Croatian Science Foundation has discontinued its programme of summer schools for doctoral fellows, but we hope to find (multidisciplinary) funding for the next year – your help is greatly appreciated.

Ana Marušić

Department of Research in Biomedicine and Health, University of Split School of Medicine
Coeditor in Chief, *Journal of Global Health Soltanska 2, 21000 Split, Croatia*
ana.marusic@mefst.hr

References

- Marušić A, Marušić M. Teaching students how to read and write science: a mandatory course on scientific research and communication in medicine. *Academic Medicine* 2003;78:1235-9.
- Vujaklija A, Hren D, Sambunjak D, Vodopivec I, Ivaniš A, Marušić A, et al. Can teaching research methodology influence students' attitude toward science? Cohort study and nonrandomized trial in a single medical school. *Journal of Investigative Medicine* 2010;58:282-6.
- Frković V, Skender T, Dojčinović B, Bilić-Zulle L. Publishing scientific papers based on Masters and PhD theses from a small scientific community: case study of Croatian medical schools. *Croatian Medical Journal* 2003;44:107-11.

Science as a public enterprise

Public meeting organized by the Royal Society's Science Policy Centre, London, 8 June 2011

Earlier in 2011 the Royal Society established a working group on the use of scientific information in ways that reflect public values.¹ Some members of the working group discussed some of the issues behind this policy study in a *Lancet* article published in May,² and others were among the speakers at "An Open Meeting on Open Science" organized by the Royal Society's Science Policy Centre on 8 June.

After the meeting had been opened by Sir Paul Nurse, Secretary of the Royal Society, Sir Mark Walport, Director of the Wellcome Trust, addressed the question "Why should science be open?" He noted that it is a characteristic of a free and enlightened society that knowledge should be available to all. He drew a parallel between campaigns to translate the bible from Latin into vernacular languages and some of the reactions from a powerful church that these provoked, with promotion of open access publishing and the reaction of a publisher giving evidence to a House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology:

"Speak to people in the medical profession, and they will say that the last thing they want are people who may have illness reading this information, marching into surgeries and asking things. We need to be careful with this very high level information." (Hansard 1 March 2004)³

Sir Mark went on to discuss two forms of openness: first, that the results of scientific research should be published; and, second, that the actual data generated by researchers should be made openly available. As the Wellcome Trust has already taken some important initiatives to promote openness – notably, by requiring public registration of the clinical trials it supports and by supporting "open access" publishing – it came as no surprise that Sir Mark supported greater openness in both these respects, for the following reasons:

- (i) The very process of science demands that results and data are made available, and contestable
- (ii) Part of the scientific process involves attempts to replicate experiments, so experimental details must be available
- (iii) When policy decisions follow scientific discovery the evidence must be transparent to all – whether in research in health, climate, or any other field
- (iv) When the public purse pays for research, accountability demands the availability of all of the results
- (v) The outcomes of expensive research are maximized by allowing everyone access to the data.

He then considered arguments against greater openness. He viewed some arguments as having little merit – for example, that researchers should be allowed to hang on to data for their own benefit; that making data available would add huge opportunity and financial costs; and that allowing the "unqualified" access to it would sow confusion. However, Sir Mark recognized that other arguments did have some merit – namely, that:

- (i) No academic credit results from the effort needed to make data publicly accessible
- (ii) Scientists in the developed world could expropriate data generated by researchers in the developing world
- (iii) The confidentiality of participants may be compromised

(iv) Private investors in science are entitled to keep the results private to preserve their commercial interests

(v) Some research has the capability of abuse, for example, a simple method for weaponising a biological toxin

(vi) Countries that make data available will lose out scientifically and economically to those countries that do not

(vii) We don't yet have well worked out ways of overcoming the challenges in sharing data.

Sir Mark concluded by noting, however, that some of these arguments against open access are contestable, giving as an example the principle that our duty of care to human volunteers in drug trials and patients demands that the results should be published, whether studies are privately or publicly funded.

Following Sir Mark's presentation, Professor Geoffrey Boulton (Regius Professor of Geology Emeritus at the University of Edinburgh, and Chair of the Royal Society's Working Group) chaired a panel discussion involving Stephen Emmott (Microsoft Research), William Dutton (Oxford Internet Institute), David Dobbs (freelance science writer), and members of an audience of about 50 people. A theme that was reinforced repeatedly was that science is "organized skepticism," and that falsifiability and replicability were key features of science, so openness was essential for science to function efficiently.

Philip Campbell, Editor of *Nature*, suggested that action to promote greater openness needs to come from the funders of research. He noted that people should not be under any illusion that, once data had been made publicly available, that it would be possible to control the way that they were used.

In a final session chaired by Professor Charlotte Waelde (Professor of Intellectual Property Law at the University of Exeter), Cameron Neylon (Science and Technology Facilities Council), and Timo Hannay (Digital Science) spoke about the need to go beyond the traditional metrics used to assign credit in academia, and noted the opportunity to learn from the experience of introducing the Creative Commons models of ownership.

The report of the Royal Society's Working Party on Science as a Public Enterprise is expected to be issued by summer 2012.

Iain Chalmers

Editor, James Lind Library, Oxford, UK

IChalmers@jameslindlibrary.org

References

- 1 Royal Society. Science as a public enterprise. <http://royalsociety.org/policy/projects/science-public-enterprise/>
- 2 Boulton G, Rawlins M, Vallance P, Walport M. Science as a public enterprise: the case for open data. *The Lancet* 2011;377:1633-5. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60647-8. [http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(11\)60647-8/fulltext](http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(11)60647-8/fulltext)
- 3 Select Committee on Science and Technology. Tenth Report. Chapter 3, Accessibility of research. Paragraph 39, The public. *Hansard*. Available at: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmsctech/399/39906.htm#note65>

EASE-Forum Digest: June to September 2011

You can join the forum by sending the one-line message "subscribe ease-forum" (without the quotation marks) to majordomo@helsinki.fi. Be sure to send messages in plain text format.

Acknowledgements in PhD theses

The literature provides plenty of advice on how to structure a PhD thesis but John Taylor had not been able to find anything on what was expected in the acknowledgements. The acknowledgements in a thesis he was editing were long and amounted to a hyperbolic eulogy of the student's professors and lecturers. He wanted to know if there was anything he could do about the 'sickly slush'. The response from the forum made it clear that such acknowledgements are common in theses world-wide and the general feeling was that editors should only correct obvious language errors. Mary Ellen Kerans pointed to research in applied linguistics (e.g. by Ken Hyland) which showed that students followed their own whims when writing acknowledgements as well as local departmental 'rules'. Françoise Salager-Meyer added that Mohammed Nahar Al-Ali (University of Jordan) had written a paper on acknowledgements in PhD dissertations written in English by Arab writers where, she commented, Allah was frequently acknowledged as well [*Academic and socio-cultural identities in English dissertations acknowledgements of Arab writers* In ESP (English for Specific Purposes) Across Cultures. vol 6. 2009. p. 7-29].

Sylwia Ufnalska had also recently edited a paper (written by a Polish author) where about 30 people were mentioned in the acknowledgements, many she thought without good reason. She had explained to the author that when publishing results in English they would need to follow English rules of science writing and advised them to correct this section in accordance with the <http://www.ease.org.uk/guidelines/index.shtml>. As a result the authors had greatly shortened the acknowledgements. Mary Ellen thought that while those guidelines worked for articles,



acknowledgments in PhD theses typically had personal touches and a sincere, not-very-academic tone to them. Although Sylwia agreed that some flowery thanks may be acceptable, she considered a whole page unacceptable. Students should confine their thanks to those for which there was a good reason. However, from Carol Norris' experience, which she illustrated with a photo of one of the stacks of theses she had edited from students in Finland, one to four pages of detailed and personal acknowledgements are normal. She commented that

many people contribute much during one's half a dozen years of research.

Joy Burrough, who edits theses by Dutch students, fervently defended long and emotional acknowledgements as a venue for young scientists to speak in their own words. She found the acknowledgements were often very personal. God may be mentioned and thanked, but also supervisors who have provided hospitality to foreign PhD students far from home, friends and colleagues who had been encouraging, or had cooked nice meals, friends who had gone on long walks during which the problems of research/the world etc. had been discussed...

James Hartley agreed with Mary Ellen that there is a distinction between acknowledgements in theses and acknowledgements in papers. He commented that the inclusion of an acknowledgement section in scientific articles has increased from about 60% in the 1960s until it is now almost 100%. There were also disciplinary differences between papers in the arts, social sciences and sciences in the kinds of things acknowledged – funding, technical support, conceptual issues, and editorial help. Blaise Cronin had researched the topic and more details could be read in pages 53-55 of Hartley, J. (2008) *Academic Writing and Publishing* published by Routledge.

Placement of table and figure captions

"Does anyone know why the captions for tables appear above the tables and the captions for figures below the figures?" James Hartley asked this interesting question and Tom Lang replied that William Playfair, who had created the concept of graphs, put the captions above the figures but he suspected that the location of captions had been determined by some aspect of early typesetting. Mary Ellen found that positioning varied depending on a journal's house style. *The British Journal of Anaesthesia*, for example, puts what other journals would call table 'foot' notes up at the top, immediately after the title and some IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers) journals put table 'titles' at the bottom.

Yateen had explored the topic some years previously and suggested that Laurence Penney had provided the answer to Tom's questions in the quote "In general, it is good practice and polite to introduce things before shoving them in the reader's face. Tables, like sections in a book, particularly need an introduction since they are symbolic – language and numbers abstracted away from their subject. A glance through a table is even less profitable than a glance through a block of text of that size. So tables need an introduction, hence a caption above them. By contrast figures and pictures usually serve as their own introduction. They are analogous to what they represent, there's no change of mode. So it could be a tiny bit patronizing to 'introduce' them, more respectful to use a caption below, which does not demand to be read." Yateen added that what applies to the entire table (i.e. introduces it) goes into the headnote and what is specific to particular cells goes into the footnote.