Writing for Science Subjects: 10 characteristics of scientific writing

Scientific writing follows these conventions:

1. It is conventional
2. It is clear
3. It is concise
4. It is accurate
5. It uses formal language
6. It is objective
7. It exercises caution
8. It avoids direct quotes
9. It gets to the point
10. It is often illustrated with figures
1. It is conventional

This means that scientific writing follows strict rules, with regard to a number of issues:

**Structure**

Writing for science subjects is generally more rigidly structured than in other subjects. For example, if you look at articles in scientific journals, you will see that they are usually arranged under a series of headings. Here is a typical structure for a report on an experiment, with suggestions for the kind of information that should be included in each section. It is crucial when writing reports that you should include your information in the correct section.

1. **Aim:** Describe the purpose of the experiment
2. **Abstract:** Give a short summary of the whole report, including conclusions
3. **Method:** Describe the techniques and materials you used. Discuss any difficulties in carrying out the experiment
4. **Results:** Describe your observations. Include calculations where appropriate
5. **Discussion:** Critically evaluate the significance of your results. Compare with previous studies. Discuss weaknesses in your study and suggest future avenues for investigation
6. **References**

Remember that this is not the only way to structure a report – for example, some reports will have a table of contents, a literature review, or recommendations. Some might have a separate section for conclusions, which summarises the findings. Your department may have their own specific requirements regarding which sections should be included, so make sure you check the guidelines.

**Use of abbreviations**

The use of abbreviations is common in scientific writing, especially for long technical terms and it can be a way to make your writing flow more smoothly.

Always give the term in full at the first use and show the abbreviation in brackets, eg:

- “Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)” or “polymerase chain reaction (PCR)”
  - Subsequently use just the abbreviation
  - See Glover (2009, p. R99)\(^1\)

Try to use accepted abbreviations (such as MRI) rather than making up your own.

Always be consistent in your use of abbreviations, eg always MRI, not mri, Mri etc.

---

\(^1\) Students at the University of Leeds can click on the links in the references section to connect to the articles used as examples in this guide. Students elsewhere can check in their own library catalogues.
Formatting of names, technical terms etc.

Scientific disciplines have their own rules about how names etc. are written. For example in biology, species names for animals and plants are given in italics, with the genus capitalised, eg *Homo sapiens* at first use, later *H. sapiens*

Note that there can be specific exceptions eg animals or plants are usually referred to by their scientific names for accuracy, but the zebrafish – *Danio rerio* – is generally just called the zebrafish in genetics.

Gene names are always given in italics, while the corresponding protein products are in normal font eg in zebrafish, *zic2a* is the gene, Zic2a is the protein.

Every discipline has its own conventions - for chemical elements and compounds, nuclear particles and so on - and it is important that you know those in your subject. Refer to your lecture notes and text books or try the style manual in the resources page.

Use of tenses

Different tenses are used for writing about different types of information and in different sections of a scientific report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established knowledge</th>
<th>Present tense</th>
<th>“Hh function results in transcriptional activation of several targets, many of which encode transcription factors (TFs).” (Sanek, et al., 2009, p. 3791.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describing your experiment (introduction, methods)</td>
<td>Past tense</td>
<td>“The aim of this study was to investigate and quantify both biological endpoints in human lymphocytes after CT scans in the presence of an iodinised contrast agent”. (Jost, et al., 2009, p. 6031.) “To determine whether six3b transcription is regulated by Zic2a in zebrafish, we employed antisense MO knockdown assays as previously described.” (Sanek, et al., 2009, p. 3792.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referring to figures in your report</td>
<td>Present tense</td>
<td>Table 1 shows the results…” (Jost, et al., 2009, p. 6033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of your experiments</td>
<td>Past tense</td>
<td>“OxdRE formed a homodimer with non-crystallographic two fold symmetry (Fig. 1A), consistent with previous gel filtration analysis results.” (Sawai, et al., 2009, p. 32093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your answer to the question (discussion/conclusions)</td>
<td>Present tense</td>
<td>“The findings of the present investigations actually illustrate that a dose enhancement in iodinated contrast agent-containing blood samples can be determined with both biological endpoints.” (Jost, et al., 2009, p. 6035-6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referencing

You must reference fully and accurately, according to the required style. The Harvard style is commonly used in science subjects but not exclusively; always check with your department!
2. It is clear

One idea per sentence
- Keep sentences 10-25 words in length (on average)

One theme per paragraph
- Keep paragraphs ¼ - ½ page long (on average)

Sub-headings can help – see Glover (2009) - but check with your department to see if they are permitted.
See Sanek et al (2009) for a good example of clarity in writing.

3. It is concise

Use as few words as possible e.g. “now” instead of “at the present time”; “near” instead of “in close proximity to”

Keep sentences 10-25 words in length

Avoid repetition within sentences as repetition just makes the sentence more confusing because everything is repeated unnecessarily and this repetition reduces clarity and flow (because it’s repetitious).

4. It is accurate

Use simple terms e.g. “identical” instead of “exactly identical”

Avoid vague terms like “most”, “nearly” eg “The concentration was tested every 15 minutes” instead of “The concentration was tested regularly”

Avoid overgeneralisation e.g. “it is widely accepted”, not “everyone knows that”

5. It uses formal language (but not excessive jargon!)

- No contractions ("do not" instead of “don’t”)
- No colloquialisms/ conversational terms (“exactly” not “bang on”; “approximately” not “near enough”; “children” not “kids”)
- No anthropomorphism (“offspring” not “babies”)
- Be accurate rather than polite! E.g. “Man/Woman” not “Gentleman/ Lady”
- No run-ons i.e. “etc.”, “so on”
- No rhetorical questions e.g. “So, what do these results mean?”
• Try to write in an active style rather than passive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I observed the angle to be…</td>
<td>The angle was observed to be…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The authors suggest…</td>
<td>It is suggested…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We used a standard graphical representation to…</td>
<td>A standard graphical representation was used to…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linked to an active style is the use of first person (I/we) rather than third person, and the person as subject of the sentence, rather than things e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First person</th>
<th>Third person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I found…</td>
<td>It was found that…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assumed…</td>
<td>It was assumed that…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person as subject</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thing as subject</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I noticed…</td>
<td>Analysis of the data indicated…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this report I will show…</td>
<td>This report presents…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Even in academic journals, opinions about whether it is better to use first or third person vary, so it is essential to check with your own tutors about their preferences, but it is generally thought better to write in an active rather than a passive style

- Sanek et al (2009) is largely personal and active, while Glover (2009) is completely impersonal – which do you find most clear?

Try Academic Phrasebank ([http://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/](http://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/)) for lots of suggestions on how to phrase your writing in an appropriate way
6. It is objective

Objective writing avoids loaded or emotive words that might prejudice the reader, or exaggerate the situation e.g. “scandalous”, “ridiculous” or “Sadly, half of the mice use in the experiment died” – in the context of a scientific report, it is not sad (which implies an emotional response) but “unfortunate” since it might interfere with the validity of the result.

You should avoid expressing your unsupported thoughts or beliefs – any opinion you give or claim you make must be supported by appropriate evidence.

You should aim to write as a neutral outside observer, without any emotional or personal investment in the subject.


**Subjective style**

These results seem to be really quite good. The model fits very well with the data points as can be interpreted by the $R^2$ values of 0.32 shown in Table 1 above. But the method used to obtain the best values for a, b, and c was a little silly and time-consuming as it required putting lots of values into a changeable Excel spreadsheet over and over to try and get the lowest $R^2$ value, even though this is probably the only way to do it accurately. Also, this model can be used to extrapolate the PCB concentrations of fish of ages not measured in the study, but that's about it.

**Writing more objectively**

These results appear to be reasonable as the model fits very well with the data points, as can be interpreted by the $R^2$ values of 0.32 shown in Table 1 above. However, the method used to obtain the best values for a, b, and c was rather time-consuming as it required putting many values into an Excel spreadsheet many times to obtain the lowest $R^2$ value. While this is probably the only way to obtain accurate results, a further limitation is that this model can be used only to extrapolate the PCB concentrations of fish within age ranges measured in the study.
7. It exercises caution – sometimes known as “hedging”

This also relates to accuracy – in scientific writing it is important to write exactly what you mean. Take care not to overstate what your evidence can support. Be especially careful with words like “proves” or “definitively”.

Common hedging words*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Adverbs</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supposition</td>
<td>Presumably</td>
<td>Appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Postulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speculation</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Suggest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjecture</td>
<td>Apparently</td>
<td>Seem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td>Not unlikely</td>
<td>May be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference</td>
<td>Seemingly</td>
<td>Speculate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEVER use more than one hedging word per sentence! Eg:

“These results may possibly suggest that there is a likelihood that this species could be vulnerable to extinction.” Better: “These results suggest that this species is at risk of extinction.”


8. It avoids direct quotes

Why? Think about the reasons that you would use a direct quote. Do these reasons apply in a scientific report?

You would only use a direct quote from a source when the exact words used by the author are essential to make your point. In writing for science this situation is very rare because it is the ideas that matter most. Explaining the ideas in your own words better demonstrates your understanding of the issue (of course, you still have to cite the source!).

9. It gets to the point

More than any other form of writing, scientific writing is skimmed or scanned – if the reader can’t see the point of your work in about 30 seconds, they probably won’t read it at all!
10. It is often illustrated with figures

- Tables, graphs, charts, photographs etc.
- All figures must be good quality reproductions and clearly readable/visible.
- Keep it as simple as possible. Don’t, for example, plot ten sets of data on the same graph.
- Represent each set of data in only one illustration eg either a table or a graph, not both.
- Figures must be clearly labelled.
- Give each one a brief, descriptive title.
- Number figures consistently i.e. 1, 2, 3... NOT 1, B, III, d etc.
- Each figure should have a legend which briefly describes the experiment and tells the reader what they are looking at.
- The key points of the illustration should be discussed in the main text.
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