

Editorial: Common Authors Mistakes in Article Writing and Editors' Advice on How to Avoid Them

Alfiya Masalimova

Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia

E-mail: alfkazan@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3711-2527>

DOI: 10.26907/esd.19.4.01

EDN: BALTVX

Writing any scientific article is a labour-intensive process that requires compliance with certain stages, scientific format and clear logic of its presentation. In this section we will talk about frequent mistakes of authors, which we see in the articles attached to our journal.

So, the *title of the article* should be short and easy to read, while reflecting the main idea of the article as accurately as possible. It should contain the problem and the promise of its solution, which arouses readers' interest and motivation. However, among the frequent mistakes of authors when formulating the title of the article, the following problems can be identified: firstly, the title is too general, which does not make it clear what the text of the article is about; secondly, the title of the article does not correspond to its content; thirdly, when translated into a foreign language, unwanted meanings appear in the title of the article, which should also be taken into account; and lastly, the title of the article lacks the main keywords.

In the *abstracts* of some articles there is insufficient consideration of the structural requirements for their design, while they should contain briefly stated information about the relevance, purpose, leading methods and (or) techniques, author's results and practical significance of the article materials. There is also insufficiently concise justification of the relevance of the research, clearly disclosing the necessity and timeliness of solving the proposed problem. Another of the most common mistakes of authors in the design of the abstract is the unclear justification of the leading approaches, methods or techniques underlying the study. In some abstracts there is a blurred representation of the author's results.

When selecting effective *keywords*, it is not recommended to use all the terms present in the title of your article, as using the same terms in the title and keywords can be redundant and lead to the loss of valuable keyword space. Instead, it is better to use related terms that develop the main ideas of the article. If the article is about the disclosure of a technique or technology, it is advisable to include it in either the title or keywords, which will make your article more accessible to researchers interested in the subject. It is also recommended to use commonly used alternative terms to the words stated in the title of the article, as different researchers may use different terms to describe the same concepts.

When providing a detailed justification of the relevance of the problem in the *Introduction* section of the article, the authors limit themselves to describing its necessity within one country or region, but for journals included into international citation-analysis databases, it is necessary to reflect this relevance from the perspective of world science. Also, a very common mistake of authors is that the presented literature analysis is superficial, while it should be accompanied by the author's reflection on the definitions, discoveries, scientific conclusions, etc. proposed by researchers. The next problem of the

authors is the limitation of the literature analysis to the framework of only domestic research because of which many articles are rejected. Any article needs to analyze both domestic and foreign literature in a certain logic depending on the scientific authority of the researchers chosen for this review. Many articles are characterized by a predominant reliance on scientific works of the last century, but the literature review should be based on modern research if the article is not comparative-historical in nature. At the end of the literature review it is necessary to formulate conclusions on the presented analysis, identifying unexplored aspects, areas that will once again emphasize the relevance of your chosen problem. Based on the identified gaps in the state of study of the problem, it is necessary to formulate the goal and objectives aimed at achieving it within the framework of the article.

In the *Materials and Methods* section, the most common mistake many authors make is not clearly presenting the logic and course of the experiment, which should include a sequential description of the actions to achieve the research goal, as well as a clear logic of the experimental steps with their description. In this section, the authors limit themselves only to listing the leading research methods, while it is necessary to provide a detailed justification of their choice, disclose their essence, and specify their purpose in relation to the study. This section of the article also requires justification of the research sample and experimental base, detailed characterization of the experimental stages, detailed description of the mathematical processing of data.

The next section of the article *Results* is also not without problems. In some articles there is a predominant substitution of the author's results by the previous accumulated experience in the field of the problem under study, while this section should include only the author's results without any analyses. Also, sometimes there are no tables and figures in scientific and practical articles, which could clearly show the results obtained by the author, or there is no accompanying text and author's conclusions to the presented figures. This section should be presented with a clear logic of the stages of the experiment, which were stated in the previous section of the article "Materials and Methods".

The purpose of the *Discussions* section is to arouse the reader's interest, therefore, this section of the paper should include the author's interpretation and evaluation of the results obtained, their consistency with the previously proposed hypothesis, present the correlation of the results obtained with the data of other studies, as well as the author's position reflecting the scientific dispute, agreement or disagreement with the previously conducted research.

The *Conclusion* section should reflect the author's brief conclusions on the article, focusing on the main points, and should also focus on the practical value and theoretical significance of the article materials.

A common mistake made by authors is to ignore the *Limitations* section. We would like to draw the authors' attention to this section, as an honest treatment of the identified problems encountered by the author will impress the reviewers more than ignoring them. This section should also outline the research perspectives and mechanisms for levelling the identified limitations and problems in further research.

And concluding this section, it is also necessary to mention the *References*, which should be neatly arranged, indicating the full output data of the sources, as well as bibliographic data of all authors, and do not forget about in-text references to all researchers who were mentioned in your article.