GS Spark: Journal of Applied Academic Discourse
Volume 03, Issue 01, 2025, pp. 1-6
OPEN ACCESS

Editorial

# Scientific Writing: What Needs To Be Included

*Niroj Dahal*

Kathmandu University School of Education, Lalitpur, Nepal



**INFO**

**Niroj Dahal**

**E-mail**

niroj@kusoed.edu.np

**ORCID**

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7646-1186

## ABSTRACT

Scientific writing serves as the basis of academic communication and knowledge dissemination in research communities worldwide. This editorial examines the essential components that constitute effective scientific writing, addressing both structural and qualitative elements necessary for successful scholarly communication. The discussion encompasses fundamental aspects, including proper manuscript structure, adherence to formatting guidelines, ethical considerations, and the critical role of clarity in scientific expression. Drawing on established research methodologies and publication standards, this editorial guides researchers at all career stages who seek to enhance their scientific writing capabilities. Key areas explored include the importance of comprehensive literature reviews, methodological transparency, appropriate use of citations, and the ethical obligations inherent in scholarly publishing. The editorial emphasizes that effective scientific writing extends beyond merely documenting research findings to encompass clear communication of methodologies, implications, and limitations. Furthermore, it highlights the transformative

**How to cite this article**: Dahal, N. (2025). Scientific writing: What needs to be included. *GS Spark: Journal of Applied Academic Discourse, 3*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17289345

potential of well-constructed scientific narratives in advancing interdisciplinary collaboration and fostering innovation across STEAM disciplines. The recommendations presented herein aim to support the development of writing practices that meet publication standards while also making significant contributions to the broader scientific discourse and advancing knowledge. Finally, this editorial concludes with a brief overview of the articles featured in Volume 3, Issue 1.

**Keywords:** scientific writing, academic communication, knowledge dissemination, formatting guidelines, ethical considerations

## Introduction

Scientific writing is one of the most critical skills for researchers across all disciplines, serving as the primary means of communicating discoveries, methodologies, and insights to the global scientific community (Day & Gastel, 2016). The ability to convey complex research findings clearly and accurately has become increasingly important in our interconnected academic landscape, where interdisciplinary collaboration and knowledge transfer drive innovation (Sword, 2012). As noted by Pinker (2014), effective scientific writing disseminates information while also shaping the trajectory of scientific progress by making research accessible and actionable for diverse audiences. The significance of well-structured scientific writing extends beyond individual publication success to encompass broader implications for scientific integrity and reproducibility (Casadevall & Fang, 2018). In an era where research transparency and open science practices are increasingly emphasized, the quality of scientific communication has a direct impact on the reliability and utility of published research (Nosek et al., 2015). Furthermore, the democratization of scientific knowledge through clear and comprehensive writing serves to bridge the gap between specialized research communities and broader societal applications (Brownell et al., 2013).

## Essential Components and Structure

### *Manuscript Organization*

The foundation of effective scientific writing lies in adherence to established structural frameworks that facilitate reader comprehension and information retrieval (Heard, 2016). The conventional IMRaD format (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion) provides a logical progression that mirrors the scientific method and reader expectations (Sollaci & Pereira, 2004). Each section serves distinct functions: the introduction establishes context and rationale (Swales & Feak, 2012), methods ensure reproducibility (Artino et al., 2013), results present findings objectively (Dahal, 2025; Kallet, 2004), and discussion interprets implications and limitations (Docherty & Smith, 1999).

Beyond basic structure, effective manuscripts require comprehensive literature reviews that position research within existing knowledge frameworks (Booth et al., 2016). The integration of relevant citations provides readers with pathways for further exploration (Pears & Shields, 2019). Moreover, appropriate use of figures, tables, and supplementary materials enhances comprehension and supports main textual arguments (Tufte, 2001).

### *Title and Abstract Construction*

The craft of informative titles and abstracts represents a critical component of scientific communication, as these elements often determine reader engagement and discoverability (Hartley, 2008). Effective titles should be concise yet descriptive, incorporating key terms that facilitate database searches while avoiding unnecessary

jargon (Bavdekar, 2016). Similarly, abstracts must provide comprehensive summaries that enable readers to assess the research's relevance and methodology without needing to access the full manuscript (Andrade, 2011).

## Language and Style Considerations

Clarity and precision in scientific writing demand careful attention to language choices and stylistic conventions that enhance readability while maintaining accuracy (Gopen & Swan, 1990). The use of active voice, when appropriate, creates more engaging and direct communication than excessive reliance on passive constructions (American Psychological Association, 2020). Additionally, the judicious use of technical terminology ensures accessibility for broader audiences without compromising scientific precision (Williams & Bizup, 2017).

Effective paragraph structure and transitional elements guide readers through complex arguments, maintaining a logical flow throughout manuscripts (Crews, 2013). The principle of "old-to-new" information progression helps readers build understanding incrementally, while clear topic sentences provide roadmaps for each paragraph's content (Clark, 2016). Furthermore, attention to sentence variety and rhythm prevents monotony and sustains reader engagement throughout lengthy technical discussions (Lanham, 2007).

## Ethical Considerations in Scientific Writing

Scientific writing carries inherent ethical obligations that extend beyond accuracy to encompass issues of authorship, citation practices, and research integrity (Steneck, 2006). Proper attribution of ideas and findings through comprehensive citation practices acknowledges intellectual contributions by enabling readers to trace the development of scientific concepts (Committee on Publication Ethics, 2019). The phenomenon of plagiarism, whether intentional or inadvertent, undermines the foundation of scholarly communication and violates fundamental principles of academic integrity (Roig, 2015).

Transparency in reporting methodologies, limitations, and potential conflicts of interest serves as a basis of ethical scientific communication (Ioannidis, 2005). The selective reporting of results or the omission of relevant limitations can mislead readers and compromise the integrity of the scientific record (Simmons et al., 2011). Moreover, acknowledging funding sources, collaborators, and institutional support appropriately ensures comprehensive recognition of research contributions (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, 2019).

## Quality Assurance and Peer Review

The peer review process serves as a critical quality control mechanism that enhances the rigor and reliability of scientific publications (Smith, 2006). Adequate preparation for peer review requires authors to anticipate potential criticisms and address methodological concerns proactively (Bornmann, 2011). The incorporation of feedback from colleagues and mentors during manuscript preparation can identify weaknesses and improve clarity before formal submission (Goldbort, 2006).

Self-editing and revision processes represent essential components of quality assurance that extend beyond basic proofreading to encompass structural organization and argument development (Revising Prose, 2007). The use of checklists and systematic review procedures helps ensure compliance with journal requirements and disciplinary conventions (Gastel & Day, 2016). Additionally, the engagement of professional editing services, when appropriate, can enhance clarity and adherence to language conventions without

compromising scientific content (Flowerdew, 2001).

## Concluding Remarks

Effective scientific writing represents a multifaceted skill that encompasses structural organization, stylistic clarity, ethical integrity, and quality assurance practices. The recommendations presented in this editorial emphasize the importance of systematic approaches to manuscript development that prioritize reader comprehension while maintaining scientific rigor. As the scientific community continues to evolve toward greater transparency and interdisciplinary collaboration, the ability to communicate research findings clearly and ethically becomes increasingly critical for individual researchers and the advancement of scientific knowledge.

The transformative potential of well-constructed scientific narratives extends beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries to foster innovation and knowledge transfer across different fields. Thus, by adhering to established conventions while embracing clarity and accessibility, researchers can contribute to a more inclusive and effective scientific discourse that serves both specialized communities and broader societal needs. Investing in the development of strong scientific writing skills ultimately benefits both individual career advancement and the collective progress of scientific understanding and application.

## Volume 3, Issue 1 Covers

Volume 3, Issue 1 includes an editorial and seven articles. The editorial highlights that effective scientific writing, as the foundation of academic communication, demands structural rigor, ethical integrity, and clarity to foster interdisciplinary collaboration, uphold publication standards, and meaningfully advance global research discourse. In the first article, *Ghimire* and *KC* analyze the historical evolution of socialist ideology through *Marxism, Leninism*, and *Madan Bhandari*'s *People's Multiparty Democracy* (Jabaj), featuring their theoretical foundations, practical adaptations, and Nepal's democratic model as a transformative alternative to violent revolution. In the second article, *Timilsina* and *Bhurtel* examine the perceptions of Nepali secondary English teachers regarding flipped classroom pedagogy, highlighting its potential to enhance student autonomy and engagement despite challenges such as limited technology, rigid curricula, and insufficient training. In the third article, *Bhandari* focuses on how remittances significantly support Nepal's economy; however, their overreliance risks long-term stagnation by undermining industrial growth, labor participation, and sustainable development. In the fourth article, *Phunyal* examines the evolving pedagogical practices of Nepali English teachers and their support for student-centered and ICT-integrated methods while revealing systemic barriers that hinder effective classroom implementation and educational reform. In the fifth review article, *G.C. et al.* reveal how social class influences mathematics achievement through cultural capital, educational attitudes, and structural barriers, urging policy reforms to promote equity and culturally responsive teaching. In the sixth article, *Adhikari* explores that despite Nepal's federal mandate for inclusive local planning, weak institutional capacity, limited engagement, and power imbalances hinder meaningful participation, especially among marginalized communities. In the final article, *Oli and Kandel* examine how female English teachers in Nepal construct their professional identities amid socio-cultural norms, highlighting the need for gender-sensitive policies and institutional support to foster their growth and effectiveness.

**References**


American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). American Psychological Association.

Andrade, C. (2011). How to write a good abstract for a scientific paper or conference presentation. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry, 53*(2), 172–175. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.82558

Artino, A. R., Driessen, E., & Maggio, L. A. (2019). Ethical shades of gray: International frequency of scientific misconduct and questionable research practices in health professions education. *Academic Medicine, 94*(1), 76–84. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002412

Bavdekar, S. B. (2016). Formulating the right title for a research article. *Journal of Association of Physicians of India, 64*(2), 53–56.

Booth, A., Sutton, A., & Papaioannou, D. (2016). *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review.* SAGE Publications.

Bornmann, L. (2011). Scientific peer review. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, 45*(1), 197–245. https://doi.org/10.1002/aris.2011.1440450112

Brownell, S. E., Price, J. V., & Steinman, L. (2013). Science communication to the general public: Why we need to teach undergraduate and graduate students this skill as part of their formal scientific training. *Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education, 12*(1), E6–E10.

Casadevall, A., & Fang, F. C. (2018). Reproducible science. *Infection and Immunity, 78*(12), 4972–4975. https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.00908-10

Clark, R. P. (2016). *Writing tools: 55 essential strategies for every writer.* Little, Brown and Company.

Committee on Publication Ethics. (2019). *Guidelines on good publication practice.* COPE.

Crews, F. (2013). *The random house handbook* (6th ed.). Random House.

Dahal, N. (2025). Qualitative data analysis: Reflections, procedures, and some points for consideration. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, *10*, 1669578. https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2025.1669578

Day, R. A., & Gastel, B. (2016). *How to write and publish a scientific paper* (8th ed.). Greenwood Press. https://doi.org/10.5040/9798400666926

Docherty, M., & Smith, R. (1999). The case for structuring the discussion of scientific papers. *BMJ, 318*(7193), 1224–1225. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.318.7193.1224

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 121–150. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587862

Gastel, B., & Day, R. A. (2016). *How to write and publish a scientific paper* (8th ed.). Greenwood Press. https://doi.org/10.5040/9798400666926

Goldbort, R. (2006). *Writing for science.* Yale University Press.

Gopen, G. D., & Swan, J. A. (1990). The science of scientific writing. *American Scientist, 78*(6), 550–558.

Hartley, J. (2008). *Academic writing and publishing: A practical handbook.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203927984

Heard, S. B. (2016). *The scientist's guide to writing: How to write more easily and effectively throughout your scientific career.* Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400881147

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2019). *Recommendations for the conduct, reporting, editing, and publication of scholarly work in medical journals.* ICMJE.

Ioannidis, J. P. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Medicine, 2*(8), e124. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124

Kallet, R. H. (2004). How to write the methods section of a research paper. *Respiratory Care, 49*(10), 1229–1232.

Lanham, R. A. (2007). *Revising prose* (5th ed.). Longman.

Nosek, B. A., Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J., ... & Yarkoni, T. (2015). Promoting an open research culture. *Science, 348*(6242), 1422–1425. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab2374

Pears, R., & Shields, G. (2019). *Cite them right: The essential referencing guide* (11th ed.). Red Globe Press.

Pinker, S. (2014). *The sense of style: The thinking person's guide to writing in the 21st century.* Viking.

Roig, M. (2015). *Avoiding plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and other questionable writing practices: A guide to ethical writing.* Office of Research Integrity.

Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science, 22*(11), 1359–1366. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632

Smith, R. (2006). Peer review: A flawed process at the heart of science and journals. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 99*(4), 178–182. https://doi.org/10.1177/014107680609900414

Sollaci, L. B., & Pereira, M. G. (2004). The introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) structure: A fifty-year survey. *Journal of the Medical Library Association, 92*(3), 364–367.

Steneck, N. H. (2006). Fostering integrity in research: Definitions, current knowledge, and future directions. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 12*(1), 53–74. https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00022268

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.2173936

Sword, H. (2012). *Stylish academic writing.* Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674065093

Tufte, E. R. (2001). *The visual display of quantitative information* (2nd ed.). Graphics Press.

Williams, J. M., & Bizup, J. (2017). *Style: Lessons in clarity and grace* (12th ed.). Pearson.