

MS31-02 *Il Buono, il brutto, il cattivo - strategies for better lectures.* Harold R. Powell, *MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology, Hills Road, Cambridge, CB2 0QH, UK*
E-mail: harry@mrc-lmb.cam.ac.uk

Presenting your results at a major scientific meeting should be an exciting and rewarding experience. Done well, it will introduce you and your results to an audience outside your own department, and can help put you on the path to your future career. However, many people develop bad presentation habits early in their careers, and these often stay with them. It is relatively straightforward to write a lecture and produce a slideshow that contain the experimental results and conclusions that the author wants to convey, but the message is often lost in the delivery. I will present examples of both good and bad practice, and will emphasise some of the techniques that keep an audience engaged and optimise the chances of a successful lecture.

Keywords: education, technical presentation, multimedia.

MS31-03 *How to present results in scientific articles* John R Helliwell *School of Chemistry, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK*
E-mail: john.helliwell@manchester.ac.uk

As researchers we should always strive to submit an article when it and the content is ready. Even so articles rarely attract the accolade 'publish as is', however, rather they are subjected to 'minor revision' or 'major revision'. Peer review and the fact that Editors can help authors in arriving at the 'accepted version' is a major benefit for authors and for the final readers of an article as the quality of content and the clarity of communication is nearly always improved. A two sentence Synopsis reveals a lot about the maturity of the work. Key points and conclusions should also be in the abstract. A good and clear title is vital to catch the eye of busy scientists. The quality of scientific argument depends on the quality of data. Crystallographic authors are assisted by community data standards, nevertheless critical appraisal of the text and data is vital. Readers also should and in our science do have access to the derived and processed data [1]. Authors are encouraged to keep raw data [2] and indeed if supported by public funds have to have a data management plan, which likely will require data archiving for 5 to 10 years. Speaking as an Editor the reasons for rejection of an article are usually a mix of poor or insufficient data and/or poor science. A submitted article without a conclusions section is not a good sign either. There are some strong variations by country notably in the quality of English syntax; an Editor cannot be a mind reader and rejection on the basis of 'impossible to understand' the article submitted I think is reasonable. Also authors should strive to ideally have zero typo errors. The references list should follow the journal requirements ie numbered or alphabetic; articles submitted without this being correct suggest that they have already been rejected from elsewhere. Careful attention to any mathematical equations is also paramount. After publication, will an article be a citations classic? That is more difficult to be sure about, but an author wants obviously to be cited for the right reasons. Finally to mention that intellectual property (IP) protection before publication may be important in cases where there is potential commercial impact of the research.

- [1] J. R. Helliwell, P. R. Strickland & B. McMahon (2006) "The Role of Quality in Providing Seamless Access to Information and Data in e-Science; the Experience Gained in Crystallography" *Information Services and Use* 26, 45-55.
[2] J. R .Helliwell & B. McMahon (2010) "The record of experimental science: archiving data with literature" *Information Services and Use* 30, 31-37.

Keywords: publication; literature; data; maturity of research; citation impact; IP protection.