

EDITORIAL

# Ten simple rules for structuring papers

**Brett Mensh<sup>1,2</sup>, Konrad Kording<sup>3,4\*</sup>**

**1** Optimize Science, Mill Valley, California, United States of America, **2** Janelia Research Campus, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Ashburn, Virginia, United States of America, **3** University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States of America, **4** Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, United States of America

\* [koerding@gmail.com](mailto:koerding@gmail.com)

## Overview

Good scientific writing is essential to career development and to the progress of science. A well-structured manuscript allows readers and reviewers to get excited about the subject matter, to understand and verify the paper's contributions, and to integrate these contributions into a broader context. However, many scientists struggle with producing high-quality manuscripts and are typically untrained in paper writing. Focusing on how readers consume information, we present a set of ten simple rules to help you communicate the main idea of your paper. These rules are designed to make your paper more influential and the process of writing more efficient and pleasurable.

## Introduction

Writing and reading papers are key skills for scientists. Indeed, success at publishing is used to evaluate scientists [1] and can help predict their future success [2]. In the production and consumption of papers, multiple parties are involved, each having their own motivations and priorities. The editors want to make sure that the paper is significant, and the reviewers want to determine whether the conclusions are justified by the results. The reader wants to quickly understand the conceptual conclusions of the paper before deciding whether to dig into the details, and the writer wants to convey the important contributions to the broadest audience possible while convincing the specialist that the findings are credible. You can facilitate all of these goals by structuring the paper well at multiple scales—spanning the sentence, paragraph, section, and document.

Clear communication is also crucial for the broader scientific enterprise because “concept transfer” is a rate-limiting step in scientific cross-pollination. This is particularly true in the biological sciences and other fields that comprise a vast web of highly interconnected sub-disciplines. As scientists become increasingly specialized, it becomes more important (and difficult) to strengthen the conceptual links. Communication across disciplinary boundaries can only work when manuscripts are readable, credible, and memorable.

The claim that gives significance to your work has to be supported by data and by a logic that gives it credibility. Without carefully planning the paper's logic, writers will often be missing data or missing logical steps on the way to the conclusion. While these lapses are beyond our scope, your scientific logic must be crystal clear to powerfully make your claim.

Here we present ten simple rules for structuring papers. The first four rules are principles that apply to all the parts of a paper and further to other forms of communication such as grants and posters. The next four rules deal with the primary goals of each of the main parts of papers. The final two rules deliver guidance on the process—heuristics for efficiently constructing manuscripts.



Check for updates

## OPEN ACCESS

**Citation:** Mensh B, Kording K (2017) Ten simple rules for structuring papers. *PLoS Comput Biol* 13(9): e1005619. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005619>

**Editor:** Scott Markel, Dassault Systemes BIOVIA, UNITED STATES

**Published:** September 28, 2017

**Copyright:** © 2017 Mensh, Kording. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Funding:** The authors received no specific funding for this work.

**Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.