One of the benefits of PAID is that it forces authors to be succinct. In other journals without word limits, authors can drone on endlessly, go off on tangents, and engage in overbaked analyses. An important skill to develop—to quotes Star Wars—is to “stay on target”. That is, learning where to focus on not get distracted by sideshows and not sacrifice too many words too unimportant matters. However, when most of us were students were taught—implicitly or explicitly—to be verbose. This is the result of (1) word requirements of graded assignments and (2) the sense that scientists write in protracted ways. But for most of you, you are no longer students and saying something straightforward, in classic prose as Steven Pinker would call it, is far better than hiding your true meaning behand science-speak. In hopes of helping you write in a more efficient manner, thereby improving your submissions and increasing the probability your paper will be accepted, I offer 10 tips on how to shorten things up.

1. Write about people. This is a science of people, not constructs. Do not write about how this construct was positively correlated with some other construct. Just say “people higher on X were more likely to Y”. The use of the constructs assumes their validity is sufficient.
2. Do not write single-sentence or mini abstracts reporting what study after study showed. Synthesize what numerous authors have stated into a coherent argument for your point.
3. Do not write about authors. The focus of science is what studies revealed. It does not matter who did it. Indeed, the very premise of parenthetical citations is that the authors are afterthoughts for the doubting Thomas.
4. Avoid science speak like “main effects”, “significantly correlated”, and other specialist phrasing. When we were students, we were taught to say there was a main effect, but this is for students and in some ways a cheat to help those marking the work go faster. Avoid saying an effect was significant. If you are engaging in null hypothesis testing, there is no reason to use the word because any effect you are referring to is, by definition, significant (i.e., unlikely to occur randomly). Saying these terms are part of the initiation process of becoming a scientist that do not have a place in peer reviewed papers. They are assumed as part of your due diligence.
5. Non-living things cannot do anything. That is, avoid the error of anthropomorphism. Do not write things like “results suggested…” or “*t*-tests showed…”. Instead, just jump ahead and say what you want to say, like what is the difference between groups. This error is part of a larger class of errors which is over-equivocation. We were all taught to be tentative, but you can take it too far. You found X. Some other study found Y. Do not be afraid to state things with confidence then cite them. Your findings—as reported in parentheses like references—back up your claims about your study.
6. When making Tables, only provide the information called for to test the relevant hypotheses and maybe auxiliary tests. You do not need the kinds of tables that you would present in a thesis like those testing normality. Avoid the exact *p*-values and use the standard system of stars instead. There are numerous online calculators where the “stats-guardians” can go check your work if he/she really wants to. You are only making the claim that it is unlikely effect. Do not confuse *p*-values with effect sizes.
7. When reporting your measures, make each paragraph uniform in structure. Introduce the measure, note any translations if relevant, provide at least one sample item per dimension, tell us what the participant’s did (i.e., no reason to say anything about Likert scales), not the scale endpoints, indicate how it was scored (i.e., averaged or summed), what the Cronbach’s alpha (Omega if you really want to, but not both) is (not reliability, but internal consistency), and (maybe) tell the reader what high scores mean.
8. In the references, remove all spaces between initials. This will save you some words. Also, throughout the paper, do not overcite. That is, your job is not to show-off how you read all the papers as you might have implicitly done as a student. Instead, you need just enough references to back up your points. Air on the side of large review papers as opposed to piecemeal empirical papers and choose ones that either have few authors or ones that you can move to “et al” in the text immediately. And if you really need to, drop references of your own and keep others’ references.
9. For tangential, backgrounds tests and information, consider the use of online appendixes like on the Open Science Foundation instead of eating up more words with a correlation table that you might not need but “stats-guardians” often request. Similarly, if your Method is sufficient in its description, there might be some details that would take up too many words like if generated a new scale with many items.
10. Avoid redundancy everywhere. If you have result reported in a table, there is no reason to rehash them, but instead, summarize them. Never report the same stats twice in two different places. When writing avoid the tendency to repeat yourself by writing in a linear fashion. If you can find ways to combine tables, do so. This will mean you do not have to repeat words used in the tables like the names of variables.