When scientists write:	They really mean:
It has long been known that	I haven't bothered to look up the original reference.
While it has not been possible to provide definite answers to these questions	The experiments didn't work out, but I figured I could at least get a publication out of it.
High-purity	Composition unknown except for the exaggerated claims of the supplier.
Very high purity	exaggerated claims of the supplier.
Extremely high purity	
Three of the samples were chosen for detailed study	The results on the others didn't make sense and were ignored.
accidentally strained during mounting	dropped on the floor.
handled with extreme care throughout the experiments	not dropped on the floor.
Typical results are shown	The best results are shown.
Although some detail has been lost in reproduction, it is clear from the original micrograph that	It is impossible to tell from the micrograph.
Presumably at longer times	I didn't take time to find out.
It is suggested that.	I think.
It is believed that	
It may be that	
It is generally believed that	A couple of other guys think so too.
It might be argued that	I have such a good answer to this objection that I shall now raise it.
It is clear that much additional work will be required before a complete understanding	I don't understand it.
Unfortunately, a quantitative theory to account for these effects has not been formulated	Neither does anybody else.
Correct within an order of magnitude	Wrong.
It is to be hoped that this work will stimulate other work in the field	This paper isn't very good, but neither are any of the others in this miserable subject.

From C. B. Graham Jr., Metal Progress, 1957