**Contribution to the field**

Bayesian methods are gaining popularity, not only due to recent criticism of the Frequentist approach, which is mostly associated with the misuse and misinterpretation of *p*-values, but also for its possibilities to incorporate information from different sources and to easily derive probability statements for every quantity of interest. Yet, the Frequentist framework is often used and taught by default in psychology, because of its ability to provide familiar indices such as *p-*values or confidence intervals, which is useful to apprehend the structure and relationships present in the data. In contrast, the Bayesian frameworks provides several indices, and no consensus has yet emerged on the ones to use, as no comparison has been done yet. After comparing and discussing these indices, we suggest that both the *existence* (in terms of clear direction of an effect) and *significance* (in terms of strength of an effect) need to be reported. We therefore propose indices that reflect these properties and provide guidelines of how to describe results within the Bayesian framework. The results contribute to the development of an intuitive understanding of the values that researchers report, allowing to draw sensible recommendations for Bayesian statistics description, critical for the standardization of scientific reporting.