CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-40139-5 — The Biomedical Writer
Yellowlees Douglas , Maria B. Grant
Index
More Information

Index

abstracts
  approach to writing, 81–83
  structured or unstructured, 82–83
Academia.edu, 2, 31
active construction of sentences, 8
  preferred to passive construction, 8–9
  sentence construction in the methods section, 9–10
American Journal of Gastroenterology, 41
American Psychological Association (APA) reference style, 40
Apple AirDrop, 134
Aristotle, 4
Asana, 132, 134, 135
ASAP registration, 95
Associated Press, 151
association, associated
  correct usage, 74

BibTeX, 40
Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA) funding (US), 92, 123
British Journal of General Practice, 58
British Medical Journal (BMJ), 39, 72, 171
BuzzFeed.com, 173

Carbon, 71
Cardiovascular Endocrinology, 6, 8, 12, 14
case reports, 43
case series, 43
case study
  overcoming disciplinary understandings, 30–31
causation, causal
  correct usage, 74
Cell, 11, 39
Chicago short (author-date) reference style, 40
Chicago Tribune, 153
clarity
  making sentences easy to read, 8
clarity principles
  avoid using expletives, 11–12
  avoid using isolated pronouns as grammatical objects, 10
  prefer action verbs, 11
  prefer active to passive construction, 8–9
  prefer actors or concrete objects as grammatical subjects, 10
  sentence construction in the methods section, 9–10
classifying research
  according to anticipated outcomes, 27–32
coherence
  contextual cues and framing, 17–18
  priming, primacy, and recency effects, 16–18
coherence principles
  head–body–foot structure for documents and sections of documents, 19–20
  head–body–foot structure for paragraphs, 19
  head sentences, 18
  making use of dead zones in documents, 20–21
cohort studies, 43
collaborative writing
  delivering unpleasant news, 137
  effective communication between team members, 135–37
  face-to-face meetings, 136
  game play model, 123
  Gantt charts, 132

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-40139-5 — The Biomedical Writer
Yellowlees Douglas , Maria B. Grant
Index
More Information

getting your name on papers, 139–40
helping others meet deadlines, 132–34
Hofstadter's Law, 129–30
horizontal-division writing, 123
identify team members' strengths, 124–25
lack of literature on biomedical writing, 122–23
lying about deadlines, 129–30
methods of tracking progress, 132–35
models for, 123–24
nature of biomedical writing, 122–23
parallel writing, 123
Parkinson's Law, 129–30
planning fallacy, 130
productivity under deadline, 135
questionnaire on team member strengths and weaknesses, 130–31
reactive writing, 123
relay model, 122–24
sequential writing, 123
skills required to produce a manuscript, 122
software to facilitate, 132–35
stratified-division writing, 123
team leader role, 130
team member types, 126–28
use of email, 136–37
use of messaging and texting, 136
collaborators
criteria for choosing, 96
communicating with the public, 141
communicating guidelines and recommendations, 143–50
effectiveness of a good press release, 156–57
getting results out to a mass audience, 150–53
pay-to-play journals, 168–69
power of paradox, 163–68
press release structure and content, 169–73
readability of consent forms, 141–43
what makes news, 153–55
write like a reporter, 157–63
confounding effects
elimination from your study design, 26–27
CONSORT guidelines, 32
contextual cues, 17–18
continuity
reading sentences, 12–13
continuity principles
sequencing to link sentences, 14–15
use of transitions to connect sentences, 15–16
using the emphasis position, 13–14
Control Freak team member, 126
correlation, correlated
correct usage, 74
cover letter
importance when submitting for publication, 80
cross-disciplinary analyses, 44
cross-reference function in software, 112

dead zones in documents
making use of, 20–21
deadlines
helping others meet deadlines, 132–34
influence on productivity, 135
lying to team members about, 129–30
Department of Defence (US)
biomedical research funding, 91–92
Department of Health and Human Services (US)
BARDA funding, 92
discussion section, 20, 71–80
avoid hedging your findings, 78–80
first paragraph, 75
framing it paragraph by paragraph, 74–80
handling weaknesses and limitations, 78
making discussions more accessible, 72–74
rhetoric and argumentation, 76–78
rhetorical structure, 71–72
second paragraph, 75–76
terms to characterize findings, 74
what to include, 71–72
writing challenges, 71–72

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-40139-5 — The Biomedical Writer
Yellowlees Douglas , Maria B. Grant
Index
More Information

documents
  head–body–foot structure for entire documents and sections, 19–20
  making use of dead zones, 20–21
Douglas' Law, 129
Dropbox, 132, 134, 135
Duns & Bradstreet Data Universal Number (DUNS), 95
Dweck, Carol S., 116–17, 126

eCommons registration, 95
Economist, The, 119, 173
Electronic HandBook (EHB) registration, 96
email
  avoiding ongoing exchanges, 137
  between collaborative writing team members, 136
  descriptive subject line, 136–37
  efficient use of, 136–37
  keep messages brief, 136
  structure, 137
EndNote, 40
Erasmus, 4
expert opinion papers, 44
expletives
  avoid using in sentences, 11–12
extramural funding, 89–90
eye saccades, 7

Fastlane system
  registration process, 95
FedConnect registration, 95
figures to help a submission achieve publication, 83
  inclusion in grant applications, 104
  use in the results section, 68–69
first author advantages, 139–40
first-ever studies, 29
fixed mindset, 116–17, 126
focus required for writing, 23–24
framing, 17–18
Free-Rider team member, 127
funding sources, 89–93

gambits, *see* writing gambits
game play model of collaborative writing, 123
Gantt charts, 127, 132
garden path sentences, 7–8
gatekeepers
  influence on submissions for publication, 80
Google Docs, 97, 132, 134, 135
Google Scholar, 31, 40, 41–42
Google Sheets, 132
grant applications, 87–121
  approach to writing, 110–12
  attitudes toward challenges and setbacks, 115–17
  avoid dependent aims within specific aims, 102
  begin with the *why*, 99–100
  benefits of mentoring, 97–98
  career progression linked to grant funding achieved, 87–88
  cast a wide but highly-targeted net for funding programs, 88
  choose collaborators based on expertise and grant history, 96
  clarity of the final draft, 104–05
  contact the grant program officers early, 114–15
  dealing with writer's block, 115
  exercise compression, 101
  follow proposal guidelines closely, 94
  getting to know potential peer reviewers, 110
  grant application cycles, 94
  identify implications for clinical practice, public health or commercialization, 106–09
  inclusion of graphics or figures, 104
  increasing odds of renewal or future funding, 117
  influence of type of anticipated outcome, 94–95
  odds of receiving funding on a first application, 115–17
  online submission procedures, 95–96

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-40139-5 — The Biomedical Writer
Yellowlees Douglas , Maria B. Grant
Index
More Information

peer reviewers' approach to assessment, 104–05, 109–10
reading the FOA, RFP or PA, 88–89
registering for online submission, 95–96
registering to use the Fastlane system, 95
renewal of an existing grant, 101–02
responding to comments on, 119–21
rhetorical and argumentative strategies, 99–101
scrutinize funding criteria, 88–89
sources of funding, 89–93
specific aims section, 102
status associated with grant funding, 87–88
strategies for resubmission, 115–17
strategy to climb the grant-funding ladder, 96–97
structure and content of each section, 98–105
study examples of successful applications, 88–89
time required to register for online submission, 95–96
types of grants, 89–93
use of priming, primacy, and recency effects, 105–06
use of software cross-reference function, 112
Grant Lab, 83, 100, 101, 102, 103, 108
grants
types of, 89–93
grounded theory, 44
growth mindset, 116–17
Guardian, The, 173
guidelines for submissions to journals, 32

Harvard Business Review, 135
head sentence, 18
head–body–foot structure
for documents and sections of documents, 19–20
for paragraphs, 19
Hofstadter's Law, 129–30
horizontal-division writing, 123
Huffington Post, 156, 173
hypothesis, 20
compared to thesis, 48–51
placement and size within the Introduction section, 48
hypothesis papers, 44

iCloud, 134
iconicity assumption, 8
images
going beyond, 2–3
to help a submission achieve publication, 83
IMRaD (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion), *see also* introduction section; methods section; results section; discussion section, 3
incidental findings with dramatic implications for diagnosis or treatment, 29
incremental improvements in knowledge, diagnosis or intervention, 28
inferential processing stage of reading, 12–21
informed consent
participant understanding of consent forms, 141–43
Ingelfinger rule, 2
Intelligent Agreer team member, 126
International Journal of Sports Medicine, 164
intramural funding, 89
introduction section, 20, 44–59
avoid Big Bang beginnings, 45–46
errors to avoid, 44–45
establishing omissions or limitations in existing literature, 46
establishing the significance of your topic, 46
hypothesis, 48–51
length of, 46
opening paragraph, 47–48
paragraph structure, 48–52
placement and length of hypothesis statement, 48

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-40139-5 — The Biomedical Writer
Yellowlees Douglas , Maria B. Grant
Index
More Information

introduction section (*cont.*)
qualitative research articles, 57–58
review articles, 59
rhetorical strategy, 46–48
rhetorical structure, 48
thesis, 48–51
writing gambits, 52–54
examples, 54–57

Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), 39, 171
journals
aims and scope, 38–39
avoid pay-to-play journals, 168–69
getting your submission past the gatekeepers, 80
guidelines for submissions, 32
high-impact-factor journals, 39
reference styles, 40
specifications for submissions, 38–39

Lancet, 30, 39, 171
Lancet Neurology, 47
Lanson, Gerald, 153
lay audiences, *see* communicating with the public
lexical stage of reading, 7–12
literature search
Google Scholar, 41–42

Marshall, Barry, 30–31
Master Delegator team member, 127–28
media relations
effectiveness of a good press release, 156–57
getting your results out to a mass audience, 150–53
harnessing the power of paradox, 163–68
press release structure and content, 169–73
what makes news, 153–55
write like a reporter, 157–63
Medical Journal of Australia, 30
Medical Research Council (UK) funding programs, 93
memory
role in reading, 13–14
mentors
assumptions about mentees' ability to write articles, 43
benefiting from their track record and connections, 37
expanding your networking opportunities, 35–36
finding a mentor, 34
influence on your career progression, 34–37
invited submissions from, 35
review paper collaboration with, 35
suggesting as peer reviewers, 36–37
working with mentees on grant applications, 97–98
meta-analyses, 43
results section, 69
methods section, 60–67
approaches to writing, 60–62
avoid recipe or narrative style, 65–66
basic inclusion and exclusion criteria for your study, 62
errors to avoid, 65–66
pre-empting peer reviewers' objections, 60–62
preferred terms, 62
purposes, 60
sample size, 66–67
sentence construction, 9–10
use of who, what, when, where, and how, 63–65
use subheadings to enhance readability, 66
what to include, 62
Microsoft OneDrive, 134
Microsoft Word
cross-reference function, 112
Track Changes function, 134
Modern Language Association (MLA) reference style, 40

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-40139-5 — The Biomedical Writer
Yellowlees Douglas , Maria B. Grant
Index
More Information

National Institutes of Health (NIH) (US), 30
  funding programs, 90–91
National Science Foundation (NSF) (US) grants, 91
natural history studies, 44
Nature, 11, 29, 39, 53, 54, 81, 83, 124, 165–67
negative studies, 43
  submission for publication, 41
networking
  importance for career development, 35–36
  opportunities provided by mentors, 35–36
New England Journal of Medicine, 39, 171, 172, 173
New York Times, 119, 151, 153, 173
New Yorker, 173
NHS National Institute for Health Research (UK) funding programs, 93
Nisus Writer
  cross-reference function, 112
  Track Changes function, 134

Open Source publication, 169

paradigm-shifting breakthroughs, 30–32
  work on *H. pylori* by Warren and Marshall, 30–31
paradoxes
  harnessing the power of, 163–68
  writing gambits, 52–57
paragraphs
  begin paragraphs with a head sentence, 18
  head–body–foot structure, 19
  topic sentence, 18
parallel writing, 123
Parkinson's Law, 129–30
passive construction of sentences, 8
  active construction preferred to, 8–9
  sentence construction in the methods section, 9–10
Pearson's coefficient, 74
peer reviewers
  approach to grant application assessment, 104–05, 109–10
  choosing, 83
  considering potential objections from, 25–27
  getting to know potential reviewers of grant proposals, 110
  pre-empting objections from, 60–62
  suggesting mentors as, 36–37
Pinker, Steven, 4
planning fallacy, 130
PLoS One, 39, 169
Portfolio Analysis & Management System (PAMS) registration, 95
prediction
  role in reading, 7–8
preferred terms, 62
press releases, 53
  effectiveness of a good press release, 156–57
  harnessing the power of paradox, 163–68
  structure and content, 169–73
  write like a reporter, 157–63
primacy effect, 13, 16–18, 20
  sequencing, 14–15
  use in grant applications, 105–06
priming effect, 16–18, 49, 67, 99, 173
  use in grant applications, 105–06
PRISMA guidelines, 32
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 15
progressing your career
  focus required for writing, 23–24
  getting your name on papers, 139–40
  resilience and resubmissions, 85–86
  responding to comments on grants and manuscripts, 119–21
  why you need a mentor, 34–37
pronouns
  avoid using isolated pronouns as grammatical objects, 10
prospective analyses, 43
public, communicating with, *see* communicating with the public

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-40139-5 — The Biomedical Writer
Yellowlees Douglas , Maria B. Grant
Index
More Information

publication, *see* submissions for publication
PubMed, 2, 40, 158, 169
  algorithms, 42

qualitative research
  introduction section, 57–58
  types of studies, 43–44
quantitative research
  types of studies, 43
questionnaire
  team member strengths and weaknesses, 130–31

randomized controlled trials, 43
reactive writing, 123
Reader's Brain, The, 5, 86
reading
  challenges for the reader, 5–7
  contextual cues and framing, 17–18
  continuity between sentences, 12–13
  garden path sentences, 7–8
  inferential processing stage, 12–21
  lexical stage, 7–12
  making sentences easy to read, 8
  primacy effect, 13
  recency effect, 13
  recognizing individual words, 7–8
  research on the reading brain, 4–5
  retrospecting, 6
  role of memory, 13–14
  role of prediction, 6, 7–8
  syntactic stage, 7–12
  three phases in reading comprehension, 4, 5–7
recency effect, 13, 16–18, 20, 49
  sequencing, 14–15
  use in grant applications, 105–06
Reddit, 173
reference management software, 40
reference styles, 40
RefMan, 40
RefWorks, 40
rejection
  attitudes toward challenges and setbacks, 115–17
  considering potential objections from peer reviewers, 25–27
  reasons why manuscripts are rejected, 71
  resilience and resubmissions, 85–86
relay model of collaborative writing, 122–24
research outcomes
  classifying research according to anticipated outcomes, 27–32
  first-ever studies, 29
  handling controversial findings (case study), 30–31
  incidental findings with dramatic implications for diagnosis or treatment, 29
  incremental improvements in knowledge, diagnosis or intervention, 28
  paradigm-shifting breakthroughs, 30–32
  using outcome categories to increase likelihood of publication, 32–33
research studies
  eligibility for publication of different types, 43–44
research.gov, 95
ResearchGate, 2, 31
results section, 67–71
  approach to writing, 67–69
  avoid writing around *p*-values, 70
  errors to avoid, 70
  meta-analyses, 69
  systematic reviews, 69
  use of figures and tables, 68–69
  use of subheadings, 67
retrospective analyses, 43
Reuters, 151
review articles, 44
  Introduction section, 59
review papers
  approach to writing, 44
  invitations to collaborate on, 35
Richards, I.A., 17, 18
Royal Society (UK) funding, 93

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-40139-5 — The Biomedical Writer
Yellowlees Douglas , Maria B. Grant
Index
More Information

sample size, 66–67
Science, 39, 53, 124
sentences
  active construction, 8
  active preferred to passive construction, 8–9
  avoiding expletives, 11–12
  avoiding isolated pronouns as grammatical objects, 10
  construction in the methods section, 9–10
  continuity between, 12–13
  making easy to read, 8
  passive construction, 8
  prefer action verbs, 11
  prefer actors or concrete objects as grammatical subjects, 10
  put important information in sentence emphasis position, 13–14
  use of sequencing for continuity, 14–15
  use of transitions to connect, 15–16
sequencing
  for continuity between sentences, 14–15
sequential writing, 123
Skype, 135, 136, 137
Small Business Administration (SBA.gov), 95
Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) grants (NSF), 91
Small Business Technology Transfer (SBTTR) grants (NSF), 91
Social Science & Medicine, 58
Spearman's coefficient, 74
STARD guidelines, 32
statistical significance, 74
Stephens, Mitchell, 153
stratified-division writing, 123
STREGA guidelines, 32
STROBE guidelines, 32
study design
  due diligence on existing publications and knowledge, 40–42
  elimination of potential confounders, 26–27
  framing with publication submission in mind, 42–44
  guidelines for submissions to journals, 32
subject–verb–object (SVO) order in English, 8
submissions for publication
  abstracts, 81–83
  answering 'So what?' and 'Who cares?' questions, 32–33
  avoid pay-to-play journals, 168–69
  choosing peer reviewers, 83
  considering guidelines for submissions to journals, 32
  considering potential objections from peer reviewers, 25–27
  discussion section, 71–80
  due diligence on existing publications and knowledge, 40–42
  eligibility of different types of research studies, 43–44
  first author advantages, 139–40
  framing your study design according to the Introduction, 42–44
  getting past gate-keepers, 80
  images can help achieve publication, 83
  importance of the cover letter, 80
  introduction section, 44–59
  methods section, 60–67
  negative studies, 41
  reasons why manuscripts are rejected, 71
  resilience and resubmissions, 85–86
  responding to comments on, 119–21
  results section, 67–71
  review papers, 44
  revise your manuscript to meet different journal requirements, 40
  types of qualitative research studies, 43–44
  types of quantitative research studies, 43
  use of reference management software, 40
  using outcome categories to increase likelihood of publication, 32–33

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-40139-5 — The Biomedical Writer
Yellowlees Douglas , Maria B. Grant
Index
More Information

submissions for publication (*cont.*)
  volunteering to write the paper, 139–40
  writing headings and subheadings first, 45
  writing to journal specifications, 38–39
syntactic stage of reading, 7–12
syntax, 7
System for Award Management (SAM), 95
systematic reviews, 43
  results section, 69

tables
  use in the results section, 68–69
takeaways
  collaborative writing, 137–38
  communicating guidelines and recommendations, 174
  communicating with the public, 174
  effective writing and the three Cs, 21–22
  framing your research, 33
  getting your research published, 84
  grant applications, 117–18
  informed consent, 174
  submissions for publication, 84
  writing press releases, 174
team leader role, 130
team member types, 126–28
  Control Freak, 126
  Free-Rider, 127
  Intelligent Agree-er, 126
  Master Delegator, 127–28
  Work Horse, 127
team members
  questionnaire on strengths and weaknesses, 130–31
teamwork
  planning fallacy, 130
terminology
  use of association, associated, 74
  use of causation, causal, 74
  use of correlation, correlated, 74
thesis
  compared to hypothesis, 48–51
topic sentence, 18
transitions
  using to connect sentences, 15–16
trolls, 119
Tumblr, 173

unpleasant news
  mode of delivery, 137

verbs
  non-action verbs, 11
  prefer action verbs, 11
vocabulary
  avoiding the use of synonyms, 16
  consistency of word choice, 16

Warren, Robin, 30–31
Washington Post, 151
Wellcome Trust (UK) funding, 93
words
  recognizing individual words when reading, 7–8
Work Horse team member, 127
writer's block, 45
  dealing with, 115
writing
  answering 'So what?' and 'Who cares?' questions, 32–33
  as a neglected skill, 1–2
  classify research according to anticipated outcomes, 27–32
  consider guidelines for submissions to journals, 32
  considerations before you start, 25–27
  dearth of core knowledge on, 4
  elimination of potential confounding effects, 26–27
  focus required for, 23–24
  research on the reading brain, 4–5
  traditional advice on, 4
  using outcome categories to increase likelihood of publication, 32–33
  See also submissions for publication, 27
writing gambits, 52–54
  examples, 54–57

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org