The Write Stuff

Boosting your writing into a higher orbit

In this issue...

Using Research Resource Identifiers (RRIDs) to enhance rigor and reproducibility

– Amy Ninetto

Researchers, journal editors, and funding agencies have identified inconsistency in the reporting of methods as an impediment to the transparency and reproducibility of biomedical research (1,2). Traditionally, authors have been asked to provide the names and locations of the manufacturers or suppliers of key pieces of equipment and reagents, and perhaps a catalog number. While that information can be helpful to readers, more specificity may be needed to make the reported experiments truly reproducible. Moreover, over time, the names of suppliers change because of corporate mergers, companies go out of business, catalog numbers change, products are discontinued, and memories fail, making it difficult for readers to precisely identify the key resources used in research published just a few years earlier.

To address these challenges in methods reporting, the [Resource Identification Initiative](#) (RII) proposed the creation of a simple, unique, persistent alphanumeric identifier for research resources. This Research Resource Identifier (RRID) consists of the prefix "RRID," a tag identifying the type of resource, and a unique identifier. For example, RRID: AB_90755 points to an unconjugated sheep anti-tyrosine hydroxylase polyclonal antibody (indicated by "AB") manufactured by Millipore. Currently, RRIDs are available for antibodies, cell lines, plasmids, model organisms, and tools such as software and databases.

The RII argues that RRIDs are better than manufacturers' catalog numbers because RRIDs are stable, machine readable, free to generate and access, and consistent across journals (3,4). For example, were RRIDs to be universally used, a researcher wanting to know how a model organism has been used could search for its RRID. Searching by RRID would be more comprehensive than searching for a catalog number, as different vendors use different numbers for, say, nude mice (4).

To find an RRID, visit the RRID portal at [scicrunch.org/resources](#). If you can't find an RRID for a resource, you can add one from that page. The RII does not itself maintain the databases it uses to create RRIDs; instead, whenever a researcher registers a new resource in an existing database (for example, [Addgene](#) for plasmids or [Cellosaurus](#) for cell lines), an RRID is automatically generated.

Many biomedical science journals are now encouraging the use of RRIDs, including journals published by Elsevier, Wiley, Springer Nature, BioMed Central, PLOS, the American Association for Cancer Research, and Cell Press. As always, authors should check their target journal's current instructions to be sure that they are complying with all rigor and reproducibility standards as they evolve. While NIH does not require the use of RRIDs in grant proposals, providing them can be one way to demonstrate attention to [NIH's Rigor and Reproducibility](#) initiatives.

To cite an RRID in your paper or proposal, we recommend using this format:

> name of resource (vendor, catalog number [if available]; RRID)

Examples:

> MDA-MB-231 cells (ATCC, cat# ATCC HTB-26; RRID: CVCL_0062) were cultured for 24 h.

> Six-week-old male NOD.Cg-$Prkdc^{scid}$ $Il2rg^{tm1Wjl}$/SzJ mice (The Jackson Laboratory, cat# 005557; RRID: IMSR_JAX:005557) were used for the xenograft experiments.

> Images were processed using ImageJ software, version 1.52p (ImageJ; RRID: SCR_003070).

Note: Scientific publishers seem to be moving away from including company locations, so we recommend including the city, state, and country only if the journal instructions specifically require this information.

One disadvantage of RRIDs is that, because they are usually found in the full text of articles, they are not reliably searchable in PubMed, which includes many journals with paywalls. However, PubMed Central and Google Scholar, which index openly available full-text articles, can be used to search for RRIDs (4).

References

1. Baker M. 1,500 scientists lift the lid on reproducibility. Nature 2016;533:452-454. doi: 10.1038/533452a

2. Begley CG, Ioannidis JPA. Reproducibility in science: Improving the standard for basic and preclinical research. Circ Res 2015;116:116-126. doi: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.114.303819

3. Bandrowski AE, Martone ME. RRIDs: A simple step toward improving reproducibility through rigor and transparency of experimental methods. Neuron 2016;90:434-436. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2016.04.030

4. Bandrowski A, Brush M, Grethe JS, et al. The Resource Identification Initiative: A cultural shift in publishing. Brain Behav 2016;6:e00417. doi: 10.1002/brb3.417

Court ruling sheds light on publishing giant OMICS International

– Joe Munch

Earlier this year, a U.S. federal judge found publishing giant OMICS International to be in violation of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Act and ordered the company to pay the FTC more than $50 million in restitution for deceiving researchers who published in its journals and attended its conferences. The ruling confirmed that OMICS International engaged in predatory publishing practices.

The court's summary judgment stems from a complaint that the FTC, in its capacity as a consumer advocate, initially brought against OMICS International (including its subsidiaries iMedPub, LTD, and Conference Series, LLC) in August 2016 under Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, which prohibits "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce." The FTC alleged, and the court's ruling affirmed, that OMICS misrepresented the nature of its journals, publishing practices, and conferences.

In particular:

- OMICS claimed that all manuscripts submitted to its journals underwent rigorous peer review, when in fact most were given only a cursory review, if any;

- OMICS listed among its expert reviewers and editors individuals who had not agreed to be affiliated with its journals, and in some cases, it continued to list individuals who had requested that their names be removed;

- OMICS represented that its journals had high Thompson Reuters (now Clarivate) impact factors, when in fact these "impact factors" were the company's own invention, calculated using Google Scholar data;

- OMICS indicated that its journals were indexed in reputable indexing services, including MEDLINE and PubMed, when in fact they were not;

- OMICS failed to adequately disclose publication fees and related fees and in some cases disclosed such fees only after articles were accepted for publication;

- OMICS denied authors' requests to withdraw their articles, preventing authors from publishing in other journals; and

- OMICS, in promoting its conferences, used the names of people who had not agreed to be associated with the conferences and in some instances had no knowledge that their names were being used.

Noting that OMICS "did not participate in an isolated, discrete incident of deceptive publishing" but instead continuously deceived researchers over several years, the court also issued a permanent injunction prohibiting OMICS from engaging in the above activities. The injunction does not ban OMICS from publishing or from hosting conferences, nor does it require OMICS to implement a rigorous peer review process.

However, the court did order that OMICS must "clearly and conspicuously" disclose all costs associated with manuscript submission and publication. In addition—assuming no change in the company's publishing model—OMICS must explicitly state that manuscripts will not undergo rigorous peer review and that authors will not be able to withdraw their manuscripts submitted for publication. OMICS must also clearly disclose the sources and calculation methods of any impact factors it assigns to its journals. Finally, OMICS must obtain the express written consent of any person named as an editor or reviewer of one of its journals or described as being associated with one of its conferences, and the company must share this consent with the FTC.

Whether OMICS will comply with the court's order and whether the FTC will be able to collect the $50 million from the India-based company remains unclear. (If OMICS fails to comply, the FTC has asserted that it will take action to have the company's journals taken offline.) OMICS has vowed to appeal the decision.

Bibliography

Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 41-58). http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title15-chapter2-subchapter1&edition=prelim. Accessed July 3, 2019.

Federal Trade Commission v. OMICS Group Inc. No. 2:16-cv-02022. D. Nev. August 25, 2016. https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/cases/160826omicscmpt.pdf. Accessed July 3, 2019.

Federal Trade Commission v. OMICS Group Inc. No. 2:16-cv-02022-GMN-VCF. D. Nev. March 29, 2019. https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/cases/de_121_-_omics_order_granting_summary_judgment.pdf. Accessed July 3, 2019.

Kolata G. The price for 'predatory' publishing? $50 million. *New York Times.* April 3, 2019. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/03/science/predatory-journals-ftc-omics.html. Accessed July 3, 2019.

For more information about predatory publishing:

Deming S. Choosing a Journal (webinar).

Gann L. Predatory Publishing Practices (webinar).

Hale K. Information Security's "questionable journal" initiative flags potentially predatory publishers and sponsors. *The Write Stuff.* Winter 2018; volume 15, no. 1.

Tutt B. Unusual terms used in scientific writing and publishing: Predatory journals, misleading metrics, and other publishing hazards. *The Write Stuff.* Winter 2017; volume 14, no. 1.

Manuscript presentation tips to improve the peer review process

– Erica Goodoff

When you submit a manuscript to a journal, you may not realistically expect the manuscript to be accepted immediately for publication, but you do hope for useful feedback from the reviewers. Although ideally reviewers' comments focus on the content of a manuscript, sometimes the format or presentation of the content can get in the way of that. Michael White, a senior editor at *Nature*, recently wrote about certain aspects of manuscript presentation that can confuse reviewers and may hinder them from properly analyzing the scientific content of the manuscript, thus delaying publication, or possibly even review, of your manuscript. He offered suggestions for preparing manuscripts clearly so that reviewers can focus on the scientific content. You can read the full article here.

Below is a summary of White's suggestions that can be applied broadly. Although White was writing specifically about how to submit manuscripts to *Nature*, many of his suggestions apply to biomedical manuscripts intended for publication in any journal. However, if a journal has specific instructions that differ from the suggestions below, be sure to follow the journal's instructions.

Formatting and layout

Line spacing*:* In general, wide spacing (such as double or 1.5-line spacing) is easier to read than single spacing.

Font size: Standard font sizes are easier to read than overly large or small ones. White recommends using a font size that will produce about 12-15 words per line of text in a single-column layout, which usually means 11- or 12-point font sizes for standard fonts such as Times New Roman or Arial.

Line numbering: Continuous line numbering allows reviewers to refer to the line numbers to make specific comments about the text. However, some journals request that line numbering not be used in the manuscript file (sometimes the software on the submission page automatically adds the line numbers in a pdf file).

Figure placement: White suggests placing figures and legends within the text where they are mentioned, at least for the initial review. However, many journals require figures to be submitted as separate files or placed at the end of the manuscript.

Writing style

Subjective wording: Subjective or "editorializing" language should be avoided in scientific papers, particularly in the Results section of a paper. White recommends not using words such as "unprecedented," "amazing," or "interesting" and instead allowing readers—and reviewers—to determine the merit of the work on their own.

Acronyms and abbreviations: Unless an abbreviation is very widely known and accepted across fields (e.g., "DNA"), it needs to be defined the first time it is used. Generally, abbreviations should be used only if they appear in the text at least five times. This will allow the abbreviation to save space in the text. If an abbreviation is used fewer than five times, the space-saving benefit of the abbreviation may be outweighed by a potential drawback: readers who come across the second and subsequent uses of the abbreviation may not remember what it stands for and may have to go back through the article to find where the abbreviation was defined.

Precise wording: In descriptions of data relationships that imply a direction, it is best to choose a word that precisely describes the direction of the relationship. Words such as "influence" or "affect" are less informative to a reader than "increase" or "decrease."

Statistical terms: The word "significant" should be used only in the context of results of a statistical test. In all other cases, a synonym such as "substantial" or "major" will prevent confusion with statistical results.

Abstracts: White suggests following the *Nature*-specific abstract template. Some other journals provide similar templates or may provide specific instructions for what to include in the abstract. As a general rule, using subheadings in an abstract can help ensure that all necessary information is included in the abstract.

Data and figures

Uncertainties: If the figure is a graph showing error bars, the figure legend should include an explanation of what the error bars represent (e.g., standard deviation, 95% confidence intervals).

Color and visual effects: Many journals now allow figures to appear in full color without extra charge. This is helpful for photographs; however, in charts and graphs, unnecessary use of color can be distracting or may even hinder interpretation of the results, especially for readers with visual impairments. It is often best to choose only one or two colors and use shades of that color when appropriate. Similarly, 3D or shadowing effects can often be distracting and are best avoided.

Source

White M. How small changes to a paper can help to smooth the review process. *Nature*. 1 May 2019; doi: 10.1038/d41586-019-01431-z.

How to insert Greek letters, symbols, and other special characters in Word documents

– *Kathryn Hale*

Greek letters, symbols, and other special characters are essential for clear and accurate communication of scientific information to a global readership. Although you may be tempted to substitute simpler characters when preparing your Word documents, use of the correct character signals to readers and reviewers that you are careful and attentive to details in your work.

Fortunately, inserting the correct character is easy and quick when you know how. Here are the steps to inserting a symbol or special character into a Word document:

1. Position the cursor in the document where you want the character to appear.

2. Click on the Insert tab of the ribbon (menu bar).

3. In the menu that appears, click on "Ω" or "Ω Symbol" (Windows) or "Ω Advanced Symbol" (Mac).

4. In the pop-up box that appears, select the character you want. If you are working in a Windows version of Word, the character will appear at the selected location in the document and the pop-up box will disappear. If you are working on a Mac version, after selecting the character you want, click on the "Insert" button in the lower right corner of the pop-up box. The character will appear at the selected location in the document. Then click the "Close" button to close the pop-up box.

If you use specific Greek letters, symbols, or other special characters very often, you can create shortcuts to those specific characters, but for occasional use, the method outlined above is the simplest.

The pop-up Symbol box includes Greek letters such as alpha (α), beta (β), gamma (γ), and mu (μ), both uppercase and lowercase; common mathematical symbols that do not appear on the standard keyboard (for example, $°, \pm, \times, \neq, \approx, \leq, \geq, ', \cong, \div$); and common typographical characters that do not appear on the standard keyboard (for example, footnote symbols, arrows, ellipses, and copyright and trademark symbols).

Diacritical marks are a special case. These are the accents (acute or grave), circumflex, umlaut, and other marks that guide pronunciation. These are generally not used in English except for words that are borrowed from other languages (Señor, soupçon), personal names (Zoë, László), and a few special cases. However, when using such words or names in your writing, the diacritical marks should be used.

Steps in using diacritical marks:

1. Follow steps 1-3 above.

2. If you are working on a Windows version, click "Ω More Symbols"; the font box should say "normal text."

3. If you are working on a Mac version, use the font menu in the pop-up box to select "normal text" (or the font you are working in).

4. For both versions, select the character/diacritical mark you want. Click on the "Insert" button. The character will appear at the selected location in the document. Click on the "Close" button to close the pop-up box.

Don't hesitate to contact Scientific Publications Services at 713-792-3305 or scientificpublications@mdanderson.org should you have any questions about using special characters in your Word document.

Changes to Plan S give researchers and publishers time to adapt

– Amy Ninetto

In the Spring 2019 issue of *The Write Stuff*, we reported on Plan S, an initiative of a coalition of European research funding agencies to mandate open access publishing by January 2020. The aims of Plan S are to dismantle the current subscription-based model of scientific publishing, which places research results behind expensive paywalls, and to make publicly funded research accessible to everyone. While researchers, publishers, and academic institutions have expressed broad support for Plan S's principles, many raised criticisms of the implementation plan. In particular, many stakeholders were concerned that the timeline for enforcing the open-access mandate was too short. European scientists raised concerns that they would be barred from publishing in highly prestigious international journals that do not use an open-access model. Smaller publishers, especially professional societies that publish journals, argued that they might not be able to continue operating without revenue from subscription fees.

In response to this feedback, cOAlition S, the group of funders sponsoring Plan S, has revised the Plan S implementation plan. Most notably, the target date for enforcing Plan S's open-access mandate has been pushed back 1 year, from January 2020 to January 2021. Several other changes have also been made to the implementation plan:

- cOAlition S will support a wider range of "transformative arrangements"—plans to transform current subscription-based journals into open-access venues. Publication of cOAlition S–funded research in journals with these arrangements will now be supported until 2024 (previously 2023).

- Proposed caps on open-access publishing fees (also called article processing charges), which are typically paid by authors or funders, have been lifted (at least for now) in response to concerns from publishers. A requirement that journals be transparent about the cost of publishing has been added.

- cOAlition S funders have agreed to make funding decisions without taking into account the prestige of the journals in which applicants publish. This change was made in response to scientists who pointed out that the professional reward systems governing hiring, funding, promotion, and tenure in academic science still demand publication in high-impact journals, many of which are not compliant with Plan S.

- Plan S will now, in some cases, allow the use of open-access licenses that are more restrictive than the Creative Commons BY license required in the first version of the plan. This change would give authors more control over how their work can be reused; for instance, authors could restrict reuse to noncommercial purposes.

Sources

Akst J. Open-access program Plan S relaxes rules. The Scientist, May 31, 2019. Accessed July 19, 2019. www.the-scientist.com/news-opinion/open-access-program-plan-s-relaxes-rules-65955

cOAlition S. Rationale for the revisions made to the Plan S principles and implementation guidance. Published May 31, 2019. Accessed July 19, 2019. www.coalition-s.org/rationale-for-the-revisions/

Else H. Ambitious open-access Plan S delayed to let research community adapt. Nature, May 30, 2019. Accessed July 19, 2019. doi: 10.1038/d41586-019-01717-2

Unusual terms used in scientific writing and publishing: Hanging indent

– Bryan Tutt

"Hanging indent" (sometimes called the flush-and-hang style) refers to the paragraph style in which the first line of text is flush left (i.e., at the left margin) and the remaining lines are indented (1). The hanging indent is most often used in indexes and glossaries rather than paragraphs of text. *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* uses the hanging indent for its entries, as shown in the examples below (2).

Canada Day *n* (1950): July 1 observed as a legal holiday in commemoration of the proclamation of dominion status in 1867

Canada goose *n* (1731): the common wild goose (*Branta canadensis*) of North America that is chiefly gray and brownish with black head and neck and a white patch running from the sides of the head under the throat

Some scientific and academic journals, notably those that follow the American Psychological Association style, use the hanging indent for reference lists (3). However, most biomedical journals use the Vancouver reference style, which calls for a numbered list (4). A numbered list, when configured with the number flush left and the remaining text indented, looks like a hanging indent but is formatted differently in Microsoft Word and other word processing and design programs. Reference management software such as End Note can help you format references according to a particular journal's style. If you are compiling your reference list manually, online guides are available to help you format text with a [hanging indent](#) or as a [numbered list](#) in Microsoft Word.

References

1. *The Chicago Manual of Style.* 17th ed. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press; 2017: 32, 980.

2. *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th ed. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster; 2003: 178.

3. *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 6th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2010: 37.

4. *AMA Manual of Style*, 10th ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2007: 40-41.

Upcoming events for authors

Please see the [Scientific Publications](#) website for more information on our educational courses.

Short Courses in Scientific English for Non-Native Speakers of English. Courses last 7 weeks and meet twice a week for 1 or 1.5 hours each day. Classes are held early in the morning, during the lunch hour, or late in the afternoon. Classes are free of charge. Participants

must speak English at the intermediate or higher level and be familiar with research and general biomedical terminology.

Dates are subject to change. Registration is required through Scientific Publications Services and will run August 12 through September 12, 2019.

Details: Mark Picus (mapicus@mdanderson.org), 713-792-7251, or John McCool (scipubseducation@mdanderson.org), 713-792-3174.

Session 5 – October 2 through November 21, 2019

Pronunciation 1, Pronunciation 2, Conversation 1, Conversation 2, Writing 2

Friday Conversation Group. The Friday Conversation Group provides an informal atmosphere for non-native speakers of English to practice their conversational abilities, learn more about American culture, and meet new friends. The class meets every Friday in the Mitchell Building (BSRB), room S3.8003, from 12:00 to 1:00 pm.

No registration is required. Details: Mark Picus (mapicus@mdanderson.org), 713-792-7251, or John McCool (scipubseducation@mdanderson.org), 713-792-3174.

Third Thursday Writing Retreat. Scientific Publications Services and the Research Medical Library are sponsoring afternoon writing retreats for faculty and trainees. These retreats, offered the third Thursday of every month from 12 to 4 pm in the Research Medical Library conference room (FCT21.6040), allow 4 hours of protected time for researchers to work on their grants and manuscripts. A scientific editor is present the entire time to answer questions, offer advice, and provide consultations on early drafts. (A separate room is available for lengthy consultations.) A librarian is also present to help with literature searches, reference formatting, EndNote issues, etc. *Details: John McCool (scipubseducation@mdanderson.org), 713-792-3174.*

August 15, 2019

September 19, 2019

October 17, 2019

Writing and Publishing Scientific Articles (WAPSA). WAPSA is a structured, practical, in-depth writing-education program for postdoctoral fellows and clinical trainees at MD Anderson taught by Scientific Publications Services. This 16-contact-hour course provides an excellent opportunity for advancing participants' skills in writing and publishing research articles while developing their in-progress manuscripts under the guidance of scientific editors.

Locations and times to be announced. Registration is required through Scientific Publications Services. Details: John McCool (scipubseducation@mdanderson.org), 713-792-3174.

September 18 and 25, 2019

December 4 and 11, 2019

Writing Persuasive R01 Proposals. This grant-writing workshop for clinical and basic science research faculty at MD Anderson focuses on the content, organization, and structure of an R01 grant application. Taught by senior editors in Scientific Publications Services, this 1-day workshop includes lecture, discussion, and guided grant outlining and development.

Locations and times to be announced. Registration is required through Scientific Publications Services. Details: John McCool (scipubseducation@mdanderson.org), 713-792-3174.

October 17, 2019

Webinars Presented by Scientific Publications Services. Scientific Publications Services continues to host a series of webinars on various topics. Dates and times, as well as links to upcoming webinars, will be posted as they become available on the [Research Medical Library](#) and [Scientific Publications](#) websites.

The following webinars have already been presented and recorded:

- **NIH Resources for Applicants** (presented July 17, 2019)

  In this webinar, Stephanie Deming, a senior scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, reviews various NIH resources you can use to help develop a strong grant application. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Designing an Effective Scientific Poster** (presented May 15, 2019)

  In this webinar, Ann Sutton, a scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, covers the basics of designing scientific posters. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Writing an Effective Narrative Review** (presented March 7, 2019)

  In this webinar, Sarah Bronson, a scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, offers guidance on writing a review article with a defined purpose and scope. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Techniques for Preparing an Efficient, Effective Grant Proposal** (presented January 16, 2019)

  In this webinar, Don Norwood, a scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, discusses some strategies for compiling an appealing, easily accessible NIH grant proposal. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Comma Basics** (presented November 7, 2018)

  In this webinar, Bryan Tutt, a scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, offers some general guidelines for using commas properly and reviews some examples of correct and incorrect comma use. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Essential Steps in Scientific Publishing: Services for MD Anderson Authors** (presented September 12, 2018)

  In this webinar, Laurissa Gann, a manager in the Research Medical Library, and Joe Munch, a senior scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, discuss how the

Research Medical Library (which includes Scientific Publications Services) can help authors achieve some essential steps in preparing, submitting, and revising a manuscript for publication in a biomedical journal. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Writing Clinical Case Reports** (presented July 19, 2018)

  In this webinar, Amy Ninetto, a scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, discusses the essentials of writing an informative case report for publication. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Navigating the Peer Review Process** (presented May 23, 2018)

  In this webinar, Erica Goodoff, a senior scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, talks to Dr. Shine Chang, a professor in the Department of Epidemiology and the director of the Cancer Prevention Research Training Program, about navigating the peer review process used by biomedical journals. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Choosing a Journal** (presented March 20, 2018)

  In this webinar, Stephanie Deming, a senior scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, discusses strategies for selecting a journal and avoiding disreputable journals. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Creating Effective Graphs** (presented January 31, 2018)

  In this webinar, Sunita Patterson, a senior scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, reviews the fundamentals of good graph design and data presentation. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Addressing ESL Issues in Scientific Writing** (presented November 9, 2017)

  In this webinar, Mark Picus, PhD, training specialist, and Ann Sutton, scientific editor, both in Scientific Publications Services, discuss some of the challenges in scientific writing that scientists who trained at institutions outside the United States are likely to encounter as they transition to working at a U.S.-based institution. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Avoiding Wordiness** (presented October 4, 2017)

  In this webinar, Don Norwood, a scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, explains how to identify wordiness—the use of too many words to express an idea—and shares strategies for eliminating it from scientific writing. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Ask the Editors** (presented July 26, 2017)

  In this webinar, two editors in Scientific Publications Services field questions about writing, editing, and publishing. A [recording of the webinar](#) is available.

- **Avoiding Plagiarism and Self-Plagiarism** (presented April 19, 2017)

  In this webinar, two scientific editors in Scientific Publications Services discuss the pitfalls of plagiarism, how plagiarism is detected, and how authors can avoid plagiarizing.

The concept of "self-plagiarism" is also discussed. A [recording of the webinar](#) and the [webinar slides](#) are available.

- **Creating Effective Tables** (presented January 19, 2017)

  In this webinar, Joe Munch, a scientific editor in Scientific Publications Services, discusses when to use a table, the elements of a table, some basic principles of effective table design, and how to use Microsoft Word to design a clear and useful table. A [recording of the webinar](#) and the [webinar slides](#) are available.

Grant Writing Advice. Scientific Publications Services now offers grant writing suggestions ([Writing R01 Grant Proposals](#)) in the [Writing Advice](#) section of our website. This information, stemming from the Grant Writers' Seminars and Workshops presented annually at MD Anderson and from the NIH's SF424 (R&R) Application Guide, focuses on R01 grants but can be applied to other types of NIH grants as well.

Writing the Specific Aims Section of a Grant Application. In this video, Sunita Patterson, senior scientific editor, presents a summary of the National Institutes of Health's grant review process and how it affects the grant proposal, an overview of the structure of an R01 grant proposal, and a model for writing the Specific Aims section. The [video](#) is available on the Scientific Publications intranet website.

Writing Abstracts Online Tutorial. [Writing Abstracts](#), an interactive, Web-based tutorial, covers the most important aspects of writing good abstracts. The lesson includes many examples and an optional self-assessment.

Improve Your Chances for IRG Funding. This [PDF presentation](#) by Walter Pagel, the former Director of the Department of Scientific Publications, guides researchers through the process of applying for institutional research grants.

Anatomy of a Research Article Video Presentation. In this [video](#), Stephanie Deming, senior scientific editor, presents advice on writing the parts of a research article: Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, title, and abstract. The [slides shown in the presentation](#) and the [presentation handout](#) can be downloaded as well.

Classes, Workshops, and Webinars Presented by the Research Medical Library. More classes, workshops, and webinars will be posted on the [Research Medical Library](#) website once they have been finalized.

Classes and workshops are located in the Research Medical Library classroom in the Pickens Academic Tower (in either FCT21.6008 or FCT21.6040). Details: Laurissa Gann (lgann@mdanderson.org), 713-794-1111.

August 2, 2019, 10:00 am, workshop: Literature Searching

August 8, 2019, 1:00 pm, class: Introduction to Systematic Reviews

August 20, 2019, 10:00 am, class: EndNote: Basics

August 28, 2019, 10:00 am, class: PubMed for Advanced Searchers

September 20, 2019, 10:00 am, workshop: Literature Reviews

October 4, 2019, 10:00 am, class: Introduction to Systematic Reviews

October 11, 2019, 10:00 am, class: Finding Studies for Systematic Reviews

October 25, 2019, 10:00 am, workshop: Literature Reviews

November 8, 2019, 10:00 am, class: Introduction to Systematic Reviews

November 15, 2019, 10:00 am, class: Finding Studies for Systematic Reviews

To register for a Research Medical Library webinar or class, please visit the library's [Education & Events Calendar](.).