

Guidebook for New Principal Investigators

Advice on Applying for a Grant, Writing Papers, Setting up a Research Team and Managing Your Time

Good reports and presentations are formulaic. Preparing them is a learned skill.

They are <u>not</u> 'inspiration at midnight'. Your raw ideas may be, but their refinement isn't. Institute of Genetics, CIHR

Roderick McInnes • Brenda Andrews • Richard Rachubinski

http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/27491.html

Common errors

- 1. Forgetting who your audience is
- 2. Failing to give the 'big picture'
- 3. Failing to provide rationale
- 4. Too much detail

"Good writing reflects clear and precise thinking."

"Writing generally forces clear and precise thinking."

"Write a report, or make a presentation, that will interest your audience."

"Learn from the papers you read and the talks you attend."





Write daily (between experiments in the weeks before the due date)
Write and revise an outline of headings and lead sentences
the 'story' should be clear from the lead sentences alone
complete paragraphs with imperfect sentences and go over page limits
use get it down
add citations while you write (e.g. endnote or refworks--http://sites.utoronto.ca/ic/software/)
Quantify your data and prepare figures
Ledit to make paragraphs and sentences concise
enove unnecessary points and use simple language
confirm accuracy
tead all headings and lead sentences to make sure the 'story' is intact









General advice

- keep backgrounds and fonts simple so your schematics and data stand out
- fonts should be clearly readable 4 feet away
- avoid jargon (terms that might only be used in your lab or a specific research area)
- minimize text (for "all-text" slides→title plus 4, 1-2-line bullet points maximum)
- get feedback from lab mates on a full draft of the poster

Title page

 include the lab PI and the person who supervised you directly (allows you to present ideas from the lab that may not have been your own)

Introduction

- What is the big picture? Why is the problem important?
- What is the specific rationale for your research questions?

Methods

use schematics

Results

• present in a logical order (not by the chronology they were done)

Conclusions

• a synthesis of the data that will require some thought (discuss with lab mates)

Include any acknowledgments of specific help or reagents at the base of Results slides or at the base of the Conclusions slide

Your poster is an aid for an oral presentation

Ask your lab PI if there is any data from the lab that should be kept confidential?

Practice your presentation (~12 minutes without interruption)

Don't worry about nervousness—convert it into enthusiasm

Speak clearly

Maximize eye contact

Sense and pause for questions (listen to them carefully, ask for clarification)

Be yourself and show excitement for your work

Don't be apologetic for incomplete work—suggest the next step

12

Present you data truthfully and openly

Of my many replicate micrographs or blots, which one should I show?

If my data failed to support my hypothesis, should I show it?

How do I present partially complete data?

What is "N"?

Should I show my quantifications as bar graphs?

PLOS BIOLOGY

What exactly is '*N*' in cell culture and animal experiments?

Stanley E. Lazic¹*, Charlie J. Clarke-Williams², Marcus R. Munafò³

Biologists determine experimental effects by perturbing biological entities or units. When done appropriately, independent replication of the entity–intervention pair contributes to the sample size (*N*) and forms the basis of statistical inference. If the wrong entity–intervention pair is chosen, an experiment cannot address the question of interest. We surveyed a random sample of published animal experiments from 2011 to 2016 where interventions were applied to parents and effects examined in the offspring, as regulatory authorities provide clear guidelines on replication with such designs. We found that only 22% of studies (95% CI = 17%-29%) replicated the correct entity–intervention pair and thus made valid statistical inferences. Nearly half of the studies (46%, 95% CI = 38%-53%) had pseudoreplication while 32% (95% CI = 26%-39%) provided insufficient information to make a judgement. Pseudoreplication artificially inflates the sample size, and thus the evidence for a scientific claim, resulting in false positives. We argue that distinguishing between biological units, experimental units, and observational units clarifies where replication should occur, describe the criteria for genuine replication, and provide concrete examples of in vitro, ex vivo, and in vivo experimental designs.

14

True replication increases the sample size (N) and thus tests a hypothesis.

Pseudoreplication does not increase N.

"Suppose researchers hypothesize that male mice have lighter brains than female mice. They could... (1) weigh the brain of 1 male and 1 female mouse 5 times, or

(2) weigh the brain of 5 male and 5 female mice once.

Both designs provide 10 data points to calculate a *p*-value, but the *p*-value is meaningless for the first design because the hypothesis is about sex differences, and there is only 1 member of each sex"

Experimental unit (EU): the entity that is randomly and independently assigned to experimental conditions. The sample size (N) is equal to the number of EUs.

EUs must be independently allocated to experimental conditions

→ because animals in a litter, seeds in a pod, or cells in a tissue sample are expected to be more alike than individuals from different litters, pods or tissues

The experimental intervention must be applied independently to each EU \rightarrow because you cannot exactly replicate the application of a treatment to all individuals

EUs must not influence each other, especially on the measured outcomes

16

What is N?

You hypothesize that a drug affects nuclear size.

1. You bath 10 embryos together in a drug, and quantify the size of the nucleus in 100 cells per embryo.

2. You individually inject 10 embryos with a drug, and quantify the size of the nucleus in 100 cells per embryo.

3. You repeat 1. in three separate weeks.

PLOS BIOLOGY

Beyond Bar and Line Graphs: Time for a New Data Presentation Paradigm

Tracey L. Weissgerber^{1*}, Natasa M. Milic^{1,2}, Stacey J. Winham³, Vesna D. Garovic¹

Figures in scientific publications are critically important because they often show the data supporting key findings. Our systematic review of research articles published in top physiology journals (*n* = 703) suggests that, as scientists, we urgently need to change our practices for presenting continuous data in small sample size studies. Papers rarely included scatterplots, box plots, and histograms that allow readers to critically evaluate continuous data. Most papers presented continuous data in bar and line graphs. This is problematic, as many different data distributions can lead to the same bar or line graph. The full data may suggest different conclusions from the summary statistics. We recommend training investigators in data presentation, encouraging a more complete presentation of data, and changing journal editorial policies. Investigators can quickly make univariate scatterplots for small sample size studies using our Excel templates.









- Please leave your poster up so that other students can see it over the term
- If you need your poster for another event, please collect it before that event
- We will recycle your poster just before our next undergraduate research poster symposium (events held in September and April)

Additional source

