I am placing three pdfs on classroom salon for you to read for Thursday. They can all be fairly “quick” reads but please think about them.

1. 6286\_chap00.pdf – Introdcution to the book “Scientific Writing: A reader and writer’s guide” by JL Lebrun (2007). Repeats some points of reader expectations (like Gopen) for scientific articles, and introduces “six qualities that are the hallmark of great scientific writing: fluid, organised, clear, concise, convincing, and interesting.”
2. 6286\_chap01.pdf – Chapter 1 of Lebrun’s book. Talks about reducing the memory requirements of readers, so they can concentrate on the scientific point(s) of your writing.
3. bem - writing the empirical journal article.pdf – I said there are few good general principles for writing and organizing whole papers. This article comes close. The downside is that it is focused on empirical research articles in psychology. The upside is that, except for some details of organization and content, the principles Bem articulates seem to me to apply to lots of different scientific papers – whether empirical or theoretical.

I’d like to discuss all 3 papers on Thu, perhaps with examples from the commented writing that you did for Tues this week.

For Tues next week, I want to change things up a bit. Instead of commenting on others’ papers I want you to do the following:

1. Carefully read the comments you got this week (or last week, if there are more of them). Write them all down in a list (yes, literally, transfer them to another document as a list), indicating for each comment in your list
   1. What page and line each comment refers to
   2. Who made the comment
   3. Your response to the comment [see below for what this should be]
2. Revise this section of your paper carefully, focusing on the list of comments you got. For your reaction to each comment (part 1c above), you can write one of three things:
   1. “Good point. Here’s how I dealt with it on line X, page Y of the revised document, and here’s why I dealt with it that way.” (obviously, replace that second sentence with however many sentences it takes to explain where & how you dealt with it, and why you dealt with it that way.)
   2. “Good point. This is essentially the same comment as comment X above (or below if that makes more sense); see my response to that comment above (or below) for how I dealt with it.”
   3. “Good point. However, I am not going to address this comment in my revision because…” (where the “because” can be any reasonable thing about the content or organization of the paper, your goals/reason for writing the paper, the kinds of things likely readers of the paper will know, etc. etc.)

Upload both the paper with the revised section, and this list of comments and your responses, to classroom salon, for discussion next Tues.