What I will cover

Introductions and course agenda The scope of medical writing Qualities of effective medical writing

- The writer's role
- Assessing the audience
- Identifying and placing key messages



Format: Summary - Sort by: Most Recent - Per page: 20 - Send to -			Filters: Manage Filters	
-			Sort by:	
Search results			Best match	Most recent
Iten	Is: 1 to 20 of 210 <	Next > Last >>	Dest materi	Mostrecent
	The Role of Flavonoids in Inhibiting Th17 Responses in Inflammatory Arthritis.		Results by year	
1.	Kelepouri D, Mavropoulos A, Bogdanos DP, Sakkas LI. J Immunol Res. 2018 Mar 5;2018:9324357. doi: 10.1155/2018/9324357. eCollection 2018. Review. PMID: 29693024			Download CSV
	Similar articles		Find related data	
			Database: Select	•
□ 2.	Multiple hit infection and autoimmunity: the dysbiotic microbiota-ACPA connection in rhe	eumatoid		
2.	<u>arthritis.</u> Sakkas LI, Bogdanos DP.			
	Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2018 Mar 13. doi: 10.1097/BOR.00000000000000503. [Epub ahead of print]			
	PMID: 29538012			
	Similar articles		Search details	<u> </u>
	CpG Island Methylation Patterns in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis.		bogdanos[All Fields]
3.				
	Tsatsakis A, Kovatsi L, Bogdanos DP, Hadjigeorgiou GM. J Mol Neurosci. 2018 Mar;64(3):478-484. doi: 10.1007/s12031-018-1046-x. Epub 2018 Mar 7.			
				//
	PMID: 29516350 Similar articles		Search	See more
	Epstein-Barr Virus: In Search of a Causal or a Casual Relationship Between the Virus a	ind the	-	
4.	Disease?		Recent Activity	
	Dardiotis E, Bogdanos DP.			Turn Off Clear
	Isr Med Assoc J. 2018 Feb;20(2):111-113. No abstract available. PMID: 29431307 Free Article		Q bogdanos (210)	PubMed
	Similar articles			
			Focus: Education — (Write Your First Rese	Career Advice: How to arch Paper
	Interaction between microbiome and host genetics in psoriatic arthritis.			-
5.	Chimenti MS, Perricone C, Novelli L, Caso F, Costa L, Bogdanos D, Conigliaro P, Triggianese P, Ciccacci C, Borgiani P, Perricone R. Autoimmun Rev. 2018 Mar;17(3):276-283. doi: 10.1016/j.autrev.2018.01.002. Epub 2018 Feb 3. Review. PMID: 29378263 Similar articles		Writing for publication	in a medical journal
			The Role of Flavonoid Responses in Inflamo	Is in Inhibiting Th17 natory Arthritis. PubMed
			-	
	Vitamin B12 folate and homocysteine levels and multiple sclerosis: A meta-analysis		Effect of coconut oil ir gingivitis — A prelimir	

Vitamin B12 folate and homocysteine levels and multiple sclerosis: A meta-analysis

		Dimitrios Bogdanos 🕜	Bogdanos 🖉		Cited by		VIEW ALL	
		Assoc Professor of Medicine -Autoimmune Diseases No verified email - Homepage				All	Since 2013	
	6	Autoimmunity Autoimmune Liver Diseases Autoimmune Rheumatic Di	IBD MS		Citations h-index i10-index	7172 45 128	3875 34 104	
		:	CITED BY	YEAR			1100	
		CD4+ CD25+ regulatory T-cells in autoimmune liver disease DP Bogdanos, P Cheeseman, G Mieli-Vergani, ogy 41 (1), 31-37	348	2004	-11		825 550	
		epatitis nghi, DP Bogdanos, Y Ma, G Mieli-Vergani nopathology 31 (3), 421-435	289	* 2009		2014 2015 2016 20	275	
	autoimmune liv	, MG Thomas, DP Bogdanos, AR Lopes, B Portmann,	242	2002	Co-authors	2014 2015 2016 20	EDIT	
	DP Bogdanos, P I	ver serology: current diagnostic and clinical challenges nvernizzi, IR Mackay, D Vergani astroenterology: WJG 14 (21), 3374	216	2008	1 Lazaros	Sakkas	>	
	N Kerkar, K Chou	4502D6193–212: a new immunodominant epitope and target of virus/self v in liver kidney microsomal autoantibody type 1-positive liver dhuri, Y Ma, A Mahmoud, DP Bogdanos, L Muratori, munology 170 (3), 1481-1489	215	2003	🛖 🛛 Luigi Mu	burg University of	、 、	
	DP Bogdanos, DS	autoimmune disease: genetics, gender and environment Smyk, El Rigopoulou, MG Mytilinaiou, MA Heneghan, nunitv 38 (2-3). J156-J169	194	2012	pietro inv			

The scope of medical writing

Internal reports

Regulatory reports

Conference presentations

- abstract
- oral presentation
- poster

Journal articles

- original research paper
- review article
- case report
- letter to editor



Introductions and course agenda The scope of medical writing Qualities of effective medical writing The writer's role Assessing the audience Identifying and placing key messages



Start with good science

Communalism - common ownership of scientific discoveries

Universalism - evaluation using universal, unbiased criteria

Disinterestedness - scientists should act selflessly

Organised scepticism - ideas tested and subjected to rigorous, structured scrutiny by peers

US sociologist Robert Merton b1910



Plan effectively

For original research: have a clear research question seek statistical advice use the right study design act ethically keep an open mind and minimise bias agree who will be principal investigator agree who will be authors and contributors agree to publish even negative results



Behave ethically

Research ethics – declaration of Helsinki, ICH

Publication ethics

avoid misconduct protect patients' identities report clearly:

> informed consent any deviation from usual practice full burden imposed on participants total risks posed to participants or others benefits to participants, patients, society

It's not always enough to state that the study was approved by an ethics committee or IRB



Protect patients' confidentiality

Beware identifiers:

age, sex, location

clinical details, test results

unusual personal story or context

photo (even if of a body part or clinical image)





Guidance on writing research papers

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals

http://www.icmje.org/

reporting guidelines for research, at the EQUATOR network resource centre

http://www.equator-network.org/





Group

About BMJ

Resources for advertisers and sponsors

- Resources for authors
- Submit a manuscript
- now
- Article progress enquiry
- Fast track publication
- Article submission
- Types of article
- Editorial policies
- BMJ house style
- Making articles more evidencebased
- Checklists & Forms Media releases Peer review process Online First
- PubMed/Medline
- Resources for BMA
- members
- Contact us
- Resources for media
- Resources for readers
- Resources for reviewers
- Sitemap
- Resources for subscribers

Making articles more evidence-based

There are now many evidence based clinical guidelines and good systematic reviews, some of which may relate directly to your article. We would like you, therefore, to provide suitable evidence for key statements - the Cochrane Library or a medical librarian should be able to help you.

Guidelines

Try to indicate probabilities and levels of evidence:

- Frequency information: when giving a differential diagnosis for a particular presentation please provide population estimates of the frequency of each separate diagnosis
- Diagnostic tests: please give their false positive and false negative rates (or sensitivities and specificities) and, if possible, the causes of false positives and false negatives
- Prognosis: information on prognosis or natural history is often missing from medical articles but is vital for rational decision making. Wherever possible, give information about remission, progression and risks of disease
- Treatments: please mention the level of evidence on which main treatment recommendations are made. This can be kept relatively simple, using three levels:
 - No clear evidence: opinions based on clinical experience, anecdotal case studies, or descriptive articles; conflicting evidence from studies or poorly designed studies, even if randomised controlled trials
 - Suggestive evidence: evidence from cohort, case control, beforeand-after studies; evidence from non-randomised experimental studies
 - Firm evidence: evidence from at least one properly designed. randomised, controlled trial with adequate sample selection, sample size, and appropriate controls; with double or single blinding; and with clear outcome(s)

Please try to quantify the benefit of treatment, giving the relative risk reduction

This week's print issue	Oet mole from the Dato				
BMJ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $Predicting outcome aftertraumatic brain injury$	The latest table of contents, editor's choice and subject based alerts, straight to your inbox Register now				
Full contents Subscribe Past issues Enlarge cover image	BMJ masterclasses Article William Related Hard Products				
Tools	BR				
Email to friend					
Print this page	P				
RSS RSS	clas				
Services	sin				
 Advanced search Rapid responses Blogs Audio Submit an article Information for authors Peer reviewers Subscribe/Activate Advertise in BMJ Librarian resources Media centre PubMed/Medline Google Scholar 	MEDICINE 29.01.07 London 08.03.07 Manchester				
Unline poll					

Clear writing

Keep it simple: use short, familiar words

Avoid jargon and acronyms

Be specific

Be concrete, not abstract

Say what you mean and mean what you say



How frequently do editors encounter manuscript problems?

Poorly written, excessive jargon Inadequate/inappropriate presentation Poor description of design Excessive zeal and self promotion Rationale confused, contradictory Essential data omitted, ignored Boring Important work of others ignored



Byrne DW, Publishing Medical Research Papers, Williams and Wilkins, 1998



Who did what and why?

authors

contributors

competing interests

publication ethics



Authorship Avoid guest- and ghost-writers

Authorship credit is based only on **<u>substantial</u>** contribution to:

- conception and design, <u>or</u> data analysis and interpretation
- drafting the article <u>or</u> revising it critically for important intellectual content
- **and** final approval of the version to be published

All these conditions must be met

Solely acquiring funding or collecting data does not justify authorship All authors included on a paper must fulfil the criteria No one who fulfils the criteria should be excluded



Contributorship

contributors who took part in planning, conducting, and reporting the work, including professional medical writers

guarantors (one or more) who accept full responsibility for the work and/or the conduct of the study, had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish

researchers must decide among themselves the precise nature of each contribution



Who did what?

Helen C Eborall, post-doctoral research fellow1, Simon J Griffin, programme leader2, A Toby Prevost, medical statistician1, Ann-Louise Kinmonth, professor of general practice1, David P French, reader in health behaviour interventions3, Stephen Sutton, professor of Behavioural science1

Contributors: SS, DPF, ATP, A-LK, and SJG conceived and designed the original protocol. All authors were involved in amending the protocol. HCE coordinated the study throughout. Data entry was carried out by Wyman Dillon Ltd, Lewis Moore, and HCE. HCE cleaned the data and ran preliminary analysis with input from Tom Fanshawe. ATP analysed the data. ADDITION trial data were supplied by Lincoln Sargeant and Kate Williams. HCE wrote the first draft of the manuscript with ATP and SS. All authors contributed to subsequent and final drafts. HCE is guarantor of the paper.



Competing interests

A person has a competing interest when he or she has an attribute that is *invisible* to the reader or editor but which *may* affect his or her judgment

Always declare a competing interest, particularly one that would embarrass you if it came out afterwards



Misconduct

Fabrication: making up data or results and recording or reporting them

Falsification: manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record

Plagiarism: the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit



CrossCheck

web tool searches for overlapping content: prepublication postpublication

specialist search engine (iThenticate) uses "text fingerprinting" and "string matching"

gets behind access controls (unlike free tools) to search >9 billion articles in CrossRef database







Introductions and course agenda The scope of medical writing Qualities of effective medical writing The writer's role Assessing the audience Identifying and placing key messages



Assessing the audience

Regulators

Markets

Conferences

Journals





How to please editors and peer reviewers

make sure the message is clear in the paper and abstract, not just in the cover letter

also send:

extra materials eg CONSORT checklist details of any closely related papers previous peer review reports

communicate clearly and promptly



Introductions and course agenda The scope of medical writing Qualities of effective medical writing The writer's role Assessing the audience Identifying and placing key messages





For original research:

Introduction: why ask this research question?Methods: what did I do?Results: what did I find?andDiscussion: what might it mean?



What makes a good research question?

FINER criteria

Feasible (answerable with a robust method)InterestingNovelEthicalRelevant



What makes a poor research question?

a question you don't care about, nor does anyone else

looking at routine clinical data and trying to think of a question

- the records will be biased and confounded
- they may lack the information you need to answer your question reliably, because they were collected for another reason

a fishing expedition/data dredging – gathering lots of information and hoping a question will emerge

 statistical analysis of many outcomes post-hoc may yield false positives (type I errors) or false negatives owing to lack of power (type II errors)



Spin: the dishonest drug trial

Not transparent (sponsors' roles, competing interests) Compares intervention with one known to be inferior with ineffective dose of competitor intervention with so much of competitor intervention that ADRs likely Uses multiple endpoints and reports selectively Reports results only from favourable centres Reports only favourable subgroup analyses Presents only most impressive results — eg reduction in relative rather than absolute risk



Spin – iť s not only in trials...

2006 BMJ paper found that industry supported systematic reviews were of lower quality than Cochrane reviews of the same drugs, were less transparently reported, had fewer reservations about methodological limitations, and always recommended the sponsor's drug without reservations

2007 BMJ paper found that sponsored meta-analyses on antihypertensive drugs were not associated with favourable results but had overgenerous conclusions



Industry-commissioned reviews

primary research articles create influence

peer review approves the science

journal brand endorses the message

better than drug reps

secondary articles spread influence

more likely to be read than research

especially if KOL authors

can alter policy



The honest review article

describe sources of information and methods of selection

ideally, cite Cochrane and other systematic reviews

clarify type and strength of evidence for key statements "A large well conducted randomised conducted trial finds..." "The findings of a small case series suggest..."

declare provenance, funding, and competing interests

How can journals help?

BMJ asks authors submitting or offering unsolicited reviews and editorials on potentially commercial topics three questions

And every published article declares competing interests and provenance

- has anyone prompted or paid you to write this article?
- would/did a professional writer contribute to the article? to what extent?
- would the BMJ article be original, or would it be similar to articles submitted or published elsewhere?

