The Write Stuff

Boosting your writing into a higher orbit

The Write Stuff Autumn 2018 Vol. 15 No. 4

Published by the Department of Scientific Publications
The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center

In this issue...

Appropriate use of grant cover letters

-- Angie Meus

A cover letter can be an important part of an NIH grant application. But because cover letters are not required for every application, when is it necessary to include one?

According to staff in the Division of Receipt and Referral in NIH's Center for Scientific Review, cover letters were used in the past by applicants to request a specific institute or study section, or to inform the NIH of reviewers who may have conflicts of interest. That is no longer necessary because that information can now be entered, if desired, on the PHS Assignment Request Form included with every NIH grant application. Cover letters have also been used to request specific reviewers, but the NIH advises applicants to avoid doing so altogether since reviewers are selected by NIH review staff.

In some circumstances, however, a cover letter is still required. For example, if an applicant is submitting a late application, a cover letter should be used to explain why the application is late; late submissions are accepted on a case-by-case basis.

A cover letter is also necessary if an applicant plans to include a video. Because videos can't be embedded in the grant application and the NIH doesn't permit the use of URLs in the main proposal text, videos must be submitted as post-submission material. In this instance, a cover letter would be used to let review staff know to expect a video as part of the application.

Certain types of data that a study is expected to produce may also require a cover letter. The NIH requests that applicants attach a cover letter if the proposed study will produce a large-scale human or nonhuman genomic data set.

In other cases, such as when a study's direct costs are greater than $500,000 or an applicant is submitting an R13 conference grant, preapproval from NIH staff is required before the application can be accepted. Requests for such approvals are typically included in a cover letter.

Finally, in career development award and fellowship applications, a cover letter is used to provide the names of referees who will be providing reference letters.

NIH experts advise that applicants include a cover letter only when one is needed. Only designated NIH staff see the cover letter. It's important that applicants use cover letters appropriately.

Sources:

National Institutes of Health. Cover Letters and their Appropriate Use. https://grants.nih.gov/podcasts/All_About_Grants/episodes/Cover-Letter.htm. April 16, 2018.

National Institutes of Health. Cover Letter Attachment. In: General Instructions for NIH and Other PHS Agencies: SF424 (R&R) Application Packages, section G.200. Updated December 29, 2017. https://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide/forms-e/general/g.200-sf-424-(r&r)-form.htm#21. Accessed October 11, 2018.

How to disagree with reviewer feedback on scientific manuscripts

-- Laura Russell

You probably already know that if you submit a manuscript to a journal and receive a request for revisions, you should respond to the reviewer comments thoughtfully and point-by-point to maximize the chances that your manuscript will be published. But what should you do if you disagree with a reviewer's feedback? Here are some points to keep in mind:

1. **Feel free to disagree with a reviewer, so long as you explain your viewpoint clearly and politely and support your position with evidence or a sound rationale.** Consider beginning your response to the reviewer's comments by thanking the reviewer for his or her time and expressing appreciation for any portions of the reviewer's

feedback that you found helpful. (Journals often share such responses with reviewers.) Then, bring up the point of disagreement with a phrase such as "We respectfully disagree with the reviewer's statement that…" or "In response to the reviewer's comment that… we have decided, after careful consideration, to…" Finally, support your viewpoint with evidence, preferably from the literature, or an explanation of your rationale or logic, if appropriate. This approach signals to the editor that you are receptive to the reviewer's comments, that you have thoughtfully considered them, and that you have solid reasons for not making one or more suggested changes.

2. **Approach the comments you receive objectively rather than emotionally.** Although it can be frustrating to receive criticism of a paper that you have devoted hours to, do not take the criticism personally. The editor requesting revisions is open to publishing your paper and is sharing reviewer comments that he or she believes will help make your paper better. However, in some cases, the editor may lack expertise in your paper's topic and not realize that a reviewer has misinterpreted your paper or made unreasonable requests. For this reason, you should respond professionally and politely to all reviewer comments, including those you disagree with.

3. **Get an unbiased review of your responses to the journal.** To ensure that your responses to the reviewer comments that you disagree with are logical and polite, consider having someone else review your revised manuscript and cover letter. The Department of Scientific Publications is happy to provide edits and suggestions.

Sources:

3 top tips for responding to reviewer comments on your manuscript:
https://www.elsevier.com/authors-update/story/publishing-tips/3-top-tips-for-responding-to-reviewer-comments-on-your-manuscript

How to deal with reviewer comments:
https://hub.wiley.com/community/exchanges/discover/blog/2015/07/30/how-to-deal-with-reviewer-comments
WAPSA manual, "Navigating the Peer Review Process," 11-12 to 11-17.

NIH focuses on increasing scientific rigor and reproducibility in funded research

– Don Norwood

The lack of reproducibility in biomedical research studies has become an important issue in recent years, as reflected in 2016 by a National Institutes of Health (NIH) policy designed to increase the reproducibility of NIH-supported research via scientific rigor and transparency. Specifically, the NIH directed researchers to increase their focus on four areas:

1. Scientific premise: the rigor of previous research supporting the proposed work
2. Scientific rigor: the rigor of the proposed research

3. Biological variables of the study subjects
4. Authentication of important biological and chemical resources

In 2017, a working group of the Advisory Council to the NIH Director was tasked with recommending steps for investigators to take to increase the reproducibility of their research. The working group's main recommendation was not to develop any additional forms or checklists but rather to develop more resources. Included in their specific recommendations was clarification of scientific premise and rigor and the new emphasis on them in grant applications. As a result of the group's efforts, the NIH plans to revise their grant instructions and clarify the wording of their review criteria.

Grant applicants often present data that demonstrate that their proposed experiments are feasible. Such data are indeed important, but they do not address the scientific premise, which is the rigor of previous research supporting the questions asked by the investigator. According to the revised grant instructions, applicants should use the Significance section of the Research Strategy to describe how the strengths and weaknesses of published work and their preliminary data are important to the proposed study. This includes acknowledging deficiencies in scientific rigor and any issues that hamper the assessment of it. Describing how the weaknesses are resolved in the proposed study should be a priority for the researcher. Specifically, the investigator must go into detail regarding how he or she will address the weaknesses in the Approach section of the Research Strategy.

The NIH has demonstrated its increased focus on scientific rigor and transparency via pilot programs geared toward ingraining these research qualities in predoctoral trainees. Furthermore, they recently announced a T32 research training grant (https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-17-341.html) to help institutions instill scientific rigor and transparency among their trainees.

The NIH's grant instruction revisions regarding scientific premise and rigor will take effect for all research and mentored career development award applications beginning with those due on January 25, 2019.

Source

Lauer M, Valdez P. Open Mike: Rigorous Resources for Rigorous Research. https://nexus.od.nih.gov/all/2018/07/02/rigorous-resources-for-rigorous-research/. Accessed July 25, 2018.

Contacting NIH staff

– Stephanie Deming

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) strongly encourages grant applicants to contact its staff for advice and feedback. However, if you are new to applying for NIH grants, you may not know which staff member to contact and when to contact them. NIH provides guidance in a helpful chart, and we summarize that guidance and provide some additional advice below.

Before Submission: Program Officials

Before submission, NIH program officials can tell you whether your research idea is a good fit for a program and help you shape your idea to best align with the program's goals.

Your initial contact with a program official should be by e-mail. In your message, say that you would like to talk by phone about your project's relevance to the official's program area, and include drafts of your application's title and Specific Aims section. The program official can review this information, formulate an initial opinion, and then contact you to arrange a phone conversation.

One way to find program officials is to use the Matchmaker tool in the NIH RePORTER database. With Matchmaker, if you input a description of your application in a text box and click the Similar Program Officials button, you will get a list of program officials assigned to similar projects, along with the officials' contact information.

You can also find information about program officials in the "Scientific/Research Contact(s)" section in the funding opportunity announcement. In requests for applications in a particular research area, the "Scientific/Research Contact(s)" section includes program officials' names and contact information. In parent announcements (announcements of funding mechanisms with no specific research area specified), the "Scientific/Research Contact(s)" section includes a link to contacts at participating institutes and centers, along with summaries of institutes' and centers' research topics of special interest.

Another way to find program officials is to search the organization chart of the institute, center, division, or branch of NIH that you think may be a good match. Different NIH entities use different terms for program officials, so try searching for *program officer*, *program director*, *program staff*, or just *program*.

Between Submission and Peer Review: Scientific Review Officers

Scientific review officers (SROs) recruit reviewers and manage the peer review meetings in which applications are discussed. After you submit an application to NIH, it is assigned to an institute or center and to a scientific review group. The SRO for this group will be listed in your eRA Commons account. If you believe the assigned scientific review group is not a good match for your proposal or you believe a group member may be biased, you should contact the SRO. You should also contact the SRO if you need to send post-submission materials—for example, a budget page revised because you have received new funding or news that you have had an article accepted for publication.

After You Receive the Summary Statement: Program Officials

If your application is scored during the peer review meeting, the program official can help you interpret your summary statement and decide how to address criticisms. Because program officials usually attend peer review meetings, they can give you insights that may not be clear from the summary statement itself. The program official's name will be listed at the top of the summary statement.

Sources

Gindhard J. Talking to NIH staff about your application and grant: who, what, when, why and how. NIGMS Feedback Loop Blog. https://loop.nigms.nih.gov/2015/11/talking-to-nih-staff-about-your-application-and-grant-who-what-when-why-and-how/. Accessed October 11, 2018.

NIH Office of Extramural Research. Contacting staff at the NIH institutes and centers. https://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide/resources/contacting-nih-staff.htm. Accessed October 4, 2018.

Russell SW, Morrison DC. *The Grant Application Writer's Workbook*, *NIH version*, Forms-D edition, April 2016. Buellton, CA: Grant Writers' Seminars and Workshops, LLC; 2016:37, 45, 48.

Unusual terms used in scientific writing and publishing: Preprints and preprint servers

– Bryan Tutt

Preprint servers, also called *prepress servers,* are online repositories where research articles can be made available to the public before peer review. Articles posted on such servers are commonly referred to as *preprints*.

Each preprint has its own unique digital object identifier (see *The Write Stuff*, Winter 2015), and the preprint remains on the preprint server in its original form even after the final version of the article is published in a peer-reviewed journal. Many preprint servers automatically add a link to the published journal article.

Although most preprint servers check articles for plagiarism and screen them to ensure that they report scientific research, the articles do not undergo peer review before posting. Preprints therefore are typically labelled with a disclaimer that the article has not been peer reviewed.

Researchers in some disciplines, notably physics, have used preprints extensively since 1991, when the first preprint server, arXiv (pronounced "archive"), came online (1); however, researchers in the biomedical sciences have been less eager to adopt the use of preprints. One reason for this reluctance is the danger inherent in making data public before peer review. Opponents of preprint servers argue that posting results before peer review could cause patients or physicians to make medical decisions on the basis of flawed data or incorrect interpretations (2).

In recent years, however, some biomedical researchers have seen the advantages of preprints. Preprint servers enable data sharing that can be crucial in responding to public health emergencies. For example, during the Ebola and Zika virus outbreaks (2014 to 2016 and 2015 to 2017, respectively), virus-related articles that appeared on preprint servers were available a median of 150 days before their publication in peer-reviewed journals (3). Researchers also may find preprints useful in promoting their research or their careers. One biologist reported that after he posted his research as a preprint, he received several job offers and was interviewed and hired before the article was published in a peer-reviewed journal (4).

Because of these advantages, preprints are gaining acceptance in biomedical research. In 2017, the National Institutes of Health announced that it would allow investigators to cite preprints as research products in proposals, applications, and progress reports (5). The announcement further encouraged researchers to use preprints to accelerate the dissemination of their findings. This year, *PLoS* announced that all research papers submitted to *PLoS* journals will be posted on bioRxiv, a preprint server focused on the biological sciences (6). Likewise, in June 2018 *Lancet* journals began a 6-month trial in which submitting authors are given the option to post their research papers to SSRN, a multidisciplinary preprint server maintained by Elsevier (7).

Authors who wish to share their research articles as preprints should first check the author instructions or contact the editors of the journal they plan to submit the article to. While some journals encourage and even facilitate the use of preprints, others, including *JAMA* journals, may reject articles that have been posted as preprints (8). These policies may change, as the trend in biomedical publishing seems to be toward acceptance of preprints; however, the role of preprints in biomedical publishing and their ultimate effect on the peer review process have yet to be determined.

In addition to bioRxiv, preprint servers focused on biomedical research include PeerJ Preprints and JIMR Preprints. Several multidisciplinary preprint servers also accept biomedical research. The multitude of available servers can make it difficult to find preprints on a specific topic, but the search engine OSF enables users to search multiple preprint servers focused on various disciplines.

References

1. Maslove DM. Medical preprints—a debate worth having. JAMA. 2018;319:443-444. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.17566.

2. Sullivan, MG. Preprint publishing challenges the status quo in medicine. Hematology News. https://www.mdedge.com/hematologynews/article/161819/business-medicine/preprint-publishing-challenges-status-quo-medicine/page/0/5. March 30, 2018. Accessed October 3, 2018.

3. Johansson MA, Reich NG, Meyers LA, Lipsitch M. Preprints: an underutilized mechanism to accelerate outbreak science. PLoS Med. 2018;15:e1002549. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002549.

4. Kiser J. Are preprints the future of biology? A survival guide for scientists. Science. https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/09/are-preprints-future-biology-survival-guide-scientists. September 29, 2017. Accessed October 3, 2018.

5. National Institutes of Health. Reporting preprints and other interim research products: NOT-OD-17-050. https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-17-050.html. March 24, 2017. Accessed October 3, 2018.

6. PLoS Blogs. PLoS and Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory enter agreement to enable preprint posting on bioRxiv. http://blogs.plos.org/plos/2018/02/plos-cold-spring-harbor-preprint-agreement-biorxiv. February 6, 2018. Accessed October 3, 2018.

7. Kleinert S, Horton R; for editors of the Lancet family of journals. Preprints with The Lancet: joining online research discussion platforms. Lancet. 2018;391:2482-2483. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31125-5.

8. JAMA Network. Instructions for authors. https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/pages/instructions-for-authors. Accessed October 3, 2018.

Upcoming events for authors

Please see the Scientific Publications website for more information on our educational courses.

Scientific Publications' 70th Anniversary Lecture Series. Since 1948, Scientific Publications has helped MD Anderson faculty and trainees get published and get funded by providing a wide range of editorial, educational, and publishing services, free of charge. This year marks our 70th anniversary, and we're celebrating by offering a special series of lectures on research article writing, grant writing, and scientific communication.

What Are Grant Reviewers Really Thinking? An Inside Look at NIH Study Sections

November 15, 2018; 12–1 pm, Main Building, AT&T Auditorium, B2.4750

At this event, a panel of current and former NIH study section members will discuss and answer questions from the audience about how NIH study sections operate and what applicants can do to improve their chances of receiving a favorable review. The panelists will include the following:

- Michelle Barton, PhD, Professor, Epigenetics & Carcinogenesis; Dean, MD Anderson UTHealth Graduate School
- Sanjay Shete, PhD, Professor, Biostatistics and Epidemiology; Department Chair, MD Anderson Cancer Center
- Imad Shureiqi, MD, MS, Associate Professor, Gastrointestinal Medical Oncology, MD Anderson Cancer Center

Dawn Chalaire, Associate Director of Scientific Publications, will moderate.

Previous events:

- Writing the Introduction Section of a Research Article. Watch the video.
- Significance and Innovation in R01 Proposals. Watch the video.
- Techniques for Polishing Your Paragraphs. Watch the video.

Writing and Publishing Scientific Articles (WAPSA). WAPSA is a structured, practical, in-depth writing-education program for postdoctoral fellows and clinical trainees of MD Anderson taught by the Department of Scientific Publications. 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 the Department of Scientific Publications. Details: John McCool (scipubseducation@mdanderson.org), 713-792-3174.

November 6 and 13, 2018

January 17 and 24, 2019

April 23 and 30, 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 the Department of Scientific Publications, this 1-day workshop includes lecture, discussion, and guided grant outlining and development.

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

November 8, 2018

January 15, 2019

May 16, 2019

Third Thursday Writing Retreat. The Department of Scientific Publications 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.*

November 15, 2018

December 20, 2018

January 17, 2019

February 21, 2019

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 the Department of Scientific Publications and will run October 29 through November 30, 2018.

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

Session 1 – January 7 through February 21, 2019

Pronunciation 1, Pronunciation 2, Conversation 1, Conversation 2, Writing 3

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.

Writing Scientific Articles (WSA): A Workshop for Faculty. WSA is a structured, practical, in-depth writing-education program for clinical and basic science research faculty at MD Anderson taught by the Department of Scientific Publications. This 1-day, 8-contact-hour course provides an excellent opportunity to advance your skills in writing research articles with focus and clarity.

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

February 5, 2019

Scientific Publications Now Charging No-Show Fees. Scientific Publications' popular full-day courses—Writing and Publishing Scientific Articles, Writing Scientific Articles, and Writing Persuasive R01 Proposals—are available to MD Anderson faculty and trainees free of charge. For many courses, we have more applicants than spaces available; and sometimes those accepted do not show up for the courses. Therefore, to ensure that as many faculty and trainees as possible can participate in our courses, we implemented a new cancellation/no-show policy. Registrants are able to drop a course without penalty until a specified date and time (typically 2 work days before the course begins), but those who do not withdraw from the course by that deadline and who do not show up for the course will be charged $95 to the chart string provided at the time of registration.

Webinars Presented by the Department of Scientific Publications. The Department of Scientific Publications continues to host a series of webinars on various topics, including the following. Dates and times, as well as links to upcoming webinars, will be posted as they become available on the Department of Scientific Publications website and in the department's "Educational Events" newsletter.

- **Comma Basics – November 7, 2018, 11:30 am – 12:00 pm**

  In this webinar, Bryan Tutt, a scientific editor in the Department of Scientific Publications, will offer some general guidelines for using commas properly and will review some

examples of correct and incorrect comma use. To join the webinar, click here at the appointed time and log in as a guest.

The following webinars have already been presented and recorded:

- **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, discuss how the Research Medical Library and Scientific Publications 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, 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 scientific editor in the Department of Scientific Publications, 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 the Department of Scientific Publications, 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 the Department of Scientific Publications, 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 the Department of Scientific Publications, 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 the Department of Scientific Publications, 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 the Department of Scientific Publications 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 the Department of Scientific Publications 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 the Department of Scientific Publications, 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. The Department of Scientific Publications 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 (developed by Drs. Stephen Russell and David Morrison and 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 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 and Webinars Presented by the Research Medical Library. More classes will be posted on the Research Medical Library website once they have been finalized.

Classes 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.

November 1, 11:00 am, class: PubMed: The Basics

November 14, 10:00 am, class: EndNote: The Basics

November 28, 10:00 am, class: EndNote: Advanced Tips

December 5, 10:30 am, class: EndNote: The Basics

December 12, 11:00 am, class, EndNote: Advanced Tips

December 14, 1:30 pm, class: Literature Reviews

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