BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

ASSIGNMENT 1: Epilepsy Reading Exercise

Due Sunday 2/1/15 (Midnight on Blackboard, submit via Turnitin)

For this assignment, read the assigned short review article, part of an excellent Nature Outlook series on epilepsy. We will focus on this series for the first two assignments. This week's assignment is designed to introduce you to the current state of epilepsy research and the exciting directions in which the field is heading. You will be asked to delve into one aspect that you find interesting for your next assignment, so keep this in mind as you read through the article.

Required reading: Eisenstein M (2014) Neurobiology: Unrestrained excitement. Nature 511: S4–S6. doi:10.1038/511S4a.

Further reading: If you are curious about this Nature Outlook series, four articles from this series are uploaded to the Section 2 folder on Blackboard. Additionally, you can access all the articles from: http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v511/n7508_supp/index.html#editorial

In a word document to be submitted via Blackboard, include the following (don't forget to include your name!):

1. List as many neuroscience terms covered by the article as you can find.
2. For five terms chosen from the above list:
    (a) **In quotes**, write down the definition/description provided by the article.
    (b) Come up with a more thorough definition/description of your own, based on your own background research. Your definitions should be understandable to an intelligent neuroscience student like yourself. For each defined term, provide the source of your information (your text book is a good place to start, and Wikipedia is ok).
3. In a few sentences, describe one aspect of epilepsy from the reading that you find interesting and would like to explore further. Why? Be prepared to discuss your answers in the next class.

PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 1

Due 2/3/15 (Beginning of class)
Citing sources properly is crucial for your success in this class. Read through the plagiarism tutorial and complete the plagiarism exercise, then email me with your score:
https://plagiarism.arts.cornell.edu/tutorial/index.cfm

Over 80% correct is accepted for full participation grade (you can take the exercise multiple times).

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

ASSIGNMENT 1 RUBRIC:

Question 1 (20%)

3 The list of terms is complete and covers the entire article

2 The list of terms is missing many key terms from the reading

1 The list of terms is very short and incomplete

Question 2 (50%)

3 For the chosen 5 terms, definitions from articles are scientifically accurate; Student definitions for 5 terms are accurate, detailed, and coherent. Student demonstrates clear understanding of the terms. Sources are properly cited

2 For the chosen 5 terms, definitions from articles are accurate; Student definitions for 5 terms are accurate but not detailed, and may be confusing or ambiguous. Sources are properly cited

1 For the chosen 5 terms, definitions from articles are inaccurate; Student definitions for 5 terms are inaccurate, not detailed, and are confusing or ambiguous. Sources are improperly cited

Question 3 (20%)

3 Student concisely describes an area of epilepsy research that is interesting to them, provides explanation of why it is interesting.

2 Student concisely describes an area of epilepsy research that is interesting to them, does not provide explanation of why it is interesting.

1 Student does not describe an area of epilepsy research that is interesting to them, does not provide explanation of why it is interesting.

Grammar/Spelling (10%)

3 No grammar or spelling mistakes

2 Some grammar and spelling mistakes

1 Many grammar and spelling mistakes

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

ASSIGNMENT 2: Epilepsy Blog Post

1st draft due Sunday 2/8/15 (Midnight on Blackboard, via Turnitin)
Final draft due Sunday 2/22/15 (Midnight on Blackboard, via Turnitin)

In 400-500 words (12 font, double spaced), write a blog post about new research related to epilepsy based on the topic you chose for last week's assignment and in-class reading. Your blog post should refer to both the review article chosen from the Nature Outlook Epilepsy series and to at least one related primary research article. Alternatively, pick a review article and a research article of your choice, both related to epilepsy. You can find these articles by searching a database you learned about in the library session, or by choosing from the reference list from Nature Outlook Epilepsy.

The blog post should be generally organized into the following sections (no need to have section titles)**:**

1) **Title:** provide a brief title that is informative, concise, and engaging
2) **Introduction/background:** provide a brief summary on your topic by using information from the Nature Outlook article and background information from the research article.
3) **Body*:** briefly outline major questions, methods, and findings of the research article you chose.
4) **Discussion*:** explain why these findings are novel and important for the treatment or understanding of epilepsy. Discuss potential future follow-up studies, or speculate on how the results may lead to improvements in epilepsy treatment and prevention.
   * You can choose to integrate the body and discussion sections, so that the impact of each result is immediately discussed. If you do this, be sure to have a summary statement at the very end!
5) **References:** You can either use the APA citation style (see the website set up for our class: http://guides.library.cornell.edu/c.php?g=213245&p=1406788) or follow the format found in one of your papers (amazingly, there is no conventional format for citing papers; each journal is different. Just pick one and be consistent. You can also check out the journal's website, which should have an author's instructions section with sample formats for articles, book chapters, books, etc.).

Your intended audience: someone like yourself and your peers; educated college students who read science blogs for fun.

Below are some examples of science blogs, feel free to find your own!

1. http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/not-bad-science/2015/01/13/can-pigs-empathize/
2. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/chronic-pain-associated-with-activation-of-brain-s-glial-cells/
3. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/rats-experience-feelings-of-regret/
4. Still looking for stylistic guidance? Here's a blog I liked that made basic scientific jargon interesting: http://www.brainfacts.org/brain-basics/cell-communication/articles/2011/neurotransmitters-how-brain-cells-use-chemicals-to-communicate/

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

ASSIGNMENT 2 RUBRIC

1st Draft Score: _____ Final Draft Score: _____ Total Score: _____

Title (5%)

3 Title is concise, informative, and engaging
2 Title is not concise, but informative
1 Title is not concise, and misleading

Introduction/Background (35%)

3 Provides relevant and interesting background information leading to major questions addressed by the primary research article. Provides enough context for the reader to gauge both the scientific merit of the paper and its broader impact to epilepsy research and society. In other words, the blog post articulates clearly why a reader should care about the results to be discussed. There is no misinformation.
2 Provides relevant background information, but does not explain why the topic is important or interesting. There is some misinformation.
1 Does not provide sufficient background information; the reader simply does not want to keep reading. There is substantial misinformation.

Body/Discussion (35%)

3 The chosen research paper has interesting results with high impact for the field of epilepsy research. The author accurately explains the major findings, which are placed in a broader context. The author articulates why the results are important. Given the results, the author is able to come up with exciting and logical potential future directions.
2 The research paper does not contribute significantly to the field of epilepsy research, but the author is able to explain its major results in a clear and concise manner. The author places the findings in a broader context but their contribution to science and society is not immediately apparent. No future directions are discussed.
1 The author misinterprets the results of the research paper, which may not be very interesting to begin with. The author fails to explain scientific jargon. No future directions are discussed.

References (5%)

3 References follow the APA format or a format from a scientific journal. This format is consistently used.
2 References are not cited in-text as numbers or have inconsistent formatting styles.
1 No references provided

Style (10%)

3 The blog pulls the reader in. The language is articulate, concise, yet engaging. There is good flow from one section to the next. Scientific jargon is explained in interesting, reader-friendly ways.
2 The language is scientifically accurate but not engaging. There might be run-on sentences that are hard to follow. There might be unnecessary scientific jargon.
1 The language is dry, incoherent, or even hostile to the reader.

Grammar/Spelling (10%)

3 No grammatical or spelling mistakes
2 Some grammatical and spelling mistakes
1 Many grammatical and spelling mistakes

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

ASSIGNMENT 3: Opinion article on *Drosophila melanogaster* as a model for neural disorders

1st draft due Sunday 3/1/15 (Midnight on Blackboard via Turnitin)
Final draft due Sunday 3/15/15 (Midnight on Blackboard via Turnitin)

THE SCENARIO
You are a professor at a major research institution, running a laboratory that investigates the neural and molecular basis of drug addiction and hyperactivity by using the fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*) as a model organism. Due to a strong anti-science climate, congress threatens to pass a bill that would cut the National Institutes of Health (NIH)'s funding in half, especially for research using invertebrate model organisms.

In 900-1000 words, write a coherent argument to persuade your congressman/woman to vote against defunding research using invertebrate model organisms, especially *Drosophila*, to study neural diseases and disorders, using addiction or hyperactivity as an example. Defend why research funds should continue to support labs using invertebrate organisms.

USE THESE QUESTIONS AS GUIDEPOSTS:
1) What are the advantages for using animal models to studying human neuropsychiatric disease in general?
2) What are specific advantages that *Drosophila* offers? If you want you can compare it briefly to another model.
3) What are some recent neural disease-related findings from *Drosophila* that demonstrate its utility for medicine and science? Here is where you should go in-depth into the results of the at least one study (suggested papers listed below).
4) Can studies in *Drosophila* have potential for human clinical trials/drug discovery?
5) What are some future gains expected from using *Drosophila* to study the mechanisms of neural disorders?

REQUIRED READING: You must cite the review paper and at least 2 primary sources from the list provided below, using in-text citation and a reference list at the end of the article. Remember, a successful paper is able to communicate the results of at least one primary study in depth, while also mentioning the other studies to bolster the argument.

Review:
1. Kaun KR, Devineni AV, Heberlein U (2012) Drosophila melanogaster as a model to study drug addiction. Hum Genet 131: 959–975. doi:10.1007/s00439-012-1146-6.

Primary papers:
2. Kaun KR, Azanchi R, Maung Z, Hirsh J, Heberlein U (2011) A Drosophila model for alcohol reward. Nature Publishing Group 14: 612–619. doi:10.1038/nn.2805.
3. Lebestky T, Chang J-SC, Dankert H, Zelnik L, Kim Y-C, et al. (2009) Two different forms of arousal in Drosophila are oppositely regulated by the dopamine D1 receptor ortholog DopR via distinct neural circuits. Neuron 64: 522–536. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2009.09.031.
4. Bainton RJ, Tsai LT, Singh CM, Moore MS, Neckameyer WS, et al. (2000) Dopamine modulates acute responses to cocaine, nicotine and ethanol in Drosophila. Current Biology 10: 187–194.

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

RUBRIC

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND (25%)
- Provides relevant background information leading to the major argument of the paper.
- Goes from broad to specific.
- Sets up a stasis/destabilization for a resistant reader.
- There is no misinformation.

BODY (35%)
- Argument for using *Drosophila* is coherent and grounded in scientific data.
- Goes into the detailed findings of at least one of the required readings.
- The author accurately explains the hypothesis and major findings, which are placed in a broader context. The author articulates why the results are important. Given the results, the author is able to come up with exciting and logical potential future directions.
- There is no misinformation.

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION (15%)
- Summarizes major points of the argument.
- Goes from narrow to broad.
- Ends with a strong statement that supports the usage of model organisms, such as *Drosophila*

STYLE (10%)
- The article pulls the reader in.
- The language is articulate, concise, yet engaging.
- There is good flow from one section to the next.
- Scientific jargon is explained in interesting, reader-friendly ways.
- The article is not too verbose (goes over the word limit) and not too sparse in information content (goes under the word limit).

GRAMMAR/SPELLING (10%)
- No grammatical or spelling mistakes.

CITATIONS (5%)
- References follow the APA format or a format from a scientific journal. This format is consistently used.
- There is sufficient in-text citation throughout.

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

ASSIGNMENT 4: News & Views article

1st draft due Tuesday 3/24/15 (Midnight on Blackboard via Turnitin)
Final draft due Tuesday 4/14/15 (Midnight on Blackboard via Turnitin)

In approximately 4 pages (Arial; font size no smaller than 11; 1" margins), write a News & Views article for Tye et. al., 2013. Prominent journals such as Nature often invite experts in a given field to write a "News & Views" article to introduce high-impact studies to be published in the same issue. These articles provide the context and perspective for why the highlighted study is transformative and impactful to the field. So, this is like a mini-review paper that highlights the results of one study, written for a non-specialist, scientific reader.

A successful paper is able to communicate the results of the focal primary study in depth, while placing them in a larger context. A good strategy is to provide what is already known about the topic, and identify gaps in knowledge that this paper helps to fill. ***SEE RUBRIC FOR MORE REQUIREMENTS.***

FIGURE: As a part of the assignment, you are required to come up with a summary diagram/figure of your own. The purpose of the figure is to graphically summarize the content/results of the highlighted article. See Optional Reading below for inspiration.

This figure can be integrated into the text or placed after the References section. It should be labeled "Figure 1", with a concise legend explaining what the figure depicts. You should refer to "Fig. 1" in the text of the article where appropriate. You can adapt elements from images taken from other sources (in which case the source needs to be cited in the figure legend), but you need to add your unique touch. While I appreciate artistic creativity, the figure should be clear and informative. Programs like Adobe Illustrator and PowerPoint, are good for making figures. Email me if you have any questions.

REQUIRED READING: Note, you are welcome to cite other papers as needed.

Deisseroth K (2014) Circuit dynamics of adaptive and maladaptive behaviour. Nature 505: 309–317. doi:10.1038/nature12982.

Tye KM, Mirzabekov JJ, Warden MR, Ferenczi EA, Tsai H-C, et al. (2013) Dopamine neurons modulate neural encoding and expression of depression-related behaviour. Nature 493: 537–541. doi:10.1038/nature11740.

RECOMMENDED READING:

Drevets WC (2001) Neuroimaging and neuropathological studies of depression: implications for the cognitive-emotional features of mood disorders. Current Opinion in Neurobiology 11: 240–249.

Sample News & Views articles:

1. Hamann S (2005) Blue genes: wiring the brain for depression. Nature Neuroscience 8: 701–703. doi:10.1038/nn0605-701.
2. Schratt G (2014) Neurobiology: a molecular knife to dice depression. Nature 516: 45–46. doi:10.1038/nature13942.

RUBRIC:

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

1. TITLE (2%)
- The title is clear, concise, and informative

2. SUMMARY (3%): In two sentences, capture the essence of your article. See Optional Reading for examples
- The summary is clear, concise, and informative

3. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND (25%)
- Provides relevant background information
- Identifies gaps in knowledge that lead to the importance of Tye et al. 2013
- Includes a discussion of why dissection of neural circuits is important, as opposed to treating the brain like a "neurochemical soup".
- There is no misinformation.

4. BODY (35%)
- The author accurately explains the hypothesis and major findings of Tye et al., 2013, which are placed in a broader context.
- Given the results, the author is able to come up potential impact on the mechanistic understanding of depression.
- There is no misinformation.

5. SUMMARY FIGURE (5%)
- The figure is informative, clear, and captures major points of your article.
- The figure legend is descriptive yet concise.
- The figure legend cites sources properly.
- Abbreviations are spelled out in the legend.

6. DISCUSSION (15%)
- Summarizes the importance of major findings of Tye et al., 2013 in the context of understanding neural mechanisms underlying depression.
- Identifies logical future experiments.
- Discusses potential contribution of results to future treatment. The author is careful in discussing the feasibility of using optogenetics in humans.

7. STYLE & GRAMMAR (10%)
- The article pulls the reader in.
- The language is articulate, concise, yet engaging.
- There is good flow from one section to the next.
- Scientific jargon is explained in interesting, reader-friendly ways.
- The article is not too verbose (goes over the page limit) and not too sparse in information content (goes under the page limit).
- No grammatical or spelling mistakes.

8. CITATIONS (5%)
- References follow the APA format or a format from a scientific journal. This format is consistently used.
- There is sufficient in-text citation throughout.
- A reference list is provided at the end of the article.

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

Assignment 5: Review Article (200 pts)

In the next four weeks you will be writing a review article on a topic of your choice that is related to a neural disease or disorder. The topic and disease you chose can be explored at the behavioral, neural network, neuron, and/or molecular and genetic levels. Your review can focus on a few of these levels or encompass all levels. The goal is for you and the reader (educated scientific audience) to gain a deep understanding of interesting aspects of a disease. Appended below is a guide on writing a review paper. Please refer to it for helpful information, as well as the structure that your review should follow.

Major portions are due **Tuesdays, at midnight, on blackboard**. Revise/improve sections as you go along. Parts 1-3 constitute 40% of the final essay grade, equivalent to a first draft grade of previous essay assignments. Late penalties will apply to each section. Due to time constraints, I will likely set aside class time to meet with you personally about your progress before you turn in the final draft, but you will not get detailed comments from me for each part before the final paper is due.

Part 1: Due Tuesday 4/21 (10 pts)
Title, Annotated Bibliography and outline

Find at least 5 primary and/or review articles relevant to your topic and disease of choice. Complete an annotated bibliography for these papers. Please refer to this online guide from Cornell Library: http://guides.library.cornell.edu/c.php?g=32342&p=203789

Additionally, please provide a general outline for your review. Your title should be a concise summary of your review's main purpose. State the objective(s) of your review, and outline sub-sections that will address specific aspects of your main objective. You will end up dividing up your literature review into sub-sections, so each subsection should develop into stand-alone portions later. In other words, each of your major sections (Intro, lit review, discussion) should address several specific topics.

Part 2: Due Tuesday 4/28 (30 pts)
Introduction & reference list

Part 3: Due Tuesday 5/5 (40 pts)
Body: literature review & figures
(Including an updated reference list)

Part 4: Due Tuesday 5/12 (120 pts)
Entire review article, including new sections: Discussion, Abstract, finalized Title & References

Format: All papers should be done in Word and double-spaced. A good review should be between 8-10 pages total, including figures and references.

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

Writing a Review Article

What is it?

A literature review is a classification and evaluation of what accredited scholars and researchers have written on a topic, organized according to the research question you wish to address. In other words, the author of a review paper summarizes a body of literature related to a specific research question, and in the most interesting cases, even tests a hypothesis using the results of other studies instead of actual data to make conclusions (i.e. look for controversial studies).

Why important?

The process of reviewing the literature is an incredibly important part of being a scientist, a science writer or even a research physician. It is critical to know what has been done and what has not been done on a specific research topic in order to avoid repeating the same studies or to develop novel approaches for future studies with appropriate hypotheses and predictions. Review papers are important syntheses of what people have learned about a particular topic and help to define the gaps in our knowledge. Most importantly, through the thoughtful integration and organization of past research, one hopes to inspire new questions.

Writing a literature review

Your objective is not to "list" as many articles on a particular topic as possible. Rather, demonstrate your intellectual ability to **recognize**, **synthesize**, and **evaluate** information relevant to a guiding concept or question you have chosen. Your readers not only want to know what literature exists, but also your informed evaluation of the data and their implications.

Thus, a literature review is NOT just a summary, but a conceptually organized synthesis of the results of your literature search. It must:

1. Organize information and relate it to the thesis or research question you are developing.

2. Identify controversy or alternative explanations for a pattern or phenomenon when it appears in the literature.

3. Synthesize results into a summary of what is and is not known.

4. Develop questions for further research.

Structure of your review paper

A. Titles

Your main title should be informative and concise summary of the main point of your review. Do not just use "literature review" as a title for your paper. Furthermore, choose section headings that provide structure and organization for the body of the review (see below).

B. Abstract (between 200-300 words)

Your abstract should be a short, powerful, and informative summary of your review.
This section should be done last, after all other sections are written. Refer to abstracts of review articles that you find for guidance.

C. Introduction

1. Explain why your topic and disease is interesting or important to the field of neurobiology. Why should we care?

2. Provide some background mechanistic information on the disease. For example, how many people are afflicted? What genes, neuromodulators, or anatomical structure does it affect? How does the system function normally, and what is changed in the diseased state?

3. Provide necessary definitions or explanations so that your reader will understand what you are trying to explain. Assume a general scientific audience, not just neurobiologists.

4. State the objectives of your review very clearly! For example, what levels of analysis will you be reviewing (behavioral, neural network, neuron, and/or molecular and genetic levels)? Given the background you have laid down, do you have specific questions that you want to focus on, perhaps on new developments in the field? Remember, even though it's a review, you can still form a **hypothesis**. If you do, the next section will aim to present primary literature that can support or falsify your hypothesis. Alternatively, there maybe some major hypotheses proposed by scientists in the field, and your review can analyze one or several of them in depth, providing a literature review to find support or lack thereof for each.

D. Body: literature review

Carefully break your objectives and/or hypotheses down into manageable parts and use key ideas or concepts to organize the body of your review. You should have subsections with concise but informative titles to clearly organize information, giving your readers landmarks by which to navigate.

Figures: To illustrate main points, you should include figures of key findings from primary or review literature. Reference to figures should be embedded into the main text. Figure legends should be concise but understandable stand-alone. Be sure to give credit to the authors for the figures.

E. Discussion

This is where you synthesize the information for your reader, extracting the core elements of the research and discussing any contradictions, patterns or significant problems. Finally, you end with suggestions for the future of this body of research. What do we still not understand? How might we begin to address it?

F. References:

Although you will only turn in 5 annotated bibliographies to me in the first week, your reference list should grow to at least **10 sources** through the review writing process. A successful review usually has many more than 10!

Chose a citation format from a journal of your choice, but you must be consistent.

(Adapted from BioEE 278, RJ Safran)

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

Assignment 5 Rubric and Grade Sheet

Student:

Part 1 score: /10
Part 2 score: /30
Part 3 score: /40
Part 4 Score: /120
Total assignment 5 score: /200

Part 4 Grade Break Down (120 pts total):

Title (2pts):
The title is clear, concise, and informative.

Abstract (8pts):
The abstract is clear, concise, and informative.

Introduction (30pts):
- Provides relevant background information.
- Identifies gaps in knowledge in the field.
- Introduces subsection topics and main hypothesis/thesis of the review.
- Engages the reader and convinces the reader that this topic is important.
- There is no misinformation.

Body (40pts):
- The subsections are detailed and well researched.
- The subsection topics are relevant to the overall topic.
- The author provides clear summaries of primary literature and provides interpretations of results.
- The author synthesizes across multiple primary papers.
- There is no misinformation.

Figures (5pts):
- The figures are informative, clear, and capture major points of the article.
- The figure legends are descriptive yet concise, and paraphrased from original source.
- The figure legends cite sources properly.
- Abbreviations are spelled out in the legends.

Discussion (20pts):
- Summarizes the importance of major subsections.
- Identifies logical future directions for research in the reviewed topic.

Grammar/style (10pts):
- The article pulls the reader in.
- The language is articulate, concise, yet engaging.
- There is good flow from one section to the next.
- Scientific jargon is explained in interesting, reader-friendly ways.

- The article is not too verbose (goes over the page limit) and not too sparse in information content (goes under the page limit).
- No grammatical or spelling mistakes.

Citations (5pts):

- References follow the APA format or a format from a scientific journal. This format is consistently used.
- There is sufficient in-text citation throughout.
- A reference list is provided at the end of the article.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY & OUTLINE, ASSIGNMENT 5
BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section, Spring 2015
TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

Your name: _____

WHAT IS AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY?
An annotated bibliography is a list of citations to books, articles, and documents. Each citation is followed by a brief (usually about 150 words) descriptive and evaluative paragraph, the annotation. The purpose of the annotation is to inform the reader of the relevance, accuracy, and quality of the sources cited.

THE PROCESS
Creating an annotated bibliography calls for the application of a variety of intellectual skills: concise exposition, succinct analysis, and informed library research.
First, locate and record citations to books, periodicals, and documents that may contain useful information and ideas on your topic. Briefly examine and review the actual items. Then choose those works that provide a variety of perspectives on your topic.
Cite the book, article, or document using the appropriate style.

Write a concise annotation that summarizes the central theme and scope of the book or article. Include in the summary: (a) evaluate the authority or background of the author, (b) comment on the intended audience, (c) compare or contrast this work with another you have cited, or (d) explain how this work illuminates your bibliography topic.

Article 1

Citation:

Summary:

Article 2

Citation:

Summary:

Article 3

Citation:

Summary:

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

ASSIGNMENT 5 Power Point Presentation
Due: Monday 5/4 5pm by email to Jenny

Make a PowerPoint presentation that is ~10 min long, with 2 min for questions.

Introduction/background: 2-3 slides, ~ 3min

- Give an overview of the disease and topic of your review paper. For example, how many people are affected, what is the history of treatment and/or diagnoses?
- Provide neural mechanistic details if they don't overlap with the body/data section.
- Briefly outline your subsection topics.

Body/Data figures: 3-5 slides, ~5 min

- Can go into some detail about your subsections.
- Show some data figures that you have chosen for your paper. Explain the experimental setup/methods, and interpretations of the results.

Conclusion/discussion: 1-2 slides; ~2min

- What are the implications of these results for understanding the etiology of the disease?
- What are the implications of these results for treatment and/or diagnoses of the disease?

General tips:

- Each slide should have a descriptive title.
- Utilize the entire slide by making fonts and graphics easy to see.
- Try not to include too much text.
- Provide citations on the bottom of slides (e.g. Smith et al., 2013)

BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section
Spring 2015

TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

Grading:

I will be grading generally based on the overall quality of your presentation.

The scale will be as follows:

Insufficient (0 participation points)
Sufficient (1/2 participation points)
Excellent (Full participation points)

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY & OUTLINE, ASSIGNMENT 5
BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section, Spring 2015
TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

Article 4

Citation:

Summary:

Article 5

Citation:

Summary:

TENTATIVE OUTLINE:

Main title:

Main topic/thesis/hypothesis:

Introduction/background:

Body:

Subsection 1:

Subsection 2:

Subsection 3:

Discussion:

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY & OUTLINE, ASSIGNMENT 5
BIONB 2220 Writing In the Majors Section, Spring 2015
TA: Ni (Jenny) Feng nf82@cornell.edu

Potential figures: