Be thinking about the following questions which will be discussed during the workshop.

Why do we loathe Publication & Reporting?

Analysis and Statistics:

In 2005, John Loannidis published a paper in PLoS Medicine titled "Why Most Published Research Findings are False." The paper's now been cited >4000 times. Do you think he's right?

Experimental Design:

When is something "Good enough?" Do you need 95% genome coverage when 90% is giving you revolutionary information?

To what degree are you responsible for data generated by a collaborator? Or by other people in the lab?

Should you cite facts from the latest paper, or go back to the original?

What are some of the ramifications of presenting the results of an exploratory analysis with a confirmatory analysis?

What role does reproducibility play in confirmatory and exploratory analysis?

Why do we need both confirmatory and exploratory analysis? Why not just confirmatory?

What are 3 important points to consider when working with animal models?

Can you think of an example where a mouse model may have provided ambiguous results?

Publication and Reporting:

Why do we loathe Publication & Reporting?