

articles. To create this list, write a brief description of the function of each sentence in the Discussion section of at least TWO target articles. When you have finished, read the analysis of the simplified Discussion section below, and then compare your list with the generic model on page 208. Some components in your list will be similar to those in the generic model; others will be specific to the research topic you are dealing with, the current conventions of your field, or the type of article you are writing. Integrate your list with the generic list to produce a robust set of model components for the Discussion section in your current research area, and adapt or update this as necessary.

An assessment of post V2D sequelae in disease survivors

Discussion

1 *To our knowledge, the study reported here is the largest study of patients who have survived the viral disease V2D, and provides a key contribution to the understanding of post-V2D health issues following infection.* **2** *Our study is the first to record a wide range of post-V2D complications, and provides clear evidence that survivors who experience a given symptom during V2D infection often present with a closely-related symptom within 300 days following infection.* **3** *This was particularly true in relation to some specific complications, such as hearing loss (Fig. 1).* **4** *A key finding was that some post-V2D health issues appear to be age-related: infants below the age of 2 experienced post-V2D cardiac complications far less frequently than adults irrespective of the severity of such complications during the acute stage (Figs. 2a and 2b).* **5** *This has clear implications for post-V2D-related public health management, and suggests that when resources are limited, cardiac screening priority could be given to adults.*

6 *Some questions remain; for example, anecdotal evidence collected from patients during the study period suggested that there was a positive correlation between viral load at the acute stage and the severity of post-V2D health issues.* **7** *However, this was not addressed formally during the study.* **8** *Although many studies have quantified viral load during acute V2D^{17,22,27,33}, a direct comparison with the*

post-viral period would provide valuable data to support such a correlation.

9 V2D RNA is known to persist in the bodies of survivors long after disease onset^{30,42}, and the results of our study provide compelling evidence that follow-up of all convalescent patients is warranted for at least 10 months after discharge from hospital. 10 In addition, the study provides evidence-based guidance for pragmatic public health recommendations that include age-related follow-up and treatment of post-V2D complications.

4.2.2 Key

In Sentence 1 *To our knowledge, the study reported here is the largest study of patients who have survived the viral disease V2D, and provides a key contribution to the understanding of post-V2D health issues following infection. the writer explicitly identifies the contribution of the study in relation to the existing literature and knowledge.*

Doesn't 'to our knowledge' sound a bit weak? Aren't I supposed to know whether it is the largest study or not?

In Sentence 1, the writer includes the phrase *to our knowledge* in case a study has been overlooked accidentally. Even after every effort has been made to search all relevant journals, it is difficult to be absolutely sure that no-one has ever done a particular type of study until now. Immediately before submission you should check current research as thoroughly as possible, using a wide range of keywords. The information you get from the internet will only be as good as your skill in looking for it, and it is unprofessional to make a mistake in a sentence like this. Research develops and is published at a very fast rate, and during the time it takes to submit to your target journal/receive peer review/redraft and resubmit, it is possible that similar research may have been published. If that is the case, don't panic. It may only be necessary to review and clarify the similarities and differences between your study and others in order to separate and identify the contribution yours makes to the topic.