Writing the Introduction & Writing the Methods (HW)

Introduction (paper link: https://www.jbc.org/article/S0021-9258(19)52451-6/pdf) :

1. Read the paper’s introduction section and categorize sentences as belonging to the following subsections: https://www.jbc.org/article/S0021-9258(19)52451-6/pdf

a. Since 1922 when Wu proposed the use of the Folin phenol reagent for the measurement of proteins (l), a number of modified analytical procedures utilizing this reagent have been reported for the determination of proteins in serum (2-G), in antigen-antibody precipitates (7-9), and in insulin (10).

d. Although the reagent would seem to be recommended by its great sensitivity and the simplicity of procedure possible with its use, it has not found great favor for general biochemical purposes.

c. In the belief that this reagent, nevertheless, has considerable merit for certain application, but that its peculiarities and limitations need to be understood for its fullest exploitation, it has been studied with regard to effects of variations in pH, time of reaction, and concentration of reactants, permissible levels of reagents commonly used in handling proteins, and interfering substances.

f. Procedures are described for measuring protein in solution or after precipitation with acids or other agents, and for the determination of as little as 0.2 y of protein.

2. I think that a reader with a reasonable amount of background knowledge in this field would be able to understand the general purpose of the paper’s work and its introduction. This is because the paper itself references that the reagent being studied has already been documented in its relation to variations in pH, time of reaction, etc.

3. I think the introduction of this paper felt slightly lacking, in that I was unable to glean much from it as someone with a weaker understanding the topics/background. I understood that the paper’s purpose was to explore a certain reagent, but the writers could have included a concrete example of one of the reagent’s current applications (if any), specifically discussing the pathways that it’s involved in, rather than just mentioning the applications briefly. The purpose of the paper was also not fleshed out very well, aside from the general statements regarding the procedures of the paper.

Methods

1. The first option is the best, because it is specific in what accession code was used, and the source of the data, but it doesn’t go into too much detail (e.g. no function names or arguments are included).

2. The second option is best, because it talks in the past tense about the methods that it used (e.g. “…a plot was created…”

3. The second option is best, because it doesn’t document every single step that was made (i.e. the first option talks in detail about the mistakes that were made, and what was done to fix them), but it still talks about the type of preprocessing that was performed on the data and the justifications for these processing steps.