

Lecture Review

Yesterday, we discussed the importance of ethics in research as it relates to the writing of articles with multiple authors from various backgrounds. In particular, the Jan Hendrik Schön and Obokata Haruko cases were discussed; focusing on issues of plagiarism, data fabrication, and lack of oversight by other authors. As it related to the issue at hand, the researcher's definition of "summarize" was given in terms of the other two keywords of this term ("assess" and "explain"). Lastly, the plan of work for the second half of the term was presented. Our goal is to write a PRL-formatted paper by August based on your current work.

Relevant Websites

<http://goo.gl/jFblDb>

<https://goo.gl/zHDtez>

<https://journals.aps.org/prl/authors>

Homework Five

Over the next week, I will return to you a critique of your 17 May abstract submission. You are to update your abstract in line with the criticisms sent to you. However, if you feel that you do not need to, that is fine. This is an example of responding to peer review. Whatever edits you make, you are to send me the updated version, via e-mail, no later than 12:00 Tuesday, 7 June.

For Next Class

For 1 June, please make sure to bring your laptop and journal notebook. We will review your 17 May submissions, focusing on what questions are generated by your written explanation of your dissertation topic.

(If you have any problems accessing the above websites or videos, please let me know).