

	<p>PUBH 8901 Doctoral Professional Development Seminar School of Public Health The University of Memphis Fall 2019 Mondays, 5:30-8:30pm 235 Robison Hall</p>
---	---

Instructor

Ken Ward

Office: 201 Robison Hall

Phone: 678.1702

E-mail: kdward@memphis.edu

Office hours: by appointment

Course Description

This is a seminar for all School of Public Health doctoral students that is required during the first or second year of training. It will address a variety of professional issues that are vital to success as a doctoral student and public health professional. A major portion of the course is dedicated to responsible conduct in research. Other topics include public health history, philosophy, and ethics; manuscript and grant writing; reviewing others' scientific work; delivering poster and oral presentations; developing positive mentor/mentee relationships, and time management.

Course Prerequisite

Enrollment as a first or second year doctoral student in the School of Public Health

Learning Objectives

1. Discuss and critically evaluate scholarly or popular treatments of major developments in the history or philosophy of public health
2. Apply ethics frameworks to public health decision making
3. Understand, evaluate, and apply accepted standards of responsible conduct in scientific research
4. Prepare and deliver effective poster and oral presentations
5. Understand effective strategies for identifying grant funding opportunities and writing successful research grants
6. Critically evaluate the quality of scientific manuscripts submitted for publication
7. Improve scientific writing skills
8. Recognize and discuss diverse issues important to educational and professional success
9. Understand the roles and responsibilities of mentors and mentees
10. Identify effective time management strategies

Competencies

SBS PhD Competency #5: Demonstrate knowledge of the history, philosophy, and professional and ethical standards of public health.

Epidemiology PhD and Health Systems and Policy PhD Competency #5: 5. Know and appreciate the history, philosophy, and professional and ethical standards of public health.

Communication

All written assignments should be submitted via email to the instructor at kdward@memphis.edu. The instructor will communicate with you, including notifying you when assignments have been received, by email. In accordance with School of Public Health policy, and due to legal, ethical, and privacy concerns, only your official U of M email address will be used for communication. Emails will be sent only to your official U of M email address, and will be accepted from you only through that account. It is the student's responsibility to regularly check this

account.

Required Texts

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition. Washington DC: ASM Press.

Readings will be assigned in addition to the textbook, as detailed in this syllabus. Links are included in this syllabus to access web-based materials. Web links sometimes change; if a link does not work, enter the resource's information in a web search engine such as Google, and you are likely to find it. If this does not work, please contact the instructor. Readings are available at: <https://umdrive.memphis.edu/kdward/public/PUBH8901>.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria

Grading will be based on attendance, participation, various homework assignments, and in-class projects, as described below:

Class attendance & participation	20%
Reaction papers (total of 10)	30%
Book review	25%
Weekly discussion questions on readings (total of 10)	10%
Oral scientific presentation	10%
Plagiarism quiz	5%

Class attendance & participation (20%): As a community of scholars, it is expected that the instructor and students will work together at all times to create an atmosphere that fosters shared discovery and mutual respect. The instructor will be prepared for each class meeting, and, likewise, students are expected to arrive prepared to ask questions, discuss, and learn. Attendance and active participation are essential to the success of a doctoral seminar such as this. As such, students are expected to be present for all classes, arrive on time, stay for the entire class session, and participate actively. In the event of an unavoidable absence, please notify the instructor beforehand, if at all possible. Because serious illness or professional travel may occasionally interfere with class attendance, a student may miss one class without penalty. The penalty for a second missed class is 10% of the total course grade. The penalty for a third missed class is an additional 10% of the course grade. A third missed class will make it impossible to achieve a passing course grade, and is therefore grounds for dismissal from the course.

Several behaviors in the classroom are disruptive and disrespectful to the instructor and other students and are not acceptable. These include tardiness, leaving early, use of electronic devices, and engaging in side conversations while others are talking. If arriving late or leaving early is unavoidable, notify the instructor in advance, if possible. Set your cell phone to silent if you must be available for an emergency. Students who engage in any of these disruptive behaviors may be asked to leave and not allowed to return until a meeting with the instructor has occurred during which a plan to avoid future problems has been worked out.

The following rubric will be used to grade classroom performance:

Criteria considered in grading:	Not Passing	“C” Level	“B” Level	“A” Level
Class attendance	Substantially late to or absent from class; no advance explanation provided. (Note: absence from class means no participation credit is earned for that session).	Arrives late to class at least occasionally.	Arrives on time, is seated and ready to begin at class start time.	Arrives on time, is seated and ready to begin at class start time, immediately ceases other activities at the time the class actually starts.
Attention	Noticeably off-task during a portion of the class and/or distracts others. Examples include, but are not limited to, attending to non-class matters (checking e-mails, texting, and/or using a laptop for any task not directly relevant to what’s going on in the class at the moment), cellphone noise, off-topic conversations/passing notes/texts	Occasionally inattentive, such as engaging in side conversations or other off-task activities. Cellphone noise is occasionally heard during class.	Generally attentive with most conversations focused on the in-class discussion. Rarely introduces peripheral noises or distractions (cellphones and other devices).	Conversations are focused on the in-class discussion. No peripheral noises or distractions (cellphones and other devices).
Participation	Does not ask/answer any questions; does not make comments (or relevant comments) during the session; or significantly derails the agenda of the class.	Does not contribute to class discussion, or participates but comments are off-topic and/or reflective of a lack of preparation (e.g. asking questions that the readings already clearly addressed).	Contributes at a good level (but without dominating); contributions add to (do not derail) the class discussion.	Contributions augment / add to comments from peers; synthesizes / incorporates readings and assignments into the class discussion.
Professional demeanor	Professionalism is lacking in one or more major ways (e.g. uses derogatory and/or other highly unprofessional language).	Professionalism is lacking in one or more minor ways (e.g. use of slang and/or marginally disrespectful or arrogant language).	Class participation reflects a good level of professionalism.	Class participation reflects a noticeably high level of professionalism.

Reaction papers (30%): Students will submit 10 reaction papers based on assigned readings. Papers submitted late (after 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class) do not receive credit. These papers will be responses to case studies presented in the textbook or other readings. Most are responsive to PhD competency 5 (Demonstrate knowledge of the history, philosophy, and professional and ethical standards of public health), as follows: Reaction paper 1 (Peer review), Reaction paper 2 (Authorship), Reaction paper 3 (Plagiarism), Reaction paper 5 (Protecting human research subjects), Reaction paper 6 (Managing competing interests), Reaction paper 7 (research misconduct), Reaction paper 8 (Scientific record-keeping), and Reaction paper 9 (Public health ethics).

The purpose of the reaction papers is to help students think critically about the readings related to responsible

conduct in research, public health ethics, and professional development. The papers also serve as a mechanism to help students improve their writing skills; as such, the instructor will provide feedback on both content and writing style.

Papers should be 1-2 pages, single-spaced, one-inch margins all around, 11-point font. Student's name and submission date should appear at the top, in the header. Be sure to pay attention to the overall organization and paragraph structure of your essay. Usually, a well-organized essay will begin with an introductory paragraph that presents the thesis, continue with at least three body paragraphs that flesh out the thesis, and end with a concluding paragraph. There should be clear structure within each paragraph (i.e. a topic sentence, followed by supporting information, then a concluding statement and/or a segue into the next paragraph). Grading is based on both content and quality of writing, so be sure to check over your sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

A checkmark system will be used to grade the reaction papers (✓+, ✓, or ✓-). In calculating the grade, a ✓- corresponds to a number grade of 70%, a ✓ corresponds to a grade of 85%, and a ✓+ to a grade of 100%. Students will submit a total of 10 reaction papers; the lowest grade will be dropped in calculating the grade.

The following rubric explains how grades will be assigned:

Not Passing	✓-	✓	✓+
Reaction paper is not submitted or is submitted late.	Reaction paper is submitted on time, but is substantially shorter than 1-2 single-spaced pages or has major deficits in either conceptualization (e.g., readings do not appear to have been used or adequately understood) or organization (e.g., poor paragraph structure or segues between paragraphs, grammatical or spelling errors).	Reaction paper is of adequate length, is responsive to the questions, makes adequate use of the assigned readings, and has no major organizational problems.	Reaction paper is of adequate length, is well organized (at a level expected of doctoral level professionals), is responsive to the discussion questions, and goes beyond normal expectations for a beginning doctoral student in terms of quality of critical analysis of relevant issues and use of readings.

Book review (25%): In consideration of PhD competency 5 (Demonstrate knowledge of the history, philosophy, and professional and ethical standards of public health), students are to select a book to review from the list attached to the end of this syllabus. Books address important historical, philosophical, and ethical issues in public health research and practice. Alternatively, another relevant book may be selected, with permission of the instructor. The purpose of this assignment is for students to gain knowledge about important historical phases and events in public health and to critically evaluate a scholarly or popular contribution in the area. Reviews should be 3-4 double-spaced pages (approximately 1000 words), 11-point font, one inch margins all around. Remember that correct grammar and spelling are important in any professional document, and will be considered in grading the book review. A suggested organizational scheme is as follows:

- 1) Introduction (1-2 paragraphs): Brief overview of the book's content and purpose. What is the topic of the book, as well as its historical context and importance? What is the theme, orientation, or philosophy that informs the author's perspective?
- 2) Summary of the content (About 2 pages): Provide a brief summary of the key points/theses of the book;

this is usually organized by chapter or section.

- 3) Evaluation and conclusions (About 1-1.5 pages): Critically evaluate the author's major theses. Are the author's arguments well-supported? What are the book's main strengths and weaknesses? To whom would you recommend the book? Students may make reference to other published reviews of the book as a way to compare and contrast their reactions.

Weekly discussion questions on readings (10%): At the start of most classes, students will submit 2-3 discussion questions based on that week's readings. These questions will be used to guide discussion for that class.

Here are some tips on writing high quality discussion questions:

- 1) When reading the article, take notes and outline its major points. Ask yourself: What is the major "take home" point of the article? What is the author's thesis; do the facts presented support the thesis, or are the suggestions given in the article useful? ,
- 2) Think of questions that interest you, both personally and as a public health professional.
- 3) Think of *why* and *how* questions, instead of *who*, *when*, or *where* questions. *How* and *why* are more interesting, complex, and discussion-focused, whereas *who*, *when*, and *where* are more simple, close-ended, and less discussion-focused.
- 4) Avoid vague questions (e.g., "Do you think the findings are valid?" "What is the author's main point?" or "How could the study have been done differently?" – these do not inspire discussion.
- 5) Avoid very specific and obvious questions ("Was the authors' hypothesis supported?", "What was the major finding?" "What are the study's limitations?") – the answers to such questions can be gleaned from a cursory reading of the article and they tend to generate brief responses rather than discussion.
- 6) High quality discussion questions help readers see patterns and connections or contradictions across readings. For example, how do the findings fit in with the existing body of literature? What are the study's implications for existing public health research or practice?

A checkmark system will be used to grade the discussion questions (✓+, ✓, or ✓-). In calculating the grade, a ✓- corresponds to a number grade of 70%, a ✓ corresponds to a grade of 85%, and a ✓+ to a grade of 100%.

Students will submit a total of 10 sets of discussion questions; the lowest grade will be dropped in calculating the grade.

The following rubric explains how grades will be assigned:

Not Passing	✓-	✓	✓+
Discussion questions not submitted, or submitted late.	Fewer than two questions are submitted, questions are not relevant to the readings, or questions do not lend themselves easily to discussion (e.g., are of the "yes" or "no" variety, or query about factual information from the readings).	2 or 3 questions are submitted, they capture important points from a majority of the readings, they are relevant to the readings, and lend themselves to discussion (e.g., are not "esoteric" and focus on issues especially relevant to graduate public health training.	2 or 3 questions are submitted, they capture important points from all or most of the readings and/or highlights common themes across the readings, and lend themselves to discussion (e.g., are not "esoteric" and focus on issues especially relevant to graduate public health training.

Oral scientific presentation (10%): To help improve oral presentation skills, each student will deliver a 15 minute oral presentation, based on his/her own research. The student will have 10 minutes to present content followed by 5 minutes for questions and feedback. Expectations will be discussed in class. Students also will submit

checklist evaluations of other students' presentations, and provide oral feedback during class. By Session 7 (October 21st) you are expected to submit your topic to the instructor for approval.

Plagiarism quiz (5%): After completing the assigned readings for Session 4, students will complete an on-line quiz of issues in plagiarism, which is available at <http://www.academicintegrity.uoguelph.ca/plagiarism/quiz-plagiarism>. For each of the 10 items, students should select a response until the correct answer is revealed. Quiz results should be printed and a hard copy submitted at the start of Session 4.

Additional requirement for doctoral students who do not possess the MPH degree

The Council on Education for Public Health requires that all students pursuing an academic doctoral degree demonstrate competency in the foundations of public health. Competency is typically demonstrated by having earned the MPH degree. For doctoral students who do not possess the MPH, the School of Public Health has developed online modules that will serve as an introduction for PhD students to gain foundational knowledge in the field and profession of public health. Review of these modules is required of all doctoral students who have not already earned an MPH degree. The modules are self-paced and provide brief assessments at the conclusion of each one. Students must answer 80% of the items correctly of each module to pass, and may take the assessment as many times as needed to obtain 80% passage rate. While no university credit is earned by reviewing the modules, a grade of "pass/fail" will be awarded to each student. Topic areas include the Profession and Science of Public Health and Factors Related to Human Health.

Grading Scale

The letter grades for each requirement are assigned using the following grading scale:

<i>Percentage Grade</i>	<i>Letter Grade</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>Percentage Grade</i>	<i>Letter Grade</i>	<i>GPA</i>
≥96%	A+	4.00	76%	C+	2.33
93%	A	4.00	73%	C	2.00
90%	A–	3.84	70%	C–	1.67
86%	B+	3.33	66%	D+	1.33
83%	B	3.00	60%	D	1.00
80%	B–	2.67	<60%	F	0.00

Promoting a Positive Learning Environment

The School of Public Health recognizes its responsibility to promote a safe and diversity-sensitive learning environment that respects the rights, dignity, and well-being of all students, faculty, and staff. Diversity means the fair representation of all groups of individuals, the inclusion of contrasting perspectives and voices, together with the appreciation and valuing of different cultural and socioeconomic group practices. Moreover, we aspire to foster a climate of mutual respect and empathy, among and between students, faculty, and staff, by nurturing an atmosphere that is free from discrimination, harassment, exploitation, or intimidation. Courses will strive to provide an opportunity for all students to openly discuss issues of diversity including, but not limited to, age, disability, ethnicity, gender, race, religious beliefs, and sexual orientation.

Writing Standards

Effective managers, leaders, and teachers are also effective communicators. Written communication is an important element of the communication process. The School of Public Health graduate program recognizes and expects exemplary writing to be the norm for course work.

Academic Conduct

All written work submitted must be the student's original work and conform to the guidelines of the *American Medical Association (AMA)* or *American Psychological Association (APA)* which are available online and via their publications. This means that any substantive ideas, phrases, sentences, and/or graphic images, from other people's published or unpublished work, must be properly referenced to avoid even the appearance of plagiarism. Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full or clear acknowledgment. It also includes the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency in the selling of term papers or other academic materials. It is the student's responsibility to know all relevant university policies concerning plagiarism. Plagiarism is a serious violation of the professional standards of public health. Any documented case of plagiarism in this course will result in dismissal from the course with a failing grade, and may result in other more serious sanctions by the School of Public Health and The University of Memphis.

Cheating is not acceptable at The University of Memphis. Cheating includes but is not limited to the following: using any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes or tests; acquiring tests or other academic material before such material is revealed or distributed by the instructor; failing to abide by the instructions of the proctor concerning test taking procedures; influencing, or attempting to influence, any university employee in order to affect a student's grade or evaluations; any forgery, alteration, unauthorized possession, or misuse of University documents.

Awarding an Incomplete Grade

A grade of "I" (Incomplete) may be assigned by the Instructor of any course in which the student is unable to complete the work due to EXTRAORDINARY events beyond the individual's control. The "I" may not be used to extend the term for students who complete the course with an unsatisfactory grade. Unless the student completes the requirements for removal of the "I" within 90 days from the end of the semester or summer term in which it was received, the "I" will be changed to an "F," regardless of whether or not the student is enrolled.

Withdrawal Policy

The School of Public Health adheres to Graduate School policies and procedures regarding withdrawal from courses. Consult the Graduate School Dates & Deadlines Calendar for specific information. A late withdrawal is withdrawal from a course after the final date to drop classes, which falls around the middle of each semester. The drop is called a retroactive withdrawal if it takes place after grades have been issued. Before the drop deadline, students can process a drop on the web or over the phone without seeking anyone else's approval. The instructor, however, will appreciate the courtesy of being notified if you decide to drop the course. After the final drop date, the student must obtain approval for late drops or retroactive withdrawal from the Director of Graduate Studies of the School of Public Health. Instructors are not authorized to approve late drops or retroactive withdrawals.

Americans with Disabilities Act

The University of Memphis does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the recruitment and admission of students, the recruitment and employment of faculty and staff, and the operation of any of its programs and activities, as specified by federal laws and regulations. *The student has the responsibility of informing the course instructor (at the beginning of the course) of any disabling condition, which will require modification to avoid discrimination.* Faculty are required to provide "reasonable accommodation" to students with disabilities, so as not to discriminate on the basis of that disability. Student responsibility primarily rests with informing faculty at the beginning of the semester and in providing authorized documentation through designated administrative channels.

Special Needs

Any student who has special needs for assistance and/or accommodation, and who is registered with the Office of Student Disability Services should meet with the instructor during the first week of classes.

Inclement Weather Policy

In the event that inclement weather requires the cancellation of classes at the University of Memphis, local radio and television media will be notified and the status of classes will be posted on the University website. Additionally, the University of Memphis has established an inclement weather hotline 901-678-0888.

Schedule of Topics and Assignments

Session 1 – August 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Course overview - Setting the stage
------------------------------	--

Required readings:

Belluz, J., & Hoffman, S. (2015, May). Science is often flawed: it's time we embraced that. Retrieved August 12, 2019 from <http://www.vox.com/2015/5/13/8591837/how-science-is-broken>.

Casadevall, A. (2012). Reforming science: methodological and cultural reforms (editorial). *Infection and Immunity*, 80, 891-896.

Platt, J.R. (1964). Strong inference. *Science*, 146, 347-353.

→ **In-class activity: Discussion of case studies**

September 2	- No class: Labor Day
--------------------	-----------------------

Session 2 – September 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advancing public health science: participating in the peer review process - Mentoring
--------------------------------	--

Required readings on peer review:

Lovejoy, T.I., Revenson, T.A., & France, C.R. (2011). Reviewing manuscripts for peer-review journals: a primer for novice and seasoned reviewers. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 42, 1-13.

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Authorship and peer review (chapter 4). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), *Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research*, 4th edition, (read pp. 105-123 on peer review). Washington DC: ASM Press.

Required readings on mentoring:

Chopra, V., Edelson, D.P., & Saint, S. (2016). Mentorship malpractice. *JAMA*, 315, 1453-1454.

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Mentoring (Chapter 3). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), *Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research*, 4th edition, (pp. 53-82). Washington DC: ASM Press.

Vick, J.M., & Furlong, J.S. (2012, May 2). Seeking the mentors you need. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/article-content/131747/>

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week's readings at the start of class (these do not need to be submitted by email).

Assignment due -- Reaction paper #1 (1-2 single spaced pages): Select either case 4.4 or 4.6 from chapter 4 of the Macrina textbook (pp. 123-129); do not respond to any of the other cases in this chapter. Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class and bring a hard copy with you to class.

→ **In-class activity: Review peer review write-up models**

→ **In-class activity: Discuss readings and Macrina case studies**

Session 3 – September 16

- ***“Critically evaluating the scientific literature”*** (guest presentation by Dr. Vikki Nolan)
- **Authorship**

Required reading for Dr. Nolan’s presentation:

To be announced

Required readings on authorship:

Albert, T., & Wager, E. (2003). How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers. The COPE Report, pp 32-34.

American Psychological Association. Authorship determination scorecard
Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <https://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-determination-scorecard.pdf>

American Psychological Association. Authorship tie-breaker scorecard.
Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <https://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-tie-breaker-scorecard.pdf>

American Psychological Association. Contract regarding publication intent.
Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-agreement.pdf>

American Psychological Association. Publication/Presentation Contract.
Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <https://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-agreement.pdf>

Journal of the American Medical Association (n.d). JAMA authorship responsibility, conflicts of interest and funding, and copyright transfer/publishing agreement. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from http://jama.jamanetwork.com/data/ifora-forms/jama/auinst_crit.pdf

Glass, R.L. (2000). A letter from the frustrated author of a journal paper. The Journal of Systems and Software, 54, 1.

Macrina, F.L. (2005). Authorship and peer review (chapter 4). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition. Washington DC: ASM Press. **(read pp. 83-105 on Scientific Publication and Authorship)**

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class (these do not need to be submitted by email).

Assignment due – Submit your proposed book on a historically important public health issue/response, to be reviewed and presented to the class. See instructions on pp. 4-5. Please email your proposed book title and author(s) to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00 on the Sunday preceding class. The selected book can be one from the attached list, or another one of the student’s choosing. All selections must be approved by the instructor.

Assignment due -- Reaction paper #2 (1-2 single spaced pages): Select one of the following Macrina case studies from Chapter 4: 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, or 4.10 (pp. 123-129), do not respond to cases 4.4. or 4.6. Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class and bring a hard copy with you to class.

→ **In-class activity: Discussion of case study assigned for Dr. Nolan’s presentation**

→ **In-class activity: Discuss readings and Macrina case studies**

→ **In-class activity: Authorship decision-making exercise (time permitting)**

Session 4 – September 23

- Causal inference in public health: Guest presentation by Dr. Jim Gurney
- Plagiarism

Required readings on causal inference in public health:

Glass, T.A., Goodman, S.N., Hernan, M.A., & Samet, J.M. (2013). Causal inference in public health. Annual Review of Public Health, 34, 61-75.

Maldonado, G., & Greenland, S. (2002). Estimating causal effects. International Journal of Epidemiology, 31, 422-429.

Required readings on plagiarism:

Flaherty, C., (2014, April 24), In her own words, InsideHigher Ed.com. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/04/25/investigation-brown-professors-plagiarism-case-goes-public>.

Reis, R. (2012, May 14). Literal and intelligent plagiarism: students beware! Tomorrows-professor-digest, 64, Issue 5.

Price, A. (2006). Cases of plagiarism handled by the United States Office of Research Integrity 1992-2005. Plagiarism: Cross- Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification, 46-56. Retrieved August 7, 2017 from <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/p/plag/5240451.0001.001/--cases-of-plagiarism-handled?rgn=main;view=fulltext>

The Writing Center, University of Wisconsin, Madison (2003, March 4). Acknowledging, Paraphrasing, and Quoting Sources.

Yang, A., Stockwell, S., & McDonnell, L. (2019). Writing in your own voice: an intervention that reduces plagiarism and common writing problems in students' scientific writing. Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education, Jun 21. doi: 10.1002/bmb.21282. [Epub ahead of print]

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week's readings at the start of class (these do not need to be submitted by email).

Assignment due -- After doing the readings on plagiarism, go to the website

<http://www.academicintegrity.uoguelph.ca/plagiarism/quiz-plagiarism> and complete the quiz. For each of the 10 items, select a response until you identify the correct answer. When you have completed the quiz, print the results and submit a hard copy at the start of class (this does not need to be emailed).

Assignment due -- Reaction paper #3 (1-2 single spaced pages): Choose one of the following topics:

Write a reaction paper based on the Flaherty case study, and respond to the following questions: Does the case described constitute plagiarism? Why or why not? Does the punishment fit the crime? What recommendations would you make to Professor Ryan to prevent a similar mishap in the future?

Or

Respond to the Yang et al. intervention study to reduce plagiarism. First, provide a brief critical analysis of the research described in the paper, summarizing the most important issues that support or challenge the paper's internal and external validity, as you might do in a peer review of a manuscript. Next, reflect on the extent to which the plagiarism intervention might be (or not be) useful to you and fellow students.

Please e-mail your paper to kward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class and bring a hard copy to class.

→ **In-class activity: Discussion of Flaherty and Yang case studies**

Session 5 – September 30

- Scientific writing skills (*we will join with MPH students enrolled in PUBH 7180, Foundations of Public Health, for this presentation by Dr. Ward; class will meet in Manning 204*)

Required readings on scientific writing skills:

- Bem, D.J. (2002). Writing the empirical journal article. In Darley, J. M., Zanna, M. P., & Roediger III, H. L. (Eds) (2002). *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schuman, R. (2018, November 4). The worst writing advice in the world. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 9, 2019: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Worst-Writing-Advice-in/244972>.
- Toor, R. (2019, May 29). (2001, August 3). Shame in academic writing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 9, 2019: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Shame-in-Academic-Writing/128483>.
- Zaretsky, R. Our students can't write: we have ourselves to blame. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 9, 2019: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Our-Students-Can-t-Write-We/246385>.

No discussion questions on readings are due this week (but please read 'em anyway!).

Assignment due -- Reaction paper #4 (1-2 single spaced pages): After reading this week's assignments, reflect on the current quality of your own scientific writing using some or all of these questions, or other questions of your own choosing: What advice from the assigned readings resonated with you? How does your writing compare to your peers? How important are good writing skills for your career goals? What kind of feedback on your writing have you received thus far from instructors? What has helped you become a better writer? What further improvements do you need to make? How will you do this, and how can you mentors and instructors in the School of Public Health best assist you?

Session 6 – October 7**Protecting human research subjects**

- Guest presenter: Ms. Kellie Watson, Research Compliance Coordinator, Division of Research and Innovation, University of Memphis

Required readings on protecting human research subjects:

- Bertholf, R.L. (2001). Protecting human research subjects. *Annals of Clinical & Laboratory Science*, *31*, 119-127. (*I recommend that you read this article first to help orient you to the other readings*).
- Code of Federal Regulations. PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS 45 C.F.R. §46.101. (2009). Retrieved August 7, 2019: <https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/retrieveECFR?gp=&SID=83cd09e1c0f5c6937cd9d7513160fc3f&pitd=20180719&n=pt45.1.46&r=PART&ty=HTML>
- Murphy, K. (2017, May 22). Some social scientists are tired of asking for permission. Retrieved August 7, 2019: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/22/science/social-science-research-institutional-review-boards-common-rule.html>
- The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979). *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. Retrieved August 7, 2019: <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html>.
- Swerdlow, P.S., and Macrina, F.L. (2014). Use of humans in biomedical experimentation (Chapter 5). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), *Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research*, 4th edition, (pp. 135-172). Washington DC: ASM Press.
- U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. *The Nuremberg Code*. Retrieved August 7, 2019: <https://history.nih.gov/research/downloads/nuremberg.pdf>.
- World Medical Association. (2013). World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA*, *310*, 2191-2194. Retrieved August 7, 2019:

<https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/>.

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class (these do not need to be submitted by email).

Assignment due -- Reaction paper #5 (1-2 single spaced pages): Choose one of the following:

Respond to one Macrina case study 5.1 – 5.10 (pp. 159-163),

Or

Compare and contrast the four human subjects protection documents that you read this week (U.S. Code 45 C.F.R. §46.101, Belmont Report, Nuremberg Code, Declaration of Helsinki). What different contextual factors led to the creation of each of them? What principles do they share, and where do they diverge in terms of priorities or relative emphasis? Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class and bring a hard copy to class.

→ **In-class activity: Discuss human subjects protection reaction papers and informed consent documents**

October 14

- No class: Fall Break

Session 7 – October 21

- Delivering scientific presentations

- Competing interests

Required readings on poster presentations:

Erren, T.C., & Bourne, P.E. (2007). Ten simple rules for a good poster presentation. PLOS Computational Biology, 3, 0777-0778.

Greenfieldboyce, N. (2019, June 11). To save the science poster, researchers want to kill it and start over. National Public Radio. Retrived August 7, 2019: <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2019/06/11/729314248/to-save-the-science-poster-researchers-want-to-kill-it-and-start-over>.

Required readings on oral presentations:

Female Science Professor. (2013, July 8). Talking the talk. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from: <http://chronicle.com/article/Talking-the-Talk/140111/>.

Shapiro, D. (2012, July 16). Grim job talks are a buzz kill. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Grim-Job-Talks-Are-a-Buzz-Kill/132843/>.

Shewchuk, J. (n.d.) Giving an academic talk. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~jrs/speaking.html>

Required readings on competing interests:

Bradley, S.G. (2014). Competing interests in research (Chapter 7). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition, (pp. 209-241). Washington DC: ASM Press.

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class (these do not need to be submitted by email).

Assignment due – Topic for oral scientific presentation due. Please submit a title for the presentation and a brief outline (no more than a single paragraph) of your talk’s content. Please email your edits to kdward@memphis.edu

by 5:00 on the Sunday preceding class, and bring a hard copy with you to class.

Assignment due – Reaction paper #6 (1-2 single spaced pages): Select one: Macrina case studies 7.1 – 7.10 (pp. 235-239). Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by the start of class and bring a hard copy with you to class.

→ **In-class activity:** Viewing of 3 short videos : “Effective poster presentations: an introduction,” “Headings,” and “Giving an effective poster presentation.” Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.ncsu.edu/project/posters/Videos.html>

→ **In-class activity:** Viewing of video “Designing effective scientific presentations: using PowerPoint and structuring your talk” by Dr. Susan McConnell, Stanford University. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hp7Id3Yb9XQ>.

→ **In-class activity:** Discuss readings and Macrina case studies

Session 8 – October 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Scientific misconduct and fraud- Academic scams
-------------------------------	--

Required readings on scientific misconduct and fraud:

Bartlett, T. (2018, September 11). “I want to burn things to the ground.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2019: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/I-Want-to-Burn-Things-to/244488>.

Bhattacharjee, Y. (2013, April 26). The mind of a con man. New York Times. Retrieved August 7, 2019 <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/28/magazine/diederik-stapels-audacious-academic-fraud.html>

Fanelli, D. (2009). How many scientists fabricate and falsify research? A systematic review and meta-analysis of survey data. PLOS One, 4, e5738. (please read the Fanelli abstract – reading the rest of the paper is optional).

Gunsalus, C.K. (2010). How to blow the whistle and still have a career afterwards. Science and Engineering Ethics, 4,

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Methods, manners, and the responsible conduct of research (chapter 1). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition, (pp 1-24). Washington DC: ASM Press.

Neuroskeptic. (2012). The nine circles of scientific hell. Psychological Science, 7, 643-644.

University of Memphis Policy Statement (2016, November 18). RE-7001 - Research Misconduct. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <https://memphis.policytech.com/dotNet/documents/?docid=484&public=true>.

Required readings on academic scams:

Carey, K. (2016). A peek inside the strange world of fake academia. The New York Times, December 29, 2016. Retrieved August 7, 2019: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/29/upshot/fake-academe-looking-much-like-the-real-thing.html>.

Kaplan, R.M. (2019, April 9). Why you should care about the raging battle for free access to research findings? Los Angeles Time. Retrieved August 7, 2019: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-kaplan-academic-journals-research-access-university-california-elsevier-20190409-story.html>.

Kolata, G. (2017). A scholarly sting operation shines a light on “predatory” journals. The New York times, March 22, 2017. Retrieved August 7, 2019: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/22/science/open-access-journals.html>.

No author. (1999). Pros and cons of open peer review (editorial). Nature Neuroscience, 2, 197-198.

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class (these do not need to be submitted by email).

Assignment due – Reaction paper #7 (1-2 single spaced pages):

Write an essay based on either the Bhattacharjee reading or Bartlett reading, and bring in any other readings you would like. Suggested topics for the reaction paper are presented below. You are free to answer some or all of the questions, or to come up with other questions you find more interesting:

What factors do you think led Diederik Stapel to commit fraud? Who was harmed and in what ways? What consequences did Stapel incur and were they just? What risks, if any, did his students face by reporting his misconduct? How do you think you would have handled this had you been his student?

Or

What is the “replicability crisis”? Is this just a problem for psychology? How big of a problem do you judge it to be in your own field of study? On what do you base this judgement? Are you more sympathetic to the “data thugs” or their skeptics, such as Richard Nisbett? What solutions would you offer to fix this problem?

Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

→ **In-class activity: Discuss readings and Macrina case studies**

Session 9 – November 4

- Grantsmanship and Obtaining Funding: Guest presentation by Dr. Wilfried Karmaus
- Scientific record-keeping

Required readings on obtaining funding:

“New and early stage investigator policies.” (n.d.). National Institutes of Health. Retrieved August 9, 2019 from http://grants.nih.gov/grants/new_investigators/. *(Please read this page and peruse some of the links).*

“Funding opportunities and notices.” (n.d.). National Institutes of Health. Retrieved August 9, 2019 from <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/>. *(Please read this page and peruse some of the links).*

“Types of grant programs.” (n.d.). National Institutes of Health. Retrieved August 9, 2019 from http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/funding_program.htm. *(Please read this page and peruse some of the links).*

Wysocki, B. Jr. (2004, June 28). “At Pitt, scientists decode the secret of getting grants.” *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved August 9, 2019 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB108837661519248681>.

Reading On Scientific Record-Keeping:

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Scientific Record Keeping (chapter 10). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), *Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research*, 4th edition, Washington DC: ASM Press.

University of Memphis Policy Statement (2018, March 27). IT6005: Data Security. Retrieved August 12, 2019 from https://www.memphis.edu/umtech/service_desk/policies/docs_policies/it6005.pdf.

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class (these do not need to be submitted by email).

Assignment due – Reaction paper #8 (1-2 single spaced pages):

Select one: Macrina case studies 10.1 – 10.10 (pp. 351-357). Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class and bring a hard copy with you to class.

→ **In-class activity: Discuss readings and Macrina case studies**

Session 10 – November 11	- “Overview of ethical frameworks”: Guest presentation by Dr. Remy Debes, Department of Philosophy - Time management
--------------------------	--

Required and Recommended Readings for Dr. Debes’s presentation:

Required

Thobaben, J. & Holsinger, J.W. (2018). The ethical basis of public health leadership. In J.W. Holsinger & E.L. Carlton, *Leadership for Public Health: Theory & Practice*. Chicago, IL: Health Administration Press.
Public Health Leadership Society. (2002). Principles of the ethical practice of public health. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from https://www.apha.org/~media/files/pdf/membergroups/ethics_brochure.ashx.

Other required readings to be assigned

Recommended

Childress, J.F., Faden, R.R., Gaare, R.D., Gostin, L.O., Kahn, J., Bonnie, R.J., Kass, N.E., Mastroianni, A.C., Morena, J.D., & Nieburg, P. (2002). Public health ethics: mapping the terrain. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 30, 170-178.
Faden, R., & Shebaya, S. (2015). Public health ethics. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/publichealth-ethics/>.

Required readings on time management:

(please at least skim each of the 10 brief essays by Susan Johnson – they are a quick read and likely to be helpful)

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Code O’: How to recover from *Overwhelm*.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.
Johnson, S.R. (2010). “The basics of organizing your work and time.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.
Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Priorities: how to decide what to do, and when.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.
Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Execution: getting your work *done*.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.
Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Getting e-mail under control.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.
Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Becoming a productive academic writer.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.
Johnson, S.R. (2010). “A plan for professional reading.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.
Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Time mapping: learning to ‘tell time.’” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.
Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Interruptions.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.
Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Getting more done through others: the basics of delegation.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Vaillancourt, A.M. (2016). Why we can’t finish things. *ChronicleVitae*. Retrieved August 7, 2019: <https://chroniclevitae.com/news/1596-why-we-can-t-finish-things>

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class (these do not need to be submitted by email).

Assignment due – Reaction paper #9 (1-2 single spaced pages: Provide and discuss at least one specific example of how the use of middle axioms has impacted a public health intervention (choose any intervention you’d like).

Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class and bring a hard copy to class.

→ **In-class activity: Discuss public health ethics and time management**

Session 11 – November 18	- Student oral scientific presentations (Part 1 of 2)
---------------------------------	--

Review these readings from Session 7 on delivering oral presentations:

Female Science Professor. (2013, July 8). Talking the talk. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from: <http://chronicle.com/article/Talking-the-Talk/140111/>.

Shapiro, D. (2012, July 16). Grim job talks are a buzz kill. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Grim-Job-Talks-Are-a-Buzz-Kill/132843/>.

Shewchuk, J. (n.d.) Giving an academic talk. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~jrs/speaking.html>

→ **In-class activity: Student presentations**

No written assignments are due this week. Remember that the written book review is due in two weeks (December 2nd, Session 13).

Session 12 – November 25	- Everything you always wanted to know about the U of M School of Public Health (but were afraid to ask): Roundtable discussion with senior doctoral students, moderated by Adam Alexander, PhD '18, Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Oklahoma Tobacco Research Center, Oklahoma City, OK - CV prep and preparing for the job market
---------------------------------	--

Required readings on surviving graduate school:

Fidler, C. (2012, March 22). What I learned about surviving graduate school. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/What-I-Learned-About-Surviving/131247/>.

Kelsky, K. (2012, March 27). Graduate school is a means to a job. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Graduate-School-Is-a-Means-to/131316/>

Schwartz, M.A. (2008). The importance of stupidity in scientific research. Journal of Cell Science, 121, 1771.

Seal, D.W. (2007). Child planning required: a father's perspective on balancing career and family within academic psychiatry. Academic Psychiatry, 31, 143-145.

Wedemeyer-Strombel, K.R. (2018, November 14). Graduate school should be challenging, not traumatic. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Graduate-School-Should-Be/245028>.

Required readings on curriculum vitae preparation:

Eyler, J.R. (2012, April 4). The rhetoric of the CV. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Rhetoric-of-the-CV/131404/>.

Wecker, M. (2013, September 14). Common pitfalls to avoid in your CV. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from <https://chroniclevitae.com/news/3-common-pitfalls-to-avoid-in-your-cv>.

These readings on preparing for the job market are recommended, but not required:

Cassuto, L. (2012, September 3). "In search of hard data on nonacademic careers." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 12, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/In-Search-of-Hard-Data-on/134030/>.

Kelsky, K. (2012, March 27). Graduate school is a means to a job. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 12, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Graduate-School-Is-a-Means-to/131316/>

Perlmutter, D.D. (2012, June 17). "Show them you really want the job." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 12, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Show-Them-You-Really-Want-the/132281/>.

Sullivan, P. (2012, March 7). "Withdrawing from a job you've accepted." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 12, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Withdrawing-From-a-Job-Youve/131075/>.

Trepal, H. (2012, May 16). "This can't be happening." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 12, 2019 from <http://chronicle.com/article/article-content/131880/>.

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week's readings at the start of class (these do not need to be submitted by email).

Assignment due – Book review. Please email your assignment to kdward@memphis.edu by the start of class today, and bring a hard copy with you to class.

Bring a hard copy of your CV with you to class.

→ In-class activity: Student roundtable discussion

→ In-class activity: Discuss CV design

Session 13 – December 2

- Student oral scientific presentations (Part 2 of 2)

- Course round-up

There are no assigned readings this week.

Assignment due – Reaction paper #10 (1-2 single spaced pages): At this point in your professional training, what kind of career do you envision for yourself five years after completing your PhD? Have these goals changed since you entered the PhD program? What are some of your accomplishments that have placed you on a solid track for that career? What could you do differently to better prepare yourself, and what are some concrete steps to get there? Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class and bring a hard copy with you to class.

→ In-class activity: Student-led discussion of book reviews

Books for review assignment
Students may select one of these books, or choose another (with instructor permission)

Author	Title	Publisher, year
Bernard, Claude	An Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine	Dover Publications, 1957/1865
Brandt, Allan M.	The Cigarette Century: The rise, fall, and deadly persistence of the product that defined America	Basic Books, 2009
Crosby, Molly Caldwell	The American Plague: the untold story of yellow fever, the epidemic that shaped our history	The Berkeley Publishing Group, 2006
Duffy, John	The Sanitarians: A History of American Public Health	University of Illinois Press, 1990
Farmer, Paul	Pathologies of Power: health, human rights, and the new war on the poor	University of California Press, 2004
Foege, William H.	House on Fire: The fight to eradicate smallpox	University of California Press, 2011
Galea, Sandro	Well: What we need to talk about when we talk about health	Oxford University Press, 2019
Garrett, Laurie	Betrayal of Trust: the collapse of global public health	Hyperion, New York, 2000
Gotzsche, Peter C.	Deadly Medicines and Organized Crime: how big pharma has corrupted healthcare	Radcliffe Publishing Ltd, 2013
Hardy, Anne	The epidemic streets: infectious disease and the rise of preventive medicine, 1856-1900.	Oxford University Press, 1993.
Johnson, Steven	The Ghost Map: the story of London's most terrifying epidemic—and how it changed science, cities, and the modern world	Riverhead Books, 2006
Kluger, Richard	Ashes to Ashes: America's hundred-year cigarette war, the public health, and the unabashed triumph of Phillip Morris.	Vintage Books, 2010
Krieger, Nancy	Epidemiology and the People's Health: theory and context	Oxford University Press, 2011
Kuhn, Thomas S.	The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 3 rd edition.	The University of Chicago Press, 1996/1962
Marmot, Michael	The Health Gap: The Challenge of an Unequal World	Bloomsbury Press, 2015
Mills, C. Wright	The Sociological Imagination	Oxford University Press, 1959
Offit, Paul A.	Autism's False Prophets: bad science, risky medicine, and the search for a cure	Columbia University Press, 2008
Paul, Benjamin D. (editor)	Health, Culture, & Community:	Russell Sage Foundation, 1955

	case studies of public reactions to health programs	
Rosen, George	A History of Public Health	The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993/1953
Shilts, Randy	And the Band Played On: politics, people, and the AIDS epidemic	Stonewall Inn Editions, 2000
Spinney, Laura	Pale Rider: The Spanish Flu of 1918 and how it changed the world	Hachette Book Group, 2017
Taubes, Gary	The Case Against Sugar	Alfred A. Knopf, 2016
Zinsser, Hans	Rats, Lice, and History: A bacteriologist's classic history of mankind's epic struggle to conquer the scourge of typhus.	Little, Brown and Company, 1963/1934

Remember: More than likely...

