

Yong (2019):

- Headline and lead sentence very eye-catching, with attention grabbing image as well
 - He had to use some jargon: 'algorithm'
- He starts off with 'the character,' i.e., the monkey Ringo. He makes the extraordinary (monkey sipping juice in lab like NBD) seem ordinary.
- The first paragraph ends on a cliffhanger
 - It gets to the point (the artificial intelligence algorithm that is evolving images to stimulate one neuron in the monkey's brain), but hasn't told you the full story
- The second paragraph introduces a mystery: what image is it forming? Oh, there's another character in the story, the monkey Anthony. It's taking you on the scientific process itself, bringing you into the discovery so you'll feel invested too.
- The third paragraph: 'Diane' - so the algorithm can even create human faces! And he humanizes the scientists involved (taking care of the monkey)
- The fourth paragraph: so, what are these images? What do they mean?
 - The analogy to dreaming is very vivid, same with Kadinsky paintings (although that says something about who Ed Yong thinks is reading his articles)
- The fifth paragraph provides more context behind the study's results (probably because this study is on 'bioRxiv', a preprint server, so it hasn't been peer-reviewed). Also because Yong introduced the idea that we don't know what the visual vocabulary means. But also says what's *new* to this work.
- The sixth paragraph is the question of the paper. So he's effectively built back the context of the work before even getting to the question, while still hooking you into the process of discovering these images.
- The seventh paragraph finally gets down to the methodology, how they got there (training the algorithm)
- The eighth paragraph provides a caveat ("glorified Rorschach test"), but the researchers passed here
- The ninth paragraph: how does this result generalize? Do humans have an uncanny valley? He's getting back to the overarching story about these creepy pictures
- The tenth paragraph: tying into history and mythology; really about story-telling now
- The eleventh paragraph: a kind of nod back to the reader re: 'if you didn't get the hype over the images, here's why'; plus getting other opinions
- The twelfth paragraph: now he's going beyond the study he covered to refer to similar work, so it's not all about the one paper. These following paragraphs are about the limitations of the visual system and the methodologies used. It's another expert opinion that shows the methodology wasn't unusual (long-term validity/context). How different would the story have been if he had started out talking about this?

Ben Goldacre: Battling Bad Science--

- His hook is about his field and the headlines; he makes the headlines relatable to the audience with a joke that then pits the headlines against each other
- The idea of critiquing academic articles could be really boring, but he makes another joke about the process as a bloodbath being welcomed
- Riffs on phd vs. doctor, like in Friends, to get his point about authority/credibility

- Gives examples of the unreliable woman's behavior
- Quickly critiques a headline from a UK paper (results don't really generalize re: the breast cancer/red wine stuff)
- Makes his next criticism relatable - it's a study on olive, veggies, etc. So then he shows he's aware of his audience by riffing on them
- His explanation of the confounds of the study are really relatable (he could have said 'confounds' - instead he talks about the people who don't have wrinkles)
- He makes it easy on his audience; he's simplified the methods quite a bit and tells it a story-like fashion so that he can say things like 'Can anyone spot the flaw?' and folks will laugh
- He recognizes jargon generally (his joke on the lack of a control group)
- When he does need to use jargon, like his funnel plot, he takes the time to explain to the audience what it is
- He leads by example: he said scientists encourage critique, and he critiques himself by saying he also prescribed the drug that turns out to have negative results too
- Analogy/metaphors: sunlight, opening the lid to look in on bad science.