

---

# Index

## A

- A priori model versus an hypothesis, 55–56
- Accessing the inductive space, 3–4, 59–60, 260–263
- Actual expected outcomes, 31
- Actual results, 31
- Akt phosphorylation
  - assumption controls and the Ras pathway, 202
  - biochemistry controls for, 162–167
  - dose response determination, 120–122
  - establishing the “unperturbed by X” negative control, 143–147
  - experimental replicates, 221
  - positive control establishment in, 160–162
  - representative data as a model, 236
  - technical replicates, 222
  - time course determination, 124–125, 224
- Animal studies, ethics of, 193–194
- Antibodies
  - positive control applied in an experiment, 162–163, 170–172
  - specificity of detection example, 98–101
- Anti-obesity drug experiment, 183–185
- Aristotle, 18
- Aspirin dosing experiment, 205–206
- Assumption controls
  - to avoid inappropriate deductions, 201–202
  - controlling for the meta assumption, 209–210
  - dangers of incorrect assumptions, 199
  - to determine if an experimental setting is representative, 202–203
  - to eliminate assumptions within the experimental question, 199–200
  - illustration of the assumption dilemma, 205–206
  - nonhuman animal models and, 206–207
  - reductionism controls as, 203–204
  - using with isolated cells to establish relevance for the whole organism, 207–209
  - using with isolated molecules to establish relevance for the whole cell, 209

## B

- Bacon, Francis, 18, 31, 52
- Bell-shaped distributions, 93–95
- Bias control
  - avoiding bias with the question/model-building framework, 53
  - in the caffeine and blood pressure experiment, 32
  - in the EcoRI experiment, 271–272
  - establishing an inappropriate data filtering system with an hypothesis, 35–36
  - factors encouraging a scientist to seek positive data, 36
  - grammatical structure of the hypothesis and, 29–31
  - introduction of bias by using a binary positive/negative distinction, 33–34
  - positive/negative binary use in a pharmacological experiment, 34–35
  - potential to discount evidence, 32–33
  - problems due to using a positive data filter, 33, 34
  - ways a scientist can avoid falsifying the hypothesis, 32
- Biochemistry experiments
  - applicability of the test subject to, 86–87
  - positive control establishment in, 162–167
  - specificity of detection example, 98–101
- Biological replicates, 219–221
- BLAST search, 64–65
- Blinded analysis, 152–153, 216
- BRCA1* gene, 146–148, 167–169
- Breast cancer study
  - choice of a model organism and, 85
  - establishing the positive control in a genetic experiment, 167–168
  - establishing the “unperturbed by X” negative control, 146–148
  - finding a responsive subject, 186–187
- Building a model. *See* Model building

## C

- Caenorhabditis elegans* (worm), 85
- Caffeine and blood pressure

- Caffeine and blood pressure (*Continued*)  
assumption controls for the experiment, 199–200  
bias for positive data example, 32  
choosing the representative case, 184  
experiment framework, 133–134  
introduction of bias, 33–34  
negative control and the unperturbed case, 137–139  
positive controls in the study, 156–158  
study design to isolate the negative control, 139–143
- Cell line transduction, 169–170
- Centrifuges, 117
- Controlled substances, 107
- Critical rationalism  
bias due to grammatical structure of the hypothesis, 29–31  
creation of a bias for positive data, 32, 34, 37  
Popper's philosophy and, 20–21  
question/model-validation framework versus, 49–50, 61, 65, 70–71  
scientists' compulsion to use, 215, 260
- D**
- Danio rerio* (zebrafish), 85
- Data filtration  
cherry-picking experiments or data sets, 241  
outlier removal, 240–241  
postanalysis filtration, 240  
preanalysis filtration, 239  
problems due to reliance on an hypothesis, 35–36  
problems due to using a positive data filter, 33, 34  
query-based filtration, 241–242
- Data variability, 95–96
- Deductive reasoning, 17–18
- Descartes, René, 6
- Detection, sensitivity of. *See* Sensitivity of detection
- Detection, specificity of. *See* Specificity of detection
- Dose responses  
determination of, 119–123  
determining for Akt phosphorylation, 120–122  
purpose of determining, 224–225
- Double-blind study, 188–189
- Drosophila melanogaster* (fruit fly), 85
- E**
- E3 ubiquitin ligases. *See* MuRF1 model
- EcoRI restriction site experiment  
assessing the inductive space, 260–263  
bias control, 271–272  
building a model, 279–281  
constructing a falsifiable hypothesis, 270, 272–273  
defining the terms, 263  
establishing necessity and sufficiency, 278–279  
establishing the system, 265–269  
experimentalist control, 281  
formatting an open-ended question, 255–258  
framing the experimental project, 254–255, 256  
incorporating prior knowledge into the design, 258, 260–263  
interpreting the results using the experimental plan, 275–278  
methodology setup, 264–265  
observation that will be investigated, 253–254  
permanence of the original framework question, 273–274  
question/answer framework for the experiment, 270–273  
rejection of formulating a hypothesis, 259
- Efficacy measurement  
dose response determination, 119–123  
frequency of administration, 123–126  
physiologic versus nonphysiologic effects, 122  
sensitivity versus efficacy, 119
- Equipment stability, 117
- Escherichia coli*, 85
- Ethics of animal studies, 193–194
- Ethylmethanesulfonate (EMS), 168
- Experimentalist controls  
blinded analysis use, 216  
different evaluators use, 216–217  
in the EcoRI study, 281  
establishing objectivity, 212–213  
establishing preset criteria for evaluation, 215–216  
instrumentation as an objective evaluator, 217–218  
intersubjectivity and the concept of objectivity, 211–212  
open-ended question structure and, 213–215  
outside repetition as the final arbiter, 218  
verifying theories that cannot be subjected to experimentation, 214
- Experimental repeats, 222–223
- Experimental systems  
applied to a framework question, 80  
components of, 79–80  
creating the framework of an individual experiment, 131–136  
designing an experiment example (*see* EcoRI restriction site experiment)  
model organism or technique choice, 85–87  
roadmap for conducting an experiment, 247–249  
summary, 227–228  
system validation (*see* System validation)
- F**
- Facioscapulohumeral dystrophy (FSHD), 234
- Falsification

Hume's rejection of inductive reasoning and, 20  
hypotheses and (*see* Hypothesis-falsification framework)  
Poincaré's reasoning about, 21  
verification versus, 20, 21, 22  
Fluorescently labeled antibodies, 107–108  
Framework of an individual experiment  
  experimental system design example, 254–255, 256  
  project versus experiment frameworks examples, 132–135  
  semantics of a project, 135  
  statistical considerations, 135–136  
  steps in creating, 131  
Frequency of administration  
  pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics, 125  
  route or method of administration, 125–126  
  time course of study and, 123–125  
Fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*), 85  
FSHD (Faciocapulohumeral dystrophy), 234

## G

Galileo, 17–18  
Genetic clones, 192–193  
Genetic complementation, 195  
Genetic experiments, 167–169  
Genomic studies, 39–41, 194  
G-protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs), 106–107

## H

Harvey, William, 6  
Human Genome Project, 39–41  
Hume, David, 6, 20  
Hypothesis-falsification framework  
  bias due to the grammatical structure of the hypothesis, 29–31  
  creation of a bias for positive data, 31–36  
  EcoRI restriction site determination and, 270, 272–273  
  experimentalist controls and, 214  
  experimental system to test “the sky is red” hypothesis, 25–27  
  hypothesis versus a question or a model, 15–16  
  inadvertent bias and, 28  
  Newton's rejection of hypothesis, 19  
  philosophical framing of, 21–22  
  a priori model versus an hypothesis, 55–56  
  psychological component to hypothesis making, 52  
  scientific settings in which it is not feasible (*see* Scientific settings without an hypothesis)  
  setting the criteria for a positive readout and, 27–28

ways a scientist can avoid falsifying the hypothesis, 32  
Hypothesis-generating projects, 43

## I

Immortalized cell lines, 144  
Immunohistochemistry  
  example of specificity of detection, 98–101  
  qualitative experiments and, 90–91  
  reagent control importance example, 177–179  
Inadvertent bias, 28  
Inductive framework model  
  accessing the inductive space and, 63–64  
  applicability of a query-based approach to experimental goals, 49  
  benefits of querying a large data set, 47–48  
  critical rationalism versus the question/model-validation, 49–50, 61  
  establishment of the inductive space, 61–62  
  focusing on a particular inductive space, 68–69  
  hypothesis-based attempt to find an optimum route, 45–46  
  incorporating prior knowledge into the design, 258, 260–263  
  model building example (*see* MuRF1 model)  
  moving from a broad to a framework question, 62  
  opportunities and limits in smaller inductive spaces, 69–71  
  problem of the limitations of individual experience, 46–47  
  relation of “accuracy” to predictive ability, 49  
  testing a model's accuracy, 48  
Inductive inference, 11–12  
Inductive reasoning. *See also* Inductive framework model  
  advantages of using for generalization, 237  
  Bacon's advocacy of, 18  
  defenses of, 21–22  
  Hume's rejection of, 20  
  Popper's view of, 20–21  
  types of, 11–12  
Inference, 233  
Insulin-like growth factor 1 (IGF-1)  
  dose response determination, 120–122  
  time course of study determination, 124–125  
Internal ribosomal entry site (IRES), 149  
Intersubjectivity and the concept of objectivity, 211–212  
Intersystem negative control, 152  
Intrasystem negative control, 151

## K

Knockouts, 190  
Kuhn, Thomas, 22

## M

Mendel, Gregor, 190  
Messenger RNA (mRNA), 43, 102, 106, 116–117, 119, 123–124, 175, 181–182  
Method and reagent controls  
  methodology control defined, 174  
  methodology controls in a microarray experiment, 181–182  
  need for methodology controls, 174–176, 179–181  
  need for reagent controls, 176–179  
  reagent defined, 173  
  tendency of scientist to study what they feel they know, 173  
Micropipettes, 117  
Microscopes, 117  
Model building  
  from a clinical study, 234–236  
  controlling variables using model systems, 190–191  
  data report form of a model, 232–233  
  definition of a model, 15–16, 18, 231  
  for the EcoRI experiment, 279–281  
  factors affecting a model's strength, 231–232  
  generalization of data, 236–237  
  inductive framework model example (*see* MuRF1 model)  
  inductive reasoning used for generalization, 237  
  inference and, 233  
  modeling a set of data, 233–234  
  models' use to create an inductive space, 243–244  
  Newton's rejection of the hypothesis, 19  
  showing representative data as a model for an entire data set, 236  
  writing the scientific manuscript and, 244–245  
Model organism for an experiment  
  common laboratory organisms used, 85  
  criteria for choosing the type of validation experiment, 87  
  importance of validation of a technique, 87  
  when satisfying a need for cross-species validation, 86  
  when satisfying a need for intraspecies validation, 85–86  
Motte, Andrew, 19  
Mouse (*Mus musculus*), 85  
mTOR, 122–124  
MuRF1 model  
  accessing the inductive space and, 59–60  
  asking the framework question, 57–59  
  basis for formulating the first experimental question, 59–60  
  building the model, 67–68, 70–71  
  categorizing the unknown, 64–65  
  establishment of the inductive space, 61–62

  focusing on a particular inductive space, 68–69  
  framing a question about function, 65–66  
  moving from a broad to a framework question, 62  
  open-ended versus close-ended questions, 58  
  opportunities and limits in smaller inductive spaces, 69–71  
  performing a functional experiment, 66–67  
  using past findings to generate questions, 60–61  
*Mus musculus* (mouse), 85  
Mycoplasma contamination, 114

## N

National Institutes of Health, 73–74  
Negative controls  
  blinded analysis, 152–153  
  caffeine study isolation of the negative control, 139–143  
  intersystem, 152  
  intrasystem, 151  
  isolating the perturbation, 137–139  
  “is Y X” question, 151–152  
  “not-X” case in an antibody experiment, 150–151  
  range of features to consider in a study design, 142–143  
  system validation and, 144–145  
  “unperturbed by X,” in a genetic experiment, 146–148  
  “unperturbed by X,” in a tissue-culture experiment, 143–146  
  “unperturbed by X,” when transducing a cell line, 148–150  
Nerve growth factor (NGF)  
  assumption controls and the Ras pathway, 202  
  biochemistry controls for, 162–167  
  dose response determination for Akt phosphorylation, 120–122  
  establishing the “unperturbed by X” negative control, 143–146  
  experimental replicates, 221  
  positive control establishment in, 160–162  
  representative data as a model, 236  
  technical replicates, 222  
  time course determination, 124–125, 224  
Newton, Isaac, 19  
NF- $\kappa$ B hypothesis, 27–28  
NIH 3T3 cells, 35–36, 148–150  
*Novum Organum* (Bacon), 18  
Nozick, Robert, 22, 60, 211

## O

*Opticks* (Newton), 19  
*Organon* (Aristotle), 18  
Outlier removal, 240–241

## P

- p70<sup>86</sup>, 122–123
- PCR (polymerase chain reaction), 108
- Perturbation, specificity of, 98–101
- Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics, 125
- Philosophical Explanations* (Nozick), 60
- Philosophy of science
  - Bacon's development of a scientific method, 18
  - cautions about the choice of framework, 73
  - consideration of the goal of experimental projects, 75
  - criticisms of a reliance on hypothesis-falsification framework, 74–75
  - criticisms of government funding choices, 73–74
  - defenses of induction, 21–22
  - falsification versus verification, 22
  - frameworks used in experimentation, 22
  - Galileo's use of deductive reasoning, 17–18
  - goal of scientists, 21–22
  - Hume's rejection of inductive reasoning, 20
  - Newton's rejection of the hypothesis, 19
  - Popper's critical rationalism, 20–21
  - value in the question/model-building framework, 75
- pH meters
  - negative controls and, 151–152
  - stability maintenance, 117
- Phosphorylation of Akt
  - assumption controls and the Ras pathway, 202
  - biochemistry controls for, 162–167
  - dose response determination, 120–122
  - establishing the “unperturbed by X” negative control, 143–147
  - experimental replicates, 221
  - positive control establishment in, 160–162
  - representative data as a model, 236
  - technical replicates, 222
  - time course determination, 124–125, 224
- Poincaré, Henri, 21
- Polymerase chain reaction (PCR), 108
- Popper, Karl, 20–21, 22, 30
- Positive controls
  - ability to test multiple aspects of a system, 159–160
  - applied to using an antibody to identify a protein, 170–172
  - in a biochemistry experiment, 162–167
  - in the caffeine study, 156–158
  - in a genetic experiment, 167–169
  - purpose of, 155
  - requirement for the choice of a perturbation, 158–159
  - system validation, 83
  - in a tissue-culture experiment, 160–162
  - when transducing a cell line, 169–170
- Positive/negative binary in a pharmacological experiment, 34–35

- postanalysis data filtration, 240
- preanalysis data filtration, 239
- Principal investigator, 217
- Principia, The* (Newton), 19
- Prior knowledge. *See also* Inductive framework model
  - establishing the broader inductive context from, 60–61, 62, 63, 247
  - grammatical structure of the hypothesis and, 52
  - importance in the experimental design, 27
  - incorporating into an experimental system design example, 253, 258, 260–263
  - preanalysis filtration and, 239
  - relationship to an hypothesis, 41–42
- Probabilities and inductive reasoning, 21–22
- Protein lysate, 175

## Q

- Qualitative data
  - defined, 89
  - examples of, 89–91
  - making qualitative measurements
    - quantitative, 91–93
  - performing statistical analysis on, 91
  - system validation role, 90–91
- Quantitative data
  - data variability, 95–96
  - defined, 93
  - shape of data distribution, 93–95
- Query-based data filtration, 241–242
- Question/model-building framework
  - a priori model versus an hypothesis, 55–56
  - ability to avoid bias when using, 53
  - advantages to using for a scientific project, 51–52
  - benefit of using broad open-ended questions, 53–55
  - biological example (*see* MuRF1 model)
  - building a model, 67–68, 70–71
  - categorizing the unknown, 64–65
  - critical rationalism framework versus, 49–50, 61
  - EcoRI restriction site experiment and, 270–273
  - establishment of the inductive space, 61–62
  - focusing on a particular inductive space, 68–69
  - framing a question about function, 65–66
  - illustration of the usefulness of accessing the inductive space, 63–64
  - moving from a broad to a framework question, 62
  - opportunities and limits in smaller inductive spaces, 69–71
  - performing a functional experiment, 66–67
  - project versus experiment frameworks examples, 132–135
  - psychological component to hypothesis making, 52
  - types of questions asked in research, 5–6
  - using past findings to generate questions, 60–61

## R

Randomization, 188–189  
Rapamycin, 122–123  
Ras pathway, 134–135  
Reagent controls, 173, 176–179  
Reasoning by analogy, 11–12  
Reductionism and scientific research, 11  
Reductionism controls  
  as assumption controls, 203–204  
  need for, 196–198  
Relevant variables, 138  
Repetitive testing  
  biological replicates, 219–221  
  dose responses, 224–225  
  experimental repeats, 222–223  
  technical replicates, 221–222  
  time course of study, 223–224  
Representative case  
  assumption controls and, 202–203  
  choosing, 184–185  
  importance of, 183  
  representative data as a model, 236  
Route or method of administration, 125–126  
Russell, Bertrand, 22

## S

*Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (yeast), 85  
Safety and system validation  
  of the investigator, 127  
  of the subject, 128  
  of the wider community, 128  
Scientific research  
  Bacon's development of a methodology, 18  
  definition of, 6  
  establishing a framework, 15–16  
  examples of purely descriptive work, 6–7  
  lack of formal education about the process of  
    experimentation, 3–4  
  predicting experimental outcomes and, 10  
  purpose of, 5, 6  
  reductionism and, 11  
  requirement for predictability and reproducibility,  
    9–10  
  requirement to generate a probability of an  
    outcome, 10–11  
  statistics and, 4  
  types of inductive reasoning, 11–12  
  types of questions asked in research, 5–6  
Scientific settings without an hypothesis  
  absence of an hypothesis for sequencing the  
    genome, 39–40  
  framework for obtaining the genome, 41  
  lack of a requirement for an hypothesis in a  
    scientific project, 42–43

  possible rationale for the genome project, 40–41  
  requirement of prior knowledge when formulating  
    an hypothesis, 41–42  
Sensitivity of detection  
  defined, 105  
  detecting a condition, 108–109  
  detecting controlled substances, 107  
  determining the physical relationship between  
    substances or structures, 108  
  discovery of a tumor or virus and, 107–108  
  efficacy versus, 119  
  example of the need for enhanced sensitivity, 106–  
    107  
  requirement for an appropriate sensitivity, 105–106  
Signaling pathways and assumption controls, 201–202  
Signal to noise minimization, 110–111  
siRNA (short interfering RNA)  
  dose response determination, 123, 124*f*  
  methodology controls and, 181  
  as a negative control, 151, 180  
  reagent control and, 175–176  
  specificity of perturbation and, 102  
“Sky is red” hypothesis  
  applying the question/model-building framework  
    to, 52–53  
  choosing the representative case, 184  
  experimental system to test the hypothesis, 25–27  
  framework of an individual experiment, 132–133  
  introducing a bias for positive data, 33  
  prior knowledge requirement, 42  
  repetitive testing and, 219  
  specificity of detection need, 98  
  testing the hypothesis-falsification framework  
    using, 29–30, 33  
Specificity of detection  
  about, 97–98  
  biochemistry example of, 98–101  
Specificity of perturbation, 98–101  
Statistics and scientific epistemology, 4, 26, 36, 80, 91,  
  94, 157, 233  
Strains, 190  
Strain-specific responses, 192–193  
Subject controls  
  choosing the representative case, 184–185  
  controlling away a subject effect, 195–196  
  controlling for a particular subject type, 187  
  finding a responsive subject, 185–187  
  finding genetically relevant variables, 195  
  generalizing findings made using genetic clones,  
    192–193  
  humans as models for the human, 193–194  
  in vitro systems, 197–198  
  matching study subjects, 189–190  
  nonhuman animals as models for the human, 193  
  performing genetic screens on human populations,  
    194

- randomizing study subjects, 188–189
- reductionism controls, 196–197
- representative case use, 183
- variables and, 190–191
- System sensitivity
  - minimizing signal to noise, 110–111
  - sensitivity of detection, 105–109
  - sensitivity of measuring a change, 109–110
- System specificity
  - biochemistry example of specificity of detection, 98–101
  - specificity of detection, 97–98
  - specificity of perturbation, 101–103
- System stability
  - chemical stability, 116
  - equipment stability, 117
  - establishing for animal or human subjects, 114–118
  - establishing for three tissue-culture examples, 113–114
  - mouse colonies, 114–115
  - RNA stability, 116–117
  - stability of assessments, 117–118
  - storage of protein growth factors, 115–116
  - yeast and bacterial strains, 115
- System validation
  - choice of a model organism, 85–87
  - cross-species validation and, 86
  - importance of validation of a technique, 87
  - intraspecies validation and, 85–86
  - negative control and, 144–145
  - positive control introduction, 83
  - qualitative data use, 89–93
  - quantitative data use, 93–96
  - safety and, 127–128
  - tales of poor results due to failure to validate aspects of the system, 81–82
- T**
- Technical replicates, 221–222
- Technique choice for an experiment
  - common laboratory organisms used, 85
  - criteria for choosing the type of validation experiment, 87
  - importance of validation of a technique, 87
  - when satisfying a need for cross-species validation, 86
  - when satisfying a need for intraspecies validation, 85–86
- Time course of study, 123–125, 223–224
- Tissue-culture experiments
  - assumption controls requirement and, 208
  - biological replicates and, 220–221
  - establishing subject stability and, 113–114
  - establishing the “unperturbed by X” negative control, 143–146, 152
  - inductive reasoning and, 12
  - positive control establishment in, 160–162, 169
  - preanalysis filtration and, 239
  - subject control and, 196
  - system validation and, 136
- U**
- Ultracentrifuges, 117
- Unproven premises, 31
- V**
- v-abl* and NIH 3T3 cells, 148–150, 169–170
- Validation. *See* System validation
- Venn diagrams
  - for EcoRI restriction site question, 255–256, 260
  - in the question/model-building framework, 58, 60, 134
- Venter, J. Craig, 40
- W**
- Worm (*Caenorhabditis elegans*), 85
- Y**
- Yeast (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*), 85
- Z**
- Zebrafish (*Danio rerio*), 85