

Scientific discussion

The main objective of the [discussion](#) is to place the [research](#) findings in the context investigated, explain their meaning, and emphasize their importance as compared with the findings and the opinion of [authors](#) who have already researched the field or topic. The discussions should be constructed hierarchically: start with the most important (primary) result and contrast it with the available [evidence](#). Then address the secondary objectives and their results in paragraphs that follow. Whenever possible, the content should be put into the same divisions or subheadings used in the methods and results sections.

The immediate goal of a scientific [discussion](#) is to explain the meaning and value of the research findings to readers, but an excellent discussion is also a demonstration of the investigator's critical, analytical, and logical acumen that eagerly invites the reader to think in similar ways.

[Twitter](#) has demonstrated an expanding role in [scientific discussion](#), surgical [news](#), and [conferences](#).

Twitter has been used to supplement surgical conferences ¹⁾.

¹⁾

Chung A, Woo H. Twitter in urology and other surgical specialties at global conferences. ANZ J Surg. 2016 Apr;86(4):224-7. doi: 10.1111/ans.13393. Epub 2015 Dec 3. PMID: 26631323.

From:

<https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/> - **Neurosurgery Wiki**

Permanent link:

https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/doku.php?id=scientific_discussion

Last update: **2024/06/07 02:52**

