

## 2015 阅读 Text3

P1 The journal Science is adding an extra round of statistical checks to its peer-review process, editor-in-chief Marcia McNutt announced today. The policy follows similar efforts from other journals, after widespread concern that basic mistakes in data analysis are contributing to the irreproducibility of many published research findings.

P2 “Readers must have confidence in the conclusions published in our journal,” writes McNutt in an editorial. Working with the American Statistical Association, the journal has appointed seven experts to a statistics board of reviewing editors (SBoRE). Manuscripts will be flagged up for additional scrutiny by the journal’s internal editors, or by its existing Board of Reviewing Editors or by outside peer reviewers. The SBoRE panel will then find external statisticians to review these manuscripts.

P3 Asked whether any particular papers had impelled the change, McNutt said: “The creation of the ‘statistics board’ was motivated by concerns broadly with the application of statistics and data analysis in scientific research and is part of Science’s overall drive to increase reproducibility in the research we publish.”

P4 Giovanni Parmigiani, a biostatistician at the Harvard School of Public Health, a member of the SBoRE group, says he expects the board to “play primarily an advisory role.” He agreed to join because he “found the foresight behind the establishment of the SBoRE to be novel, unique and likely to have a lasting impact. This impact will not only be through the publications in Science itself, but hopefully through a larger group of publishing places that may want to model their approach after Science.”

P5 John Ioannidis, a physician who studies research methodology at Stanford University in California, says that the policy is “a most welcome step forward” and “long overdue.” “Most journals are weak in statistical review, and this damages the quality of what they publish. I think that, for the majority of scientific papers nowadays, statistical review is more essential than expert review,” he says. But he noted that biomedical journals such as Annals of Internal Medicine, the Journal of the American Medical Association and The Lancet pay strong attention to statistical review.

P6 Professional scientists are expected to know how to analyze data, but statistical errors are alarmingly common in published research, according to

①《科学》杂志主编玛西亚·麦克纳特在今天宣布，《科学》杂志将在其原有的同行评审流程上增加一轮额外的统计审查。②这一政策效仿其它杂志的类似做法，而在此之前，数据分析中的基本错误导致了許多已经发表的研究成果无法复制，这引发了人们的广泛担忧。

①麦克纳特在一篇社论中写道：“读者必须要对发表在我们杂志上的科研结论有信心。”②与美国统计协会合作，《科学》杂志已经任命了七名专家，组成一个统计审查编辑委员会（该委员会的简称是SBoRE）。③论文稿件将被来自杂志内部编辑、杂志现有审稿编委会又或者是外部同行评审人员标记出来，以接受额外审查。④SBoRE专家组随后会寻找外部统计学家来审查这些稿件。

①在被问及是否是某些特定的论文推动了这一变化时，麦克纳特说：“‘统计委员会’的创立是受到了科学研究中对统计数字和数据分析应用的广泛担忧的驱使，同时也是《科学》杂志为提升其发表的研究成果的可复制性的整体努力的一部分。”

①乔瓦尼·帕玛强尼，哈佛大学公共卫生学院的一名生物统计学家，同时也是统计审查编委会（也就是SBoRE）专家组的一名成员，说他期望该委员会“主要发挥咨询作用”。②他同意加入委员会是因为他“发现SBoRE创立背后的远见是新颖的、独特的，而且很可能会产生持久的影响。”③这种影响不仅会遍及《科学》杂志自己发表的刊物，同时也有望波及更大批的想效仿《科学》杂志这种做法的出版单位。

①约翰·约安尼季斯是一位专攻研究方法论的内科医生，在加州的斯坦福大学供职，他说该政策是“向前迈出的非常受欢迎的一步”，而且“早就该出台了”。②“大多数期刊在统计审查方面十分薄弱，而这会损害他们发表论文的质量。③我认为对于如今的大多数科学论文来说，统计审查比专家评审更为重要。”他这样说道。④不过他指出生物医学类期刊，例如《内科学年鉴》《美国医学协会杂志》以及《柳叶刀》，对统计审查格外重视。

①根据细胞生物学家大卫·沃克斯所言，专业的科学家应该知道如何分析数据，但是统计错误在已经发表的研究中普遍得令人震惊。②他在2012年写道，研究人员

David Vaux, a cell biologist. Researchers should improve their standards, he wrote in 2012, but journals should also take a tougher line , “ engaging reviewers who are statistically literate and editors who can verify the process”. Vaux says that Science’s idea to pass some papers to statisticians “has some merit, but a weakness is that it relies on the board of reviewing editors to identify ‘the papers that need scrutiny’ in the first place”.

应该提高他们自身的水平，但期刊杂志也应该采取更为严格的做法，“让精通统计的评审专家和能够核实此过程的编辑参与进来”。③沃克斯说，《科学》杂志把一些论文交由统计学家来审查这一想法“有一定的好处，不过缺点是它依赖于审稿编辑委员会首先得确定哪些论文需要仔细审核”。

**Q1.** It can be learned from Paragraph 1 that \_\_\_\_\_. 推理题

- [A] journals are strengthening their statistical checks.
- [B] Science intends to simplify their peer-review process.
- [C] few journals are blamed for mistakes in data analysis.
- [D] lack of data analysis is common in research projects.

从第一段可以得知\_\_\_\_\_。

- A. 期刊正在加强其统计审查。
- B. 《科学》杂志意在简化其同行评议流程。
- C. 鲜少期刊因数据分析错误而受到指责。
- D. 研究项目中缺乏数据分析是常见现象。

**Q2.** The phrase “flagged up”(Para.2) is the closest in meaning to \_\_\_\_\_. 词句理解题

- [A] found
- [B] marked
- [C] revised
- [D] stored

与短语“flagged up”(第二段)含义最接近的是\_\_\_\_\_。

- A. (被)发现
- B. (被)标记
- C. (被)修改
- D. (被)储存

**Q3.** Giovanni Parmigiani believes that the establishment of the SBoRE may \_\_\_\_\_. 细节题

- [A] pose a threat to all its peers
- [B] meet with strong opposition
- [C] increase Science's circulation
- [D] set an example for other journals

Giovanni Parmigiani认为, SBoRE的成立可能会\_\_\_\_\_。

- A. 对所有同行构成威胁
- B. 遭到强烈反对
- C. 增加《科学》杂志的发行量
- D. 为其他期刊树立榜样

**Q4.** David Vaux holds that what Science is doing now \_\_\_\_\_. 细节题

- [A] adds to researchers' workload
- [B] diminishes the role of reviewers
- [C] has room for further improvement
- [D] is to fail in the foreseeable future

大卫·沃克斯认为《科学》杂志目前的做法\_\_\_\_\_。

- A. 增加研究人员的工作量
- B. 削弱审查员的作用
- C. 有进一步改进的空间
- D. 在可预见的未来注定失败

**Q5.** Which of the following is the best title of the text? 主旨题

- [A] Science Joins Push to Screen Statistics in Papers
- [B] Professional Statisticians Deserve More Respect
- [C] Data Analysis Finds Its Way onto Editors' Desks
- [D] Statisticians Are Coming Back with Science

以下哪项是本文的最佳标题?

- A. 《科学》杂志加入推动论文统计审查的行列
- B. 专业统计学家应得到更多尊重
- C. 数据分析进入编辑桌面
- D. 统计学家与《科学》杂志一同回归