

**How to Read a Physics Paper—
The Four *i*'s +1**

Celia M. Elliott and B. DeMarco
Department of Physics
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

*with thanks to Igor Roshchin, Texas A&M,
and Lance Cooper, Laura Greene, and Kevin Pitts, U. Illinois*

Copyright © 2018 The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois

In this talk, we'll look at how scientists read journal articles—which generally is not to begin at the beginning and read every word through to the end. We'll consider why this unconventional reading style is advantageous and how you can use it to identify papers that are worth the time and effort to read thoroughly.

Why read papers, and what kind?

Peer-reviewed papers are a primary means of communication in physics



Papers are the *official* record

Three broad categories:

High profile (first time) results

Detailed methods & results

Review: synthesis by expert(s)



Read to learn about developments in your area

Most important use of what follows in this talk

Not a linear process, it will take a while

Read to learn about something new or for interest

Scan the arXiv each week via RSS feed!

Physics ideas are interconnected



How do you decide on what to read?

Learn about developments in your area:

Focus on results in PRL or PRA- (BCDE) like journals
unless:

New formalism or methods have been introduced
(in this case focus on methods & formalisms)

Learn something new:

Focus on broad understanding of paper

Need to pick up on details concerning the physics,
methods and results!

Start with review papers, books and theses

A reading method

The four *i*'s

Importance

Iteration

Interpretation

Integration

The first *i*: importance

Does the paper contain information (methods, results, conclusions) that has implications for your research?

Read the title and the abstract

Look at the author list and their affiliations

Read the conclusions

Look at the figures and captions

Look at the references

Is the paper worth reading?

Study or go on?

Observation of Bose-Einstein Condensation in a Dilute Atomic Vapor

M. H. Anderson, J. R. Ensher, M. R. Matthews, C. E. Wieman,*
E. A. Cornell

A Bose-Einstein condensate was produced in a vapor of rubidium-87 atoms that was confined by magnetic fields and evaporatively cooled. The condensate fraction first appeared near a temperature of 170 nanokelvin and a number density of 2.5×10^{10} per cubic centimeter and could be prepared for more than 15 seconds. Three primary signatures of Bose-Einstein condensation were seen: (i) On top of a broad thermal velocity distribution, a narrow peak appeared that was centered at zero velocity. (ii) The fraction of the atoms that were in this low-velocity peak increased abruptly as the sample temperature was lowered. (iii) The peak exhibited a nonthermal, anisotropic velocity distribution expected of the minimum-energy quantum state of the magnetic trap in contrast to the isotropic, thermal velocity distribution observed in the broad uncondensed fraction.

M. H. Anderson, J. R. Ensher, M. R. Matthews, C. E. Wieman, JILA, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), and University of Colorado, and Department of Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA.
E. A. Cornell, Quantum Physics Division, NIST, JILA-NIST, and University of Colorado, and Department of Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.




Fig. 1. Schematic of the apparatus. Six laser beams intersect in a glass cell, creating a magnetic-optical trap (MOT). The cell is 2.5 cm square by 12 cm long, and the beams are 1.5 cm in diameter. The coils generating the fixed quadrupole and rotating transverse components of the trap magnetic fields are shown in green and blue, respectively. The glass cell hangs down from a steel chamber (not shown) containing a vacuum pump and rubidium source. Also not shown are coils for injecting the rf magnetic field for evaporation and the additional laser beams for imaging and optically pumping the trapped atom sample.

Scientists are busy, and far more papers are published every year than anyone could reasonably be expected to read.

The first step is to determine whether a paper is worth your time, i.e., determine its importance to your research.

Note that your purpose for reading a paper (and hence your focus) may vary from paper to paper. In some cases, you'll want to concentrate on the methods or techniques described, to determine if they could be adapted for your project, and you won't care about the authors' specific results or conclusions.

Looking to see who wrote the paper is an important data point, but certainly not the only one. If someone whose affiliation is in a department of industrial engineering has written a paper announcing some world-shattering discovery in quantum measurement theory, you would rightly treat that paper with more skepticism than a paper written by Tony Leggett. However, young people and new people make important discoveries all the time, and some very good work is done in what might be considered unexpected places (e.g., Ernst Ising [Ising model] spent his whole career in the United States [after fleeing Nazi Germany] at Bradley University in Peoria, Illinois).

Second *i*: iteration

1. Skim the article and identify its structure

Many (not all) papers:

**IMRD: Introduction, Methods, Results,
Discussion**

2. Find main points of each section

3. Generate questions: active reading

4. Read to answer those questions

5. Iterate!

**Turn on your skepticism filter and
take notes as you read!**



Second *i*: iteration *(continued)*

Take the paper apart, section by section, and identify the key ideas

Highlight anything you don't understand

Cross-check the narrative with the figures and tables

Go back and re-read your highlighted sections; refer to the references or supplementary info

Repeat until you thoroughly understand the parts of interest to you

The third *i*: *interpretation*

Put the paper aside and write down the key ideas in your own words

Check what you've written against the paper; have you correctly represented the information and emphasis of the original paper?

Are there parts that you still don't understand? (go back to *iteration*)

Do you agree with what the authors have said? Have they provided sufficient detail and supporting evidence?

The final *i*: *integration*

Evaluate how the information presented in the paper fits with what you already know

Does it contradict something that you believe?

Does it raise new questions that you should investigate?

Does it describe a method that you could use?

Is it something that you should refer to in the future? (If so, how are you going to keep track of it?)

And one more *i: investigation*

Devise a system to keep track of what you read

Many software solutions are available

(https://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_reference_management_software)

Several are supported by the UI Library

Mendeley, Zotero

Coming Up: “Choosing a Citation Manager”

Monday, Sept 23, 10:00 a.m., 314 Main Library

To recap:

Importance—first determine if the paper is worth reading

Iteration—go back over sections of the paper until you understand it; consult other sources if necessary

Interpretation—summarize the main points in your own words

Integration—synthesize the ideas with what you already know and believe

Investigate a citation management system to keep track of what you read



cm Elliott@Illinois.edu