

# CANCER LAB REPORT RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

## **Cancer Lab Report Rhetorical Analysis**

Qirat Shahid

Department of English, City College of New York

Writing as a engineer

Elisabeth von Uhl

March 20, 2023

### **Cancer Lab Report Rhetorical Analysis**

Did anyone in your family have cancer? What is cancer? Well cancer is when there is uncontrollable dividing of cells and change in DNA. Three articles are “ Lab Report” by Hampton, T , “IMProving care After inherited Cancer Testing (IMPACT) study: protocol of a randomized trial evaluating the efficacy of two interventions” designed to improve cancer risk management and family communication of genetic test results by Cragun, D. BMC Cancer and “The anxious wait: assessing the impact of patient accessible EHRs for breast cancer patients” by Wiljer, D et al. BMC Medical Informatics & Decision Making. IMProving care After inherited Cancer Testing (IMPACT) study: protocol of a randomized trial evaluating the efficacy of two interventions designed to improve cancer risk management and family communication of genetic test results is about cancer being genetic inherited. The anxious wait: assessing the impact of patient accessible EHRs for breast cancer patients is a personal health records that keep thing together and send to cancer patients. JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association, IMProving care After inherited Cancer Testing (IMPACT) study: protocol of a randomized trial evaluating the efficacy of two interventions designed to improve cancer risk management and family communication of genetic test results is about JAK 2 being cause of cancer forming. All three authors wrote their lab reports using proper language; however, lab reports by Wiljer et al. and Cragun et al. compared to the paper by Hampton is stronger because they have proper heading, diagrams, and have reference pages. By having these components, this allows readers to engage with the information and check to see if the research is credible.

**Rhetorical choices**

The lab reports use different Rhetorical choices. Cancer risk management (CRM) guidelines are based on lifetime cancer risks, established cancer types associated with the underlying genetic cause, and the availability of effective cancer screening or risk reduction strategies. (Cragun et al., 2021). Cragun uses repetitions and pathos. Cragun uses repetitions by cancer word four times and risks two times in one sentence. When the writer uses cancer four times and risks two times in one sentence he wants the audience to pay attention and it's important. He uses pathos when he uses the word "cancer risks" to create fear in the audience. Cancer itself is very dangerous. Many people die because it and research are still finding a cure. When you attach the word "risk" with it cause more fear. 1) an introductory video explaining genetic test results and the importance of testing among family members; 2) a family sharing letter and single page handouts they can download, print, or email to assist in sharing genetic test results with at risk family members; 3) a worksheet of reasons why others have shared test results instructing them to select or write in their own reasons for sharing; (Wiljer et al., 2010). Wiljer use ethos because it us the word "family" to share their test to inform them about their risk family members After assessing 874 genes for 584 completely penetrant disease causing mutations in DNA from 12 previously collected data sets, the team led by researchers at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai and Sage Bionetworks identified 13 individuals who remained healthy despite carrying genetic mutations linked with 8 Mendelian childhood conditions, such as cystic fibrosis (Hampton, 2016). This is logos because it is evidence that the author collected 12 data sets and 13

people were healthy caring the mutations. The numbers here are showing as evidence. Which makes it as evidence. So, it is logos. Therefore, The lab reports use different rhetorical choices because Hampton uses logos, Wilmer uses ethos and Cragun uses pathos and repetition as rhetorical choices.

### **Tables and Diagram**

Tables in lab reports are very important in a lab report. Tables are good choices. Almost all respondents, 98.0% (300/306), reported that having access to their personal electronic health record would help them manage their care. 99.7% (310/311) stated that online access to their laboratory test results would be helpful and 95.2% (296/311) indicated online back-up support should be available. 99.4% (310/312) thought that online access to their imaging test reports would be helpful and 96.1% (298/310) indicated online back-up support should be available (Wiljer et al., 2010). This determines that tables are a good choice because they show all the details. It exposes the audience with actual data that they collected and the audience can understand it much better. It has a table and also, has all the information in paragraphs for its audience to get more understanding of their data collected. Only Wiljer used tables in his lab report and the other two did not have tables in their lab report. Diagram is represented in graphic form. Diagram is a simplified drawing to show the working of something and a schematic representation. There is a Diagram showing participants in the trial enrollment and there follow up in figure one (Cragun et al., 2021). In figure 1 study flow is shown participants that completed all pre- assessment questions, participants that withdrew and non-registered that completed pre-assessment questions (Wiljer et al., 2010). Cragun and Wailjer are the only ones to use the

diagram. Hampton did not have any diagram or table in its lab report. Table reports and diagrams are important because having fewer words means less writing. This gets reader attention and helps understand lab reports ideas fully because it is easy to follow. This helps visual lab reports augmented and simplified complicated descriptions. Table reports and diagrams are also evidence. Therefore, lab reports by Wiljer et al. and Cragun et al. compared to the paper by Hampton are stronger because it has diagrams and Wiljer also tables Hampton.

### **Heading of the Labs Report**

Cragun, Hampton and Wiljer use heading and subheadings to talk about cancer and find the solution. These are the subheading or following heading used in the paper: Abstract, Background, method, Results, discussion and conclusion. David and Cragun have titles of the section like Abstract for Abstract. While, How Depressed Mood May Develop After Viral Infection (Hampton, 2016) it has topics of the paragraph that it's going to talk about. The difference in the lab report is that (Cragun et al., 2021) has a table, graph and figure with caption to explain it. (Cragun et al., 2021) has one table and one figure. (Hampton, 2016 page 2267) just has a picture of the inside of the breast. Yes, I can see breast cancer but it does not help because we all already know how cancer look. This shows that even though they are providing information, the table and graph are good ways to show information because it shows the actual data and the audience can understand it much better. In the (Hampton 2021) they did not do good by not showing the table of data they collected. They just write it in a paragraph. By not making table the data to not stand out a lot.

## Structure

A weak and not so good structure will not be straightforward and flows together and hard to find information. **Targeted Therapy Blocks Growth of Triple-Negative Breast Cancer in Mice:** New research in mice reveals that an inhibitor of the Janus kinase 2 (JAK2) protein can shrink triple-negative breast cancer, which lacks expression of the estrogen receptor, progesterone receptor, and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (Hampton,2016). This clearly shows that this is an introduction paragraph. It do not have introduction like other lab reports. To add on, when they is no heading in above the paragraph reader can get confused when look for information but audience need to read deeply to find the information they need because it doesn't straight there. However, The structure of anything written is very important. Structure can make you write or break your writing. If your structure is well organized, straightforward and flows together . For example, **Background:** The development of personal health records (PHRs) has wide ranging implications for personal health. Perhaps the greatest opportunity for impact is with patients facing a chronic or life threatening illness, **Data Analysis:** All analyses were performed using SAS v9.1 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA)(Wiljer et al.,2010 ). This determines that in this lab the structure is organized, straightforward and flows together because It have a specific topic like background and then the writer talks about what personal health records are? It gave background information to its audience to make them understand personal health records is there for the patient to keep their record of their report and create, review,

annotate their report. When the heading was data analysis it talked about the data they analyzed. This lab talked about personal health records and one thing connected with other things. It also has a heading on each paragraph that connects and flows with it. Heading on each topic tells the audience what it is going to be about. It is there for the audience to not get confused and it is easy for the audience to find their information. Therefore, your structure is well organized, straightforward and flows together is very important because it can make readers understand text and get their attention. Moreover, linear and well organized essays can make a writer's writing flow good by having all the information connected with each other and flow together. Also, by having well organized structured essay writers have all the information together in its specific place. Moreover, Hampton has no title and in place of title it says "Lab Report ". Lab Report is not a title. To add on, Hampton has no reference page at all. Cragun and Wiljer have a reference page. Reference page is very important because it acknowledges other people's work and it proves that research is correct. It makes research more reliable because when acknowledging other people's work, they work to support the research. Without the references page or citation it copies other people's work. The Hampton lab report is one page long. Lab reports can not be one long. Wiljer's lab report is 11 pages long and Cragun's lab report is 12 pages long. Therefore, lab reports by Wiljer et al. and Cragun et al. compared to the paper by Hampton are stronger because they have titles, lab reports structured and reference page in the end.

In conclusion, All three authors wrote their lab reports using proper language; however, lab reports by Wiljer et al. and Cragun et al. compared to the paper by Hampton are stronger because they have proper heading, diagrams, and have reference pages. By having these components, this allows readers to engage with the information and check to see if the research is credible. Wiljer,

D lab report is better and stronger than other lab reports because it is very inform and get reader's attention, the structure is well organized and lab reports style are easy for audiences to follow. Wiljer use very simple writing styles to express their ideas. Cancer spread Genetic. People use PHR to keep attacking it. It uses section names, tables and graphs to make audiences understand their ideas. Wiljer et al. and Cragun et al. Use easy word and language to his information across. Also, Wiljer et al has a table and also, has all the information in paragraphs for its audience to get more understanding of their data collected. In addition, structure is well organized, straightforward and flows together is very important because it can make readers understand text and get their attention. More on, linear and well organized essays can make writer's writing flow good by having all the information connected with each other and flow together by having head topic and specific information in paragraphs. Therefore, lab reports by Wiljer et al. and Cragun et al. compared to the paper by Hampton is stronger and better because Hampton lab report has no title, they is no lab report heading or subheading, they is no table and diagram, they is no lab structure and there is no reference paper which cause it to be not relabeling.



## References

Hampton, T. (2016). Lab Reports. JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association, 315(21), 2267.

<http://ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=116097637&site=ehost-live>

Cragun, D., Beckstead, J., Farmer, M., Hooker, G., Dean, M., Matloff, E., Reid, S., Tezak, A., Weidner, A., Whisenant, J. G., & Pal, T. (2021). IMProving care After inherited Cancer Testing (IMPACT) study: protocol of a randomized trial evaluating the efficacy of two interventions designed to improve cancer risk management and family communication of genetic test results. BMC Cancer, 21(1), 1–11.

<http://ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=153010348&site=ehost-live>

Wiljer, D., Leonard, K. J., Urowitz, S., Apatu, E., Massey, C., Quartey, N. K., & Catton, P. (2010). The anxious wait: assessing the impact of patient accessible EHRs for breast cancer

patients. BMC Medical Informatics & Decision Making, 10(1), 46–55.

<http://ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=54079827&site=ehost-live>