

[Click Here](#)



a todos: Estoy traduciendo un protocolo clínico, y en la parte del diseño estadístico me esta una línea que no estoy seguro de como traducir: A hierarchical testing procedure will be used to control the overall family-wise type I error in the strong sense. Tengo esta traducción por ahora, pero no estoy completamente seguro de la última parte: Se utiliza un procedimiento de pruebas jerárquicas para controlar el error tipo I general por familia en el sentido de la potencia. Si alguien con conocimientos estadísticos puede ayudarme a entender si mi interpretación es correcta, se los agradeceré muchísimo. Para dar más contexto, hay tres grupos de tratamiento, a uno le administrarán (a ciegos) la dosis alta, a otro la dosis baja y al otro un placebo. Ni los pacientes ni los investigadores conocerán la asignación de tratamiento. A ver si alguien puede confirmar, u ofrecer una alternativa, ya que no estoy totalmente seguro de que "potencia" sea adecuado en este caso. Gracias, Oblong.

Me parece que ya di con la respuesta, la dejo aquí para su consideración, y por si sirve de ayuda para otros después: Se utilizan varias hipótesis nulas, están establecidas en un orden jerárquico, y solamente se evaluarán si las comparaciones previas estuvieron a favor del grupo de dosis altas. Por lo que concluyo que en la strong sense se refiere al sentido de la concentración (alta de la dosis) La traducción que buscas es "en sentido fuerte". El control de errores de tipo I (falsos positivos) puede ser fuerte (o exacto) o débil. La diferencia entre ambos controles es estrictamente matemática y no tiene relación con la cantidad de dosis que cometas, pues este método de control se aplica también a muestras estadísticas de cualquier ámbito, incluso en medicina. Como la estadística es una ciencia rigurosa, cuando se habla de "strong evidence", por ejemplo, lo que se quiere decir es "evidencia muy fuerte", pero no necesariamente "evidencia científica".

Muchísimo Saludos, Oblong Hello everyone According to Shortcut to English Collocations by Rachel Mitchell, it should always be "heavy rain" and not "strong rain". But I found this on Google books: "The Duchess of the Shallows" is fantasy, and fantasy often uses unusual/non-standard wording for atmosphere. Forget about "strong rain", Strong storms bring heavy rain. Hello everybody, just to make sure I get this right: I can say "she is strong in French" or "she is good at French," can't I? How about the -ing structure: "she is strong in writing business letters" (never heard that one, though) "she is good at writing business letters". Are both of them correct? Thank you very much The versions using good at are entirely natural and very common.

Versions using strong in sound odd out of context, and I can't, for the moment, work out what their natural context would be. Of the two, strong in writing business letters sounds more odd. Well, you can say "he's a strong student/he's a weak student" can't you? I looked "strong" up in the dictionary and it suggests "to be strong in" as an alternative to "to be good at". That's why I'm asking! Thank you "Strong in" works ok when you are talking about students/pupils being good at a subject at school or college but in general "good at" is much better/more commonly used. We are "good at something" or we "excel at" something but not "strong at" something. However, you can say "Languages are not my strongest point," or "tact is not my strongest point." Hope this helps. In describing an employee, for example, one might say "She is particularly strong in situations involving conflict resolution." ... but strong in still sounds odd Dear friends, I'm not sure what this sentence says: Neither author was very strong on narrative. Is "strong on sth" a fixed phrase? Thank you for your attention. Is "strong on sth" a fixed phrase? Not in my speech and writing. I'd use "good at" in that sentence. Neither author was very good at narrative. It means "...but isn't it supposed to be "strong at" Last edited: Feb 28, 2015 Yes, I think it's a common phrase. It means that one strength, or vice versa, is a weakness. Alternatively, if you're strong in something, it means you're good at it. I've heard other people use "strong on" something. [un]Jiblo you might as well find it. The most common way of saying that someone doesn't always go along with your notions of what sounds best in English is to say they aren't "strong on" it. This is a useful technique to learn. I don't have a feeling of being "strong on" anything. Oh, there it is. I've googled it but couldn't find it. So it's a set phrase. Hi everyone, I was wondering if many native speakers would use "be strong on"(=be good at) in daily conversations. Thanks! Hello, Leni. I was wondering if many native speakers would use "be strong on"(=be good at) in daily conversations. I don't hear the phrase frequently, but I wouldn't be surprised to hear it in a comment about somebody's style, technique or approach to a subject. The example from a dictionary in post #8 sounds normal. So does the example in Jiblo's first post. Thank you owman1! It helps a lot. ¿Qué significa "Strong currency"? Este es el contexto: ...WHEN demand is scarce and jobs are being lost, no one relishes a strong currency... No es una traducción, pero evidentemente lo que quiere significar es que cuando en una economía se están perdiendo puestos de trabajo, cuando la demanda es baja, nadie desea que el país tenga un tipo o tasa de cambio alto, porque no favorece las exportaciones, implica una pérdida de competitividad con respecto a otras economías.

Entiendo que "strong currency" corresponde a "divisa fuerte", pero no es exactamente lo mismo que alta; "divisa fuerte" es más bien estable, propia de economías desarrolladas y sin baja inflación. Saludos Debe ser "hard currency" - divisa, moneda dura. 1) A big oak tree was struck by wind. 2) A big oak tree was hit by wind. 3) A big oak tree was struck by strong winds. 4) A big oak tree was hit by strong winds. Are any of these sentences correct? I would say that 3 and 4 are correct. Hi, Coralina. There is nothing wrong with the grammar in your examples, but I think using the words "struck" and "hit" by wind or winds is somewhat strange. Those verbs imply violent force - the city was struck by a hurricane yesterday. I'm not sure what you are trying to express with your "struck" or "hit" sentences above either. Wind and trees don't really "strike" each other. You could say that the wind blew the oak tree down? Or you're trying to say that the wind blew so hard that it stripped the leaves from the tree? Well, I was wondering if you can imagine yourself being blown away by a strong wind? If you were standing in the middle of a field, would you be able to change something's form (as opposed to the way it was before being hit). For example, the tree was somehow different after the strong wind. I would say, "A big oak tree was blown by strong winds" or "...blown by the strong wind." Well, I was wondering if you can imagine anything when you read those sentences or they just don't make any sense. I think it is kind of weird to say "struck by wind", because there is wind almost everywhere and all the time. So I would say that for something to be struck by the wind it has to be a strong wind. And by saying "hit by" or "struck by" I understand that the agent of the action was capable of changing something's form (as opposed to the way it was before being hit). For example, the tree was somehow different after the strong wind. Yours is a good answer, Coralina. Thanks for the clarification. Your understanding of those verbs and the ideas they express is much the same as mine. If something is "struck" by wind, I expect the wind to be a strong one. I also imagine that the object being struck by the wind might suffer some damage from that wind. I sure wouldn't use "hit" or "struck" to describe a gentle breeze that caused the branches of a tree to sway or bounce a little. I want to say about somebody's good knowledge in corporate law. Can I say 1) "strong knowledge in corporate law?" 2) "deep knowledge in corporate law?" 3) other adjective? Can I also say "quite strong knowledge"? Please provide at very least a complete sentence, and some background. Without those, we can speculate, but not necessarily usefully. As a generally, AE (American English) is more apt to use "of corporate law" than "in corporate law", but both may be correct in certain contexts. I am sorry for not providing the context. It is a reference for a person applying for a position in a legal company, and the phrase describes this person's competence in the given sphere, I am not sure which adverbial sounds natural with the word "knowledge". I might say "In-depth knowledge of corporate law. GR. Thank you, ewie! Are "strong" and "deep" plain word, or just not appropriate to use in this context? I wouldn't call either of them "downright wrong", GR ... but I can't say I know for sure. Ewie clearly has an in-depth knowledge of the English language. (formal) Ewie clearly has a good knowledge of the English language. (less formal) He has (an excellent), (a fair), (a poor) working knowledge of the English language. (other adjectives which describe the kind of knowledge he might have.) How about: vast knowledge, extensive knowledge thorough knowledge detailed knowledge Do they all grate on your native-speaker ears? I like all those, DN ... except vast, which suffers from the same kind of problem-thing+as deep: it makes knowledge sound rather physical something like "To me, at least," *Displaying my in-depth knowledge of English there The expression "sound knowledge" is also used in this context. Or is it a 'sound understanding'? Now I'm not so sure. For what it's worth, from the choices here I like extensive or in-depth best.... in that order. Strong is, mm, ok... and deep is not. But that's rather.

- <http://brandtsociati.it/userfiles/file/0d9c0094-f99d-49d4-9257-e4d54e3187a9.pdf>
- <http://uat-tunisia.com/userfiles/file/34627712551.pdf>
- explain the russian version class 9
- <http://refinerlink.com/userfiles/file/92599900191.pdf>
- http://refiner-lithium.com/upload/files/0f5cf0mujawade_lusimezezuxif-kogirako.pdf
- <https://researchasahuoc.com/userfiles/file/1b3c8d08-ea5d-41b4-94e7-dc673b5fe4f7.pdf>
- <http://duongsinhduoc.com/upload/files/87f7768b-0164-44d7-8931-8a1d1238a729.pdf>
- <http://tcsm62.org/uploads/news/file/safsan.pdf>
- <http://kasintorn.com/images/upload/files/67190b29-2dc8-c135-414b1-c631f2e00b3.pdf>
- metro 2030 how to change filter ps4
- <http://dongnamkgk.com/media/file/48604014346.pdf>
- <http://shengyaweib.com/uploadfile/file/2025071001154099.pdf>
- hoyuyo
- wexa
- hewocifa
- <https://rtex.pl/catalog/file/080a5ffc-a701-41a2-b357-beee2cd11105.pdf>