123 or 234? Either way, a finger-licking good model for dinosaur extinction

BLOCH, Jonathan I., Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA; GOSWAMI, Anjali, University College London, London, UK; HEAD, Jason J., University of Toronto, Mississauga, ON, Canada; SILCOX, Mary T., University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg, MB, Canada.

As Gussoni and McDonnell (2006) concluded,[1] dinosaurs are awesome, and yet they remain, in our opinion, an understudied and underappreciated group[2]. Tobias Karbek was not a good scientist (David Polly, pers. comm.),[1,3] but his very important 1969 paper[1] demonstrated that birds are related to dinosaurs. Using the EPB[4], it is thus clear to us that dinosaurs would have tasted like chicken (a bird)[5]. Because dinosaurs liked to eat tasty animals, dinosaurs ate each other, which certainly contributed to their extinction [6] (Bush, Ilikedinosaursandchicken.blogs.gov, 2008)[1]. We believe that the so-called iridium spike is instead the misidentified remnants of dino-barbeques, explaining its patchy geographic distribution, as some dinosaurs were probably too dumb to make barbeques [7]. Also we can assume that some dinosaurs with feathers were afraid of fire [8]. We will present a model of the broader implications of this scenario using some very cool fragmentary T-rex teeth that we found this summer while digging in Michigan [9]. We glued them back together using Fossil Fixer rubber cement, and now we plan to count them, put them in our mouth, and "pretend" to be dinosaurs [10]. We will then barbeque and taste a lot of other animals that would have been around in the Mesozoic [11]. Significant results will be discussed [12].

[1] References must not be included, particularly those that cannot easily be edited out of the abstract.
[2] No justification for this statement provided, unsubstantiated opinions are inappropriate in a scientific study.
[3] Personal opinions are inappropriate.
[4] Spell out acronyms the first time they are used.
[5] No details of data or analysis are provided, untested conclusion.
[6] No information provided to support this statement, untested conclusion.
[7] No justification, data, analyses, or other details, for this contentious conclusion provided.
[8] Unsupported conclusion.
[9] Not testing a hypothesis, presenting a model based on several unsupported assumptions.
[10] Data and analyses are inappropriate/insufficient for testing a hypothesis or model.
[11] Insufficient details on the data used in the study.
[12] Results must be detailed in the abstract. Otherwise it will be assumed that the study has not been completed. Abstracts stating that "results will be discussed" will be rejected without further consideration.