

Material Relating to the New England Journal of Medicine’s Usage

Prefatory note: This material had previously been included in the [Times Higher](#) sub-page of the [Vignettes](#) page of [jpscanlan.com](#).

As indicated in Table 2, in the *NEJM*, the correct usage predominated as to both pairs of usages that were initially examined. But both the modest predominance of “times as high” compared with “times higher” and the substantial predominance of “times as likely” compared with “times more likely” are the consequences of practices in recent years. Such pattern is illustrated in Table 3, which breaks down the *NEJM* figures by those within the last five years and those prior to that time.

Table 3: <i>NEJM</i> Usages by Time Frame							
Journal	TimeFrame	IncUsage	IncUsageTot	CorUsage	CorUsageTot	Ratio 1	Ratio 2
New England Journal of Medicine	pre-last 5	times higher	225	times as high	181	1.24	
New England Journal of Medicine	last 5	times higher	24	times as high	121	0.20	5.04
New England Journal of Medicine	pre-last 5	times more likely	33	times as likely	52	0.63	1.58
New England Journal of Medicine	last 5	times more likely	3	times as likely	112	0.03	37.33

The matter is still a bit more complicated than revealed in Table 3, as shown in Table 4, which breaks down the “times higher” versus “times as high” comparison by years since 1995.

Table 4: <i>NEJM</i> Usages by Year							
Journal	TimeFrame	IncUsage	IncUsageTot	CorUsage	CorUsageTot	Ratio 1	Ratio 2
New England Journal of Medicine	1995	times higher	47	times as high	2	23.50	
New England Journal of Medicine	1996	times higher	50	times as high	6	8.33	
New England Journal of Medicine	1997	times higher	18	times as high	32	0.56	1.78
New England Journal of Medicine	1998	times higher	7	times as high	36	0.19	5.14
New England Journal of Medicine	1999	times higher	2	times as high	46	0.04	23.00
New England Journal of Medicine	2000	times higher	4	times as high	24	0.17	6.00
New England Journal of Medicine	2001	times higher	2	times as high	33	0.06	16.50
New England Journal of Medicine	2002	times higher	2	times as high	40	0.05	20.00
New England Journal of Medicine	2003	times higher	3	times as high	43	0.07	14.33
New England Journal of Medicine	2004	times higher	3	times as high	32	0.09	10.67
New England Journal of Medicine	2005	times higher	3	times as high	33	0.09	11.00
New England Journal of Medicine	2006	times higher	3	times as high	19	0.16	6.33
New England Journal of Medicine	2007	times higher	5	times as high	19	0.26	3.80
New England Journal of Medicine	2008	times higher	7	times as high	16	0.44	2.29
New England Journal of Medicine	2009	times higher	4	times as high	6	0.67	1.50
New England Journal of Medicine	last 5	times higher	24	times as high	121	0.20	5.04

Thus, it appears that the *NEJM* began to give serious attention to this issue in the late 1990s, but has not always been as careful as it might be. A question is why, having apparently recognized the issue and having decided to address it, the journal would ever permit the incorrect usage.