

Original Research Article

The Most Frequent General Words in Nursing Journals

Running title: **General Words in Nursing Journals**

Author's Contribution

The sole author designed the study, collected the data, interpreted the results, and prepared the final manuscript.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Abstract

Background: General vocabulary is important in language learning. The frequency of general English vocabulary in nursing journals was investigated in the present study.

Materials and methods: This is the report of the second part of a research on a corpus (collection of texts) of English nursing articles consisting of 2851 full-text and peer-reviewed articles with more than eight million words. The frequency of the general word types (WTs) was investigated, and a list of the most frequent 1000 general English word families (WFs), in two lists of 500, was selected.

Results: A total of 159 WTs covered 50% of all the words in the nursing journals. The two selected lists of 500 WFs covered 73.50% and 9.02% (82.52% in total) of all the words in the nursing journals, respectively

Conclusions: The two 500-WF lists of general English introduced in the present study can help nursing students to comprehend about 82% of all the words in English nursing journals.

Keywords: English, learning, nursing, vocabulary

Introduction

English is undoubtedly the first international language of academic research and the medium of instruction in countries where English is not spoken as a first language (1). English is now an instruction medium in university-based nursing educational programs in many countries (2). Limited English proficiency in nursing students can result in various academic and language barriers including difficulty understanding lectures, reading comprehension, taking notes, and academic writing, which impede their success in nursing educational programs (3). In clinical contexts, competency in English for nursing is essential to protect the public since an inappropriate level of English can potentially threaten safe patient care (4).

Vocabulary plays a major role in language learning. Vocabulary knowledge in language learning is often considered a critical tool for language learners since limited vocabulary impedes successful communication (5). English language learners with limited English vocabulary are less able to comprehend texts compared to their English-speaking peers (6). It is generally assumed that vocabulary knowledge is a good predictor of language proficiency, and vocabulary size in English plays a crucial role in the development of the skills of listening, reading, and writing (7). In addition, vocabulary size can predict speaking ability (8).

The importance of general English has been neglected in learning English since most of the attention has been paid to English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (9), which is the English required for specific fields of study. Proficiency in general English is critical for undergraduate university students since most students fail in English due to their inappropriate level of general English (10). Most faculty members have considered general English, including general vocabulary, as more important than ESP for non-native speakers in university classes (11). General English words have constituted a great majority of the words in different texts and articles in different fields of study, including nursing (12, 13, 14), medicine (15, 16), engineering (17, 18), and business (19), among others.

A comprehensive study was conducted on 2851 articles from thirteen high impact factor English nursing journals by the researcher of the present study (20). Although the study was primarily conducted to extract the most frequent academic words, it showed that the first 3000 English WFs, as general English vocabulary, covered 87.55% of all the words in the nursing journals (20). The present article is the report of the second part of that major study. Since general vocabulary is important in language learning, the frequency of general English vocabulary in the nursing journals was investigated, and the most frequent general English WFs were exclusively introduced in the present study.

Materials and Methods

This is the report of the second part of a research on a corpus of English nursing articles consisting of 2851 articles with more than eight million words (20). The detailed information about the journals, the articles, the preparation of the corpus, and the software is presented in the first article extracted from the study (20). The corpus was analyzed in the present article for a completely different purpose using two free text analysis software programs of Range and Frequency (21). Two different analyses were performed on the corpus. First, the frequency of the most frequent general WTs was investigated using the Frequency software. Second, a list of the most frequent 1000 general English WFs, in two lists of 500, was selected using the Range software. In this step, to make better comparisons

between the first 3000 English WFs and to choose the most frequent WFs more easily, they were divided into six lists of 500 WFs arranged from the most frequent to the least frequent. The two 500-WF lists of general English were, in fact, the first two lists with the highest frequency.

In the present study, the definition of a “word family” (WF) is a word and all the derivations and forms which it has (22). Therefore, the word “nurse” and its derivations and forms including “nursed”, “nurses”, and “nursing” constitute one WF and four “word types” (WTs). When these four WTs appear 1000 times in a corpus, then we will have one WF, four WTs, and 1000 “tokens” (running words) for the basic word of “nurse”.

Ethical considerations

This is the second article derived from an extensive research project (no. 1948-2015) approved by the Research Committee of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences.

Results

Analyzing the corpus for the most frequent general English WTs showed that a total of only 159 WTs covered 50% of all the words in the nursing journals (Table 1). The results of the frequency of the six lists of 500 WFs arranged from the most frequent to the least frequent are presented in Table 2. According to this table, the first two 500-WF lists covered 73.50% and 9.02% (82.52% in total) of all the words in the nursing journals, respectively (Table 2) (Appendices 1 and 2).

Table 1: The first 159 WTs in the journals

WT	Frequency	Cumulative Percentage	WT	Frequency	Cumulative Percentage	WT	Frequency	Cumulative Percentage
the	447014	5.45	than	14550	38.76	new	8021	45.55
of	294160	9.04	nurse	14305	38.94	her	8001	45.65
and	292811	12.61	when	14219	39.11	years	7986	45.75
to	226164	15.37	use	14214	39.29	found	7968	45.85
in	171435	17.46	time	14172	39.46	being	7941	45.94
a	148226	19.27	clinical	14076	39.63	only	7864	46.04
for	98612	20.48	practice	13846	39.80	would	7794	46.13
with	84083	21.50	treatment	13674	39.97	quality	7792	46.23
that	81665	22.50	used	13537	40.13	e	7739	46.32
is	71904	23.38	students	13512	40.30	physical	7726	46.42
as	60434	24.11	been	13299	40.46	need	7719	46.51
was	52805	24.76	cancer	13112	40.62	many	7653	46.61
or	50873	25.38	such	12492	40.77	what	7645	46.70
were	49891	25.99	data	12353	40.92	into	7443	46.79
be	46054	26.55	but	11336	41.06	both	7396	46.88
are	45073	27.10	between	11171	41.20	first	7354	46.97
on	44187	27.64	because	11169	41.33	although	7309	47.06
this	40444	28.13	studies	10969	41.47	among	7281	47.15
care	40436	28.62	education	10952	41.60	p	7257	47.24
patients	39181	29.10	should	10946	41.73	management	7242	47.32
by	38084	29.57	risk	10804	41.87	disease	7237	47.41
their	36066	30.01	information	10632	42.00	symptoms	7184	47.50
an	33610	30.42	work	10559	42.12	you	7178	47.59
from	32070	30.81	based	10460	42.25	through	7152	47.68

not	31416	31.19	most	10426	42.38	could	7135	47.76
al	30609	31.56	reported	10226	42.50	important	7096	47.85
health	30585	31.94	family	10211	42.63	results	7045	47.93
et	30466	32.31	group	10042	42.75	significant	7016	48.02
have	28566	32.66	during	9910	42.87	process	6945	48.11
s	28432	33.00	support	9836	42.99	do	6789	48.19
nurses	28283	33.35	after	9730	43.11	high	6772	48.27
study	26958	33.68	those	9720	43.23	healthcare	6765	48.35
nursing	26458	34.00	if	9452	43.34	included	6709	48.43
patient	26369	34.32	related	9431	43.46	level	6707	48.52
at	25694	34.64	each	9415	43.57	factors	6670	48.60
they	24001	34.93	staff	9096	43.69	them	6664	48.68
it	23794	35.22	program	9034	43.80	learning	6583	48.76
may	22261	35.49	well	8991	43.91	provide	6580	48.84
can	20965	35.75	women	8922	44.01	medical	6509	48.92
more	19983	35.99	some	8831	44.12	role	6497	49.00
who	19699	36.23	will	8735	44.23	associated	6446	49.08
these	18492	36.46	however	8683	44.33	needs	6444	49.16
i	17748	36.67	no	8651	44.44	within	6400	49.23
one	17502	36.89	older	8562	44.54	hospital	6375	49.31
also	16562	37.09	experience	8542	44.65	analysis	6353	49.39
participants	16032	37.28	self	8540	44.75	she	6353	49.47
about	15758	37.48	two	8488	44.86	outcomes	6347	49.54
had	15609	37.67	using	8479	44.96	including	6321	49.62
other	15416	37.85	how	8203	45.06	members	6249	49.70
research	15103	38.04	there	8171	45.16	pain	6207	49.77
has	15091	38.22	we	8159	45.26	did	6181	49.85
all	15042	38.41	life	8127	45.36	social	6153	49.92
which	14833	38.59	knowledge	8072	45.46	often	6092	50.00

Table 2: Frequency of the six 500-WF lists in the journals

500-WF lists	Tokens (%)	WTs (%)	WFs
1st 500	6024,573 (73.50)	3005 (3.66)	500
2nd 500	738,975 (9.02)	2720 (3.31)	500
3rd 500	266,254 (3.25)	2342 (2.85)	500
4th 500	102,782 (1.25)	2171 (2.64)	500
5th 500	35,778 (0.44)	1803 (2.19)	500
6th 500	8180 (0.10)	1261 (1.54)	490
Not in the lists	1020,411 (12.45)	68,843 (83.81)	????

Discussion

This research was carried out on a corpus of English nursing articles consisting of 2851 articles with more than eight million words (20). The results showed that a total of only 159 WTs covered 50% of all the words in the nursing journals, and only five WTs of “al”, “e”, “et”, “healthcare”, and “p” were outside the first 3000 English WFs (Table 1). “Et” and “al” are the two sections of the expression “et al” meaning “and others”, which is common in articles, “e” and “p” are two alphabet letters, and “healthcare” is a compound word combined of “health” and “care” which both exist in the 3000 WFs of English.

Most of the words in Table 1 are the function words, which are the words related to the grammar not to the meaning of the sentence, including articles (the, a, an), prepositions (of, to, in, for, for, with, etc.), pronouns (that, this, they, it, etc.), auxiliary verbs (is, was, were, be, are, etc.), and conjunctions (and, or, but, if, etc.). This result is consistent with the

results of the studies conducted by Nor Mohamad and Jin (13) and Budgell et al. (14) which reported the function words as the most frequent words in nursing textbooks and journals, respectively. This result is indicative of the importance of the function words, as the most frequent general words in English.

The words “she”, “her”, and “women” were, but the words “he”, “his”, “him”, “man” and “men” were not among the first 159 WTs (Table 1), and this is in line with Budgell et al.’s study (14) which reported female words to be more frequent than their male equivalents in nursing journals. This result may suggest a kind of gender bias in nursing vocabulary.

In the present study, the most frequent content words, which are words carrying a particular meaning, were “care”, “patients”, “health”, “nurses”, “study”, “nursing”, and “patient” (Table 1), being consistent with the results of Nor Mohammad and Jin, reporting “patients”, “patient”, “care”, and “health” (13), Budgell et al., reporting “nurse”, “patient”, and “care” (14), and Muhammad et al., reporting “patient”, “care”, “study”, “health”, and “nurses” (23) as the most frequent content words in nursing textbooks and journals. The high frequency of these words implicitly signifies the important role of nurses and the nursing profession in patient care and health.

The results showed that the six 500-WF lists of general English covered approximately 87% of all the words in the nursing articles (Table 2). This result is consistent with the coverage of 70.68% in medicine (15), 88.63% in engineering (18), and 88.47% in business texts (19), highlighting the importance and the high coverage of the first 3000 general English WFs. The results of the frequency of the six 500-WF lists showed that the first and the second lists covered 73.50% and 9.02% (82.52% in total) of all the words in the nursing journals, respectively (Table 2) (Appendices 1 and 2). This result suggests that all the first 3000 English WFs do not have high frequency since approximately 82 out of every 100 words in the nursing journals belonged to the first two 500 WFs. The sixth 500 WFs covered only 0.10% of all the words in the nursing journals, and the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth 500-WF lists, consisting of 2000 WFs altogether, covered only 5.04% of all the words in the nursing corpus (Table 2). This result highlights the importance of the first two 500-WF lists introduced in this study presented in Appendices 1 and 2.

Conclusion

Learning general words is important in learning English. The two 500-WF lists of general English introduced in the present study with a coverage of 82.52% and the academic word list as well as other words with limited meaning loads presented in the first article extracted from this research (20) can help nursing students to comprehend more than 91% of all the words in English nursing journals.

Acknowledgments

The author appreciates the Deputy for Research and the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences for approving and funding this research project (no. 1948-2015).

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Flowerdew J. English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP) Writing: Making the case. *Writing & Pedagogy* 2016;8.1:5-32. DOI: 10.1558/wap.v8i1.30051
2. Suliman WA, Tadros A. Nursing students coping with English as a foreign language medium of instruction. *Nurse Educ Today* 2011;31(4):402-7. DOI: 10.1016/j.nedt.2010.07.014
- 3- Starkey TJ. The critical factors that influence faculty attitudes and perceptions of teaching English as Second Language nursing students: A grounded theory research study. *Nurse Educ Today* 2015;35(5):718-25. DOI: 10.1016/j.nedt.2015.01.017
4. Glew PJ. Embedding international benchmarks of proficiency in English in undergraduate nursing programmes: challenges and strategies in equipping culturally and linguistically diverse students with English as an additional language for nursing in Australia. *Collegian* 2013;20(2):101-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colegn.2012.04.002>
5. Alqahtani M. The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education* 2015;3(3):21-34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002>
6. August D, Carlo M, Dressler C, Snow C. The critical role of vocabulary development for English language learners. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* 2005;20(1):50-7. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-5826.2005.00120.x
7. Stæhr LS. Vocabulary size and the skills of listening, reading and writing. *Language Learning Journal* 2008;36(2):139-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571730802389975>
8. Uchihara T, Clenton J. Investigating the role of vocabulary size in second language speaking ability. *Language Teaching Research* 2018;1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362168818799371>
9. Seedhouse P. Needs analysis and the General English classroom. *ELT Journal* 1995;49(1):59-65. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.1.59>
10. Babu AR. The school of English decadence: a study on progress of general English at undergraduate level in Satavahana university, Karimnagar. *Journal of English Language and Literature (JOELL)* 2015;2(2):185-9.
11. Johns AM. Necessary English: A faculty survey. *TESOL Quarterly* 1981;15(1):51-7. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586373>
12. Yang MN. A nursing academic word list. *Engl Specif Purp* 2015;37: 27-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.05.003>

13. Nor Mohamad AF, Jin NY. Corpus-based studies on nursing textbooks. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies* 2013;4(2):21-8.
14. Budgell B, Miyazaki M, O'Brien M, Perkins R, Tanaka Y. Developing a corpus of the nursing literature: A pilot study. *Japan J Nurs Sci* 2007;4:21-5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-7924.2007.00071.x>
15. Hsu W. Bridging the vocabulary gap for EFL medical undergraduates: The establishment of a medical word list. *Language Teaching Research* 2013;17(4):454-84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813494121>
16. Lei L, Liu D. A new medical academic word list: A corpus-based study with enhanced methodology. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 2016;22:42-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.01.008>
17. Todd RW. An opaque engineering word list: Which words should a teacher focus on? *Engl Specif Purp* 2017;45:31-9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.08.003>
18. Hsu W. Measuring the vocabulary load of engineering textbooks for EFL undergraduates. *Engl Specif Purp* 2014;33:54-65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2013.07.001>
19. Hsu W. The vocabulary thresholds of business textbooks and business research articles for EFL learners. *Engl Specif Purp* 2011;30:247-57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.04.005>
20. Pournia Y. A study on the most frequent academic words in high impact factor English nursing journals: A corpus-based study. *Iranian J Nursing Midwifery Res* 2019;24:11-7. DOI: 10.4103/ijnmr.IJNMR_190_17
21. Heatley A, Nation IS, Coxhead A. Range and Frequency Programs; 2002. Available from: <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul-nation>. [Last accessed on 2014 Sep 10].
22. Nation IS. How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Can Modern Lang Rev* 2006;63:59-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/cml.2006.0049>
23. Muhammad MM, Hamzah SG, Bin Abdullah SK, Jack CS. A study of closure in a nursing textbooks and journals: A corpus based study. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences* 2017;4(2): 96-105. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2017.02.017>

Appendix 1: The first 500 general English WFs in the nursing journals

	Need	Make	System	Receive	Train
	Educate	Base	Disease	Function	Perform
The	Treat	Should	Score	Safe	Involve
Be	One	Most	How	Effective	Case
Of	Time	Improve	Life	Employ	Think
And	Student	Day	Role	Problem	Meet
To	Practice	Hospital	Behavior	Feel	Critic
A	Experience	Learn	Review	Sample	Depress
In	Find	Profession	Physical	Complete	Strategy
For	Also	Intervene	There	Control	Examine
That	Report	Associate	Member	Medical	Value
With	Group	Significant	Rate	Compare	Survey
Nurse	About	Old	Require	Consider	Unit
They	All	Staff	Focus	Pain	People
Have	Develop	Woman	Effect	Describe	Table
As	Which	During	Test	Model	Injure
This	She	Will	Evaluate	Participate	Suggest
Or	Than	After	Quality	Response	Act
Care	Program	If	Would	Reduce	Determine
On	When	You	Only	Show	Item
Use	We	Symptom	What	Within	Term
Patients	Family	Each	Many	Social	Interview
Study	High	He	Take	Team	Ill
By	Increase	Analyze	Understand	Know	Long
Not	Inform	Measure	Mean	Present	Approach
Health	Support	Factor	Three	Environment	So
From	Cancer	Well	Into	Evidence	Potential
It	Result	Two	Specific	Organize	Live
Patient	Manage	Process	Both	Number	Recommend
At	Year	Person	Important	Continue	Regard
I	Such	Age	First	Give	Month
Provide	Data	New	Indicate	Any	Common
Can	Risk	Lead	Discuss	Communicate	Type
May	Level	Through	Although	Often	Less
Include	Some	Help	Among	State	Must
Who	Individual	Able	Could	Issue	Community
More	Active	However	Service	Plan	Survive
Work	Add	No	Vary	Prevent	Mental
Do	Identify	Self	Centre	Method	General
Research	But	Adult	Child	Decision	See
Participant	Assess	Set	Question	Skill	Up
Other	Change	Outcome	Therapy	Population	Cause
Clinic	Between	Follow	Limit	Occur	Conduct
Relate	Because	Knowledge	Current	Home	Part

Drug	Likely	Previous	Whether	Multiple	Death
Primary	Standard	Special	Period	Category	Express
Week	Assist	Advance	Form	Stage	Psychiatry
Example	Goal	Tool	Human	Like	Frequent
Teach	Another	Large	Without	According	Brain
Positive	Exercise	Opportunity	Breast	Satisfaction	Criteria
Difference	Benefit	Demonstrate	Pressure	Purpose	Recognize
Culture	Emotion	Total	Offer	Graduate	Consistent
Course	Early	Project	Procedure	Few	Job
Condition	Place	Maintain	Collaborate	Very	Remain
Reside	Concept	Status	Even	Characteristic	Trial
Way	Nation	Point	Unite	Aware	Best
Implement	Stress	Parent	Begin	Small	Due
Decrease	Affect	Allow	Observe	Own	Enhance
Concern	Promote	Contribute	Per	Necessary	Achieve
Great	Four	Success	School	Deliver	Minute
Different	Situation	Fall	Where	Heart	Strong
Available	Become	Every	Engage	Facility	Good
Out	Expect	Interact	Better	Document	Figure
Area	Appropriate	Apply	Obtain	Ensure	Instruct
Faculty	Create	Disorder	Reason	Clear	Agent
Resource	States	Body	Interest	Explain	Psychology
Scale	Challenge	Monitor	Get	Initial	Want
Occupation	Collect	Exist	Sex	Session	Degree
Literature	Second	Therefore	Overall	Institution	Expose
Range	Influence	Perceive	Guideline	Disabled	Complex
Address	Prepare	Say	Five	Perception	Department
Over	Refer	Low	History	Select	View
Article	Stroke	Lower	Dose	Explore	Prior
Design	Cost	Screen	Theme	Barrier	Attitude
Blood	While	Responsible	Facilitate	Predict	Theory
Difficult	Similar	Future	Negative	Man	Correlate
Hour	Impact	Go	Site	Direct	Final
Sleep	Statistic	Competent	Share	Initiate	Might
Ask	Then	Severe	Investigate	Represent	Component
Define	Note	End	Write	Short	Call
Respond	Further	Event	Same	Loss	Structure
Possible	Particular	Access	Rely	Infect	Encourage
Lack	Before	Content	Guide	Visit	
Several	Reflect	Author	Establish	Record	

Appendix 2: The second 500 general English WFs in the nursing journals

	Sign	Believe	Actual	Drive	Detect
Recent	Least	Real	Emergency	Gender	Amount
Step	Essential	Admission	Locate	Link	Regulate
Young	Perspective	Approve	Especially	Burden	React
Importance	Open	Either	Choose	Wide	Bed
Progress	Description	Past	Interpret	Single	Force
Face	Approximate	Directed	Material	Aim	Comprehensive
University	Genetic	Rather	Recover	Choice	Speak
Context	Topic	Late	Adolescent	Hand	Random
Anxiety	Average	Recruit	Versus	Talk	Walk
Cell	Consent	Respect	Now	Framework	Hold
Administration	Prefer	Oral	Skin	Search	Language
Major	Six	Board	Frequency	Adjust	Balance
Instrument	Various	Appear	Comfort	Still	Telephone
Thus	Read	Publish	Keep	Relative	Correct
Partner	Academy	Option	Assign	Female	Sensitive
Toward	Complicate	Right	Sense	Mortal	Under
Surgery	Public	Reveal	Since	Gain	Computer
Policy	Grow	Spirit	Institute	Once	Basis
Normal	Attend	Despise	Tell	College	Desire
Move	Implicate	Serve	Summary	Introduce	Finance
Order	Across	Incorporate	Target	Presence	Company
Weight	Aspect	Non	Estimate	Unique	World
Client	Seek	Moral	Subject	Build	Diet
Technology	Much	Curriculum	Pattern	Consist	Memory
Agree	Discharge	Discipline	Society	Hope	Abuse
Key	Practitioner	Transition	Friend	Close	Internal
Task	Belief	Tradition	Objective	Line	Routine
Accept	Position	Post	Food	Demand	Consequence
Adequate	Come	Failure	Stay	Next	Via
Combine	Depend	Accurate	Little	Power	Seem
Poor	Nature	Size	Technique	Cover	Basic
Product	Conclusion	Avoid	Confidence	Look	Typical
Protect	Percent	Back	Easy	Relevant	Consult
Intense	Valid	Shift	Motive	Coordinate	Moderate
Phase	Return	Schedule	Emerge	Free	Veteran
Effort	Class	Attention	Peer	Country	Pay
Just	Science	Error	Connect	Oriented	Immediate
Code	Play	Majority	Source	Fact	Left
Side	Room	Answer	Thing	Comment	Colleague
Full	Start	Contact	Smoke	Adapt	Leave
Cope	Usual	Independent	Medicine	Counsel	Diverse
Integrate	Strength	Expert	Committee	Variety	Attempt
Certain	List	Mother	Fear	Local	Word

Modify	White	Undergo	Name	Dimension	Legal
Main	Attribute	Volume	Handle	Worse	Upon
Construct	Reach	Priority	Global	Light	Generate
Always	Propose	Near	Muscle	Mark	Above
Principle	Insure	Solution	Carry	Career	Already
Transfer	Background	Deal	Theoretical	Minor	Again
Conflict	Stable	Last	Recognition	Familiar	Energy
Ethnic	Infant	Region	Rapid	Advertise	Against
Device	Judge	Off	Rights	Efficient	Cross
Suicide	International	Personnel	Aid	Turn	Episode
Deep	Why	Tissue	Million	Mention	Feature
Account	Image	Consume	Threat	Gene	Assume
Operate	Vulnerable	Calculate	Rural	Secure	Format
Yet	Section	Alternative	Down	Vital	Law
Contain	Agency	Resist	Translate	Electronic	Enough
Trust	Too	Mechanism	Drink	Substance	Practical
Doctor	Until	Sufficient	Fund	Radiate	Private
Simple	Supervise	Tend	Index	Space	True
Detail	Subsequent	Along	Beyond	Advocate	Tube
Alcohol	Idea	Core	Gap	Put	Anticipate
Length	Half	Pilot	Delay	Mind	Check
Laboratory	Eight	Network	Extend	Office	Exclude
Regular	Formal	Mobile	Original	Organ	Damage
Male	Together	Never	Request	Stimulate	Weak
Try	Spend	Violence	Alter	Furthermore	Confer
Serious	Edit	Distribute	Expand	Restrict	Immune
Suffer	Equipment	Differ	Ready	Decide	Black
Commit	Version	Enter	Clarify	Almost	Flow
Whereas	Emphasize	Lose	Acknowledge	Really	Excellent
Produce	Field	Miss	Quantity	External	Significance
Hear	Fit	Around	Annual	Pregnant	Mood
Decline	Sustain	Enable	Equal	Inject	Video
Grade	Confirm	Date	Disaster	Concentrate	Master
Seven	Head	Remove	Contrast	Adopt	Grant
Intent	Register	Extreme	Web	Elevate	Listen
Journal	Alone	Character	Separate	Incident	Entire
Die	Element	Broad	Eat	Night	Story
Encounter	Bring	Highlight	Foundation	Revise	
Mail	Admit	Repeat	Harm	Economy	
Respective	Capacity	Elder	Disturb	Senior	