

## **Anatomy (Critique) of a Research Paper**

Clarie B Hollenbeck, PhD; **email:** clarie.hollenbeck@sjsu.edu

### Before you start (1\*/2\*\* pts)

- What is the title of the article?
- What is the journal?
- Who are the authors?
- Describe author's expertise in this specific topic.
- Are any conflicts of interest disclosed? If not, explain if there are any potential conflicts of interest OR why none are suspected.
- What information do you need to know before you can understand the article?

### Introduction (2\*/3\*\* pts)

- What is this article about; what research question is asked?
- Is evidence provided to establish initial support for the hypothesis? How strong is this evidence? Is it logical or is it simplistic?

### Methods (4\*/6 \*\* pts)

- What kind of study design was used?
- Is it appropriate for the research question being asked?
- What types of subjects were used?
- Would this allow the findings to be applied to a more general population?
- Was the number of subjects adequate for the design? Did the authors do a power analysis?
- Were the groups randomly assigned to treatments?
- Were the groups similar in clinical characteristics? Was there a control group?
- What kind of data was collected? Is it appropriate? Is it sufficient to answer the research question(s) posed?
- What statistical methods were described? Were they appropriate for the data collected and can they answer the research question?
- Was there Human Subjects approval?

### Results (3\*/5\*\* pts)

- What were the results of the study; what data was presented?
- Were the data presented clearly or were they confusing?
- Were specific comparisons made or were the authors on a fishing expedition and all possible comparisons made? Were the comparisons appropriate? Do they make sense in terms of the hypothesis or research question?
- Were results presented separately from the discussion?

### Discussion (4\*/6\*\* pts)

- Were all of the results discussed, or just those in support of the research question(s)?
- Were the results discussed in relation to the existing literature? What did the comparisons to the literature show?
- Was the discussion adequate or were observations left unexplained?
- Did the authors distinguish between statistical significance and clinical significance?
- Did the authors consider any alternate explanations for the data, or did they provide just one vision? Did the authors recognize any existing limitations to their research?
- Were the conclusions supported by the data presented? Were the conclusions appropriate for the level of differences and/or support for the data?

### Organization/spelling/grammar (3\*/1\*\* pts)

Total possible points: \* 1<sup>st</sup> semester – 25 pts; \*\* 2<sup>nd</sup> semester students – 15 pts

**Presentation Evaluation Form**

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Presenter: \_\_\_\_\_

Article /Seminar Title: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Possible Score</b>	<b>Comments/Rating</b>
<b>Quality of Research Analysis</b>		
Introduction	5	
Design/methods	10	
Results	5	
Discussion/Limitations	17	
<b>Quality of Presentation</b>		
Slides (format; organization)	5	
Oral presentation skills	5	
Professional appearance	3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	

Additional remarks (required):

**Presentation Evaluation Form**

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Presenter: \_\_\_\_\_

Article Title: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Possible Score</b>	<b>Comments/Rating</b>
<b>Quality of Research Analysis</b>		
Introduction	5	
Design/methods	10	
Results	5	
Discussion/Limitations	17	
<b>Quality of Presentation</b>		
Slides (format; organization)	5	
Oral presentation skills	5	
Professional appearance	3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	

Additional remarks (required):

NuFS 201  
Colloquium  
Spring 2008

**Advisor Approval Sheet for 3<sup>rd</sup> Time Students' Presentation**

\_\_\_\_\_ is a graduate advisee working on a  
thesis / project under my supervision, entitled: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.

They have completed or are nearing completion of the thesis / project, and will be able to present, and have my permission to present an abstract of their work in NuFS 201 by 10<sup>th</sup> full week of the semester (April 1<sup>st</sup>). The advising professor is responsible for notifying the Colloquium instructor, and Department Chair my April 1<sup>st</sup> if their student will be unable to present their work as originally indicated.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Faculty

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Faculty

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date