Scholarly Elective: Research Project   
Assessment Form (Assessors Only)

**Note:** Assessors should consult the G*uidelines for Assessors of Subspecialty Scholarly Elective: Research Projects* which accompany this assessment form.

Trainee Details

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Trainee ID** |  | **Subspecialty Training Program** |  |
| **Title of Research Project** |  | | |

**KEY** **E** – Excellent **S** – Satisfactory **U** – Unsatisfactory **P** – Poor

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **E** | **S** | **U** | **P** | **(tick relevant box below)** |
| AIMS | | | | | |
| Aims of study clearly described |  |  |  |  | Aims of study poorly described |
| Hypothesis to be tested clearly stated (if appropriate) |  |  |  |  | Hypothesis to be tested not clearly stated (if appropriate) |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | | | | | |
| Literature review comprehensive but selective |  |  |  |  | Literature review incomplete or unfocussed |
| Key finding in the literature identified |  |  |  |  | Key findings omitted or ill defined |
| Literature critically reviewed |  |  |  |  | Literature reviewed in an uncritical fashion |
| METHODS | | | | | |
| Appropriate study design used |  |  |  |  | Study design seriously flawed |
| Appropriate methods used |  |  |  |  | Inappropriate methods used |
| Limitations of design / methods recognised and stated |  |  |  |  | Limitations of design / methods not recognised and stated |
| RESULTS | | | | | |
| Data recorded with care and accuracy |  |  |  |  | Data carelessly and/or inappropriately recorded |
| Appropriate methods of statistical analysis used |  |  |  |  | Inappropriate methods of statistical analysis used |
| Results of statistical analysis interpreted correctly |  |  |  |  | Results of statistical analysis misinterpreted |
| DISCUSSION | | | | | |
| Appropriate interpretation of results, contextualised within the literature |  |  |  |  | Inappropriate interpretation of results, contextualised within the literature |
| Balanced discussion of strengths / weaknesses of project |  |  |  |  | Imbalanced discussion of strengths /weaknesses of project |
| Implications for practice clearly discussed |  |  |  |  | Implications for practice poorly discussed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CONCLUSIONS | | | | | |
| Conclusions reached justifiable from data and analysis |  |  |  |  | Conclusions reached not justifiable from data and analysis |
| Limitations inherent in study recognised and stated |  |  |  |  | Limitations inherent in study not recognised or stated |
| STYLE | | | | | |
| Fluent piece of writing |  |  |  |  | Clumsy piece of writing |
| Style appropriate for a scientific publication |  |  |  |  | Style inappropriate for a scientific publication |
| PRESENTATION | | | | | |
| Well-presented layout |  |  |  |  | Poorly presented and difficult to read |
| Reasonable length |  |  |  |  | Over/under length required |
| Correct citation of references |  |  |  |  | Incorrect citation of references |

**Major strengths of this Research Project:**

**Major weaknesses of this Research Project:**

Assessment

**NOTE:** To obtain the assessment of **SATISFACTORY** it is necessary to achieve at least Satisfactory for each of the items on the first page of this form. The final assessment is not based on a simple summation of the ratings but on a global assessment of the value of the research project as a whole.

**This Research** – please tick one box only

□ is Satisfactory

□  is Satisfactory, requires minor revisions eg. grammatical/ formatting. **No further external review required.\***

□ is Unsatisfactory, requires minor revisions and is suitable for resubmission

□ is Unsatisfactory, requires major revisions and is suitable for resubmission

□ is Unsatisfactory, unsuitable for resubmission and is rejected

\* I give authority to RANZCOG Subspecialty staff to check minor grammatical / formatting corrections have been made as indicated by the assessor. No further external review required.

I give authority to RANZCOG Subspecialty staff to record my CPD hours for this assessment of this research project, as per number of CPD hours indicated below.

**Assessor’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Assessor’s Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** **Date**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**CPD Domain**: Educational Activities

**CPD Activity Type**: Teaching/Supervision/Mentoring/Examining **Number of Hours:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Guidelines For Assessors of Subspecialty Scholarly Elective:   
Research Projects

**NOTE:** The following criteria from the *ANZJOG* Guidelines for Manuscript Reviewers should be used for the assessment of subspecialty research projects.

Guidelines For Manuscript Reviewers for All Original Manuscripts

**Reviewers should consider the following issues for all manuscripts:**

* Is the manuscript presented in the most appropriate format?
* If necessary to this study, are the ethical procedures and approvals recorded? Are there ethical concerns about this study?

**Further specific issues to be addressed for original research and clinical audit manuscripts** (with specific issues for randomised controlled studies, cohort studies, and case control studies), **review manuscripts and case reports are listed below.**

Guidelines For Manuscript Reviewers for Original Research and Audit Manuscripts

**In addition to the general ANZJOG guidelines, for all research and clinical audit manuscripts:**

* Does this manuscript address a clearly focused issue or stated hypothesis?
* Is this manuscript original in the manner in which it addresses the issue / hypothesis?
* Are the results relevant to the focus / hypothesis?
* Are the conclusions drawn warranted from the data and its interpretation?
* Is the methodology adequately described?
* Are the individuals who were studied described adequately and are groups properly compared? Are the subjects adequately described and are groups properly compared?
* Were all those entered into the study accounted for?
* If relevant, is the sample size calculation clear, and is the sample adequate?
* Are the figures and tables clear, understandable and necessary?
* For randomised controlled studies, cohort studies and case control studies please see additional questions below

**In addition to the general ANZJOG guidelines, for randomised controlled studies:**

* Was the randomisation to treatment groups used and was that process appropriate?
* Were the treatment and control groups similar at the start of the trial?
* Are the subjects adequately described and are groups properly compared?
* Were the subjects and investigators kept ‘blind’ about treatment allocation? (Not always possible)
* Apart from the treatment under investigation, were the groups treated equally?
* Were all those entered into the study accounted for?
* Were all the subjects analysed in the groups to which they were randomly allocated?
* Is the scale and direction of the measured effect(s) stated?
* Is any statistical measure of uncertainty given? (eg. Confidence intervals, p values)

**In addition to the general ANZJOG guidelines, for cohort studies:**

* Are the source populations comparable? (i.e. are exposed and unexposed subjects, or subjects with different levels of exposure, or subjects with different levels of prognostic markers, or subjects with different prognostic factors, the same?)
* Are participation rates at enrolment, by exposure, indicated?
* Is the likelihood that some eligible subjects might have the outcome at the time of enrolment assessed and taken into account in the analysis?
* What percentage of individuals or clusters recruited into the study is included in the analysis?
* Is there any comparison between full participants and those lost to follow up, by exposure status?
* Are the outcomes clearly defined?
* Is the assessment of outcome made blind to exposure status?
* If blinding was not possible, is there evidence (direct or indirect) of the influence of knowledge of exposure status on the assessment of outcome?
* Was the method of assessment of exposure or prognostic status adequate?
* Is there evidence that the method of assessment used was valid and reliable?
* Is exposure level or prognostic factor assessed more than once?
* Are the main potential confounders identified and taken into account adequately in the design and analysis?
* Is the scale and direction of the measured effect(s) stated?
* Is any statistical measure of uncertainty given? (eg. Confidence intervals, p values)

**In addition to the general ANZJOG guidelines, for case control studies:**

* Are the cases and controls taken from comparable populations? Are the same exclusion criteria used for both cases and controls?
* What percentage of each group (cases and controls) participated in the study?
* Are cases clearly defined and differentiated from controls? Is it clearly established that controls are non-cases?
* Is there any comparison of participants and non-participants to establish their similarities or differences?
* Have measures been taken to prevent knowledge of primary exposure influencing case ascertainment?
* Is exposure to the intervention measured in a standard, valid and reliable way?
* Are the main potential confounders identified and taken into account adequately in the design and analysis?
* Were the treatment and control groups similar at the start of the trial?
* Are the subjects adequately described and are groups properly compared?
* Were all those entered into the study accounted for?
* Were all the subjects analysed in the groups to which they were randomly allocated?
* Is the scale and direction of the measured effect(s) stated?
* Is any statistical measure of uncertainty given? (eg. Confidence intervals, p values)