**9701 – Introduction Class**

**Article Review**

Objectives/Introduction

*Are the objective(s) clearly stated? What questions are to be answered?*

* 1-3 primary, secondary, and tertiary objectives or goals should be stated.
* What were the objectives, did all members of the group get the same objectives or was there different interpretations.

*Is there a brief review of previous work and background on why the study was done?*

* Was there enough background to understand the importance/relevance of this study.
* Are you redoing, updating or expanding on previous work that was done in the field?
* Could more information/detail have been provided?

Methodology

*What is the study design?*

* ­this should be clearly stated by the paper
* clinical paper example: randomized trial

*Were the inclusion/exclusion criteria clearly stated?*

* Were only male or females chosen, were multiple ethnic backgrounds represented?
* Sometimes trials are done with only one population (ex. White males) and then once released the drug is ineffective or has adverse effects in another population.

*What was the treatment/comparator?*

* Ex. The drug that was administered.

*Were the outcome measures subjective or objective? Were they appropriate for the desired endpoint(s)?*

* Subjective Example: Measuring satisfaction of life by only surveying the wealthy population of London residents versus surveying individuals who have moved from other regions in Ontario.
* Objective Measure: measuring if an administered drug was able to alter systolic blood pressure.

*What is the target population?*

* Was the population studied applicable to the real world?
* Examples: apply results from a rodent study to humans

Results

*Were the results clearly, accurately, and adequately presented?*

* Is it clear what the significance of the findings are?

*Were all of the findings presented?*

* Comparing the methodology to the results; is everything presented with the correct/corresponding controls.
* Did they only present certain findings (cherry-picking) to help support a hypothesis that other results contradict.

*Were the results relevant to the study objective?*

* Do the results make sense in the context of what the authors were trying to achieve?

*What do the tables/figures show?*

* Are these results relevant to the goal of the article?
* Are they clearly labeled and easy to understand or unnecessarily confusing?

Discussions/Conclusions

*Were valid conclusions drawn based upon the results presented?*

* Ex. Following a survey of London residents the conclusions are drawn about Canadian satisfaction of life.
* Are the links between results and conclusions clear or are large leaps made between the results and the conclusions

*Do the authors place the results into perspective with previous trials, comparing and contrasting results?*

* Do the authors results match what is already known or has been speculated/shown by previous studies or results.

*Does the discussion outline the shortcomings of the study?*

* *­* Is the information form the study helpful? Do the results have a significance or relevance?

*Provide your own conclusion (i.e., an overview of the impact of the article and if there are any fatal flaws in the study (A fatal flaw is one that causes you not to accept the outcome of the study)*

**Receiving Feedback**

*Reflect on the feedback*

* Maybe it doesn’t seem helpful in the moment but maybe it will going forward
* Negative feedback can seem hurtful in the moment but give yourself an opportunity to digest the information and find a way to constructively incorporate it going forward.
  + Know that when people are providing you with feedback it is because they only want to see you improve and succeed.

*Can the feedback be incorporated into the presentation?*

* Sometimes feedback can be easily integrated into future presentations but sometimes it could result in further confusion.

*Will the feedback affect the message or style of the presentation?*

*Will the feedback contribute to a better presentation?*

**Giving Feedback**

*Constructive feedback always*

* There is always a way to articulate feedback in a constructive manner.
  + Ex. I sat in the back of the room and therefore I had a hard time hearing you, maybe in the future try to project your voice during your presentation.

*Try reframing criticism in a helpful manner*

* Consider if you were giving a presentation and the feedback you have is what you received, would it be helpful and constructive? Is it clear and easy to understand?

*Rephrase any suggestion that is not well understood*

* Try to avoid getting defensive, always try to reframe your criticism if the presenter doesn’t initially understand.
  + Ask other members of the audience if they also had a difficult time hearing the presentation.

*Consider if this were your presentation, what would be helpful to you*

* We all have bad days so try to be compassionate, you never know what another person is going through.