



RACP

Specialists. Together

EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE

Advanced Training Committee in Neonatal/Perinatal Medicine

Research Project Assessment Form – Clinical or Laboratory Project; Systematic Review; Questionnaire or Survey; Clinical Audit; Quality Assurance Project

Trainees Name:

Project Title:

OVERALL OUTCOME:

- Pass
 Resubmit – Poor in two of 4, 5, 6 or 7 or ≥ 3 poor in total
 Fail - Does not meet any of the criteria for a research project for Neonatal/Perinatal Medicine

(Use "X" to select)	not applicable	poor	average	above average/excellent
1. Abstract Short plain language description of the study		Poorly represents the study <input type="checkbox"/>	Contains minor omissions or too much detail <input type="checkbox"/>	Provides a well-balanced representation of the study <input type="checkbox"/>
2. Introduction Discussion of the literature and placement of their study in context		Obvious omissions in discussion of relevant literature and have misplaced their own study or aims within this context <input type="checkbox"/>	Minor omissions of relevant literature and/or have less clearly placed their own study or aims within this context <input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant literature well discussed and their own study or study aims are appropriately placed within this context <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Aims of the research		Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>	Aims identified but do not fully represent the research <input type="checkbox"/>	Aims clearly identified <input type="checkbox"/>
4. Methodological approach Description and ability to replicate the study		Incomplete description – replication difficult <input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate description but insufficient to allow replication and/or over detailed <input type="checkbox"/>	Concise, complete and easy to replicate <input type="checkbox"/>
5. Results of the Study		Illogical presentation (little or inappropriate support by diagrams, tables or graphs) <input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate presentation (where appropriate supported by diagrams, tables or graphs) <input type="checkbox"/>	Logical presentation (where appropriate supported by diagrams, tables or graphs) <input type="checkbox"/>

6. Interpretation of results or critical analysis of literature		Inadequately interpreted/analysed the research, little or no alternative explanations <input type="checkbox"/>	Under-or over-interpreted/analysed the research, limited alternative explanations <input type="checkbox"/>	Well balanced interpretation/analysis, alternative explanations acknowledged <input type="checkbox"/>
7. Statistical Analysis Quantitative or qualitative analysis planned for the study will adequately		Incorrect statistical analysis/qualitative analysis of data <input type="checkbox"/>	Statistical/qualitative analysis largely correct <input type="checkbox"/>	Correct statistical/qualitative analysis of data <input type="checkbox"/>
8. Limitations of the study		Demonstrates little or no understanding of the limitations of the research, experimental design or techniques used <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates some understanding of the limitations of the research, experimental design or techniques used <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates good understanding of the limitations of the research, experimental design or techniques used <input type="checkbox"/>
9. Discussion of the study Placement of results in context of the available literature		Poor placement with little insight into the context of the study <input type="checkbox"/>	Placement slightly misaligned or incomplete <input type="checkbox"/>	Very balanced placement <input type="checkbox"/>
10. Format of the paper		Major stylistic errors <input type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate format with minor stylistic errors <input type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate format with very few errors <input type="checkbox"/>
11. Reference List		Incomplete and/or inaccurate <input type="checkbox"/>	Complete and mostly accurate <input type="checkbox"/>	Complete and accurate <input type="checkbox"/>
12. Writing style syntax, spelling/typographical errors		Paper poorly organised, difficult to read and/or poorly proof read <input type="checkbox"/>	Clear, fluent writing style, good syntax and few errors <input type="checkbox"/>	Clear, fluent writing style, good syntax and very few errors <input type="checkbox"/>
13. Graphs and Tables		Graphs and tables of poor quality, not described in text/legends <input type="checkbox"/>	Fair graphs/tables of acceptable quality and light support in text and legends <input type="checkbox"/>	Clear and simple graphs/tables of high quality; well supported in text and legends <input type="checkbox"/>

General Comments: