**SDS 390 – Population Health: Data and Analysis**

**Article Critique Form**

Title: <Enter article title >

Author: <Enter author’s name>

Reviewer: <Enter your name>

**Instructions:** The form below contains the questions you need to address in your critique. Please use this form to summarize your findings. You may use short sentences or bullet points. Bring the completed form to class.

**Part 1: General reviewer comments**

|  |
| --- |
| General comments can include something about the focus of the study; the importance or significance of the study; the organization of the information; or even (either positive or negative) comments about the grammar and style if notable. Provide your overall comments about the paper with a few sentences or bullet points |

**Part 2: Specific comments organized by section of STROBE criteria**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TITLE AND ABSTRACT** | | | |
| Please provide your overall impressions of the title and abstract. | | | |
| **Specific item check list** | **Yes** | **No** | |
| 1a. Is the study’s design indicated with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract? |  |  | |
| 1b. Is the abstract an an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found? |  |  | |
| Comments | | | |
| **INTRODUCTION – BACKGROUND/RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES** | | | |
| Please provide your overall impressions of the Introduction.  What is the study hypothesis? | | | |
| Specific item check list - Introduction | Yes | No | |
| 1. Is the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported clearly articulated?    1. Is there a clear succinct statement of the study objective and its relevance?    2. Does the background and cited literature place the issue in context and establish its important? 2. Are specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses stated?    1. Is the study hypothesis reasonable?    2. Is it feasible to test the hypothesis with the author’s methods? |  |  | |
| Comments | | | |
| **METHODS** | | | |
| Please provide your overall impressions of the methods.  What is the study design?  What is the population being studied?  What is the outcome variable and how is it ascertained?  What are the exposure variable(s) and how were they ascertained?  What were approaches to reduce bias?  What are the statistical analysis methods?  How appropriate was the analysis for testing the specified hypothesis? | | | |
| **Specific item check list** | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** |
| 1. Are key elements of the study design articulated early in the paper? 2. Is the study setting clear and appropriately detailed? 3. Are the eligibility criteria and recruitment/selection of participants clear? 4. Are variables well defined?    1. Is the outcome well defined?    2. Does the outcome address the study’s hypothesis?    3. Are the exposures, predictors, potential confounders and modifiers clear? 5. Are sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement) clear? 6. Are efforts to reduce bias articulated? 7. Is is clear how the study size was determined? 8. Is it clear how quantitative variables were handled analytically (including groupings, reference categories) 9. Are statistical methods clear?    1. Are all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding clear?    2. Are methods to examine subgroups and interactions clear?    3. Is it clear how missing data were addressed?    4. Are loss-to-follow-up (cohort), matching (case-control), or analytic treatment of sampling strategy (cross-sectional) clear?    5. Are any sensitivity analyses described clearly? |  |  |  |
| Comments | | | |
| **RESULTS** | | | |
| What was the study population and what were the general characteristics of this population?  What were the results of the test(s) of the study hypothesis?  How were the results reported (i.e., relative/absolute scale, tables/figures): | | | |
| Specific item check list - Results | Yes | No | N/A |
| 1. Are the participants in the study clear?    * 1. Are the numbers of individuals at each stage of study reported?      2. Were the reasons for non-participation at each stage clarified?      3. Was a flow diagram used? 2. Are the descriptive data clearly presented? 3. Are the characteristics clearly presented of:    * 1. Study participants      2. Exposures      3. Potential Confounders 4. Was the number of missing data for each variable presented? 5. For cohort studies, is follow-up time summarized appropriately? 6. Are the outcome events clearly reported? 7. Are the main results clearly presented? 8. Are unadjusted and adjusted estimates given with 95% CIs? Is it clear which confounders were included? 9. Are the category boundaries for continuous variables clear? 10. Were relative risk measures converted into absolute risk? 11. Were other analyses (subgroup/interactions, sensitivity analyses) clearly reported? |  |  |  |
| Comments | | | |
| **DISCUSSION** | | | |
| What were the key findings?  What were limitations and strengths were presented?  How do these findings fit within the limitations of the study and the existing literature?  How generalizable are these results?  What are their implications for public health? | | | |
| Specific item check list - Discussion | Yes | No | |
| 1. Are key results clearly presented and with reference to study objectives? 2. Are limitations of the study, including potential bias (including direction and magnitude) discussed? 3. Is the overall interpretation of results presented clearly?    1. Does the overall interpretation consider the objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from other studies? 4. Is the generalizability of the results discussed? |  |  | |
| Comments | | | |
| **OTHER INFORMATION** | | | |
| Specific item check list: | Yes | No | |
| 1. Are funding sources, including for the original study, presented clearly? |  |  | |
| Comments | | | |