This form is no longer required by ABOG. It is provided here in case programs wish to use it for their own purposes. Please do not submit this form to ABOG.

FELLOWS RESEARCH AND THESIS DEFENSE SUMMARY

| | | | | | | The fellow should be able to participate fully in the theoretical and /or basic science research projects. | | | | | |
|--|-----|--------|------------|---------------|----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| ENABLING OBJECTIVES: The fellow should write a thesis which is a scholarly publication and be able to defend it according to the following outline: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please | use | the f | ollov | ving r | ankinş | g system from 1-5 ($5 = \mathbf{Best}$) to evaluate the fellows thesis. | | | | | |
| A. | Ну | poth | esis (| 5 = B | est) | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 □ □ | 1 | What are the study objectives? What was the population to be studied? Was the study population representative of the target population? | | | | | |
| В. | Des | sign (| of the | e Inve | estigat | tion (5 = Best) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | What was the study design and was it appropriate for addressing the study hypothesis? Were there possible sources of bias or confounding factors? How were cases and controls selected? What was the statistical power of the study? | | | | | |
| | Com | ments: | | | | what was the statistical power of the stady. | | | | | |
| C. | Ob | serv | ation | s (5 = | : Best |) | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 □ | 2 | 1 | Were there clear definitions of the terms used (i.e. diagnostic criteria, measurements made and outcome variables)? Were the observations reliable and reproducible? | | | | | |
| | | | | | | What were the sensitivity, specificity and predictive values of the methods? | | | | | |

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
|-------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--|
| | | | | | Were the findings presented clearly, objectively, and in sufficient detail? |
| | | | | | Were the findings internally consistent? (ie. did the numbers add up properly and could the tables be reconciled etc.) |
| Con | nments: | | | | |
| . An | nalysi | s of t | he Re | esults | (5 = Best) |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | | | | Were the data worthy of statistical analysis? If so, were the method of analysis appropriate to the source and nature of the data? |
| | | | | | Were the appropriate assumptions met for the statistical methods utilized? |
| | | | | | Were there sufficient analyses to ascertain whether "significant difference" might, in fact, have been due to a lack of comparability of the groups: (i.e. age, sex, clinical characteristics etc.)? |
| | | | | | Was there an improper use of statistical techniques? |
| | | | | | Was there mention of the type of test used or the significance level Was there use of measured sensitivity without specificity? |
| Con | mments: | | | | was there use of measured sensitivity without specificity: |
| Со | onclus | sions | of Su | mma | ry (5 = Best) |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | | | | Which conclusions were justified by the findings? Were the conclusions relevant to the hypothesis? |
| | | | | | were the conclusions relevant to the hypothesis? |
| ('0" | nments: | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | J | |
| | adagia | m th | Ctuc | | |
| | | | e Stud | • | |
| | the st | udy c | ould t | oe imj | proved, how should the candidate revise the experimental design in o |
| If to | the st | udy c | ould t | oe imj | proved, how should the candidate revise the experimental design in o ralid information relevant to the questions under study? |

| Each candidate may be asked about references cite judged based upon their knowledge of the literature | ed in their thesis. The candidate also will re related to the subject of their thesis. |
|---|--|
| Comments: | |
| IRB Approval | |
| Date | _ |
| Number | |
| Additional Comments: | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Signature of Reviewer | Date |