**Final Criteria:**

**Use the follow 3 criteria to assess each of your five papers. Write a short paragraph (at least 2 sentences) for each paper explaining your reasoning.**

**DEADLINE: THURSDAY APRIL 4 204**

**Column 1: Data availability and accessibility**

*Numerical score out of 3:*

**3/3 - Unfettered Access**

Immediate access, no perceived barriers

*e.g. link provided to online cache of study data, free databases used, supplemental data provided, etc.*

**2/3 - Access with Barriers**

Access but uncertain timeline

*e.g. confidentiality, approving agency or subscription delays*

**1/3 - Unsatisfactory Access**

Uncertain access and uncertain timeline

*e.g. must contact authors or journal*

**0/3 - No Access**

Cannot get access (realistically)

*e.g. no contact information provided, broken data links*

**Column 2: Description of study protocol**

*Categorical score using yes/no check points. Sum the check marks for each section out of 3.*

3a) Description of method

☐ Is the objective of the study clearly defined?

☐ Are the conclusion clearly supported by the collected evidence?

☐ The method protocol is detailed and clearly written.

*e.g. order of steps taken*

3b) Description of data

☐ The data or sample population under study are clearly defined for each analysis.

*e.g. Sample size, metadata*

☐ The source of the data/population is clearly defined.

*e.g. from database collection, approving agency, collected from previous experiment (or from the same study), which cell line, cite other study that you got data, etc.*

☐ Data pre-processing or processing is clearly defined.

*e.g. missing data, outliers, data removed, sub-populations, data sets narrowed down based on different targets, biological and/or technical replicates, blinding, randomization, etc.*

3c) Description of tools

☐ The tools that directly contribute to the collected evidence are identified.

*Note: literally just the name of the tool like “scanning electron microscope” or “R”.*

☐ The tools are also clearly defined in detail.

*e.g. make/model of equipment, supplier/developer, supplier/developer location, software name, version numbers, etc.*

☐ The parameters are defined for each tool that directly contribute to the collected evidence.

*e.g. settings, limitations, modifications, software changes, updates, adaptations, extensions, bugs/debugging, packages, etc.*

*3/3 checks = Excellent, 2/3 checks = Satisfactory with room for improvement (describe in body of article), 1/3 checks = Poor, 0/3 checks = Unsatisfactory*

**Column 3: Tool availability and accessibility**

*Numerical score out of 3:*

**3/3 - Unfettered Access**

Immediate access, no perceived barriers

*e.g. no license needed, free online software, code/program available online (i.e. github, other repo).*

**2/3 - Access with Barriers**

Access but uncertain timeline

*e.g. confidentiality barriers, approving agency or subscription delays.*

**1/3 - Unsatisfactory Access**

Uncertain access and uncertain timeline

*e.g. must contact authors or journal, internally developed software or equipment that is not freely accessible.*

**0/3 - No Access**

Cannot get access (realistically)

*e.g. no contact information provided, broken links.*

***To be discussed on Thursday April 4th 2024:***

**Final column:**

**Can those trained in the field can reproduce the study given the appropriate resources?**

**Very likely**

**Likely**

**Possibly**

**Not likely**

**Very unlikey**

**And then see degree of correlation with the other 3 columns (criteria) for starship (spiderweb) plot.**