

From: [SMS MD Project](#)
To: [Llew Mills](#)
Subject: MD Project Final Report - Your Student Results 2019 cohort
Date: Monday, 23 May 2022 11:54:00 AM

Dear Llewellyn

We are pleased release the marking for **Kieran Cook** MD Final Report that was submitted in 2021.

All students received this feedback last Monday, 16th May 2022.

Each report was graded by 2 or more academic staff. The overall cohort performance was: mean 72 +/- 10 (SD), median 74, max 92. The pass mark is 50.

All students will be invited to present their work at the Online MD Research Symposium to be held on 12th and 13th September 2022 (details announced soon). Supervisors are also invited to attend and especially encourage this if your student is chosen to give an Oral Presentation. Student attendance at the MD Research Symposium is compulsory for all Year 4 students as it is a requirement for MDMP5410.

Final Grade: 55

Comments provided by the examiners are provided below.

Marker 1 comments:

Abstract - Although the aim is stated, the rationale for doing so is not summarised in the abstract. Context, rationale, study questions, literature review - Although the author outlines the scope of the NMDS, the rationale for using the ATOP as a comparator is not explained, nor are alternative questionnaires explored as part of a literature review. The author could better explain the potential contribution of this research to existing knowledge. Methods - This section is very brief and insufficient. Although it is appreciated that a pre-existing data set was used, the author should have detailed what the data sets encompassed (ie study population, setting and criteria for inclusion). The aim here would be to provide sufficient detail to replicate or evaluate the work. Findings - The results are clearly and logically presented and address the study question. The use of two decimal places in proportional results for several table seems unnecessary. Synthesis and critical discussion - The discussion is logical with appropriate commentary to explain the results and limitations. It is interesting that Applications are outlined in the final paragraphs of the discussion. This would provide the much needed rationale in the abstract/introduction! Overall Multiple grammatical and spelling errors, inconsistent formatting of references The word count is already at the lower end, coupled with the title/date format used for references, it would be even lower.

Marker 2 comments:

This report on testing the validity of NMDS questions about additional drug of concern is of pass standard. I can appreciate the degree of statistical analysis the candidate would have learnt to do by participating in the project and it will serve him/her well in the future. Abstract was succinctly written but I would have liked to be able to see how NMDS was compared with ATOP. There were some grammatical errors and missing citations / references which could have been detected through thorough proof-reading. Rationale for the use of arbitrary cut-offs in methods could have been explained (through citing similar

studies or explanation of reasons). Given large dataset, sample size calculation could have been done and presented. Table 1 I feel could be broken down - demographic data in the top group and drug of concerns information probably belong on another table given they are the study variables. I can see there were many variables to deal with - tables and graphs greatly assisted understanding, although axis labelling in Figure 1 could improve. Overall Pass - more in-depth literature review, referencing, analysis and interpretation would improve the quality of this report, as well as proof-reading.

Thank you for all your hard work.

Kind Regards

The MD Project Team

Help us improve: Was this message helpful? [[Yes](#)] [[No](#)]

