

From: [SMS MD Project](#)
To: [Llew Mills](#)
Subject: MD Project Final Report - Your Student Results 2019 cohort
Date: Monday, 23 May 2022 11:56:43 AM

Dear Llewellyn

We are pleased release the marking for **India Cordony** 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: 79

Comments provided by the examiners are provided below.

Marker 1 comments:

This is an excellent narrative review that is clearly set out, with a systematic approach to identifying relevant literature, with a structured and comprehensive review of existing work. The abstract is very clear, concise and well-presented addressing all areas expected of a high-quality abstract. Introduction/rationale/aims This paper provides an excellent concise but comprehensive review of the literature. A clear rationale is set out, linking the literature to the study question at hand with a justification for the current work. Methods Excellent, comprehensive and clear detail of the methods used. Standard methods and criteria have been applied for inclusion/exclusion. Findings A clear outline of all the eligible studies is provided with an excellent summary table. Discussion The author has provided a critical analysis of the findings and drawn appropriate conclusions. There is a good attempt at evaluating evidence quality, including randomisation methods. The author demonstrates good insight into the limitations of the study. References The reference list is accurate and without errors. I note that the author has exceeded the word limit, although no penalty is applied due to the small margin (297 words). However, it is important to consider that were the work submitted for publication, there would be strict word or character limits so the author would be forced to fit within those limits. Overall the student is to be congratulated for an excellent piece of work, that would stand alone even without the more limited time to changing projects. I encourage the student to continue developing research and writing skills, aiming for publication of this or future work.

Marker 2 comments:

The candidate's review on effective of routine outcome monitoring and feedback on client outcomes in drug and alcohol treatment was informative to someone who has no background knowledge on the topic. Abstract was well structured and clearly provided the summary. Introduction explained the rationale for the study well backed up by references. Candidate stated there were evidence supporting client outcome monitoring and feedback

from psychotherapy, counselling, and went on to explain the mechanisms for how this may improve treatment outcomes - exploring other dimensions may have enriched this report. Methods had a list of search terms and clear inclusion and exclusion criteria, with PRISMA flow chart - which makes the review high standard. One narrative review was excluded, rightfully so, but some explanation on what it was about would have been informative, given this report is also a narrative review. Summaries of the studies in results section was easy to read and covered all main points of the studies. Discussion was well written and good argument was made. I felt the positive evidence mostly emerged out of smaller RCTs or retrospective reviews of questionable methodology. Candidate's wording of the evidence quality was contradictory at times "quality of evidence in this review is quite strong" vs "several papers represented a low evidence level". Information on evidence quality can be presented as table - there are many examples of that in any Cochrane report, and I wondered why formal evaluation of the risk of bias could not be undertaken. Well done overall.

Thank you for all your hard work.

Kind Regards

The MD Project Team

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

