

From: [SMS MD Project](#)
To: [Llew Mills](#)
Subject: MD Project Final Report - Your Student Results 2019 cohort
Date: Monday, 23 May 2022 11:52:53 AM

Dear Llewellyn

We are pleased release the marking for **Peter Becker** 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: 67

Comments provided by the examiners are provided below.

Marker 1 comments:

Abstract - Overall well written. The aim could be better explained - It is unclear how this study is more likely to "bring clarity" to the relationship between secondary drug use and OST compared to the studies that precede it, nor what the hypothesis was (which is explained later but should be in the abstract). Context, rationale, study questions - Good review of the background, rationale and introduction of the hypothesis. As part of the literature review, a critique of pre-existing studies rather than just a statement of their findings would have improved this section. How is your study design more likely to provide clear answers where previous literature is inconsistent? Study/sampling size is important, but not detailed here. Methods - Overall the research methods are described adequately. It is unclear whether the sample size is adequately powered to demonstrate changes in secondary drug use changes. For clarity, Table 1 would be better expressed as a flow chart (similar to the CONSORT flow diagram used in trials), as is common in the literature to demonstrate the impact of inclusion/exclusion criteria on final sample size. Findings - The findings are presented reasonably well, with reference to tables and figures. Key data (indeed the key finding regarding cannabis use) is presented in the appendix, when sadly there are no marks for appendices. Synthesis and critical discussion - Apart from a less heterogeneous study population, the author could propose further study questions that address its limitations. Overall formatting is good. Some of the writing is written well in a prose style but in a less scientific manner which can lack clarity.

Marker 2 comments:

This report on "Patterns of Secondary Drug Use in Patients Enrolled in Opiate Substitution Therapy" is a clear pass standard and presented well. Abstract is clear, succinct summary of the rationale, methods, results and conclusion. Introduction illustrated the well-researched problem of concurrent other drug use in patients with opioid dependence, with possible mechanisms, and other major studies illustrating the secondary drug use

complicating the treatment outcomes of OST. Methods section should contain ethics approval details from the study the data was extracted from. Otherwise the section was written well, greatly assisted by the use of table to explain the reason for n=1000. Appendix was helpful in seeing what ATOP is, to someone not working in the field. I appreciate the efforts required by the candidate to understand statistical analysis details and gain software skills to carry out the data analysis work. Results were supplemented with appropriately labelled graphs, which illustrated the dataset with multiple complicating variables nicely. Discussion emphasized the main points from the study well, however in-depth interpretation and reasoning is lacking. Discussion of the limitations was superficial as well - how did the lack of the details affect the results of the study? how it could be improved in the future? are some of the details the could be added. Finally, there were sentences missing citations and obvious spelling errors or inappropriate words used (possibly arising from auto-correct) which could be improved with closer proof-reading and would improve the quality of the report.

Thank you for all your hard work.

Kind Regards

The MD Project Team

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

