Dear Llewellyn

We are pleased release the marking for **Aleksander Stadnicki** 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: 80

Comments provided by the examiners are provided below.

Marker 1 comments:

Abstract The abstract provides a concise and clear summary of the research topic. A more detailed summary of the results could have been provided. Given the key limitation of a high dropout rate and other potential sources of bias, one ought to be careful about concluding that there is a "robust temporal relationship between QoL and cannabis use". Introduction A clear rationale is provided for this study, with a good attempt at explaining how the present study design would aid in answering the research question where other correlative studies have not. The Aims/hypothesis should be more concise and clear - As a paragraph/sentence it is rather wordy. It could be improved by removing non-essential statements (e.g. "using a variety of scales at multiple timepoints"). It is unclear how comprehensive the literature review is - a single longitudinal study is referenced (Hser and colleagues [16]). A more systematic analysis of the extant literature would provide the necessary background and justification for the present work. If indeed the existing published work is deficient, it could be spelled out in more detail. Methods The research and data analysis methods are adequately described. However, it would be helpful to attempt to identify sources of bias and how this could be minimised. Since this is a secondary analysis of data collected in an RCT, the population studied or indeed the intervention (whether placebo or study drug) could have affected the outcome (or there could be divergent outcomes depending on treatment allocation). Results/Discussion The results are well described and could be further improved with an analysis by intervention (i.e. does the treatment allocation group affect the outcome of the secondary analysis?). Discussion of this limitation would have been helpful, with an appropriately cautious interpretation of results.

Marker 2 comments:

It was a pleasure reading this candidate's excellent report on "Effects of Cannisbis Use Reduction on Quality of Life Among People with Cannabis Dependence" Abstract was

succinctly written with all main points to understand the study covered. Paragraphs in introduction flew well and appropriately referenced. Correlational research vs concurrent argument in the introduction showed the depth of the candidate's understanding on the topic and related research. Methods section was written clearly with easy-to-understand description of the tools used. Given the data were obtained from already approved trial, it would be appropriate to include ethics approval details of the original trial. The actual survey included as appendix may be useful for some readers, although I recognise there may be potential copyright issues there. Presentation of results were visually appealing using appropriately labeled tables and graphs, and explanations were well-written. Discussion analyzed strengths and weaknesses of various tools used. Discussion of limitations was clearly marked, identifying most of the major weaknesses in a succinct manner. Adequate number of references used for the length and depth of the report. Not much to fault. Well done.

Marker 3 comments:

Abstract Clear overview of the project Introduction- Context, rationale and Lit review. This is a well written introduction that gives the background information on CUD and QoL. Easy and engaging to read. Well referenced and the aims and hypotheses are clearly stated. Methods Ethics statement is present. Study design is clearly articulated. Inclusion and exclusion criteria are clear. Data collection and analysis are appropriate. Statistical analysis is described well. Results Well written results section. Text flows well and is supported by the tables and figures. Tables and figures are clearly presented and appropriately labelled with clear legends. Figure 1 lacks n values. Discussion Well-structured discussion that covers the main issues arising from the results section. The findings are discussed in relation to current literature. Limitations are described and future studies are suggested. The concluding paragraph draws it all together and answers the aims. Referencing Appropriate formatting and suitable literature have been cited. Presentation. The report is presented well and appropriately formatted. Scientific writing style is well developed.

Thank you for all your hard work.

Kind Regards

The MD Project Team

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