**Pre-Judging Comments for SSEF 2018**

**School Name:** RAFFLES INSTITUTION

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Code** | **H3 Project** | **Prejudge 1 Remark** | **Prejudge 2 Remark** | **Prejudge 3 Remark** |
| TM008 | No | The results of the study, some turned out to be discordant with the hypothesis. This may partially be due to the literature study that was not thorough enough.  Or, the design and methodology were not good enough to anticipate the unexpected findings.  Nevertheless, the results of the study are valuable in helping to set better design and methodology on the future study. | Interesting project, clear report. I look forward to hearing the presentation during Final Judging. | There are some important issues that need further thinking/addressing. Examples: 1) Using the maximum 'CTC' in controls as the threshold - is that really the best cutoff, given 'noise', or perhaps even undiagnosed cancer since there was no clear description on the 'healthy controls'? When the result obtained was not significant between the 2 groups, perhaps one should consider trying different cutoffs? 2) What is the SD between two samples taken from the same patient twice, and also the same sample but measured twice (i.e. with two 1ml sample taken out for the CTC analysis)? 3) There were some analyses done that did not seem to make sense to me e.g. why test CTC vs mutation? why will it make sense to expect CTC to be associated with mutation? Also, it is important to make clear that 'CTC' in controls are not actually CTCs from the beginning (although it was mentioned at the end) |