

National university - Sudan

Faculty of Medical Laboratory Sciences

Batch 9 - Third year (sem. 6)

Introduction to Research - MLS - RESH -326

Paper critique

Lecture {27}

Us.Tagwa Hafiz
0928500144

- **The easy way to critique a Research paper:**
- Follow the direction given /answer the following questions as you are reading the research paper.
- Combine your answers into a few paragraphs and edit to correct any mistakes/fix the flow of the critique.
- You are now done with your critique.

The Title

- Is the title interesting? Does it catch the reader attention?
- Read over the entire paper and come back to the title.
- -decide whether the title is reflective of the content.

The Abstract

- Look at the size of the abstract
 - -Proper APA style abstract is 150-250 words.
- Does the abstract include the main points of the paper?
- Is the abstract clear and well written?

The Introduction

- What is the question?
 - Write out the question (objective) of the study on a separate sheet of paper and refer to it as you are reading the research paper to see whether things mentioned in the paper are relevant to the question.
 - What is new about the study?
 - Why is this study important?
-
- Are all the references used relevant to question being asked?
 - Is there information missing?
 - Could an addition of another source have made a confusing point clearer?
 - Are there any inconsistencies?
 - Inconsistencies in content
 - Inconsistencies in reference cited in the intro but not cited in the reference page
 - Number of references

Methods

- Read through the method section and try to act out the experiment.
- Make a note of anything that confuses you.
 - This means that the methods were not thoroughly written.

- If possible, ask a friend to act out the experiment as you read the methods section.
 - -If your friend sets up the experiment the same way you did, the methods section is written very clearly (or you and your friend just have very similar ways of thinking about things).
 - -Make a note of any discrepancies and include them in your critique-these are the sections the authors should have made clearer.

- Does the methods section follow a timetable?
- Are things explained in order in which they were done?
- Is everything being done in the experiment necessary to answer the question?

- Are there clear operational definitions of all the variables?
- Who are the participants in the study?
- Is the inclusion/exclusion criteria clearly listed?

Results

- Check the results of statistical analysis, df values in particular to make sure they coincide with number of participants used in the study.
 - Is the statistics test used appropriate?
 - Do graphs and charts support the results stated by the paper?
-
- Are the graphs and chart simply a summary of what has already been said in the paper?
 - -Graphs and charts are used to clarify things that might be difficult to explain in words, they are unnecessary if they simply show what has already been said?
 - Are graphs and chart captions consistent with what the graphs/chart is showing?

Discussion

- What new information did this study add?
- Is there an explanation of how this study relates to previous research?
- Are any of the results stated in the paper not discussed?
- What were the limitations?
 - -Are all limitations addressed?
- Are there suggestions for future research?

References

- Are all references listed used throughout the text?

Thank you