

RP5: Epidemiologic Research Report 1st Submission Grading Rubric

	Peer Grading Criteria: Evidence Scale			
Report Item (40 pts total)	2.5	2	1	0
TITLE & File Name Do not include author information for anonymous review	The exposure, disease outcome & frequency, and the target population were clearly stated in the title of the paper.	Some efforts are made but key information is missing given to title instructions.	Author information included or missing independent Title page.	No title
INTRODUCTION 1.1. Definition of Disease	Disease of interest was well defined concisely in one paragraph.	Some efforts are made, but some important information is missing.	Minimal attempts describing disease.	Missing introduction.
INTRODUCTION 1.2. Disease Distribution Focus on only one of disease frequency from incidence, prevalence, hospitalization, or mortality, etc. 1 illustration can explain multiple factors.	The statistics of an identified public health problem were well described in words overall and by person, place, and time factor using the data from the FDH website.	Evidence of 2 or 3 of 4 (overall, person, place, and time) in-text explanation.	Evidence of 1 of 4 factors (overall, person, place, and time) in-text explanation.	No statistics in text.
	The statistics of an identified public health problem were visualized overall and by person, place, and time factor using table/figure from the FDH website.	Illustrations (with title) for 2 out of the 3 factors (person, place, and time).	illustration (with title) for only 1 of the 3 factors (person, place, and time).	No illustrations.
INTRODUCTION 1.3 Risk Factor When DOH did not provide any data for the listed risk factors, smoking, obesity can be chosen after discussion.	Modifiable and non-modifiable risk factors for the disease were identified comprehensively from literature review.		Included but not distinguish modifiable vs. non-modifiable ones.	No risk factors.
	Specify one of the modifiable risk factors as your topic.	Specified the exposure of interest, but the exposure is not modifiable.	Exposure was specified, but not from the list of known risk factors.	Did not specify one for focus.
	Well, logical explanation for reasons for selection linking to findings in section 1.2.	Some explanation for selection.		No explanation.
INTRODUCTION 1.4 Study Aim	Included a well-stated research question, including exposure, disease outcome, and the target population.	The research question is formulated but not clear or missing information.	The research question is different from the title page.	No evidence.
METHODS 2.1-2.2 Methods	Ecological analysis (correlation analysis) was well defined, and key terms for a literature review were well developed/described.	1 section was completed following the instruction.	Completed but did not follow the instruction.	No evidence.
RESULTLS 3.1 Correlation Analysis	A correlation chart, with a coefficient and a p-value, was presented on the chart	A correlation chart without a coefficient and p-value on the chart.	A correlation chart, but not accurate	No chart.
	Interpretation of both parts (r and p) correct.	One of them correct.	Interpretation was not correct.	No interpretation.
RESULTLS 3.2 Summary Table	All 3 abstracts were from analytical, primary epidemiological studies.	2 abstracts met the criteria	1 abstract met the criteria.	None met the criteria.
	All 3 abstracts addressed the chosen topic (exposure and disease outcome).	2 abstracts met the criteria	1 abstract met the criteria.	None met the criteria.
	All 3 abstracts reported results in OR/RR/HR with 95% CI.	2 abstracts met the criteria	1 abstract met the criteria.	None met the criteria.
	All of the key information was well identified and correct.	All the information was identified but some information incorrect.	Some information is missing.	No table.
LANGUAGE AND GRAMMAR	Scientific language throughout with little-to-no grammatical mistakes.	Some casual language with minor grammatical mistakes.	Casual language with many grammatical mistakes throughout.	

RP6-1: Peer Review Grading Rubric

Evaluation item (60 pts total)	10	8	6	4	0
Review Completion on time (10 pts)	Attended the class and completed all reviews on time.	Reviews were done 1 day late.	Reviews done 2 days late.	Either did not attend the class or reviews were done 3 days late.	Reviews were done 4+ days late.
Complete reviews (10 pts)	All reviews submitted completely or communicated with peers if errors happened.	3 reviews submitted completely	2 reviews submitted completely	1 review submitted completely	No review
Constructive reviews (10 pts)	All reviews included constructive comments in the rubric when points were deducted to help peers improve their final version.	Constructive comments were provided for 3 papers.	Constructive comments were provided for 2 papers	Constructive comments were provided for 1 paper.	No review
Fair/Accurate reviews (10 pts) Errors include incorrect grading, creation of grading scale, non-sense comments, etc.	All reviews done based on grading rubrics without errors or communicated with peers if errors happened (i.e., no missing comments on the submission page to note the time the review was completed, all papers given perfect scores when errors were present, etc.)	3 reviews done fairly without errors.	2 reviews done fairly without errors.	1 review done fairly without errors.	No review
RR6 Part 1 & Part 2 Completed on time (10 points)	RR6 Part 1 Quiz & Part 2 Survey completed on time.	RR6 Part 1 Quiz or Part 2 Survey submitted late	Both RR6 Part 1 Quiz & Part 2 Survey completed late.	Either RP6 Part 1 Quiz or Part 2 Survey not submitted.	Both RP6 Part 1 Quiz or Part 2 Survey not submitted.
Survey Responses (10 points)	All responses were correct.	Some responses were incorrect or missing (four scores, in descending order, median score)	Qualtrics responses were not based on grading rubric.		No survey completed

RP7: Final Epidemiologic Research Report Grading Rubric

Report Item (100 pts total)	Instructor Grading Criteria: Quality Scale				Not Attempted
	High	Average	Low	Poor	
	30	26	21	15	0
Overall Revision Efforts (30 pts) Title through Section 3.2 A revision table is required to indicate revisions. Indicate the changes made using different font color or yellow highlight.	No revision required from peer review or specific attention given to revision requested.	Some attention given to revision requested.(Some parts still needs correction, such as the interpretation of correlation analysis, three articles, etc.)	Little attempt to revise it based on feedback or revisions were made in text but no revision table was provided.	Some parts of 1.1 – 3.2 are not complete.	No evidence of revision in text and table.
	10	8	6	4	0
RESULTS 3.3 Interpretations (20 pts) Separate paragraph per each article.	Interpretations of the strength of OR/RR/HR were correct for 3 papers.	Interpretations of the strength of OR/RR/HR were correct for 2 papers.	Interpretations of the strength of OR/RR/HR were correct for 1 paper.	Attempted but none of them specific to the ratio estimate.	No interpretations for the ratio estimate or ratio estimate not identified.
	Interpretations of 95% CIs were correct for 3 papers.	Interpretations of 95% CIs were correct for 2 papers.	Interpretations of 95% CIs were correct for 1 paper.	Attempted but none of them correct.	No interpretations for the confidence intervals or 95% CI not identified.
CONCLUSIONS (20 pts)	Well summarized in one paragraph including the summary of the strength of association.	Summarized well but missing the strength of association.		Minimal attempt addressing conclusion.	No conclusions
	Well stated clinical/public health implications in a separate paragraph based on literature review	Clinical/public health implications but without thought or logic.	.	Minimal attempt addressing implication	No conclusions
REFERENCES (10 pts)	All cited works, both text and visual (tables and figures), are done in the correct APA style format to avoid unethical practices and plagiarism.	Citations are complete but style is not properly formatted for APA (in-text citations and/or reference page)	Minor errors (i.e., reference page is not in alphabetical order, missing elements of a citation on the reference page, etc.).	Missing citations either in-text and/or on the reference page, from tables/figures)	No citations and/or additional evidence of academic integrity violations (e.g., plagiarism, use of AI-generated text)
	5	4	3	2	0
Language and Grammar (5 pts)	Scientific language throughout with little-to-no grammatical mistakes.	Some casual language with minor grammatical mistakes.		Non-scientific casual language with numerous errors.	
Formatting Requirement (5 pts)	Specific attention given to formatting instructions.	Some attention given to formatting instructions.	Little attention given to formatting instructions.		Missing formatting.
Similarity Score (5 pts)	< 30%	30 - < 35%	35 - < 40%	40 - <50 %+	50% +

Contents (5 pts)	Writer demonstrates logical and subtle sequencing of ideas through well-developed paragraphs.	Followed the template to develop logical sequences of ideas. Some errors present but not hinder comprehension.	Followed the template to develop logical sequences of ideas, but lots of errors hindering comprehension.	Did not follow the template and lacks logical flow of ideas.	Did not complete the report, so it hindered comprehension
-------------------------	---	--	--	--	---