Instructor Information
Yan Wang, PhD, MS
Assistant Professor, Department of Epidemiology
College of Public Health and Health Professions and College of Medicine
352-294-5942
ywang48@ufl.edu
Office Hours: Monday 10am – 12pm or by appointment

Course Overview
The principal goals of this Epidemiology Literature Review and Critiques are:
1) To understand current methods and concepts used in the field of epidemiology through evaluating published research
2) To prepare students to perform peer-review and to think critically. In weekly class discussion sessions, students will review peer-reviewed, published research studies that demonstrate innovative or faulty epidemiologic content or methods. Feedback will be given by student peers and faculty.
3) To learn to write, submit and publish a critical review of a recent article in the student’s area of focus

Course Objectives and/or Goals
As a result of this course, students will:
1) Learn “best practices” for reviewing and critiquing scientific articles in public health and medical research journals
2) Critically review scientific literature, analyze and summarize strengths and weaknesses, and make recommendations for improvement
3) Critique articles recently published in medical and public health journals
4) Discuss broad issues in Epidemiologic methods and content
5) Become familiar with journals in our field, impact factors, how to choose a journal, and how reviewers are selected
6) Understand ethical issues in field methods and in the review process
7) Prepare for professional peer-review assignments
8) Prepare and submit a letter to the editor

Course Materials
Course information and grades will be available in Canvas.

Textbook
There is no required textbook for this course. Students will select articles for review and prepare for in-class discussion.

Additionally, several journal articles and web sites are assigned as supplements:

1) http://annals.org/aim/journal-club


5) http://www.nejm.org/page/author-center/letter-submission

Course Requirements
Each student will be required to:

- Select an article, with instructor’s approval, for individual discussion/presentation. The students will choose an article to demonstrate a specific study design (Cross-sectional design, Quasi- or Randomized designs, Reliability and Validity, Randomized Controlled Trial, Longitudinal designs, Case-Control designs) within a specific topic area/discipline of interest to the student. The article needs to be from a top tier journal (e.g., JAMA, New England Journal of Medicine, AJPH, Archives of XYZ or other high impact journal in the field) and a journal that accepts and publishes letters to the editor. Articles must be recent enough to be eligible for a letter to the editor. Please pay attention to the timeline for publishing letter to the editor, which differs from journal to journal.

- Presentation will include:
  1) Reviewing the article title, authors, affiliations of the authors, funding source for the work conducted, abstract, background, methodology, results discussion of the research regarding strengths and weaknesses noted by the authors, and strengths and weaknesses noted by the student in addition to those presented by the authors.
  2) Presentations, in Power Point format, will be approximately 15-20 minutes in length, followed by a 5-10 minute discussion.
3) Letters to the Editor will be presented as well.
4) Students will be graded on both letters (content and independent thinking) and presentations (staying within time limit, presentation style, and content). Grading will be performed by the Instructor and student peers.

- One week prior to presentation, the student will send the article to be presented to students and the instructor. Based upon feedback from other students and/or the instructor, the letter to the editor will be revised after the class discussion.

- Letters to the editor will be submitted to the journal; proof of submission will be needed for assignment credit.
### Study Analysis and Critique – Supplement: Important Considerations for Each Study Part

#### Authors/Introduction
- If potential conflicts of interest exist, did they appear to influence the study's objective, methods, or conclusions?
- Was an appropriate scientific background and rationale provided?
- Is the stated objective or hypothesis consistent with the research question that needed to be addressed?

#### Methods

**Design**
- Is study design appropriate and optimal to fulfill objective/hypothesis?
- Was method used to assign patients to treatment groups appropriate and clearly described?
- Were all involved with study appropriately blinded? Was success of blinding determined? Was unblinding likely?

**Patients/Subjects**
- Were there any problems with how or from where patients were enrolled?
- Were the inclusion and exclusion criteria appropriate and representative of the population of interest? What additional criteria, if any, would have strengthened the study?
- How was sample size determined? Was the initial sample size adequate for each primary outcome measure?

**Treatment Regimens**
- If an active control used, was it an appropriate selection?
- Were the study drug(s) and any active control(s) dosed and administered appropriately and in a comparable manner?
- Were the drug(s) administered for a sufficient duration?
- Were the different groups handled similarly except for treatments studied?

**Outcome Measures**
- Were primary and secondary outcome measures clearly defined? Were any methods needed to enhance their quality (e.g., training of investigators or patients, standardization among multicenter sites, etc.) and were these performed?
- Were outcome measures appropriate and optimal given the study objective?
- Was timing of outcome measurements appropriate and of adequate frequency and duration?

#### Methods (Continued)

**Data Handling**
- Was it clear how many patients were in each analysis? Did the data handling method used significantly affect interpretation of study findings?
- Was the number of patients accounted for at each step of the study? Could the reasons for dropout affect the clinical usefulness of therapy?

**Statistics**
- Were appropriate statistical tests used for all primary outcomes? Were secondary outcomes analyzed appropriately?
- Was power appropriate for all primary and secondary outcome analyses, considering dropouts? If subgroup analyses performed, was power sufficient?

#### Results
- Were any significant differences apparent among groups at baseline that could influence study results?
- Were results reported for each measure described in Methods section?
- Were the measure(s) of variability used appropriate and sufficient?
- Were findings statistically and clinically significant?
- Was Type II error likely for non-statistically significant findings?
- Was compliance addressed and could this have influenced study results?
- Were there factors (e.g., study setting, diet, other confounding variables) besides the treatments used that could have affected the results observed? If so, were they accounted for or controlled for in the study?
- Were differences in adverse effects among groups statistically analyzed?

#### Discussion/Conclusion
- Were results interpreted appropriately by authors?
- Did authors adequately explain key study limitations and any discrepancies from other similar studies?
- Were authors’ conclusions consistent with the results and study limitations and extrapolated appropriately?

© 2005, 2006 West Virginia University School of Pharmacy (Abate MA, Blommel ML)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric for Journal Club Oral Presentation</th>
<th>Elements of a strong presentation</th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>STUDENT SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knowledge and explanation of subject matter: | • conveys *big picture* understanding  
• presents the essential information  
• accurate description of facts, procedures, hypotheses, etc. | 40% of the whole grade | N/A |
| Introduction | • introduces the authors of the paper and their conflicts of interest, who funded the study  
• gives clear and concise description of the central question addressed by the paper, *and* its significance  
• contains sufficient background needed to understand the results | 5 |  |
| Methods | • gives information necessary to understand results  
• shows experimental flow/approach if appropriate  
• shows data related to central question  
• explains discussion | 5 |  |
| Summary/Conclusions | • reiterates key findings and discusses them in terms of relevance to past literature | 5 |  |
| Q&A | • gives answers that convey understanding | 5 |  |
| Overall organization of talk | • introduces content in logical, easy-to-follow sequence  
• emphasizes main points and repeats them | 5 |  |
| Overall effectiveness of slides (text and visuals) | • conveys key message with slides  
• gives good balance of text and figures  
• slides are visually pleasing  
• shows the right balance of slides | 5 |  |
| Overall effectiveness of delivery | • is confident in delivery  
• speaks loudly enough to be heard  
• gets to main points quickly  
• has strong eye contact  
• uses epidemiological terms  
• stays on time | 10 |  |
| TOTAL | | 40 |  |
### Rubric for Journal Club Letter to the Editor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of a strong letter</th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>STUDENT SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knowledge and explanation of subject matter: | • conveys *big picture* understanding  
• presents the essential information  
• accurate description of facts, procedures, hypotheses, etc. | 50% of the whole grade | N/A |
| Clarity of argument (strengths or weaknesses) | • introduces content in logical, easy-to-follow sequence  
• emphasizes main points and repeats them | 25 |
| Overall effectiveness of delivery | • uses epidemiological terms  
• proper English and grammar | 25 |
| **TOTAL** | **50** | |

- Non-presenting students will write a 300 word (maximum) summary stating what they learned from one of the presentations and submit it.

### Rubric for Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of a strong summary</th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knowledge and explanation of subject matter: | • conveys *big picture* understanding  
• presents some fact and some opinion in 300 words or less | 10% of the whole grade | N/A |
| Capacity to critically review scientific literature | • summarizes the presentations with clarity | 5 |
| | • summarizes the facts and gives opinions using proper epidemiology terms, proper English and grammar | 5 |
| **TOTAL** | **10** | |

### Evaluation/Grading

This course will be graded satisfactory/unsatisfactory following the policies described here [http://gradcatalog.ufl.edu/content.php?catoid=2&navoid=762#grades](http://gradcatalog.ufl.edu/content.php?catoid=2&navoid=762#grades).

Presentations will be scored by student peers and Instructor and averaged based on the rubric above. The averaged scores will be added up. Letters to the Editor will be graded based on the rubric above, with input from student peers and the Instructor, and the scores averaged and added up. The 300 word essay will be graded by the Instructor.

All scores will be added up and those that fall below 80% will be considered U (unsatisfactory). It is possible to receive a grade of Incomplete (I) with instructor permission and at instructor discretion for unforeseen circumstances, but it must be requested by the student. Grades of I not completed within one year are converted to F or U.
Course Outline

8/23 Introduction and overview
- Course overview
- Identify area of interest/focus for your Letter to the Editor

8/30 Ethical issues in scientific review and publishing (visit ORI website)
- **Readings:** Read ORI website (https://ori.hhs.gov/) and bring one article on the Ethical Principles of Journal Writing (Use Nature, Science, JAMA, NEJM or another high impact journal)
- Authorship
- Conflict of interest
- Self-plagiarism

9/6 Librarian guest lecture (Nancy Schaefer)
- How to access journals
- Impact Factors

9/13 Review of research designs in epidemiology
- Most commonly used study designs
- Corresponding statistical analysis

9/20 How to write a Letter to the Editor
- **Readings #1-5**
- Bring an example of Letter to the Editor for discussion
- Discuss how to write Letters to the Editor

9/27 Mock review of a journal article manuscript
- Conduct your own review of an assigned article
- Compare your review with actual reviewer comments of the article

10/4 No Class (Homecoming)

10/11 Student Presentations (1) (starts at 9:00 instead of 9:30)

10/18 No class

10/25 Student Presentations (2)

11/1 Student Presentations (3)

11/8 Student Presentations (4)

11/15 Student Presentations (5)

11/22 Student Presentations (6)
Statement of University’s Honesty Policy

University of Florida Academic Honesty Statements
“I understand that the University of Florida expects its students to be honest in all their academic work. I agree and adhere to this commitment to academic honesty and understand that my failure to comply with this commitment may result in disciplinary action up to and including expulsion from the University.”

“All faculty, staff and students of the University are required and expected to obey the laws and legal agreements governing software use. Failure to do so can lead to monetary damages and/or criminal penalties for the individual violator. Because such violations are also against University policies and rules, disciplinary action will be taken as appropriate.”

“We, the members of the University of Florida, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honesty and integrity.”

Citations and Plagiarism
The two key purposes of citation are to: 1) give appropriate credit to the authors of information, research findings, and/or ideas (and avoid plagiarism), and 2) facilitate access by your readers to the sources you use in your research.

Quotations: When directly quoting an outside source, the borrowed text, regardless of the amount, must be surrounded by quotation marks or block quoted. Quoted text over two lines in length should be single-spaced and indented beyond the normal margins. Every quote must include a source—the author, title, volume, page numbers, etc.—whether an internal reference, footnote, or endnote is used in conjunction with a bibliography page.

Paraphrasing or Citing an Idea: When summarizing an outside source in your own words or citing another person’s ideas, quotation marks are not necessary, but the source must be included. This includes, but is not confined to, personal communications from other students, faculty members, experts in the field, summarized ideas from published or unpublished resource, and primary methods derived from published or unpublished sources. Use the general concept of “when in doubt – cite.”

Plagiarism is a serious violation of the academic honesty policy of the College. If a student plagiarizes others’ material or ideas, he or she may receive an “E” in the course. The faculty member may also recommend further sanctions to the Dean, per College disciplinary action policy. Generally speaking, the three keys of acceptable citation practice are: 1) thoroughness, 2) accuracy, and 3) consistency. In other words, be sure to fully cite all sources used (thoroughness), be accurate in the citation information provided, and be consistent in the citation style you adopt. All references should include the following elements: 1) last names along with first and middle initials; 2) full title of reference; 3) name of journal or book; 4) publication city, publisher, volume, and date; and 5) page numbers referenced. When citing information from the Internet, include the WWW address at
the end, with the “access date” (i.e., when you obtained the information), just as you would list the
document number and date for all public documents. When citing ideas or words from an individual
that are not published, you can write “personal communication” along with the person’s name and
date of communication.

**Policy Related to Class Attendance**
Absences must be conveyed to the instructor in advance, or on the day of the absence for illness.

**Policy Related to Make-up Exams or Other Work**
Students are expected to attend and be prepared to participate in all class sessions. Personal issues
with respect to class attendance or fulfillment of course requirements will be handled on an
individual basis.

**Statement Related to Accommodations for Students with Disabilities**
If you require classroom accommodation because of a disability, you must first register with the
Dean of Students Office (http://www.dso.ufl.edu/). The Dean of Students Office will provide
documentation to you, which you then give to the instructor when requesting accommodation. The
College is committed to providing reasonable accommodations to assist students in their
coursework.

**Counseling and Student Health**
Students may occasionally have personal issues that arise in the course of pursuing higher education
or that may interfere with their academic performance. If you find yourself facing problems
affecting your coursework, you are encouraged to talk with an instructor and to seek confidential
assistance at the UF Counseling & Wellness Center, 352-392-1575. Visit their web site for more
information: http://www.counseling.ufl.edu/.

The Student Health Care Center at Shands is a satellite clinic of the main Student Health Care
Center located on Fletcher Drive on campus. Student Health at Shands offers a variety of clinical
services, including primary care, women's health care, immunizations, mental health care, and
pharmacy services. The clinic is located on the second floor of the Dental Tower in the Health
Science Center. For more information, contact the clinic at 392-0627 or check out the web site at:
www.health.ufl.edu/shcc.

Crisis intervention is always available 24/7 from:
Alachua County Crisis Center: (352) 264-6789.

BUT – Do not wait until you reach a crisis to come in and talk with us. We have helped many
students through stressful situations impacting their academic performance. You are not alone so
do not be afraid to ask for assistance.