

**Journal club grading rubric**

	<b>Weightage</b>	<b>D 49 and below</b>	<b>C 50-59</b>	<b>B 60-74</b>	<b>A 75-89</b>	<b>A+ 90 and above</b>
<b>Choice of article</b>	<b>15%</b>	Choice of article is not justified	Choice of article pertaining to topic is justified but no justification on research design or journal	Choice of article is justified in terms of topic and design or journal	Choice of article is justified in terms of topic, design and journal	Choice of article is justified in terms of topic, design and journal with an analysis of other articles that were considered and reason for the current choice justified
<b>Description of content</b>	<b>10%</b>	Content is copied and pasted from the original article	Content is adapted for the presentation but contains a large amount of irrelevant matter Or does not have relevant matter	Content is adapted for presentation and is comprehensive and adequate to give the audience clear understanding of the content Unable to describe graph figures and tables	Content is adapted for presentation and is comprehensive and gives the audience clear understanding of the content Describes graphs, figures and tables adequately	Content is adapted for presentation and is comprehensive and gives the audience clear understanding of the content Describes graphs, figures and tables clearly
<b>Critical appraisal using standardized tools- Internal validity</b>	<b>15%</b>	Does not justify choice of critical appraisal tool (CAT) Merely lists the scores	Justifies choice of CAT. Does not fully justify reasons for scores	Justifies choice of CAT. Justifies reasons for scores except statistical validity	Justifies choice of CAT. Uses a comprehensive CAT which has sections devoted to statistical analysis Or uses an additional tool for statistical appraisal Is not able to justify appraisal of statistics well	Justifies choice of CAT. Uses a comprehensive CAT which has sections devoted to statistical analysis Or uses an additional tool for statistical appraisal Is able to justify appraisal of statistics well

Journal club grading rubric

	Weightage	D 49 and below	C 50-59	B 60-74	A 75-89	A+ 90 and above
<b>Critical appraisal for clinical applicability - external validity</b>	20%	Not able to articulate the application of the article in our setting	Able to mention why the article is useful in our setting but not fully justified objectively	Described why the article is important to our setting but does not justify analytically about various aspects	Clearly describes why this article is important to our clinical setting.  Factors that may affect its application including outcome measure and participant characteristics are described	Clearly describes why this article is important to our clinical setting.  Factors that may affect its application including outcome measure and participant characteristics are described and justified
<b>Clinical translation</b>	15%	Unable to articulate the relevance or application of the article in our setting	Mentions why this article can be useful for patient care. But it is not convincing	Describes clearly why this article can be useful for patient care. No tools to demonstrate translation are given	Describes clearly why this article can be useful for patient care. Example of how it can be applied with new protocols/guidelines/assessment form is sketchy	Describes clearly why this article can be useful for patient care. Shows an example of how it can be applied with new protocols/guidelines/assessment form

\*Our setting means JSS, and India at large

Journal club grading rubric

	Weightage	D 49 and below	C 50-59	B 60-74	A 75-89	A+ 90 and above
<b>Analysis pertaining to future research</b>	<b>10%</b>	No analysis is evident	Some attempt is made to place this article in current practice which is not convincing	Places this article and its findings in the context of current practice and is able to describe what the article adds. Limitations are not identified.	Places this article and its findings in the context of current evidence/ CPG. Limitations are partly identified (not what the authors identified).	Places this article and its findings in the context of current evidence/ CPG and is clearly able to describe what the article adds. Limitations are identified (not what the authors identified) pertaining to external validity and importance.  Future direction is described clearly.
<b>Presentation</b>	<b>10%</b>	Use of presentation techniques is monotonic	Use of limited presentation techniques  Employs limited presentation aids (e.g., graphs, multi-media, text, charts, images, tables etc.).  Uses language and terminology not often technical, to express content.	Professional use of several presentation techniques  Employs several presentation aids that somewhat effectively integrates various elements (e.g., graphs, multi-media, text, charts, images, tables etc.).  Uses technical language and terminology to somewhat clearly and professionally express content.	Dynamic, integrated and professional use of a number of engaging presentation techniques  Content selection is very good and provides a visual communication of the information which is selected with recent evidence	Dynamic, integrated and professional use of a wide range of engaging presentation techniques  Employs succinct, creative and engaging presentation aids that effectively integrate a wide range of elements (e.g., graphs, multi-media, text, charts, images, tables etc.).  Uses external content to make topic relevant and interesting
<b>References</b>	<b>5%</b>	No additional references.	A few additional references that are random	Many references but wide lapses in referencing and justification of aspect	Wide list of references but not all points are justified	Comprehensive list of external references to justify all points of the JC
<b>Overall grade</b>	<b>100%</b>					