

University of New Mexico

**UNM Digital Repository**

---

Theory and Practice Seminars 2001-2009

MPH

---

9-11-2008

## **MPH Theory & Practice Seminar Assignment Three: Public Health Informatics Blinded Peer Assessment Exercise**

Jonathan Eldredge

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/hsc\\_inst\\_coph\\_mph\\_tps](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/hsc_inst_coph_mph_tps)

---

**Assignment Three: Public Health Informatics  
Blinded Peer Assessment Exercise**

Assignment Three Student Number \_\_\_\_\_ Anonymous Reviewer Number \_\_\_\_\_

**Directions:**

You will be given a packet of materials from a fellow student who completed Assignment Three. This student's identity will be removed from the materials so you can evaluate his or her informatics literature database searching and communication skills without personal consideration. **Your colleague's documentation should provide sufficient detail and clarity that another class member such as yourself can replicate the search exactly**, as outlined in the criteria below. In addition, be sure to score the documentation using the evaluation rubric on the next page.

**Replicability of the searches on the basis of the narrative or table:**

PubMed Basic Search:

Searched via the MeSH Database

Selected an appropriate MeSH term

Utilized a single subheading, if appropriate

Applied limits appropriate for the question

Description completeness: is there anything important left out?

Description conciseness: is there any unnecessary detail?

Do the methods reflect the techniques learned in class?

Does the accompanying table accurately/completely document the searches?

What did you learn from the table that might be of future benefit?

Suggestions for improvement:

PubMed Advanced Search:

Searched via the MeSH Database

Selected appropriate MeSH terms

Combined appropriate MeSH terms

Combined MeSH terms logical (AND, OR, NOT)

Applied limits appropriate for the search

Description completeness: is there anything important left out?

Description conciseness: is there any unnecessary detail?

Do the methods reflect the techniques learned in class?

Does the accompanying table accurately/completely document the searches?

What did you learn from the table that might be of future benefit?

Suggestions for improvement:

**PsycINFO Search:**

Searched via the Thesaurus

Selected appropriate Descriptor (DE)

Applied limits (“Refine Search”) appropriate to the search

Description completeness: is there anything important left out?

Description conciseness: is there any unnecessary detail?

Do the methods reflect the techniques learned in class?

Does the accompanying table accurately and completely document the succession of searches?

What did you learn from the table that might be of future benefit?

Suggestions for improvement:

30%	Replicability of the searches on the basis of the narrative	1	2	3	4	5
30%	Replicability of the searches on the basis of the table	1	2	3	4	5
10%	Completeness: is there anything important left out?	1	2	3	4	5
10%	Conciseness: is there unnecessary detail?	1	2	3	4	5
20%	Do the methods reflect techniques learned in class?	1	2	3	4	5
--	Overall Quality of Project	1	2	3	4	5

Legend: 1 = Lowest; 5 = Highest adherence to standards

**Overall Suggestions for Improvement:**

**Instructor’s Recommendations:**

**For Searcher:**

**For Peer Reviewer:**

File: MPH 1&P 2008 Assign 1 thro Peer Review