Case Report Rubric - Imaging

CRITERIA	% WEIGHTING
Case details communicated clearly, concisely and logically	10%
Image appraisal	20%
Image interpretation and diagnosis / differential diagnoses	35%
Critical reflection and EBVM	20%
Overall attention to case report technique and construction including: scientific language and terminology, referencing format, spelling and grammar, adherence to word limits.	15%

Case details communicated clearly, concisely and logically						
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
Little or no communication of the pertinent details of the case.	Not clearly or logically presented and/or; details of presenting problem, historical and signalment factors omitted/disordered/ illogical or waffling.	Inadequate communication of the main facts of the case. Some details of presenting problem, historical and signalment factors, omitted or not well ordered, illogical or overly wordy.	Adequate communication of the main facts of the case including the presenting problem, historical and signalment factors, Information presented less logically, concisely, and candidate less able to discriminate between useful and extraneous information.	Good communication of the main facts of the case including the presenting problem, historical and signalment factors. Good ability to present information logically, concisely, discriminating between useful and extraneous information.	Very good communication of the main facts of the case including the presenting problem, historical and signalment factors. Very good ability to present information logically, concisely, discriminating between useful and extraneous information.	Excellent communication of the main facts of the case including the presenting problem, historical and signalment factors, Excellent ability to present information logically, concisely, discriminating between useful and extraneous information.
Image appraisal						
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
No attempt to appraise the image(s)	Poor appraisal of the image(s) presented. Clear omission of multiple important	Inadequate appraisal of image(s) presented. At least one clear omission /	Adequate appraisal of the images. Pertinent points covered although not	Good appraisal of the image(s) presented.	Very good appraisal of the image(s) presented. Any	Excellent appraisal of the image(s) presented. A clear,

| presented or image appraisal incorrect | details such as patient positioning, exposure, processing, safety factors etc. | noted such as failure to comment on inadequate exposure, patient positioning etc. | well presented by the candidate. | | pertinent points noted and clearly presented in order of significance to the reader. | concise description with no omissions. |

Image interpretation and diagnosis / differential diagnoses

Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
No attempt to interpret images or present a diagnosis/ differential diagnosis. Interpretation attempted but multiple major errors noted and incorrect diagnosis.	Image interpretation attempted but several minor or single major error noted. Diagnosis inappropriate or incorrect or important differentials omitted	Omissions or errors noted with image interpretation and /or diagnosis although interpretation good in parts.	Adequate interpretation of images presented. Minor errors or omissions. Tendency to be wordy or waffle. Differentials presented but not logically ordered or exhaustive.	Good Interpretation of images and diagnosis / differential diagnoses	Very good image interpretation and diagnosis / differential diagnoses – clearly presented and logically ordered.	Excellent interpretation of images and clearly prioritised list of differential diagnoses.

Critical reflection and EBVM

Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
No attempt to include reflection or use evidence based medicine in discussion of the case.	Poor ability to critically reflect on the case. Poor ability to recognise aspects of the case that required reflection. Poor ability to review the relevant literature and/or use the literature to reflect on the case. Poor use of the available clinical and/or literature evidence, with few poor quality resources cited such as Wikipedia or	Inadequate ability to critically reflect on the case. Inadequate ability to recognise aspects of the case that required reflection. Inadequate ability to review the relevant literature and/or use the literature to reflect on the case. Inadequate use of the available clinical and/or literature evidence. Few references cited either not relevant to	Adequate ability to critically reflect on the case, having reviewed the literature. Adequate use of the available clinical and/or literature evidence. Resources generally relevant to the task; some resources not of high quality where more suitable references are available(Use of secondary sources/ book chapters etc.	Good ability to critically reflect on the case, having reviewed the literature. Good use of the available clinical and/or literature evidence. Good quality sources used, recent and seminal articles mostly relevant to task	Very good ability to critically reflect on the case, having reviewed the literature. Very good use of the available clinical and/or literature evidence. Very good quality sources used; recent, seminal and peer reviewed almost always relevant to task.	Excellent ability to critically reflect on the case, and questions posed having reviewed the literature. Excellent use of the available clinical and/or literature evidence. Excellent quality references used, recent and seminal peer-reviewed literature highly relevant to task. .

	questionable secondary or tertiary sources.	the task or poor quality.	where primary sources would have been preferable)			
Overall attention to case report technique and construction						
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
Very little overall attention to detail and construction e.g. very poor attention to detail in terminology, language, spelling, or grammar and/or; Failing to address the specific requirements of the assignment.	Poor overall attention to detail and construction e.g. poor use of correct and precise terminology when describing lesions, anatomical locations, radiographic projections, medications etc.; Poor attention to detail in spelling and grammar; Poor reference formatting, not using the Harvard Style.	Inadequate overall attention to detail and construction e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing lesions anatomical locations, radiographic projections, medications etc.; Inadequate attention to detail in spelling and grammar or adherence to word limits; Inadequate reference formatting using the Harvard Style.	Adequate overall attention to detail and construction e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing anatomical lesions, locations, radiographic projections, medications etc.; Adequate attention to detail in spelling and grammar and adherence to word limits; Adequate reference formatting using the Harvard Style.	Good overall attention to detail and construction e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing lesions, anatomical locations, radiographic projections, medications etc. Good attention to detail in spelling and grammar and adherence to word limits; Good reference formatting using the Harvard Style.	Very good overall attention to detail and construction e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing lesions, anatomical locations, radiographic projections, medications etc. Very good attention to detail in spelling and grammar and adherence to word limits. Very good reference formatting using the Harvard Style.	Excellent overall attention to detail and construction e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing lesions, anatomical locations, radiographic projections, medications etc. Excellent attention to detail in spelling and grammar and adherence to word limits; Excellent reference formatting using the Harvard Style.