"Small ruminants" (Veterinary Science) review form example

<u>Assignment type:</u>

In the subject 'Small Ruminants' (medicine and surgery of sheep, goats, alpaca and deer), students were required to develop an imaginary scenario presenting a disease problem in one of these species. Each student reviews a scenario based on criteria such as its realism and clarity. The same student conducts a 'virtual disease investigation', answering a series of questions about their diagnosis of the cause of the disease in the scenario and its underlying risk factors. The answers to the investigation are returned to the student who wrote the scenario, for them to provide feedback to the investigator about the diagnostic process and whether or not the investigator's diagnosis was correct.

<u>Review form:</u>

Instructions: This is where, as 'Student B', you complete Phase 2 of the assignment:

1. You answer the six standard questions at the bottom of the case scenario you have been assigned.
2. You evaluate the case scenario itself, for realism, clear associations between disease, risk factors, etc, and how easy it was to complete!

If you have typed out your six standard answers, you can copy and paste them one by one into the appropriate sections below.

Answer the following questions about the case scenario you have received:

1. Summarise the problem that has led to the animals' owner seeking your help.

2. Identify a likely diagnosis for the problem described and the features in the scenario that make your diagnosis likely.

3. List possible differential diagnoses and explain why you consider them as alternative causes for the problems described.

4. Describe what further investigation, clinical testing or other procedures you would now conduct to confirm your provisional diagnosis and exclude the differential diagnoses. For both the provisional and differential diagnoses, explain how you would interpret the results of these additional investigations to confirm the diagnosis.

5. Identify the risk factors in the scenario underlying your main diagnosis and explain how they have led to the disease occurring.

6. Write a plan for treating the disease now, if applicable, and preventing it reoccurring in the future. Refer to the risk factors you have identified, and other aspects of the disease, as appropriate.

Assessing the case scenario itself: (Explanations and feedback for the following questions are strongly encouraged!)

1. How realistic was the scenario?

   Very unrealistic
   Mildly unrealistic
   Some unrealistic and some realistic elements
   Quite realistic
   Extremely realistic (Man, I had sweaty palms just reading it!)

   Comments/Justification:

2. How clear were the associations between the description of the case, the disease risk factors and the differential diagnoses you have proposed? (This will relate to how easily you could answer Questions (2) & (3) above.)

   Very unclear
   Unclear
   Some clear but others were not
   Clear
   Extremely clear

   Comments/Justification:

3. How difficult was the scenario for you (Student B) to complete? (Note that a 'good' case scenario should score somewhere in the middle of this scale, rather than at the extremes.)

   It was very difficult for me to work out and answer the six standard questions
   It was quite difficult for me to work out and answer the six standard questions
   There were some easy elements and some hard ones

It was reasonably easy and straightforward for me to complete the scenario

It was too easy for me to complete the scenario

Comments/Justification:

Feedback form:

Note that the following 1 to 5 answers represent a spectrum of how right or wrong Student B's answers might be. If their answer doesn't match precisely one of the 5 descriptions, use your common sense to award a mark, based on the following:

    1 = an awful answer
    2 = still wrong
    3 = just a pass
    4 = correct but could do better
    5 = a very good answer. Their Mum would be proud.

1. How well did Student B summarise the presenting problem?

    Very poor summary of the presenting problem with few or no facets identified

    A minority of features of the presenting problem identified

    Just enough features of the problem were identified to make the answer acceptable.

    A majority of features of the presenting problem identified; maybe not all clearly articulated

    All features of the presenting problem clearly and accurately identified

    Comments/Justification:

2. Did Student B identify a plausible diagnosis and justify the features in your scenario to support their proposed diagnosis?

    No reasonable diagnosis or explanation was offered

    The diagnosis offered was incorrect, and the explanation was absent, poor or inconsistent. Or, a correct explanation given was for the wrong diagnosis!

    The diagnosis was correct but the explanation was absent or largely incorrect.

    A reasonable diagnosis was proposed but the explanation was not comprehensive.

    The correct diagnosis was proposed and comprehensively justified.

    Comments/Justification:

For more information about student peer review, visit: **http://peerreview.cis.unimelb.edu.au**

Support for this project has been provided by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. The views in this project do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.

3. Did Student B offer reasonable differential (i.e., alternative) diagnoses for the presenting problem, with appropriate justification?

No reasonable differentials or explanations were offered.

A limited list of differentials was offered and the explanations were poor.

The differentials proposed were correct but the explanation was absent or poor.

The differentials proposed were almost all correct but with several aspects of the explanations were wrong.

The correct differential diagnoses were listed, accompanied by comprehensive explanations.

Comments/Justification:

4. Did Student B identify appropriate further tests, investigations or procedures to confirm their proposed diagnosis and/or exclude their differentials? Did they correctly explain how they would interpret the results of these additional tests, investigations or procedures?

No reasonable further investigation or diagnostic tests were suggested.

Some correct additional investigations or tests were suggested, and the interpretation of the suggested investigation results was largely incorrect.

Correct additional tests were suggested, but the interpretation was absent or incorrect.

The additional investigations or tests suggested were correct, but important aspects of their interpretation were incorrect or missing.

The suggested additional investigations or tests were correct, and so was their correct interpretation.

Comments/Justification:

5. Did Student B correctly identify your disease's risk factors and explain how they were associated with the disease?

No risk factors or associations were identified.

A limited number of risk factors were identified but the proposed associations were incorrect.

Some risk factors and some associations were identified.

Most of the risk factors were identified, and the explanations of the associations were acceptable.

All of the risk factors were correctly identified and the associations were correctly explained.

Comments/Justification:

6. Did Student B propose an appropriate plan for treating and/or preventing the disease, with appropriate reference to risk factors?

No appropriate treatment or prevention plan, or explanation was offered.

The suggested treatment(s) and/or prevention(s) were largely incorrect, with no reasonable explanations either.

The treatment and/or prevention was essentially correct but there was no appropriate explanation for why they would be undertaken.

A reasonable treatment or prevention plan, and explanation was offered, but elements of the answer were wrong or missing.

A comprehensive treatment and/or prevention plan was offered, along with a correct explanation.

Comments/Justification: