# Review Criteria Summary SCORES for Case Reports

**BACKGROUND (15%) + CASE (40%) + CONCLUSION (20%) + IMPORTANCE (25%) = 100%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BACKGROUND (15 pts)</strong></th>
<th>Excellent/Very Good</th>
<th>Good/Fair</th>
<th>Marginal/Inadequate</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Subject Matter</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Purpose of Report</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Relevant Literature</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CASE (40 pts)</strong></th>
<th>Excellent/Very Good</th>
<th>Good/Fair</th>
<th>Marginal/Inadequate</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pertinent Demographics Features</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case History</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting Signs/Symptoms</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Findings</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Abnormalities</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination of Diagnosis</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Images/Graphics</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments/Outcomes Description</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CONCLUSION (20 pts)</strong></th>
<th>Excellent/Very Good</th>
<th>Good/Fair</th>
<th>Marginal/Inadequate</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Principal Findings</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked to Literature</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plausible Explanations Discussed</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation for Management</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IMPORTANCE (25 pts)</strong></th>
<th>Excellent/Very Good</th>
<th>Good/Fair</th>
<th>Marginal/Inadequate</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness of Case</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual Diagnosis or Clinical Course</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to Clinical Practice</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Scientific Knowledge</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability for Publication</td>
<td>5 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TOTALS</strong></th>
<th><strong>RESEARCH</strong></th>
<th><strong>DEPARTMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>WILL</strong></th>
<th><strong>CALCULATE</strong></th>
<th><strong>TOTALS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Background (15 points = 15%)

Importance of Subject Matter – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Provides a very clear, well-articulated statement of the significance of this particular case. 5-4
Good/Fair: Provides a relatively clear statement of the significance of this particular case. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: The significance of this particular case is vague or unclear. 1-0

Specific Purpose of Report – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Offers a solid explanation or reason for why he/she selected the case with respect to what the physician may learn from this case. 5-4
Good/Fair: Offers a relatively strong explanation or reason for why he/she selected the case with respect to what the physician may learn from this case. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Offers no adequate explanation or reason for why he/she selected the case with respect to what the physician may learn. 1-0

Use of Relevant Literature – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Uses key background information from the published literature to strengthen the understanding and/or appreciation of this particular case (having at least 5 or more references). 5-4
Good/Fair: Uses a fair amount of background literature to strengthen the understanding and/or appreciation of this particular case (having 3-4 references). 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Uses minimal background information from the published literature to strengthen the understanding and/or appreciation of this particular case (having only 2 or fewer references). 1-0

Case (40 points = 40%)

Pertinent Demographic Features – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Provides at least 4 relevant demographic variables (e.g., age, race, gender, family size, marital status, education level, religion, employment, income, insurance status, etc.). 5-4
Good/Fair: Provides at least 3 relevant demographic variables (e.g., age, race, gender, family size, marital status, education level, religion, employment, income, insurance status, etc.). 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Provides 2 or fewer relevant demographic variables (e.g., age, race, gender, family size, marital status, education level, religion, employment, income, insurance status, etc.). 1-0

Case History – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: References relevant prior illnesses, hospitalizations, chronic conditions (or states that the patient history was unremarkable). 5-4
Good/Fair: References at least one relevant prior illness, hospitalization, or a chronic condition (or states the history was unremarkable). 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Does not reference any relevant illnesses, hospitalizations, chronic conditions (nor states that the history was unremarkable). 1-0

Presenting Signs/Symptoms – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Offers ample details on patient’s initial presentation including both signs (recognizable by patient, family member and/or physician) and symptoms (recognized by patient only). Provides a time frame for presenting this data (“...patient states the pain began two days ago...”). 5-4
Good/Fair: Offers adequate detail on patient’s initial presentation including both signs (recognizable by patient, family member and/or physician) and symptoms (recognized by patient only). May or may not provide a time frame for this data. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Offers few details on patient’s initial presentation in which either signs (recognizable by patient, family member and/or physician) or symptoms (recognized by patient only) are lacking. Does not provide a time frame for this data. 1-0
Clinical Findings – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Provides important details of the physical examination results as well as the results of any pathological tests. Unusual observations are highlighted. 5-4
Good/Fair: Provides sufficient details of the physical examination results as well as the results of any pathological tests. May or may not comment on unusual observations. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Little detail on physical examination results as well as the results of any pathological tests. No comment on unusual observations. 1-0

Laboratory Abnormalities – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Provides all or most key laboratory values. 5-4
Good/Fair: Provides most or some of the important laboratory values. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Provides some (or none) of the important laboratory values. 1-0

Determination of Diagnosis – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: The process of determining the correct diagnosis (including an explanation of differential diagnoses) is presented in a very clear fashion. Uses a precise timeline to guide the reader. 5-4
Good/Fair: The process of determining the correct diagnosis (which may or may not include an explanation of differential diagnoses) is presented in a fairly clear fashion. Uses an abbreviated timeline to guide the reader 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: The process of determining the correct diagnosis is confusing or unclear and/or there is no explanation of differential diagnoses. May or may not include an abbreviated timeline. 1-0

Use of Images/Graphics – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: There is the inclusion of at least 3 or more images, photographs, x-rays, charts, graphs, figures. 5-4
Good/Fair: There is the inclusion of 1 or 2 images, photographs, x-rays, charts, graphs, figures. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: There may be the inclusion of 1 image, photograph, x-ray, chart, graph, figure (of questionable quality)—or none at all. 1-0

Treatment(s)/Outcome(s) Description – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Includes a strong rationale for each treatment decision. Describes expected and actual outcomes of treatment plan. Adverse response(s) to the therapies are noted. 5-4
Good/Fair: Includes rationale for main treatment decision. Describes expected and actual outcomes of treatment plan. Adverse response(s) to the therapies may or may not be noted. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Does not include rationale for treatment decisions—or the rationale is very weak. May or may not describe expected and actual outcomes of the treatment plan. Adverse response(s) to the therapies may or may not be noted. 1-0

Conclusion (20 points = 20%)

Summary of Principal findings – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Restates key information about both the management and outcome of the case in a succinct yet highly interesting manner. 5-4
Good/Fair: Restates key information about the management and/or outcome of the case in a succinct and interesting manner. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: May or may not restate key information about the management and/or outcome of the case. Of so—it lacks intensity or interest. 1-0
**Linked to Literature – 5 points**
Excellent/Very Good: Explains whether this case study corroborates with or detracts from current beliefs about the expected management or outcome of the diagnosis—**and** compares/contracts this case with at least one published report. 5-4
Good/Fair: Explains whether this case study corroborates with or detracts from current beliefs about the expected management or outcome of the diagnosis, **or** compares/contracts this case with at least one published report. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: May or may not relate this case to published reports. If another case is cited, the comparison or contrast is confusing or not clear. 1-0

**Plausible Explanations Discussed – 5 points**
Excellent/Very Good: Offers a highly credible explanation for the course of events in the case—one that is likely to stimulate much discussion among clinicians. 5-4
Good/Fair: Offers a potential explanation for the course of events in this case—one that may or may not stimulate much discussion among clinicians. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Offers a fair-to-weak explanation for the course of events in the case—one that most likely will not stimulate any discussion among clinicians. 1-0

**Recommendation for Management – 5 points**
Excellent/Very Good: Provides important/robust suggestions for diagnosis and/or management such that the case represents a valuable source of information and guidance for physicians faced with a similar puzzling/challenging case. 5-4
Good/Fair: Provides good-to-fair suggestions for diagnosis and/or management such that the case represents a potential source of information and guidance for physicians faced with a similar puzzling/challenging case. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Provides weak (or unusable) suggestions for diagnosis and/or management that appear ‘unsubstantiated’ or unsupported. Would not be helpful to other physicians faced with a similar puzzling/challenging case. 1-0

**Importance (25 points = 25%)**

**Uniqueness of Case – 5 points**
Excellent/Very Good: Cites actual number of cases or similar cases previously published—and generally would fall between only 1-5 cases appearing in the past five years. 5-4
Good/Fair: Cites actual number of cases or similar cases previously published—and generally would fall between only 6-10 cases appearing in the past five years. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Does not cite actual number of cases or similar cases previously published—or cites a relatively high number (>10) appearing in the past five years. 1-0

**Unusual Diagnosis or Clinical Course – 5 points**
Excellent/Very Good: Highlights the ‘uncommon’ aspects of the case in a succinct or concise manner. 5-4
Good/Fair: Highlights the ‘uncommon’ aspects of the case in a clear or fairly clear manner. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Does not highlight the ‘uncommon’ aspects of the case—or does so in a minimal and unclear manner. 1-0
Relevance to Clinical Practice – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Explains how this case study can add value to future clinical practice by listing or describing—in a very clear manner—at least 3 instructive or teaching points that add value to this case. 5-4
Good/Fair: Explains how this case study can add value to future clinical practice by listing or describing—in a relatively clear manner—1 or 2 instructive or teaching points that add value to this case. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Does not explain how this case study can add value to future clinical practice—or describes 1 instructive or teaching point in an unclear manner. 1-0

Contribution to Scientific Knowledge
Excellent/Very Good: Describes findings that shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect. May provide directions for future investigations. 5-4
Good/Fair: Describes findings that may possibly shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect. May provide directions for future investigations. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Describes findings that do not shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect. May provide directions for future investigations. 1-0

Suitability for Publication – 5 points
Excellent/Very Good: Case is rare, interesting, and presented so well that it is likely or highly likely to be accepted for publication. 5-4
Good/Fair: Case is unusual, interesting, and presented in a good way that it is somewhat likely or likely to be accepted for publication. 3-2
Marginal/Unacceptable: Case is not that unusual, only somewhat interesting, and the presentation is not good thus not likely to be accepted for publication. 1-0