

Article Critique Instructions

Please select **one** of the following research articles and write a critical review. The review should be properly formatted, single-spaced, and have one-inch margins all around. There is no minimum or maximum page or word count for this assignment. All papers will be submitted through Turnitin so must be either a word document or pdf. The format of the article can follow either of the two given in the [attached reference](#)  from the University of Guelph. Make sure you include the proper citation of the article when you submit your paper.

The critique should be about 1500-2000 words.

Articles:

1. [A multi-level usability evaluation of mobile health applications- A case study.pdf](#) 
2. [Common data elements for secondary use of electronic health record data for clinical trial execution.pdf](#) 
3. [OpenNotes After 7 Years: Patient Experiences With Ongoing Access to Their Clinicians' Outpatient Vis.pdf](#) 
4. [Investigating the need for clinicians to use tablet computers with a newly envisioned electronic hea.pdf](#) 
5. [Application of electronic trigger tools to identify targets for improving diagnostic safety | BMJ Qu.pdf](#) 
6. [Persuasive design features within a consumer-focused eHealth intervention integrated with the electr.pdf](#)  [Persuasive design features within a consumer-focused eHealth intervention integrated with the electr.pdf](#) 
7. [Physicians' Perceptions of Chatbots in Health Care: Cross-Sectional Web-Based Survey.pdf](#) 

Critical Review Rubric (1)

Critical Review Rubric (1)							
Criteria	Ratings					Pts	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Appropriate details	15.0 pts Judicious choice of details maximizes interest and understanding	12.0 pts All relevant details presented, but details not critical to understanding omitted	9.0 pts Enough critical details presented for understanding, unnecessary details generally omitted	6.0 pts Most important details included but may include too much or too little detail for easy understanding	1.0 pts Some critical details missing, unnecessary details may be present	15.0 pts	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Statement of context, relevance in field of health informatics	10.0 pts Place of study in field clearly described, illuminating links to other studies or topics made	8.0 pts Place of study in field clearly described, some reference to relationship to other studies or topics	6.0 pts General relevance of study in field described	4.0 pts Attempt made to place in context, possibly not quite appropriately	0.0 pts No attempt made to describe context of study	10.0 pts	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Writer's evaluation of the study	15.0 pts Clearly articulated, well supported statements of value and/or shortcomings of study	12.0 pts Evaluation includes positive value of study as well as clearly supported explanation of shortcomings	9.0 pts Good attempt at evaluation with some support for conclusions; possibly more negative than positive comments	6.0 pts Some attempt at evaluation, comments valid but not necessarily well supported	0.0 pts No attempt to evaluate study or evaluative statements unsupported or inappropriate	15.0 pts	

Critical Review Rubric (1)

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Overall organization	10.0 pts Overall purpose, methods, results and conclusions of study clearly stated; seemingly effortless and seamless logical flow	8.0 pts Overall purpose, methods, results and conclusions of study clearly stated; logical flow always easy to follow	6.0 pts Purpose, methods, results and conclusions clearly stated; most of presentation flows logically	4.0 pts Purpose, methods, results and conclusions stated; possibly some awkwardness in logical flow	1.0 pts Major sections missing or lack of logical flow	10.0 pts
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Clarity of explanations	10.0 pts Sophisticated use of language maximizes interest, enjoyment and comprehension; explanations very clear, factually correct	8.0 pts All explanations clear and easy to understand, factually correct	6.0 pts Most explanations clear and easy to understand, mostly factually correct	4.0 pts Overall meaning is understandable; possibly some areas of slight confusion or minor factual errors	1.0 pts Serious difficulty explaining ideas, major factual errors; lack of comprehensibility	10.0 pts
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Use of terminology	10.0 pts Correct use of all terminology, attention to nuances of meaning, judicious use of clearly defined jargon	8.0 pts All technical terms used correctly and defined clearly, including terms with different common meanings; overuse of jargon avoided	6.0 pts Few errors in use of terminology; definitions provided for technical terms, overuse of jargon avoided	4.0 pts Most terms used correctly, possibly some incorrect usage or use of unnecessary or undefined jargon	1.0 pts Jargon terms used incorrectly, without definition; attempting to sound "scientific" without understanding meaning of terms	10.0 pts

Critical Review Rubric (1)	
----------------------------	--

Criteria	Ratings						Pts
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Writing style							5.0 pts
	5.0 pts Sophisticated, elegant style, complex yet lucid sentence structure, flawless grammar	4.0 pts Error-free, easy to read writing style, well practiced and polished use of language	3.0 pts Good basic writing style, easy to read, few errors, almost entirely in author's own words, little paraphrasing or unnecessary quotation	2.0 pts Mostly basic, correct writing style, relatively few errors and little awkwardness, minimal use of unnecessary quotation or paraphrasing	1.0 pts Serious errors and awkwardness, excessive use of quotation in place of author's own words, excessive paraphrasing		
Total Points: 75.0							