# Journal club checklist

This checklist provides an outline that you can use to guide your discussion of any article in your journal club. Further advise and tools to use when critically appraising papers can be found in the [EBVM Resources page.](https://knowledge.rcvs.org.uk/evidence-based-veterinary-medicine/ebvm-resources/tools-guidelines-and-checklists/)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | [**Training and validation of a novel non-invasive imaging system for ruling out malignancy in canine subcutaneous and cutaneous masses using machine learning in 664 masses**.](https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2023.1164438) |
| **What are the aims or objectives of the study?** |  |
| **When and where was the research carried out?** |  |
| **Are there any potential sources of bias?** |  |
| **Why do you want to review this paper?** |  |
| **What methods did the researchers use?** |  |
| **Does this study aim to validate a new test (against a reference standard) or compare two validated tests?** |  |
| **What is the rationale for using the HT system for ruling out malignancy?** |  |
| **Is the study design described clearly enough to enable you to follow what was done?** |  |
| **Are the number and type of patients included in this study clearly described?** |  |
| **Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria clearly described?** |  |
| **Are these patients relevant to your practice, if not what differences need to be considered?** |  |
| **Where the animals divided into groups?** |  |
| **Were the assessments blinded?** |  |
| **What are the important findings of the study?** |  |
| **Are all patients accounted for in the analysis?** |  |
| **How many cases were diagnosed as false positives in the validation study?** |  |
| **Was the accuracy of the HT Vista system similar for different types of tumour?** |  |
| **What does the difference between the reported positive predictive value and the reported negative predictive value tell us about the appropriate use of this test?** |  |
| **What are the limitations of the study?** |  |
| **Do the findings support or alter your current knowledge?** |  |
| **Having read the paper are there any other sources of information you need to access before changing practice?** |  |
| **What would be the impact of using this test on your patients/population?** |  |

**Reference**

Dank, G. et al (2023) Training and validation of a novel non-invasive imaging system for ruling out malignancy in canine subcutaneous and cutaneous masses using machine learning in 664 masses. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*, 10, p.1164438. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2023.1164438>