



ORIGINAL ARTICLE / REVIEW / CASE STUDY

TITLE MUST BE CONCISE AND INFORMATIVE (Arial, Size 14, Capital)

***Author (Surname in CAPITAL)^{1*}, Author (Surname in CAPITAL)², Author (Surname in CAPITAL)³**

¹Faculty of Medicine, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Selangor Kampus Sungai Buloh, 47000 Sungai Buloh, Selangor, Malaysia

²Faculty of Medicine, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Authors' Email Address: ¹email address, ²email address, ³email address

Received Date: *date (Please leave blank)

Revised Date: *date (Please leave blank)

Published Date: *date (Please leave blank)

*Corresponding Author:
title/name; email address; phone number

ABSTRACT

A concise and factual abstract is required. The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone. For this reason, references must be avoided. Also, non-standard or uncommon abbreviations should be avoided, but if essential they must be defined at their first mention in the abstract itself. The abstract must be in a single paragraph. Abstracts should outline the aim of the study, methods, results, discussions and conclusions of the work. It should contain no more than 300 words.

Keywords: *provide a maximum of 5 keywords, arranged alphabetically, separated by (,)*

Abbreviations:

e.g. ADA: American Diabetes Association
T1DM: Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus

INTRODUCTION (Arial, Size 12, Capital)

Start your introduction here. Provide background information, state the research question, and outline the structure of the paper. Paper must strictly follow Malaysian Journal of Clinical Biochemistry format as provided. Please use font **Times New Roman, size 11pt for all paragraphs, with single spacing**. The minimum number of pages for the manuscript is 5 pages.

If you have more than one paragraph, **please insert a line spacing between the paragraphs**. Do not insert any space before and after the paragraph. Please insert a line spacing after each paragraph, before the next section.

METHODS/RESULTS/DISCUSSION (Heading 1) (Arial, Size 12, Capital)

Write the methods/results/discussion (related work) here. Describe the methods used in your study. Include details about data collection, experimental design, and statistical analysis. Present the results of your study. Use tables, figures, and graphs to illustrate key findings. Discuss the implications of your results and compare them with previous studies. Explore limitations and suggest avenues for future research.

If you have more than one paragraph, please insert a line spacing between the paragraphs. Do not insert any space before and after the paragraph. Please insert a line spacing after each paragraph, before the next section.

Methods/Results/Discussion 1 (Heading 2)

Write the related work here. Please indent the first line of the paragraph by 0.5". Continue the paragraph as usual when writing the subtopics.

If you have more than one paragraph, please insert a line spacing between the paragraphs. Do not insert any space before and after the paragraph. Please insert a line spacing after each paragraph, before the next section.

e.g.

Study Design

A hospital-based cross-sectional study was conducted

Figures and Tables

Below are the examples to insert Figure 1 and Table 1 in the manuscript. Please make sure your figure has a border around it.



Figure 1: Questions & Answers (Arial, size 11, centered, placed below the figure)

Table 1: Measurement Criteria (Arial, size 11, centered, placed above the table)

Rank	Value
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Not Sure	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1

CONCLUSION (Arial, Size 12, Capital)

Write the conclusion of your paper here. Summarize the main findings and their significance.

If you have more than one paragraph, please insert a line spacing between the paragraphs. Do not insert any space before and after the paragraph. Please insert a line spacing after each paragraph, before the next section.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (Arial, Size 12, Capital)

Write your acknowledgments here. Acknowledge any individuals, organizations, or funding sources that contributed to the research.

FUNDING (Arial, Size 12, Capital)

Provision of Fund: Whether the study was partially or fully funded or not funded at all. Please specify any sources of funding (institutional, private, and corporate financial support) for the work reported in the paper. If there was no funding, the following wording should be used: "This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors."

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION (Arial, Size 12, Capital)

[example] Ahmad, B. and Tan, C. formulated and designed the experiments, while Eliza, D. executed the experiments and prepared the data. Ali, D. was responsible for planning and conducting the simulations. Tan, C. played a key role in interpreting the results. Ahmad, B. spearheaded the writing of the manuscript. All authors actively contributed to providing critical feedback, shaping the research, guiding the analysis, and refining the manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION (Arial, Size 12, Capital)

The author(s) must certify that they have No Conflict of Interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

[example] I/We affirm that there is no Conflict of Interest among the author(s) concerning the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript. We further certify that the article represents the original work of the Authors and Co-Authors. The manuscript has not been previously published and is not currently under consideration for publication elsewhere. This research/manuscript has neither been submitted for publication nor published in whole or in part elsewhere. We attest that all authors have made significant contributions to the work, ensuring the validity and legitimacy of the data and its interpretation, thereby warranting its submission to the Malaysian Journal of Clinical Biochemistry.

REFERENCES (Arial, Size 12, Capital)

Follow **APA 7th Edition** citation style. Arrange the references in alphabetical order.

- Avery, R. J., Bryant, W. K., Mathios, A., Kang, H., & Bell, D. (2006). Electronic course evaluations: Does an online delivery system influence student evaluations? *The Journal of Economic Education*, 37(1), 21–37. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JECE.37.1.21-37>
- Berk, R. A. (2012). Top 20 strategies to increase the online response rates of student rating scales. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 98–107.
- Berk, R. A. (2013). *Top 10 flashpoints in student ratings and the evaluation of teaching*. Stylus.

- Boysen, G. A. (2015a). Preventing the overinterpretation of small mean differences in student evaluations of teaching: An evaluation of warning effectiveness. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 1(4), 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000042>
- Boysen, G. A. (2015b). Significant interpretation of small mean differences in student evaluations of teaching despite explicit warning to avoid overinterpretation. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 1(2), 150–162. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000017>
- Boysen, G. A., Kelly, T. J., Raesly, H. N., & Casner, R. W. (2014). The (mis)interpretation of teaching evaluations by college faculty and administrators. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(6), 641–656. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.860950>
- Buller, J. L. (2012). *Best practices in faculty evaluation: A practical guide for academic leaders*. Jossey-Bass.
- Dewar, J. M. (2011). Helping stakeholders understand the limitations of SRT data: Are we doing enough? *Journal of Faculty Development*, 25(3), 40–44.
- Dommeyer, C. J., Baum, P., & Hanna, R. W. (2002). College students' attitudes toward methods of collecting teaching evaluations: In-class versus on-line. *Journal of Education for Business*, 78(1), 11–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832320209599691>
- Dommeyer, C. J., Baum, P., Hanna, R. W., & Chapman, K. S. (2004). Gathering faculty teaching evaluations by in-class and online surveys: Their effects on response rates and evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(5), 611–623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930410001689171>
- Feistauer, D., & Richter, T. (2016). How reliable are students' evaluations of teaching quality? A variance components approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(8), 1263–1279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1261083>
- Gilovich, T., Griffin, D., & Kahneman, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808098>
- Griffin, T. J., Hilton, J., III, Plummer, K., & Barret, D. (2014). Correlation between grade point averages and student evaluation of teaching scores: Taking a closer look. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(3), 339–348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.831809>
- Jaquett, C. M., VanMaaren, V. G., & Williams, R. L. (2016). The effect of extra-credit incentives on student submission of end-of-course evaluations. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 2(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000052>
- Jaquett, C. M., VanMaaren, V. G., & Williams, R. L. (2017). Course factors that motivate students to submit end-of-course evaluations. *Innovative Higher Education*, 42(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-016-9368-5>
- Morrison, R. (2011). A comparison of online versus traditional student end-of-course critiques in resident courses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(6), 627–641. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003632399>
- Nowell, C., Gale, L. R., & Handley, B. (2010). Assessing faculty performance using student evaluations of teaching in an uncontrolled setting. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(4), 463–475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930902862875>
- Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701293231>
- Palmer, M. S., Bach, D. J., & Streifer, A. C. (2014). Measuring the promise: A learning-focused syllabus rubric. *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, 33(1), 14–36. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tia2.20004>
- Reiner, C. M., & Arnold, K. E. (2010). Online course evaluation: Student and instructor perspectives and assessment potential. *Assessment Update*, 22(2), 8–10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/au.222>
- Risquez, A., Vaughan, E., & Murphy, M. (2015). Online student evaluations of teaching: What are we sacrificing for the affordances of technology? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(1), 210–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.890695>
- Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598–642. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313496870>

- Stanny, C. J., Gonzalez, M., & McGowan, B. (2015). Assessing the culture of teaching and learning through a syllabus review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(7), 898–913. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.956684>
- Stark, P. B., & Freishtat, R. (2014). An evaluation of course evaluations. *ScienceOpen Research*. <https://doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AOFRQA.v1>