The rMETRIQ Score

		0	1	2	3
CONTENT	1	**Does the resource provide enough background information to situate the user?**	No, the information presented within the resource cannot be situated within its broader context without looking up information independently.	No, the information presented within the resource cannot be situated within its broader context, but users are directed to other valuable resources with this information.	Yes, the resource provides sufficient background information to situate the user.	Yes, the resource provides sufficient background information to situate the user and also directs users to other valuable resources related to the topic.
	2	**Does the resource contain an appropriate amount of information for its length?**	Insufficient content.	Lots of unnecessary, redundant, or missing content.	Some unnecessary, redundant, or missing content, but most content was essential.	No unnecessary, redundant, or missing content; all content was essential.
	3	**Is the resource well written and formatted?**	The resource is poorly written and/or formatted, and should not be a resource for learning.	The resource is somewhat well-written and formatted, but could benefit from substantive editing (e.g. grammatical errors are seen, or better organized).	The resource is reasonably well-written and formatted, but aspects of the organization or presentation are distracting or otherwise detrimental to learning.	The resource is very well-written and formatted in a way that optimizes and benefits learning.
CREDIBILITY	4	**Does the resource cite its references?**	No, no references are cited.	Yes, there are references listed but they do not map to specific statements within the resource.	Yes, the references are cited and clearly map to specific statements within the resource, but statements of fact that are not common knowledge are made without the support of a reference.	Yes, the references are cited, clearly map to specific statements within the resource, and all statements of fact that are not common knowledge are supported with a reference.
	5	**Is it clear who created the resource and do they have any conflicts of interest?**	No, the author of the resource has significant conflicts of interest; or the author is not clearly identified (e.g. no name or a pseudonym is used).	Yes, the identity of the author is clear, but they do not list their qualifications or disclose whether they have any conflicts of interest.	Yes, the identity and qualifications of the author are clear, but they do not disclose whether they have any conflicts of interest.	Yes, the identity and qualifications of the author are clear and they specify that they have no relevant conflicts of interest.
REVIEW	6	**Are the editorial and pre-publication peer review processes that were used to create the resource clearly outlined?**	No, it is unclear whether or not the website has a review process; or, there is no process.	Yes, a review process is mentioned on the website, but it was not clearly described.	Yes, a clear review process is described on the website, but it was not clear whether it was applied to the resource.	Yes, a clear review process is described on the website and it was clearly applied to the resource.
	7	**Is there evidence of post-publication commentary on the resource's content by its users?**	No, there was no mechanism to leave comments; or comments that were present were either unrelated to the post or unprofessional.	There was a mechanism to leave comments but none had been made.	Yes, some comments have been made on the resource, but a robust discussion about the resource's content has not occurred.	Yes, a robust discussion of the resource's content has occurred that expands upon the content of the resource.