

## A guideline for reviewing a clinical research paper

Lyndon V. Hernandez, MD, MPH,<sup>1</sup> Lauren B. Gerson, MD, MSc<sup>2</sup>

Milwaukee, Wisconsin; San Francisco, California, USA

Peer review is one of the most fundamental principles of high-quality scientific publication. Like our democratic justice system—in which a fair trial is received with a jury of one's peers—medical journals and many funding institutions rely on peer review to assess the scientific quality and novelty of manuscripts and research work. In turn, we look for it to be a seamless endeavor resulting in a perfect final outcome. Often, however, it is not. Peer review is thought to be an essential tool for advancing science and medicine, despite the fact that peer review can be inconsistent, prone to bias, and has limited evidence of its effectiveness.<sup>1,2</sup> Moreover, few guidelines exist on how to critique a paper and how to manage the inherent flaws of the review process. Herein we present our recommended systematic approach for reviewing clinical research papers, highlighting the inner workings of our *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* (GIE) review process, and emphasizing what we expect from reviewers and how we measure a quality review.

### SYSTEMATIC APPROACH FOR CRITIQUING A MANUSCRIPT

#### Reviewing the manuscript

Read the manuscript as a skeptic but approach it objectively from a bird's-eye view, letting go of your preconceived dogmas to allow the evidence to unfold before you. In other words, beware of your own cognitive bias. As you read the manuscript, you do not have to go from front to back; in fact, many seasoned reviewers advise against this because it hinders efficiency. It is also almost impossible to read the manuscript only once and expect a thorough, even-handed critique. A survey of our top GIE reviewers revealed that it takes an average of 3 hours to create a thorough review. Even experts in the field

routinely survey the medical literature before forming their opinions. It is recommended that you read the manuscript at least twice.

**The first pass.** The main objective of the study must be clearly stated. Remember, many respected medical journals insist on a single primary endpoint. Take a look at the overall picture. Are there flaws in how subjects were selected? Were subjects excluded from the analysis, and if so, does it over-inflate the final outcome? Are the main results of the analysis clearly stated? Are the conclusions justified by the results?

Perform a brief PubMed search of the topic to see whether articles have been published on this topic and to consider how this manuscript might add to the current literature. *GIE* and other similar journals make this easy by providing links directly to search engines using the key topics of the manuscript. If there have been similar and recent publications on this topic, then *GIE* will likely reject the submission early in the review process. Often, this might occur by a preliminary review from the assigned Associate Editor, which would eliminate the process of peer review altogether. Another reason for early rejection is detection by the Associate Editor of obvious flaws in the study design or overall scientific methods.

**The second pass.** This is a good time to pause, to envision what the study should look like, and to ask yourself: is it clear what the investigators are doing, and is the entire manuscript consistent and focused? Appraise the rationale of the study, results, and conclusion.

#### Writing your critique

**Summarize the manuscript in 2 to 4 well-written sentences.** This may seem like a waste of time, but encapsulating the study *in your own words* not only shows the authors that you actually took the time and effort to read their

*Abbreviations:* CONSORT, Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials; GIE, Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; STROBE, Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology.

**DISCLOSURE:** All authors disclosed no financial relationships relevant to this publication.

Copyright © 2015 by the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy 0016-5107/\$36.00

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gie.2015.05.015>

Received April 6, 2015. Accepted May 6, 2015.

Current affiliation: Medical College of Wisconsin and GI Associates, Milwaukee, Wisconsin (1), Gastroenterology Research Program, California Pacific Medical Center and University of California San Francisco (2), San Francisco, California, USA.

Reprint requests: Dr. Lyndon V. Hernandez, Medical College of Wisconsin/GI Associates, 3111 W. Rawson Avenue, Suite 240, Franklin, WI 53132.

work, it will also serve as the basis of your evaluation, making it easier for you to build on your observations. It should include study design, patient selection criteria, main outcome measured, and a highlight of the results. An example of a well-written review, with comments, can be accessed online.<sup>3</sup>

**Divide your critique into major and minor comments.** Reserve elements that have no major bearing on the study, such as syntax or grammar and quality of tables and graphs or figures, for minor comments. We encourage international submissions, and if needed we have copyeditors to address grammatical errors. Like most international journals, we acknowledge that only a portion of our writers have the luxury of being raised in the Mother tongue of our journal. Make every effort to judge a manuscript on its science. Bad grammar is fixable. Bad science is not. For the major comments, ideally present your critique in orderly sequence as follows

- **Title and authorship.** Does the manuscript title convey the scientific question posed in an accurate and succinct manner? Does the title describe the type of study performed (prospective randomized controlled trial, retrospective database, meta-analysis, or clinical review)? Asking questions or stating the results in the title should generally be avoided. Is the number of authors and the role of each justified for the article? Did each author contribute enough to satisfy criteria for authorship, including contribution to the study idea and design, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting and/or revision of the article, and providing final approval?
- **Abstract.** We have recently adopted a more universal format, requiring only 4 abstract headings: Background and Aims, Methods, Results, and Conclusions. Are the results of the study easy to interpret and do they use the correct descriptive terms? Is the conclusion supported by the data? Occasionally, the conclusion over-reaches beyond the scope of the study and needs to be deconstructed and toned down.
- **Introduction.** What is the rationale for the study? Many investigators falter here by not clearly stating the disease burden and what is already known and, most importantly, failing to make a case for the significance or novelty of the study. If you as the reviewer do not get it, most of the general readers will undoubtedly miss it, and so the significance of the study *has* to be plainly stated. Even if you are not convinced about the significance of the study from the start, stay open-minded and continue with your appraisal. Occasionally, you will come across a study that goes against conventional wisdom, but the aim of the study is clear and dovetails to a well-executed study design. Remember, your role is to provide as much information as possible so the Associate Editor can make a decision on the manuscript. It is no doubt better to err on the side of supplying the Associate Editor more than enough evidence for or against a manuscript rather than too little. In addition, does the Introduction state the hypothesis of the study and the

aim(s)? Is the length of the introduction section appropriate or too long? A common mistake is to try to present a full review article in the Background section. The goal is to bring the reader “up to speed” as quickly and thoroughly as needed to understand why the study was done.

- **Methods.** The core principles in critiquing this most important section are to promote clarity and transparency and to minimize bias.<sup>4</sup> Approval by an institutional review board and clinical trials registration, where required, should be stated. The authors should highlight the type of data collected, including patient demographics; duration of the condition; medications used; presence of comorbidities; treatments rendered including medical, surgical, radiographic, or endoscopic therapy; and duration of follow-up. This section should include a definition of outcomes, for example, explaining that the presence of anemia is defined as hemoglobin level less than 10 g/dL.

Below are reporting guidelines that are a valuable checklist to efficiently appraise various types of submissions. In our experience, we have found that although *GIE* mandates that authors adhere to Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT), Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE), and Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines, we still occasionally detect deficiencies that need to be implemented.

- Randomized controlled trials: CONSORT.<sup>5</sup>
- Observational studies: STROBE guidelines.<sup>6</sup>
- Meta-analysis: PRISMA.<sup>7</sup> The authors need to state how the literature search was performed and which search engines were used and should include which variables were extracted and the software program used for meta-analysis. The authors may want to show the actual search terms in an appendix. How was heterogeneity assessed and was testing for publication bias performed?
- Diagnostic tests: Standards for Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy.<sup>8</sup>
- Health economic studies: *British Medical Journal* economics checklist.<sup>9</sup>
- **Statistical analysis.** Although you are not expected to know the intricacies of statistical analysis, you can opine on the proper approach and how bias was or should have been mitigated. Statistics can also be overused to support the conclusions in a study, such as presenting statistically significant *P* values for associations that are not clinically relevant. Another common error is the calculation of multiple *P* values in the manuscript for secondary analyses without use of the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons. Sample size estimation should be included ideally for any clinical trial, showing how it was performed to determine whether the study was adequately powered to reach the desired conclusion. The manuscript should mention the type of program used for calculations (including Microsoft Excel, Statistical

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6097700>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6097700>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)