

# REVIEW METHODS

In the process of Peer-review of articles on the prospect of Orissa journal of otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery the following methods are adopted :

## *A.Submission:*

The authors submit their articles as per the instructions given in the “INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS” page mentioned in the journal website - [www.ojohns.com](http://www.ojohns.com) or that mentioned in last of the printed journal .Submission may be made through website by uploading the article after registering the author’s details or through the journal’s Email [editorodishaentjournal@gmail.com](mailto:editorodishaentjournal@gmail.com) or by sending the hard copy of the article.The author(s)has (have) to send the copyright transfer letter ,title page,manuscript,photographs ,legends of the photograph(s),and references of the articles separately addressing to the editor of the journal .However the editorial board now encourage all the authors to submit their articles though the website submission.

## *B.Scrutinisation:*

Once received all the articles are verified about the completeness of submission and these then are enrolled and each article is then entitled a serial number .Then the title of the articles ,manuscript along with abstract,legends of the photographs and references are encoded with the serial number without any encryption of name and address(es) of the authors ,so that when sent to the reviewers name and address(es) of the authors will be remained undisclosed .Each titled article with its serial number is sent for review to two of our peer reviewers non selectively but usually the articles addressing any particular issue(s) are sent through Email to those reviewers specialized or expert in that subject or particular issue. We send the questionnaires as given at ,to our reviewers along with articles so that they would review in that line. The reviewers are to review within a time limit of one month .Usually we are flexible to some extent in respect of time limit of reviewing as the journal is being published twice per year. An article after review by the reviewers; if accepted or rejected by both the reviewers for that concerned article will be taken as final as such for further correspondences. But if two reviewers differ in opinion regarding the acceptance of the article then the decision of the editor in chief would be final.

## **KEY POINT QUESTIONAIRES FOR REVIEWERS**

1. Are the citations complete? Is the work original?Is the science of high quality?
2. Is the abstract relevant in all aspect with the whole content?
3. Are the study’s research questions relevant?
4. Was there a clear statement of the purpose and aims of the research? Is there enough new information in the paper to justify publication?
5. Do you have any editorial/presentation suggestions?
6. Was the study repeated?
7. Indicate the strengths of the paper & Indicate the weaknesses.
8. **Does the study design is appropriate for the research question?**
9. Are there any questions remain unanswered?
10. Was informed consent obtained and is it clear why some individuals chose not to participate?
11. Was the sample size sufficient?
12. Is this representative of the larger population?
13. Was the description about the control sufficient?
14. **Does the study methods address the key potential sources of bias?**

**15. Key points to consider in review of literature and meta analysis**

1. Were all relevant studies included (i.e. was the search comprehensive, did it exclude articles on the basis of publication status or language and was the potential for publication bias assessed)?
2. Were selected articles appraised and data extracted by two independent reviewers?
3. Was sufficient detail provided about the primary studies, including descriptions of the patients, interventions and outcomes?
4. Was the quality of the primary studies assessed?
5. Did the researchers assess the appropriateness of combining results to calculate a summary measure?
6. Was relevant background literature reviewed?

**16. Questions on Randomised controlled trial:-**

1. Was the process of treatment allocation truly random?
2. Would participants have been able to know or guess their treatment allocation?
3. Were participants and researchers 'blinded' to participants' treatment group?
4. Were outcomes assessed objectively?
5. Were all participants who were randomly allocated a treatment accounted for in the final analysis?
6. Were all participants' data analyzed in the group to which they were randomly allocated?<sup>a</sup>

**17. Questions on Cohort studies**

- a. Is the study prospective or retrospective?
- b. Is the cohort representative of a defined group or population?
- c. Were there important losses to follow-up?
- d. Were participants followed up for a sufficient length of time?

**18. Was the study done in the original line of protocol?**

**19. Does the study test a proposed hypothesis?**

**20. Was the statistical analysis done correctly?**

**21. Key methodological points**

1. Were the cases clearly defined?
2. Were the cases representative of a defined population?
3. How were the controls selected and were they drawn from the same population as the cases?
4. Were study measures identical for cases and controls?
5. Were study measures objective or subjective and is recall bias likely if they were subjective?
6. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate for this study?

**22. Do the data and conclusions contradict each other? Do the data justify the conclusion?**

**23. How could future studies be improved?**

**24. Are all the references pertinent?**

**25. How much would you give score to the article overall?**

**Adapted from:**

1. © Law et al., 1998 Guidelines for Critical Review Form – Qualitative Studies Guidelines for Critical Review of Qualitative Studies Based on Guidelines for Critical Review Form-Qualitative Studies by © Law, M., Stewart, D., Letts, L., Pollock, N., Bosch, J., & Westmorland, M., 1998

<http://wwwfhs.mcmaster.ca/rehab/ebp/> <http://www-fhs.mcmaster.ca/rehab/ebp/pdf/qualguidelines.pdf>

<http://wwwfhs.mcmaster.ca/rehab/ebp/pdf/qualreview.pdf>, Giacomini, Cook. Users' Guides to the Medical Literature XXIII, JAMA 2000; 284: 357-362, Giacomini, Cook. Users' Guides to the Medical Literature XXIII, JAMA 2000; 284: 478-482, CASP 10 Question to help make sense of the literature <http://www.public-health.or.uk/casp/qualitative.html> and Law, Stewart, Letts, Pollock, Bosch, Westmorland.

*2. How to Critically Appraise an Article*

Jane M Young; Michael J Solomon

Nat Clin Pract Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2009;6(2):82-91.

1. [twp.duke.edu/uploads/media\\_items/scientificarticlereview.original.pdf](http://twp.duke.edu/uploads/media_items/scientificarticlereview.original.pdf)

<http://twp.duke.edu/writing-studio> How to Read and Review a Scientific Journal Article:  
Writing Summaries and Critiques