

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_109629</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>How to Read and Interpret a Scientific Article</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>YES.</b> Even though there are several articles on critically reading a manuscript, I feel more awareness is still needed.</li> <li>2. <b>YES.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Abstract needs some changes.</b> There are some complex/compound sentences that can be simplified for better reading. Some sentences are wordy too. Example – the phrase ‘that is’ adds nothing to the first sentence. ‘...information validated through scientific articles’ is good enough.</li> <li>4. Sections 1 and 2 should be combined together as Introduction. Add a section about the title and abstract. What critical information can the reader derive from the title?</li> <li>5. Manuscript is a narrative review and might not have covered all available literature on the topic. So, I do not see scientific flaws in it.</li> <li>6. With less than a dozen references, the article seems half-baked. There may be other perspectives that need to be added to make the observations more robust.</li> <li>7. “Approximately 6,000 articles are published every day;” This is based on data that is a decade old. There has been a further boom in publications. Are there any new data that can be added here.</li> <li>8. References 2 and 3 are from the same chapter of a book. But the authors mentioned are different. Did different authors write different sections of the chapter/lesson?</li> <li>9. “Scientific articles are classified into primary, secondary, or tertiary articles.” Please add ‘published in scholarly journals’ or ‘published in academic journals’ to distinguish it from other scientific articles such as theses, science articles published as blogs, on websites, in multimedia, popular magazines etc.</li> <li>10. Many authors consider narrative reviews also as secondary articles rather than tertiary. Please add alternative perspectives as well.</li> <li>11. This section does not seem like it is written by a native speaker of English. It is not clear and smooth to read. Please rephrase.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. “For an original article to be published in a scientific journal, an original article must present and written in a clear language that is understandable even to readers outside the medical field. They should also be replicable by the reader and well-structured to facilitate easy access to information. The results of the study should answer the research question and fulfill the purpose of the work. Accordingly, we will provide details on the structure and different sections of a research articleresults that have not been previously published but may have been reviewed.”</li> </ol> </li> <li>12. The section “ARTICLE TYPES” is a block of text. Consider breaking into paragraphs and adding more white space to aid reading. Also, combine it with the Introduction section. It is not until the last line of this that the actual objective of this article is clear.</li> <li>13. Mention about the different types of research papers and their hierarchy. If this is a guide for the clinicians, they should be able to judge that an RCT is better evidence than an observational study.</li> <li>14. As a reader, I would have preferred to have more guidance about what the title and abstract tell me about the study. Is there something in it that will help me decide if I want to read the full text of the paper?</li> <li>15. There is no coherence between these sentences. Please rephrase so that it is easy to read and comprehend. “At the end of the introduction, the objective of the work is stated which, in most cases, is the initial sentence in the discussion [6]. This is followed by the hypothesis and objectives of the study, as well as how the study can contribute to clinical</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>practice. The objective of a study is what the author is aiming to describe, understand, or evaluate.”</p> <p><b>16.</b> Each sentence here makes sense alone but together, they create confusion. One sentence should lead to the other. Please rephrase this _</p> <p>“The methods section describes the research protocol that leads to reproducible results when applied under the same conditions. The components of this section can be summarized by the mnemonic “SPLICA,” which stands for Study, Patients, Local, Intervention, Criteria, and Analyses [7].</p> <p>In general, the duration, hypothesis of the study, sample size calculation, statistical analyses, and ethical considerations should be described. One way to build and address a research question is by using the PICO model which stands for Patient/Problem, Intervention, Control/Comparison, and Outcome [8].”</p> <p><b>17.</b> “If the p-value is less than 0.05, it indicates a significant difference between the groups” Significance probability is a value set by the researcher according to the circumstances of each study, it does not necessarily have to be 0.05.</p> <p><b>18.</b> Many of the sentences talk about what the authors should or should not do. Instead, these should talk more about how the reader should and should not read and interpret what is written in the manuscript.</p> <p><b>19.</b> I am glad you spoke of how every person can have a different way of reading through an article. Also, the mention of a checklist for appraising the article is a good idea.</p> <p><b>20.</b> Somehow, I felt the article ended rather abruptly. Can you please modify the ending of the article?</p> <p><b>21.</b> It might be a good idea to add a table/figure to make your article more attractive.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Needs modification if it is for the global audience. Some sentences have colloquial phrases that may become difficult for others to understand. I suggest seeking the support of a language editor.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The article type mentioned here is “Original Research Article”. It is a narrative review.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Natasha Das
Department, University & Country	India