## *EDITORIAL*

# Synopsis of Manuscript Review

Scholars and students can analyze and evaluate the research of other expert professionals in a given field by using the article review method, which concentrates on a summary of the most recent research on the topic[1]. The significance of writing reviews are to offer a thorough basis on which a subject, describe the status of knowledge right now, find research gaps in current studies that might be addressed in the future and draw attention to the primary research approaches.

What has been done, what has been discovered, and how these findings are presented all contribute to the review's value. When preparing to write a review, the question "why" is more crucial than the question "how." The primary goal for creating a review is to compile the best literature sources for a significant research question or an active area of study into an easily understandable synthesis[2].

Review articles in the health sciences are becoming more and more important. Clinicians typically use review articles to update their knowledge in their area of expertise and as a starting point for developing recommendations. [3] These reviews are used by organizations that fund additional research to demonstrate the need for these studies. Murlow studied 50 review papers that were published in 1985 and 1986 and found that none of them fulfilled definite scientific standards.[4] In 1996 by an international group that reviewed articles and highlighted aspects of literature reviews and meta-analyses that did not adhere to scientific standards, but the QUOROM (QUality Of Reporting Of Meta-analyses) statement, which was developed, focused on meta-analyses of randomized controlled studies. PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) is a later update to this standard.[5]

A 27-item checklist is included in the PRISMA statement that is extended to generate well-designed review articles. It will be appropriate to meet these standards while writing a review article or performing a meta-analysis. Thus, it may be possible to prepare an understandable article with excellent scientific content[6].

Narrative and systematic reviews are the two subcategories of review articles. Narrative reviews are written in a style that is simple to read and allows for a broad analysis of the subject matter which rely on papers gathered over time and recommended by colleagues, Systematic reviews struggle to locate the best studies that can address the issues that were established at the outset of the review and in-depth literature survey on the chosen topic is carried out.[7] The two types of systematic reviews are qualitative and quantitative. A thorough literature review is done for both of them. In contrast, study data are gathered and quantitatively assessed (i.e., meta-analysis) in quantitative reviews.[8] A systematic review on a specific topic typically follows the same pattern as many research articles, with parts for the introduction, methods, results, and discussion[8].

The use of the appropriate method in review articles is crucial since it aids readers approach current material with objectivity. When employing research data to provide answers to specific queries, researchers may run across two issues. First, when choosing research papers, individuals may be biased or the articles actually may be biased. The review procedures should enable the researchers to define and use research with the least amount of bias possible in order to reduce this danger. The majority of studies have used tiny sample sizes, which is the second issue. The power of statistical analysis of the research improves through the use of statistical tools in meta-analyses[9].

The general structure of a systematic review includes the parts Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion, as is the case with many research articles. Introduction presents the problem and other issues covered in the review article. Methods that describe the process of research and assessment or the number of studies evaluated or selected. Result that states the quality, and outcomes of the selected studies. Discussion that summarizes results, limitations, and outcomes of the procedure and research[10].

The following sections comprise the steps for writing a good review article. Pre-title page: on this page, one should specify the type of article the reviewer is reviewing, the name of the journal in which it was published, the names of all authors who contributed to it, and the affiliations of the authors (position, department, institute, city, state, country, and email

address).Optional corresponding author information, including fax, email, name, and contact information. Running head: Only using APA style. It is the paper's title condensed to fewer than 40 characters. Summary page: Depending on one's instructor's requirements, optional. The maximum number of words for the summary is 800. Make use of simple, non-technical terminology. In this section, we must not repeat the text verbatim or reference any sources. Give relevant background information, describe the purpose of the research and list the findings and describe the methodology[11]. On the title page, there is a full title, a 250-word abstract, "Keywords:" and 4-6 keywords. There should be an introduction, a body with methods and results and discussion, conclusion references, and a page with optional suggested proof readings, tables, and figure legends. In conclusion, write a quick overview of the article's major elements, along with remarks on its importance, validity, and clarity. Comment, if justified on the field's implications for more study or debate[12].

Due to the growing use of research and practice based on evidence developing stronger evidence, review articles have thus evolved into vital tools for summarizing, synthesizing, integrating, or critically evaluating prior knowledge in the field of medical science.

***(J Bangladesh Coll Phys Surg 2023; 41: )***
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3329/jbcps.v41i3.67394

**Professor (Brig Gen Retd.) Mamun Mostafi**
*Professor & Head Department of Nephrology*
*Gonoshasthya Somajvittic Medical College & Gonoshasthya Hospitals*
*Dhaka, Bangladesh*

**Dr. Aminur Rahman**
*Assistant Professor, Dept. of Neurology*
*Sir Salimullah Medical College & Mitford Hospital, Dhaka, Bangladesh*

**References:**

1. Jahan N, Naveed S, Zeshan M, Tahir MA. How to Conduct a Systematic Review: A Narrative Literature Review. Cureus. 2016 Nov 4;8(11):e864
2. Becker L. A., Oxman A.D. In: Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. Higgins J. P. T., Green S., editors. Hoboken, nj: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2008. Overviews of reviews; pp. 607–631.
3. Oxman AD, Cook DJ, Guyatt GH. Users' guides to the medical 1 literature. VI. How to use an overview. Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. JAMA. 1994; 272:1367–71.
4. Mulrow CD. The medical review article: state of the science. Ann Intern Med. 1987; 106:485–8.
5. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2009;62:e1–34.
6. Montori V. M., Wilczynski N. L., Morgan D., Haynes R. B., Hedges T. Systematic reviews: a cross-sectional study of location and citation counts. bmc Medicine. 2003; 1:2.
7. Archer N., Fevrier-Thomas U., Lokker C., McKibbon K. A., Straus S.E. Personal health records: a scoping review. Journal of American Medical Informatics Association. 2011;18(4):515–522
8. Ahn E, Kang H. Introduction to systematic review and meta-analysis. Korean J Anesthesiol. 2018 Apr; 71(2):103-112.
9. O'Sullivan TA, Jefferson CG. A Review of Strategies for Enhancing Clarity and Reader Accessibility of Qualitative Research Results. Am J Pharm Educ. 2020 Jan;84(1):7124.
10. Jilcha Sileyew, Kassu. 'Research Design and Methodology'. Cyberspace, IntechOpen, 17 June 2020.
11. Elo, S., Kääriäinen, M., Kanste, O., Pölkki, T., Utriainen, K., & Kyngäs, H. Qualitative Content Analysis: A Focus on Trustworthiness. SAGE Open, 2014; 4(1).
12. Chebbout R, Heywood EG, Drake TM, Wild JR, Lee J, Wilson M, et al. A systematic review of the incidence of and risk factors for postoperative atrial fibrillation following general surgery. Anaesthesia. 2018; 73:490–8.