



How to Read and Interpret a Scientific Article: A Short Note

**Fernando Luiz Rolemberg Dantas^{a,b*},
Julia Alvarenga Bernardes^a,
Fernanda De Luca Felicíssimo^a,
Victor Kelles Tupy da Fonseca^a
and Alessandra Hubner de Souza^a**

^a Faculdade de Ciências Médicas de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brasil.

^b Neurological Surgery, Biocor Instituto/Rede D'Or, Belo Horizonte, Brasil.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JAMMR/2023/v35i235306

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/109629>

Short Communication

Received: 30/09/2023

Accepted: 03/12/2023

Published: 06/12/2023

ABSTRACT

Evidence-based medicine is an approach to clinical practice that uses information that is validated using scientific methods. As such information is disseminated through scientific articles, clinicians should be able to efficiently read and interpret them. This article presents the reader with the principles of critical reading and analysis of scientific articles. This includes the fundamentals of study design, article structure, statistical analysis, sources of error, and study limitations. Readers need fundamental knowledge for the accurate selection and interpretation of scientific articles, without the need for extensive methodological knowledge.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: dantasfernando2@gmail.com;

Keywords: Scientific articles; critical reading; interpretation; publication; clinical practice.

1. INTRODUCTION

Despite the importance of critical reading for clinicians and researchers, many individuals within these professions have not mastered this skill. Approximately 6,000 articles are published every day; therefore, clinicians and researchers must consistently stay updated with the latest medical literature [1]. But recently these publications have become more frequent. As of 2022, over 5.14 million academic articles are published per year, including short surveys, reviews, and conference proceedings.

However, owing to the availability of scientific content from various databases, critical reading of the existing material is essential for determining whether currently published information can provide healthcare services of higher quality. Alatore describes research as a human activity carried out to acquire knowledge that can be used to understand and manage real-life problems, make discoveries, and establish new inventions [2]. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has stated that an article should effectively communicate the results of research, ideas, and debates in a clear, concise and reliable manner. Therefore, every medical publication must be clear, relevant to the field, and up-to-date [3]. This article aims to explain the proper approach to reading and interpreting an article.

Publications are classified primary, secondary and tertiary. Primaries present research results or findings from systematic observation. The most common types are the original article, a brief communication or clinical case. Secondary sources include systematic reviews with or without meta-analyses, guidelines, letters to the editor, and articles on research methodology. Finally, tertiary articles include narrative reviews, scientific letters, or opinion pieces and editorials [4].

The original article must be presented and written in clear and simple language, even for readers outside the medical field, and must be short and well-structured to facilitate access to information. Your results must answer the research question and fulfill the objective of the work.

Below we will describe details about the structure and different specifications of a scientific article

2. ARTICLE STRUCTURE

Every article starts with a title page that includes the title of the study and the names and affiliations of the authors. Some journals include the dates of submission and acceptance on the title page. This is followed by the abstract, which includes a summary of the study and can have a structured or unstructured format. A structured abstract is typically organized under the following subheadings: introduction, methods, results, and conclusion, while an unstructured abstract does not include subheadings.

The main text of an original article is usually divided into the following sections: Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion (IMRAD) [5]. Each section should essentially include specific information that is well-organized in a logical manner. Moreover, the information in each section should be self-contained, coherent, and consistent. Each section should be clear, rigorous, objective, and concise, without any redundancy [6].

The Introduction section should include the research question, the relevance of the study, what is already known, and what still requires evidence. The objective(s) of the study should be stated at the end of the introduction. The Methods section should describe the type of the study (e.g., observational or experimental, prospective or retrospective), the study population and/or sample, and how the authors attempted to answer the research question. The Results section describes the outcomes of the study when the methods were carried out. Preferably, tables, graphics, and figures should be included. The Discussion section should demonstrate the significance of the results in clinical practice. In the following sections, we will provide details on each section of a research article, focusing on the most important components.

2.1 Title

Is the most simplified and condensed version of the article, it should attract attention, and it is necessary to express in a few words all aspects of the study. Must be accurate, informative, complete and created from survey question.

2.2 Abstract

The importance of the summary cannot be overstated. Typically, journals impose a maximum word count of between 150 and 300 words, as well as mandatory title nomenclature to be used in the abstract. Abstracts are often written in the third person and need to provide enough information so that they can be read and the details of the study understood independently of the rest of the manuscript.

2.3 Introduction

In the introduction section, the author must provide background information about the research topic. Therefore, a good practice is to ask certain questions before starting to read an article. For example: When was the last relevant study conducted? Is it a frequently discussed theme? Is it always the same team that writes on the topic? How important is the topic in one's day-to-day life? How does this work fit into a broader context? In this section, the author contextualizes an article related to the theme of the study. 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 practice. The objective of a study is what the author is aiming to describe, understand, or evaluate. A well-written introduction is fundamental to the quality of an article because it captures the reader's attention by clearly addressing the research topic.

2.4 Methods

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, Location, Intervention, Criteria and Analysis [7]. In general, the duration, study hypothesis, sample size calculation, statistical analyzes and ethical considerations should be described. In this section it should be described whether the PICO model was used to construct the research question. PICO, which stands for Patient, Intervention, Control and Outcome[8].

In addition, the study design should be clearly described. For example, it should be stated whether it is a prospective, retrospective, or cross-sectional study, whether it is a randomized

single- or double-blinded study, and whether it is an interventional study or a systematic review. In addition, the quality of the work is determined by this section, and any defects in the methods can lead to negative comments on the study. Such defects include problems in bias randomization and blinding, and the occurrence of systematic errors and bias resulting from improper classification or selection. Bias can lead to the overestimation or underestimation of the results. [9]. The methods section should also include the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study subjects. The former refers to the characteristics that make the study reliable and standardized, such as demographics and clinical aspects. The latter includes characteristics that can be a source of bias and compromise the validity of the results [10].

After reading the methods section, it is pertinent to pose specific questions. Some of these are summarized as follows: Is the study design suited to fulfill the aims of the study? Is the study confirmatory, exploratory, or descriptive in nature? What specific study type was chosen, and does it effectively address the study's objectives? Is the study's endpoint clearly and precisely defined [10]?

2.5 Results

The results section presents the outcomes of the study. It usually includes text supported by well-organized tables and figures. For example, a diagram can be used to describe the study population. This section should include the answer to the main research analyzing the subgroups. It should not describe the methods in detail or explain the reasons behind the results because these are described in other sections.

In the results section, the significance of differences between groups is determined using appropriate statistical methods and is typically denoted by the letter p. 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.

Another parameter that is included in this section is the confidence interval. It represents the pre-specified range of values within which the observed mean deemed acceptable. A 95% confidence interval indicates that if the study were repeated 100 times using the same

methodology, the observed average would fall within the confidence limits in at least 95 instances [11].

2.6 Discussion

The discussion section should confirm that the objectives of the study have been met and explain the importance of the results in the clinical context. This section could be divided into four segments. The first segment includes a summary of the results and demonstrates whether the initial research objectives were achieved. Generally, the first sentence of the discussion responds to the last sentence of the introduction, which is called the key sentence. The second segment involves a critical evaluation of the work, including comparisons of the findings of the current study with those of previous studies. The third segment focuses on highlighting the future implications of the work and the originality of the study. The fourth segment offers concluding remarks on the study, explaining the contribution of the study to the current state of knowledge on the research topic. The discussion primarily involves the authors' interpretation of the results and the implications of the study. This section should be clear, consistent, accurate, and easy to communicate to the reader.

2.7 Conclusions

The conclusions must be in accordance with the study objectives. The authors should base their conclusions solely on the findings of their own research and not extrapolate from other studies. Additionally, the conclusion may include gaps in the existing literature on the subject and propose potential directions for future studies.

3. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following the main text of an article, statements regarding funding and conflict of interest related to the article are included. Previous studies have demonstrated that the results of scientific articles for which the authors have declared a conflict of interest are better than those for which none was declared [8].

Scientific articles present a hierarchy of importance related to their power as scientific evidence. Systematic reviews with meta-analysis are at the top of the chain, followed by randomized clinical trials, cohort studies, case-control studies, cross sectional studies, animal trials & in vitro studies and lastly are case reports, opinion papers and letters.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In summary, a scientific article is more appealing when it features a compelling title; a well-structured and consistent summary; a clear and concise hypothesis; simple, clear, and well-organized methods; explanatory results; engaging discussion; coherence between research questions, results, and discussion; and methodological congruence.

Reading scientific papers is an important task in the medical field. A reader should maintain focus and avoid being biased regarding the topic. To quickly gauge the relevance of an article, it is advisable to begin with the title, as it provides insights into the study's objectives, design, and the population under investigation. Then, the reader should proceed to scan the abstract, which serves as a succinct summary of the article. However, there is no specific technique for quickly reading an entire article. The reader would eventually discover the most suitable reading technique after accumulating sufficient experience. For example, the reader can start by scanning the figures and charts and then carefully reading the article, looking for the research question, and then asking: Is this study necessary for me and the community? It is important to reread the article and take notes while reading, which improves understanding and memorizing the information included in the article. The reader should ask further questions and summarize the article in a few sentences.

After the final reading of the scientific work, some questions should be asked to assess the quality of the study. For example: Did the results answer the research questions? Are the selected methods appropriate? Were all solutions considered? Have the study limitations been addressed? Does the study include any source of bias? Is this study useful? Can the study be reproduced? If all the answers to all questions were positive, then the scientific work is of good quality. Further credibility criteria can be used to further assess the quality of a scientific article. These include the study design, method of randomization and data collection, masking techniques, efficacy and effectiveness of the methods, the follow-up time, the loss of follow-up (>20% of the work lost quality), and the inclusion and exclusion criteria [2]. Du prel et al. described a checklist for evaluating a scientific article concerning the design, inception, implementation, analysis, and evaluation of the study [10].

Reading and interpreting a scientific article means evaluating the evidence of its validity, that is, knowing which results should be accepted and which should be rejected.

CONSENT

It is not applicable.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

It is not applicable.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that no competing interests exist, and no financial support was received from any organization for the submitted work. All the authors declare that they have no financial relationships at present or within the previous three years with any organization that might have an interest in the submitted work. All authors have declared that there are no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

REFERENCES

1. Gibney E. How to tame the flood of literature. *Nature*. 2014;513(7516):129-30. DOI: 10.1038/513129a
2. Alatore WEB. Leitura crítica de artigos científicos. In: Falavigna A, Avila JMJ. Educação em pesquisa: da ideia à publicação. Cxias do Sul, RS: EDUCS. 2015;287-90
3. Guyot JP. Leitura crítica de artigos científicos. In: Falavigna A, Avila JMJ. Educação em pesquisa: da ideia à publicação. Cxias do Sul, RS: EDUCS; 2015;129-37
4. Falavigna A, Avila JMJ. Educação em pesquisa: da ideia à publicação. Caxias do Sul, RS: EducS; 2015
5. Sollaci LB, Pereira MG. The introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) structure: A fifty-year survey. *J Med Libr Assoc*. 2004;92(3):364-7.
6. Bouadana L. Points clés de la lecture d'un article. *Journées de formation de la société de réanimation de langue française*. 2016. Available: <https://www.srlf.org/> Accessed 07 November 2023.
7. Narain AS, Hijji KH, Kudaravalli KT, Singh K. Cervical arthroplasty: do conflicts of interest influence the outcome of clinical studies? *Spine J*. 2017;17(7):1026-32. DOI: 10.1016/j.spinee.2017.03.018
8. Santos CM da C, Pimenta CA de M, Nobre MRC. The PICO strategy for the research question construction and evidence search. *Rev Latino-Am Enfermagem*. 2007;15(3):508-11. DOI: 10.1590/s0104-11692007000300023
9. Boiano JM, Sestito JPE, Luckhaupt SE, Robinson CF, Walker JT. *Epidemiology*. In: Charney W, editor. *Handbook of modern hospital safety*. 2nd ed. CRC Press; 2009; 262
10. Flechner L, Tseng TY. Understanding results: P-values, confidence intervals, and number need to treat. *Indian J Urol*. 2011;27(4):532-5. DOI: 10.4103/0970-1591.91447.
11. du Prel JB, Röhrig B, Blettner M. Critical appraisal of scientific articles: part 1 of a series on evaluation of scientific publications. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*. 2009; 106(7):100-5. DOI: 10.3238/arztebl.2009.0100

© 2023 Dantas et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/109629>