



The Modern Review of a Scientific Article

A Revisão Moderna de um Artigo Científico

The scientific review of a journal is a fundamental quality element. Reviewer's work requires agility, scientific knowledge, objectivity, confidentiality and impartiality. On the other hand, reviewers benefit by exposure to the latest developments in their fields, facilitating their keeping up-to-date with the latest publications^{1,2}.

To standardizes the way to review a scientific article is the current trend among specialized journals.

In a similar way to the new requirements determined for authors in the creation of a more appropriate structured article, the way in which they are analyzed goes through transformations, aiming to follow the scientific evolution and the new tendencies of evidence based medicine. Many changes are in progress in our Journal, following this worldwide tendency.

The submission process begins with the structural validation of an article. At this initial moment the content is not evaluated. If the structure is not suitable for the type of study, the submission is interrupted and the article returned to the author. Structurally appropriate articles follow for the first stage of analysis, where a quick-thinking analysis of the abstract is performed. The theme of the study and the scope of the journal are confronted and analyzed by the Editors. Only from this moment are the reviewers appointed and the Review process itself begins.

Reduction of subjectivity, use of standardized tools and authorship blindness intents to total neutrality on the part of the reviewers for the approval or rejection of an article. For that, simpler and more objective questionnaires have allowed decision making in a more continuous way. In addition, the standardization of the criteria favored the creation of a "style" for the Journal, making it easier for authors to identify it, in order to decide if the journal is suitable for their study.

Among the investigations to the reviewers, is the evaluation of the pertinence of the type of study and the adequate ethical documentation, including registration of clinical trials.

Once the article is submitted, the confidentiality of its content and the entire process must be certified. During review process, the Journal must ensure that there is no possibility of disclosure of any part of their content prior to the final decision. In this context, even if the reviewer uses third-party assistance to review a study

or subject, the responsibility for confidentiality must be guaranteed by him³.

Reviewers should reinforce attention when analyzing an article, in the active search for signs of plagiarism⁴. Contents of the body of the text, tables and figures may be the source of this unlawful act. If an article is published and presented as a plagiarism, it is the responsibility of the authors, but also of the Journal. The editorial board, including reviewers, carry out, through electronic tools, an active search for signs of plagiarism.

Precise literary and grammatical style as well as clarity, aesthetics and originality in tables and figures are very important factors and they increase the chances of acceptance of an article. It is a general tendency to value schemas, illustrations, algorithms and tables at a time when the speed of information is increasing. In the same way, the precise choice of keywords can be decisive for approval. A well-made summary and appropriately chosen terms can be differential in the number of times an article is located and consequently quoted. All these factors are objectively considered by the Scientific Reviewers.

Finally, the analysis of the cited references is also a stage of great importance, since it is one of the supporters of the category of the article and of the Journal. The choice of references based on current events, relevance, citation of national and international authors and their impact makes the article more important and with greater power to disseminate knowledge. Likewise, our reviewers evaluate the cited references to guarantee the quality of the article.

DOV GOLDENBERG
Editor-in-Chief RBCP

REFERENCES

1. Pytynia KB. Why Participate in Peer Review as a Journal Manuscript Reviewer: What's in It for You? *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2017;156(6):976-7. DOI: 10.1177/0194599816669661
2. Pierno A, Fruscio R, Bellani G. [The recognition of peer reviewers activity: the potential promotion of a virtuous circle.] *Recenti Prog Med.* 2017;108(9):355-9. Italian. DOI: 10.1701/2745.27985
3. Al-Khatib A, Teixeira da Silva JA. Is Biomedical Research Protected from Predatory Reviewers? *Sci Eng Ethics.* 2017 Sep 13. DOI: 10.1007/s11948-017-9964-5. [Epub ahead of print]
4. Juyal D, Thawani V, Thaledi S. Plagiarism: an egregious form of misconduct. *N Am J Med Sci.* 2015;7(2):77-80. DOI: 10.4103/1947-2714.152084