

# HOW TO WRITE A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW ESSAY PEER

*Key Indexing Terms: Review Literature; Authorship; Peer Review, research; Manuscripts; Meta- analysis Information used to write this paper was collected.*

Watch Video Early career researchers and the pressure to publish Early career researcher Patricia Garcez discusses the challenges and opportunities facing ECRs in building an international reputation in the 21st Century. In addition to critical thinking, a literature review needs consistency, for example in the choice of passive vs. This is the case not just at the writing stage, but also for readers if the diagram is included in the review as a figure. For people writing literature reviews for articles or books, this system also could work, especially when you are writing in a field with which you are already familiar. Rule 6: Be Critical and Consistent Reviewing the literature is not stamp collecting. The need to keep a review focused can be problematic for interdisciplinary reviews, where the aim is to bridge the gap between fields [18]. Once the sample studies have been shortlisted, they are analyzed in detail. This will also help avoid duplication. The protocol needs to be submitted to the journal along with your manuscript. Once you complete these six steps, you will have a complete draft of your literature review. This could create a conflict of interest: how can reviewers report objectively on their own work [25]? Set a specific time frame for how long you will search. It is important to be careful in noting the references already at this stage, so as to avoid misattributions. Jeger, D. Make sure that you only get articles and books in those areas, even if you come across fascinating books in other areas. It is generally helpful to draw a conceptual scheme of the review, e. Instead, focus on using the literature review to aid in setting a foundation for the manuscript. Matoni, and D. A careful selection of diagrams and figures relevant to the reviewed topic can be very helpful to structure the text too [22]. These connections are supported by the evidence provided. Criteria must be established at the outset for what constitutes a relevant study and what does not. When systematic reviews analyse quantitative results in a quantitative way, they become meta-analyses. Most journals expect authors of systematic reviews to use the PRISMA statement or similar other guidelines to write their protocol. They basically fall into 2 broad categories: narrative reviews and systematic reviews. Some scientists may be overly enthusiastic about what they have published, and thus risk giving too much importance to their own findings in the review. It is challenging to achieve a successful review on all these fronts. It is however advisable to reread the draft one more time before submission, as a last-minute correction of typos, leaps, and muddled sentences may enable the reviewers to focus on providing advice on the content rather than the form. Second, instead of citing the original article, they cite a related article that mentions the original article. Step One: Decide on your areas of research: Before you begin to search for articles or books, decide beforehand what areas you are going to research. The breadth of evidence mapping helps to identify evidence gaps, and may guide future research efforts. If you are writing a review on, for example, how epidemiological approaches are used in modelling the spread of ideas, you may be inclined to include material from both parent fields, epidemiology and the study of cultural diffusion. Including material just for the sake of it can easily lead to reviews that are trying to do too many things at once. Lonsdale, A. This helps describe and also advance your ideas. Weisberg, and X. Rule 9: Include Your Own Relevant Research, but Be Objective In many cases, reviewers of the literature will have published studies relevant to the review they are writing.