



---

## Article Review Overview

---

Please use these slides and the article review instruction sheet to conduct your article review



---

## Scholarly Journals

- Publish original reports of research
  
- Why Original?
  - The first published accounts of research
  - Primary sources of information
  - Details the methodology used
  - In depth description and discussion of findings
  - Peer reviewed
  
- Research summaries reported in textbooks, popular magazines, newspapers, etc
  - Secondary resources- provide only global description of result and methodology



## Peer Review

---

- Peer review
  - A critical element of scholarly publication, and one of the major cornerstones of the scientific process.
  
  - Serves two key functions:
    - Acts as a filter:
      - Ensures research is properly verified before being published
    - Improves the quality of the research:
      - Rigorous review by other experts helps to hone key points and correct inadvertent errors



## General Guidelines- Prereading

---

1. Read the first few paragraphs where the author usually provides a general introduction of the problem area.
  1. It gives a feel for the author's writing style and their general perspective on the research problem
  
2. Jump to the last paragraph in the introduction section. Authors typically list their research questions here.
  
3. Scan the rest of the articles- noting all headings and sub-headings
  
4. Scan the text in each section and subsection
  1. Do not get caught up in the details or any point that seem difficult or confusing
  2. Your purpose at this point is to get an overview



## Prereading - Importance

---

- Widely recommended as the first step in reading reports
- Provides an overview of the purpose and contents of a report
- Helps to keep an eye on the bigger picture as one subsequently work through the details of the report from beginning to end



## Reading

---

1. As you read- Summarize the main points
2. Remember to note the page number where the idea is mentioned in the paper, especially if you are copying an author's word verbatim
3. Look for explicit definitions of key terms
4. Make notes of questions or concerns you have as you read the article
5. Note any conclusions you may reach about the validity of the research.



## Evaluation Criteria- Originality

- *Originality*
  - Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication?
  - Does it add to the canon of knowledge?
  - Is the research question an important one?



## Evaluation Criteria- Structure

- Is the article clearly laid out?
- Introduction:
  - Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly state the problem being investigated?
  - Normally, the introduction should summarize relevant research to provide context, and explain what other authors' findings, if any, are being challenged or extended.
  - It should describe the experiment, the hypothesis(es) and the general experimental design or method.



## Evaluation Criteria- Structure

- Method:
  - Does the author accurately explain how the data was collected?
  - Is the design suitable for answering the question posed?
  - Does the article identify the procedures followed? Are these ordered in a meaningful way?
  - If the methods are new, are they explained in detail?
  - Was the sampling appropriate?
  - Have the equipment and materials been adequately described?
  - Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded;
  - Has the author been precise in describing measurements?

Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research?



## Evaluation Criteria- Structure

- Results:
  - This is where the author/s should explain in words what he/she discovered in the research.
  - It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence.
  - You will need to consider if the appropriate analysis has been conducted.
  - Are the statistics correct?
    - If you are not comfortable with statistics, please advise when you submit your report.
    - Interpretation of results should not be included in this section.



## Evaluation Criteria- Structure

---

- Conclusion/Discussion:
  - Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable?
  - Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research?
  - Does the article support or contradict previous theories?
  - Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?



## Notes

---

1. Authors Last name, Initial
  2. Title of the article
  3. Publication year
  4. Name of journal, volume, page numbers
  5. Name of electronic file
- 
6. What is the main point of the article
  7. Describe the methodology used
  8. Describe the findings
  9. What, if anything is notable about this study?  
Is it a landmark study, does it have flaws, is it an experiment, or survey, and so on
  10. Look for methodological strengths and weaknesses
  11. Distinguish between assertion and evidence
  12. **Identify gaps**



## Writing the Review

---

- Consider your purpose before beginning to write
- Assume that the readers have not read this work, and you want to provide them “sufficient” detail (no more or less) so as to develop their interest in the study
  - No less- They will get confused
  - No more- If they want more details, they can read the original article
- Reassemble your notes
  - Reevaluate your notes to determine how the pieces you’ve described will be reassembled



## Report

---

- Report
  - Contains the key elements of your review, addressing the points outlined earlier.
  - Should be courteous and constructive
- Provide a quick summary of the article at the beginning of your report.
- Serves the dual purpose
  - Remind the editor / audience of the details of the report
  - Reassures that you have understood the article.

Plan to suggest specific directions for future research near the end of the review



## Article Review / Literature review

---

1. Informative

The review should contain a neutral description about what happened within study

2. Evaluative

1. The review should include critical statements analysing the study

2. Providing insight into any deficiencies is important.

1. You should explain and support your judgment so that we are able to fully understand the reasoning behind your comments.



## Presentation Slides

---

- 10 -12 minutes
- You will be an expert on the article, we are not
- Make us aware of the article content
- How the current study could be extended
  - Identified gaps / deficiencies
  - Future extensions
- Use your article review report to prepare presentation slides