

Systematic review Review Form

CHECK LIST

Answer each item in the list (YES indicates compliance with the journal's requirements; NO does not meet the journal's requirements).

All inconsistencies with the journal's requirements should be reflected in the review in the section "Weaknesses of the article and what needs to be done to improve the article".

ABSTRACT

Is the abstract clear, accessible, and format-appropriate?*

The abstract should accurately reflect the content of the article with a brief description of the purpose of the study, a description of the main procedures (selection of participants, study conditions, data collection and analysis methods), main results (preferably with quantitative indicators, statistical and clinical significance) and conclusion. The conclusion should emphasize new and important aspects of the results obtained, and not just repeat the presentation of the conclusions.

- Yes
- No

The abstract does not exceed 300 words*

The summary should not exceed 300 words.

- Yes
- No

The abstract has the following structure: Purpose, Material and Methods, Results, Conclusion.*

- Yes
- No

TITLE

Is the title of the article informative and relevant to the content?*

- Yes
- No

KEYWORDS

Are keywords relevant to the text?*

- Yes
- No

Do the keywords match MeSH (Medical Subject Headings)?*

- Yes
- No

REFERENCES

Articles in the list of references correspond to links in the text*

- Yes
- No

References include articles recently published (7-8 years)*

- Yes
- No

Are articles in the references formatted correctly?*

The list of references is drawn up according to the Vancouver style.

- Yes
- No

ARTICLE STRUCTURE

Does the structure of the article meet the requirements of the journal:

- Introduction
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion?

*

- Yes
- No

INTRODUCTION

Is it clearly described what is already known in the field of study?*

Is there a brief summary of the history of the relevant field of study and the specific problems being analyzed, as well as a statement of the hypotheses being investigated?

- Yes
- No

Is the research question clearly defined?*

- Yes
- No

METHODS

Is the study design specified and is it appropriate to achieve the goal?*

- Yes
- No

Are the literature search strategies, data acquisition procedures, grades of evidence, and types of analysis used clearly described?*

-
-

Are all terms adequately defined?*

- Yes
- No

Are statistical methods described in detail and appropriately?*

- Yes
- No
- No need

RESULTS

Are the results presented as required by the journal?*

- Yes
- No

Does the text of the article duplicate data from tables or figures?*

The text of the article should not duplicate data from tables or figures?

- Yes
- No

Is it clear from the text what is a statistically significant result?

- Yes
- No

Is it clear from the text what is the practically significant result?*

- Yes
- No

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Are there repeated details or other information provided in other parts of the manuscript?*

Text in the Discussion section should not repeat details or other information provided elsewhere in the manuscript, such as in the Introduction or Results sections.

- Yes
- No

Are the conclusions consistent with the purposes of the work?*

- Yes
- No

Is the article itself written consistently and logically?*

- Yes
- No

REVIEW

General statement or summary of the article and its results in your own words*

(a brief description of the problem, the relevance of the article, the most important aspects of the article)



Strengths of the article and what this study can add to what is already known in the field*



Weaknesses of the article and what needs to be done to improve the article

Given the questions from the checklist and your answers to them, give your recommendations

Key points in the article that need clarification, re-analysis, rewriting and additional information and your suggestions on what can be done to improve the article*

List and number the recommendations

Minor points, such as drawing tables not mentioned in the text, missing references, typos and other inconsistencies*

List and number the recommendations

NOTES TO THE EDITOR*

Confidential to the editor, including recommendations for publishing the article

DECISION*

Choose one (underline)

- Recommend the article for publication;
- Recommend the article for publication after revision taking into account the comments (minor changes);
- Recommend the article for publication after revision taking into account the comments (major changes);
- Do not recommend the article for publication.