

## **A brief guide to preparation of a review article:**

1. Organize information and relate it to your proposed topic
2. Synthesize results into a summary of what is and isn't known
3. Identify contradictions, inconsistencies in the literature
4. Develop questions for further research
5. Draw conclusions based upon your own evaluation of the studies presented

## **Methods section requirements:**

It is required that you include, at a minimum, each of the following elements in your Methods Section:

1. The database searched (e.g., PUBMED)
2. The date the search was conducted (month and year)
3. The time period searched
4. Each of the specific search terms used (e.g., “tremor”, “mechanisms”).
5. The exact number of articles the search identified
6. The number of articles you selected for review
7. The criteria for selecting these articles (e.g. language, size of study, nature of study, etc).

## **Common Problems to Avoid When Preparing Your Review:**

*1. Poor organization.* The sections and subsections of your paper should follow a logical sequence that is easy to follow. Furthermore, the content of each section or sub-section should be consistent with the title of that section or sub-section.

*2. Lack of transparency.* Complete transparency about the choice of material included in your review is required. A section, within the Methods, should describe in detail the search terms.

*3. Superficial review of the literature.* The piece that you write should be considered the most definite treatment of the topic at the time of publication. Referencing of prior literature should be detailed and dense.

*4. Relying excessively on opinions rather than data.* Evidence-based statements are preferable to anecdotal or imprecise remarks that are not supported by citable data. If you wish to submit a paper primarily based upon opinion, a *Viewpoint* article might be more appropriate.

*5. Summary without synthesis.* The paper should include a section with a thoughtful attempt at synthesis. While you may not be contributing new data to the field, your article should

nevertheless be a contribution to the literature. Things to aim for - discuss the approaches, limitations, and conclusions of past reviews; find a new angle that has not been covered adequately in the previous reviews; incorporate new material that has inevitably accumulated since their appearance.

*6. All authors have not critically contributed to the paper.* All authors are responsible for the contents of the article. If the article is being co-authored by a junior author and a senior author, the senior author is responsible for guiding the junior author to produce an article of appropriate standard.

*7. Selection of too broad a topic.* This often results in point 3. Ensure that your topic something that can be comprehensively addressed in this form of article. It may be necessary to reduce the scope to something more manageable.