



Criticism of health researches: why and how

Hasan Ashrafi-rizi^{1*}, Fatemeh Zarmehr²

Received 15 May 2015; Accepted 22 Sep 2015

ABSTRACT

► Please cite this paper as:

Ashrafi-rizi H, Zarmehr F. Criticism of health researches: why and how. 2016;3(2):64-65.

Research is one of the most important ways of science production (1). The purpose of research is exploring the unknown and explaining the variables that affect the human life. In the health sciences the purpose of which is health promotion, research is valued as much as human life (2). In many scientific texts, there is an emphasis on the importance of health researches in the quality of human life; the lack of attention to the quality of the publishing process is considered as the cause of much damage (3-10). The result of health researches is usually published as a paper, thesis, research project and book, the contents of all needs to be assessed. This process is named Research Review or Research Critique (2). Research critique is done during publishing process or after it, and in this paper we deal with it after publishing health texts. The broker chain between information producer and consumers who is the critic (Reviewer) and critique journals has been less attended. In short, Soltani indicates that the purpose of critique as a defense of society's cultural rights is to help the reader to choose the appropriate work, help the writer identify his weak points and his strengths (11), and also prevent damage to the society, especially people's health. In the critique of health researches, there are two essential stages: in the first stage, the work is studied quickly by the critic (Survey study). The aim of this study is gaining knowledge of the text and usually the bibliographic information of work like title, writer, incentive of work, headings and so on is assessed briefly (12). In the second stage, a critical study is done. The critical study is the most important and most critical step in the reviewing the texts. "In this study, the critic judges as to the accuracy, reliability, or value of the text based on criteria or standards. This type of study is the key to the appropriate understanding. This method is necessary to determine the truth and value of literature "(12, 13). The critic also accepts or rejects the content by reason, logic, scientific arguments and citation." So, to do a critical study, four techniques are essential: asking questions, inferring, relevant content and association between the work content with other works, and evaluation "(12). Also in this stage, taking note is done carefully. In the third stage, the notes are arranged and final edit based on the structure of the target journal is done. Time and accuracy at this stage add to the quality of the final text. Scientific journals usually allocate a space to the critique of scientific texts. Some of the journals are also published just with the aim of texts critique. Guide to writing critique on scientific literature is different in different journals, but the following parts exist in most journals: title, introduction, bibliography of critic, bibliography of work like first and second name of the writer, title of work and features of publication (place of publication, publisher and the year of publication), main subject of the work (headings and sub-heading), author's competence, comparison of the work with similar ones(the purpose is to know whether new content has been produced), critique of the text (content, punctuation, structure and appearance), summary and conclusion (in this part , the reviewer points to the ability and competence of the author in writing, success or failure of the author in predicting the target, strengths and weaknesses of the text and especially refers to the particular characteristics). The fourth stage, as the final stage, is writing critique and is known as a Review Report (Critique Report). Now the final text is ready to be sent to the target journal. Research review, particularly health research, is a critical process for stakeholders to recognize the value of the produced knowledge. Critics or reviewers need some skills for fair critique such as research methodology, introduction to statistics, scientific writing and information literacy to make fair and accurate critique. As mentioned earlier, health researches are involved in the human health, so paying attention to their quality is necessary. Therefore, it is suggested that medical universities and centers of information production should hold writing critique workshop for researchers, set up critique journals, and encourage the researchers to publish reviews and focus on their training and research programs.

¹ Health Information Technology Research Center, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran

² Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran

*Corresponding Author: H Ashrafi-rizi, Medical Library and Information Science, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran, Email: hassanashrafi@mng.mui.ac.ir

References

1. Kalhor M, Taleie g, Hosseini M. Survey on Printed researchers by Biosot model in Lorestan University Medical Sciences (2003-2005). *Health information Management Journal* 2013;1:12-3.
2. Abedi HA, Masoudi R, Hosseini-gholafshani Z. [The process of qualitative and qualification research review]. *Jamenegar*. 2011.
3. Dayani F. Role of medical library and information centers to produce science. *Health information Management Journal*. 2013;1(33).
4. Ebrahimi S. The situation of scientific publications of Iran's universities of medical sciences. *Health information Management Journal*. 2013;1:11.
5. Farokhania M. [The survey of Iranian English medical journals in some data bases]. *Health information Management Journal*. 2013;1(36).
6. Ghasempour M, Eftekharian F. The scientific preclusions of medical universities in Web of Science (2000-2007). In: Mosavi A, Tirgar A, Yaminifiroz M, editors. *Scientometric in Medical Sciences*. Babol: Babol University of Medical Sciences; 2010. p. 213-32.
7. Jamallimahmoei R. Assessment of Iranian medical sciences. In: Mosavi A, Tirgar A, Yaminifiroz M, editors. *Babol University of Medical Sciences*. Babol: Babol University of Medical Sciences; 2010. p. 13-32.
8. Khodabandeh S, Begliu MH, Asadi M. The Middle East scientific outputs in cancer field in Medline (1965-2008). In: Mosavi A, Tirgar A, Yaminifiroz M, editors. *Scientometric in Medical Sciences*. Babol: Babol University of Medical Sciences; 2010. p. 309-20.
9. Mokhtari H, Mirzaei A. Differences among science, social science and humanities from scientometric perspective. *Health information Management Journal* 2013;1:56.
10. Weiss AP. Measuring the impact of medical research: moving from outputs to outcomes. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2007;164(2):206-14.
11. Soltani MA. Necessity and methods of book review. *Pajohesh Ayeneh*. 1990;1(1):10-7.
12. Seif AA, Tehran T. Learning and Reading. Doran Publications. 2000.
13. Ashrafi-rizi H. The process and parts of book reviewing. *Monthly Book Review*. 2011;15(1):62-9.