

Clinical expertise

A critical [justification](#) for the strengths and weaknesses of a [manuscript](#) depends not only on the [clinical expertise](#) in a given subject area and the time available for the [review](#) but also on the use of standard [guidelines](#) during the [revision](#) process.

Without a standard and systematic revision, there is a risk of missing important parts of a [manuscript](#). The consequence can be a superficial review, with no real justification and support for the [editor's](#) decision.

Most journal reviewers acquire the skills and knowledge to perform a manuscript review through their clinical [expertise](#) and their own experience in critically appraising the literature. If an individual performs an inadequate review, it is likely that his or her service will not be requested again. Sometimes an inadequate review is not the reviewer's fault, but is due to insufficient formal training provided by the journals to establish standard methods to analyze the manuscript, or due to lack of information. Even if the reviewers analyze the manuscript as though they themselves were submitting it, sometimes there is a lack of a comprehensive set of guidelines for all aspects of the review process, leading to an unsupported decision ¹⁾.

¹⁾
Kehr P: Editorial. A new direction for EJOST! Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol 24:1329, 2014

From:

<https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/> - **Neurosurgery Wiki**

Permanent link:

https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/doku.php?id=clinical_expertise

Last update: **2024/06/07 02:53**

