

## Original articles and brief communications

### TITLE

Is the title clear, concise and informative?

Does the title correspond to the content of the article?

### ABSTRACT

Is the abstract structured (introduction, objective, methods, development and conclusions) and does it contain the essential information in each part?

Is it limited to a maximum of 250 words (150 if it is a short communication)? Does it offer relevant information about the content of the article?

### INTRODUCTION

Is the problem identified and the reasons for the research justified?

Is the background presented briefly, clearly and appropriately, with its bibliographical justification?

Does the purpose, importance and current knowledge of the topic be reported? Does the introduction conclude with a precise statement of the objective?

### METHODS

Is the content of the section clear enough to replicate the method?

Is the type of research design carried out and its spatial and temporal delimitation clearly stated?

Are the population and sample, the sampling method used and the criteria for calculating the sample size, as well as the inclusion, exclusion and exit criteria, specified?

Are the study location and period described?

If experimental designs are used, is it specified how subjects were selected or assigned to study groups?

Were the variables analysed clearly described?

Are the methods of obtaining information, the sources of data collection and the procedure followed with the main techniques explained?

Are the statistical methods described in sufficient detail to allow the results to be verified from the data?

Are algorithms, classifications, scales, flowcharts or other types of published scientific contributions, if they were used in the research, properly referenced, following the Vancouver style?

Are the analysis techniques and procedures sufficient and pertinent?

Is there reference to compliance with the ethical principles of research, the treatment given to the subjects who participated in the research, the signing of informed consent, the correct use of the information obtained in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki?

### RESULTS

Are the results presented in a logical sequence? Are the sources of the data declared? Do the tables and figures used justify their existence and is the information well summarized in them? Are the tables or graphs properly numbered and titled?

Is the graphic material pertinent and does it clearly and simply illustrate ideas, data, processes or relationships that the written text could not present with equal efficiency?

Are only the pertinent statistics that were reflected in the Methods section used?

**DISCUSSION**

Are the results critically evaluated?

Are the results analyzed in relation to other research?

Is the use of sources from a quantitative and qualitative point of view sufficient in the analysis of the results?

Are the scope and limitations of the research analyzed?

**CONCLUSIONS**

Are they derived from the findings identified in the study? Are the most relevant data from the study summarized?

Is the contribution of the research to science declared?

Do the conclusions respond to the objectives of the study? Are they brief, precise, and do not repeat textual information?

**BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES**

Do they correspond to the Vancouver Standards style?

Have 75% or more of the sources been published in the last five years? Is relevant national and international literature on the topic represented?

Are the sources used sufficient in quantity and quality?

Is there a correspondence between the citations in the body of the text and the list of references at the end of the article? Are the electronic addresses (URL) of the references accessible and do they lead to the full text?

**OTHER ISSUES**

Does the study have the value and novelty required for publication?

Is internationally accepted scientific terminology used correctly?

Does the text have scientific rigor?

Does the article demonstrate logical consistency in the relationship between the parts: problem, objective, theoretical framework, methodology, results and conclusions?

Is the article considered a contributor to knowledge and scientific debate in medical and biomedical sciences?

**Review Articles****TITLE**

Is the title clear, concise and informative?

Does the title correspond to the content of the article?

**ABSTRACT**

Is the abstract structured (introduction, objective, methods, development and conclusions)?

Is there a maximum limit of 250 words?

Is the type of review carried out declared?

Does it offer relevant information about the content of the article?

Is the wording of the abstract clear and does it correspond to the body of the article?

**INTRODUCTION**

Does it present brief, clear and appropriate background information with bibliographical justification?

Does it express the need and importance of the review?

Does it justify the scientific problem that originates the review? At the end, are the objective(s) of the work specified?

**METHODS**

Is the type of review carried out declared?

Are the criteria for searching and selecting information sources described (search terms, databases, languages, publication dates, types of sources, geographic origin, etc.)?

Is there a reference to the number of articles located, selected, and analyzed, according to the selection criteria (inclusion and exclusion)?

Is there a description of how the information from the selected sources was processed?

Is the content of the section clear enough to replicate the method? Does the method correspond to the type of review declared?

**DEVELOPMENT**

Is there evidence of a consistent argumentative strategy?

Is there a scientific critique of the sources consulted?

Are there trends, regularities, coincidences or differences in the literature consulted?

Does it provide relevant information for understanding the current state of the topic in scientific literature?

Are the most important and recent works on the topic discussed?

Does the use of figures and tables help to highlight relevant aspects without repeating information?

Are the limitations of the study stated?

Is the writing clear, coherent and precise?

**CONCLUSIONS**

Do they meet the objectives of the study?

Are they clear, concrete and relevant to the objective of the review?

Are the most important results of the review summarized?

**BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES**

Do they correspond to the style of the Vancouver Standards?

Have 70% or more of the sources been published in the last five years?

Is the relevant national and international literature on the topic represented?

Are the sources used sufficient in quantity and quality?

Is there a correspondence between the citations in the body of the text and the list of references at the end of the article? Are the electronic addresses (URL) of the references accessible and do they lead to the full text?

**OTHER ASPECTS**

Does the study have the value and novelty required for publication?

Is internationally accepted scientific terminology used correctly?

Does the text have scientific rigor?

Does the article show logical consistency in the relationship between the parts: problem, objective, methodology, results and conclusions?

Is the article considered a contributor to research in medical and biomedical sciences?

## Case Reports

### TITLE

Is the title clear, concise, and informative?

Does the title correspond to the most interesting phenomenon (symptom, disease, diagnosis, test, intervention) that gives rise to the clinical description, treatment, or technical variant used?

### ABSTRACT

Is the abstract structured (introduction, objective, case presentation, and conclusions)? Does it provide relevant information about the content of the article?

### INTRODUCTION

Does it summarize the background of the clinical case presented?

Does it refer to the relevant medical literature?

Are the reasons justifying the presentation of the case explained?

Does it specify the objective of the article?

### PATIENT INFORMATION

Is demographic information (age, sex, skin color, occupation) described?

Is medical, family, and psychosocial history referenced?

Are concomitant diseases and previous interventions and their results detailed?

Is there concordance between the text and figures (photos, tables, family trees), if these are used?

Is the information in the figures and signs (if any) of sufficient quality?

Are the patient's identifying features removed and, if this is not possible, is the patient's consent declared for the publication of the image?

### COMPLIANCE OF THE ETHICAL COMPONENT OF CLINICAL RESEARCH

Is the process for case approval by the institution's research ethics committee described? Is the procedure for obtaining informed consent from the patient explained?

### PATIENT PERSPECTIVE

Is the patient's perspective or experience with the care received explained, whenever possible? Is the information provided considered sufficient?

### CLINICAL FINDINGS

Are the findings identified by physical examination or examination of the patient clearly explained? Are the main symptoms and signs in the patient explained from the beginning, their evolution and the current state of the disease?

Do the findings identified justify the novelty, rarity, clinical variant, change in surgical technique or other characteristic argued in the introduction?

### CALENDAR



Are important dates and times described in this case? (if applicable)

### **DIAGNOSTIC EVALUATION**

Are laboratory, imaging, pathologic, microbiologic, or other diagnostic procedures clearly presented?

Are units of measurement and quantitative expressions of diagnostic results appropriately used?

Are those aspects that make the patient's condition unique highlighted?

Is the diagnostic reasoning, including differential diagnoses and prognosis where applicable, described?

### **THERAPEUTIC INTERVENTION** (if applicable)

Is the type of intervention performed (pharmacological, surgical, preventive, self-care) described in detail?

Is the administration of the interventions specified (dose, concentration, duration)? Are they expressed clearly and precisely?

Are the changes made to the interventions explained? Are they justified in a coherent manner?

### **MONITORING AND RESULTS**

Are the evaluated results summarized?

Are important results of follow-up diagnostic tests detailed?

### **DISCUSSION**

Is a critical analysis of the results of the study performed, comparing them, if possible, with those of previous publications?

Are analogous cases reported in the literature discussed?

Is the pathophysiology of the disease studied reported?

Are theories or hypotheses on the implications of the findings analyzed?

Are the difficulties in establishing the diagnosis or treatment of the case presented described? Are differential diagnoses discussed?

Are the novel and important aspects of the research specified? Are the limitations of the study and their possible influence on the results obtained stated?

### **CONCLUSIONS**

Are the most important aspects of the case summarized? Do they justify the presentation of the case? Are the contributions made to scientific knowledge specified?

### **BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES**

Do they correspond to the Vancouver Standards style?

Have 50% or more of the sources been published in the last five years?

Is the relevant national and international literature on the topic represented?

Are the sources used sufficient in quantity and quality?

Is there a correspondence between the citations in the body of the text and the list of references at the end of the article? Are the electronic addresses (URL) of the references accessible and lead to the full text?

### **OTHER ASPECTS**

Does the study have the value and novelty required for publication?

Is internationally accepted scientific terminology used correctly?

Does the text have scientific rigor?

Does the article show logical consistency in the relationship between its parts?

Is the article considered a contributor to knowledge and scientific debate in the medical and biomedical sciences?

## Featured images in medicine

### TITLE

Is the title brief, clear and consistent with the content of the article?

### BRIEF STORY OR COMMENT

Does it refer to the background, clinical, imaging, microbiological, anatomopathological, laboratory findings, evolution and treatment?

Does it provide significant information about the relevance of the images?

### IMAGES

Are they in GIF or JPG format and of good technical quality?

Is the presentation as a single image or in a panel appropriate?

Is adequate signage used to highlight the most relevant visual information?

Do they appear in different planes or views? Are they correctly commented on in the photo caption?

Is there concordance between them and the text? Is the information presented clearly perceived?

Are the patient's identifying features eliminated and, if this is not possible, is the patient's consent declared for the publication of the image?

### OTHER ASPECTS

Does the study have the value and novelty required for publication?

Is internationally accepted scientific terminology used correctly?

Does the text reveal scientific rigor in its content?

Does the article show logical consistency in the relationship between its parts?

Do the images show novel and illustrative findings for the practice and learning of medical sciences?