

## The technique of writing a review article: Understanding the past for the management of future knowledge.

## La técnica de escribir un artículo de revisión: Comprender el pasado para la gestión del conocimiento futuro.

Dr. Meenakshi V. Rathi \*

P. G. Department of Chemistry, RNC Arts, JDB Commerce, NSC Science College, Nashik Road, Nashik. (Maharashtra) India  
Affiliated to Savitribai Phule Pune University, e-mail: [meenakship2@gmail.com](mailto:meenakship2@gmail.com)  
Phone No. +91 9403510314

### ABSTRACT

A study of past, relevant material is a vital component of every academic research. In the era of rising numbers of research papers, review articles of good standard are often needed. A literature review aims to critically evaluate existing research data. Academic writing should not be shaped by technical jargon or limited to a series of tips and tactics aimed at a quick publishing. This brief contribution does not impose stringent regulations on academic publications, but rather helps potential authors prepare and improve their review papers to the advantage of a wide audience. Review articles might suggest new study directions and draw fresh conclusions from current data. Because reviews are important for evaluating results, the value of one is related to the results that have been discovered, as well as how these findings are presented. The issue of "why" is most crucial when writing a review, not "how." One of the primary and essential reasons for composing a review is to assemble an informative synthesis of the most superior resources.

Key Words: Scientific review, Academic research, Analysis of literature, Research papers.

### RESUMEN

Un estudio del material relevante del pasado es un componente vital de toda investigación académica. En la era del creciente número de trabajos de investigación, a menudo se necesitan artículos de revisión de buen nivel. Una revisión de la literatura tiene como objetivo evaluar críticamente los datos de investigación existentes. La escritura académica no debe estar moldeada por una jerga técnica o limitada a una serie de consejos y tácticas destinadas a una publicación rápida. Esta breve contribución no impone normas estrictas a las publicaciones académicas, sino que ayuda a los autores potenciales a

preparar y mejorar sus artículos de revisión en beneficio de una amplia audiencia. Los artículos de revisión pueden sugerir nuevas direcciones de estudio y sacar nuevas conclusiones a partir de los datos actuales. Debido a que las revisiones son importantes para evaluar los resultados, el valor de una está relacionado con los resultados que se han descubierto, así como con la forma en que se presentan estos hallazgos. El tema del "por qué" es más crucial al escribir una reseña, no el "cómo". Una de las razones principales y esenciales para componer una revisión es reunir una síntesis informativa de los recursos más superiores.

Palabras clave: Revisión científica, Investigación académica, Análisis de literatura, Trabajos de investigación.

## INTRODUCTION

A review article is a survey of previously published research on a topic. A good review is thorough and focused on ideas. The primary goal of writing a review is to generate a legible summary of the best materials available in the literature for a critical research question or a hot topic in the field. (Conn & Coon Sells, 2014) Unlike an original research article, it will not present new experimental data. Reorganisation of existing facts, rather than the review article may be seen as an original publication, by some. A study scientist's "not-original" attitude is understandable. (Wright et al., 2007) Review studies do not provide new data to the literature. It has a topic, a beginning, a logical development of the theme, and an end. A good literature review can convey a tale. It must start with a key idea and then take the reader on a journey, detailing it from basics to advanced concepts. (Short, 2009) Review articles are similar to class notes combined into one enormous file - but the author must never take the reader for granted and must start with the basics, progressively unravelling the intricacies. They give us new perspectives on old issues. They innovate and increase novel knowledge in this way.

### Chapter 1

Strategies of writing the review article:

- Writing an article may be done primarily to emphasise one's own or others' scholarly efforts.
- This is fine as long as it is stated explicitly.
- For each article in the references, the data supporting the reported conclusion should be scrutinised.

- It should be determined if there is an alternate interpretation consistent with the data presented or other data that differs from the authors' interpretation.(Siwek et al., 2002)
- Reconsiderations of data are particularly relevant in light of subsequent changes.
- Each section, and even each paragraph, should convey a key point to the article's ultimate goal.
- The field's conceptual framework and the review article's contribution to its advancement should always be clear.
- Controversies should be highlighted, with an emphasis on their origins and resolutions.
- Ultimately, the analysis should assist the synthesis of data and concepts reflected in the model given.(Sanders, 2020)
- No one research approach, journal, or geographic area is covered in a comprehensive assessment.
- What has been done, what has been discovered, and how these findings are presented determine the usefulness of a review? When starting to write a review, the question of "why" comes first and then "How". (Gülpinar & Güçlü, 2013).

## Chapter 2

### Troubleshooting Guidelines for the authors:

A good review builds a solid basis for learning. It helps build theories, solves research gaps, and exposes research needs. A scientific review article should be viewed as a scientific endeavour employing scientific procedures.(Taylor, 2012) A summary of the criteria for including and excluding non-cited articles should be supplied. Authors and editors should include a section explaining how the review's sources were found. A modern literature review may include an Internet survey. (Sasson et al., 2021) Provide a list of databases and search phrases used. There is an abundance of scientific material available, and it might be intimidating to examine it systematically. Understanding motivation in scientific review writing is critical. You should not claim authorship unless you believe that publishing the article would result in a better understanding of a discipline and an original contribution to the literature based on your own informed perspective. Other factors exist, but if they dominate, the review article is likely to be flawed.(Wright et al., 2007). Readers would then perceive that the article is more of a promotional advertisement than a review.

Potential authors are also scholars who have conducted a literature review before to starting a project and built theoretical models based on this review. (García-Granda, 2013) There are two categories of reviews. First, authors could tackle a mature issue requiring

analysis and synthesis of existing research. They would then provide a conceptual model that synthesises and extends prior research. Second, authors could address a new subject that would benefit from theoretical grounding. The literature review on the emerging issue would have to be shorter here. The author's contribution would be to build new theoretical underpinnings for a conceptual model.

### Chapter 3

#### Meticulous writing techniques:

As a reviewer, organise the material so that your review functions as a useful 'guidebook'. Creating schematic maps and classifications might help readers visualise a field's evolution and discover relevant papers. A review paper should have a solid plot to engage the reader. Introduce the topic with a compelling problem statement that piques the reader's curiosity. Then take the reader on a journey that gently reveals the problem's origin. Always start with the essentials. Use visuals and words to illustrate ideas. Schematic charts and diagrams help illustrate difficult-to-understand theories, keeping the reader involved and helping them grasp the theory. Analyse the literature as a scientist, you must integrate data from various sources and comprehend its broader implications.(Paul & Criado, 2020) Comparing and contrasting research often reveals hidden scientific paths. No single study can reveal these patterns. These minor writing techniques are identified and interpreted in a literature review report to generate new research ideas and hypotheses.

### Chapter 4

#### Scientific Steps for drafting a review article:

A literature review is not simply a summary of published research because every study is unique and the findings and interpretations may vary. Rather, a review can point out gaps or contradictions in the literature. So, attempt to produce a review that conveys what is 'clear' and what is still 'mysterious'.

To write flawless review article, the scientific steps are (Mondal, H., & Mondal, 2019)

- 1 .Keep it simple. Assume your audience isn't an expert.
2. Use referencing software - no article is perfect on the first draught. Learn this skill to make life easier.
3. Get the review outline correct — your review will likely require numerous iterations, and a good outline can help.
4. Always provide the finest quality pictures and design the schematics as best you can

5. The opportunity to write a literature review is serious.

6. When conducting a literature review, differentiating good research from bad research and relying on the outcomes of the better studies is an important aspect of the review process.(Sharma & Singh, 2011) This strategy decreases the workload.

This is a great way to start your study as well as get your article published. Having a thorough grasp of the field you will be working on beforehand greatly speeds up your development. This can help keep the article as a living document. It would organise the periodic updating of the article with fresh content and revisiting older facts.

## Chapter 5

Approaches to writing reviews:

Review articles come in many forms. We all know the traditional types. Systematic reviews and Chronological reviews are the two main categories of review papers. A Chronological review offers the facts and statistics in an easy-to-follow format, so we can comprehensively assess the subject matter. While it is correct to say that systematic reviews are done on a specific topic, it is incorrect to say that such studies are carried out on selected issues. A systematic review is formed by including both qualitative and quantitative reviews. As well, considerable literature study is performed in both cases. The collection and statistical analysis of study data are commonly used in quantitative reviews (eg. in a meta-analysis). .

Systematic reviews of relevant studies can provide the best information for not only academicians but also clinicians.(Pautasso, 2013).This includes: (1) summarising a large amount of literature; (2) resolving literature conflicts; (3) evaluating the need for a large clinical trial; and (6) increasing the statistical power of smaller studies.(Harris et al., 2014)

## Chapter 6

Significance of writing the review article:

Writing a literature review,

- Explain the current level of knowledge ,
- Identify gaps in existing studies for prospective future research ,
- Highlight the primary methodology and research strategies and
- Also allows you to critically evaluate and arrange current research.(Harris et al., 2014)

Many publications, including some of the most prominent, publish review articles routinely, if you write a meaningful, well-organized essay in good English. The fact that

almost every magazine publishes reviews helps the new author. , if you keep seeking publication, you should ultimately see it in print.(Mulrow, 1987) People who have finished or made significant progress on a research stream are well positioned to tell their colleagues what they have learned and where the field can most profitably focus its efforts.(Riordan, 2012).

Good review methods are important since they give the reader an unbiased perspective on the subject.(Ogunsolu et al., 2004) A review should be prepared in a systematic manner, according to popular beliefs commonly observed. The research methodologies must be clearly stated in a systematic review with a focused question. The best way for determining the optimum working style for a research project is to use a 'methodological filter.' Finally, when writing a review, it is best to be concise, to keep a firm focus on fixed concepts, to approach the literature in a procedural and analytical manner, and to articulate your self-discoveries in an appealing manner.(Lexchin et al., 2003)

## Chapter 7

### Adversity and Endurance in review writing:

While the prospect of writing a review is appealing, it is critical to devote time to identifying the most important issues. It has been observed that the act of beginning to write an article and getting right to it appears to be quite attractive, but identifying the challenging points in your review won't be a waste of time. Despite having agreed upon a systematic review design, it was determined that the majority of the studies that were expected to follow this design failed to meet this agreement. (Carver et al., 2011) .One out of every four studies that were assessed did not apply suitable procedures of describing, evaluating, or synthesising evidence.(Daldrup-Link, 2018). Non-systematic reviews utilise old research that has been gathering dust for years, along with your colleagues' recommendations. Reviews, in contrast, take into consideration the time and effort required to identify and review the best possible research.(Cargill, M., & O'Connor, 2021).The question that must be answered requires an array of techniques and delivers the most effective outcomes when multiple approaches are employed. (Lorés-Sanz, 2011) Some yet slightly distinct studies can be synthesised to better answer critical concerns. Set aside time to come up with a solution to a problem that interests your peers in the same field. As we are drawing on research in order to resolve specific challenges, we can potentially deal with two issues at once.

As conclusions, with the foregoing, it may reasonably conclude that reading, reviewing, and writing for imaging literature are all worthwhile endeavours.(Beyea & Nicoll, 1998) As a critical reader and reviewer, it is crucial to remember to read selectively and critically.(Ng, K. H., & Peh, 2010) .With regard to producing a review article, you

should be able to indicate the steps to be achieved as follows: see the matter from a large perspective, and get rid of entrenched notions and obsessions from your head. A critical approach, along with a methodological attitude, should be taken when researching papers in the literature. (Pautasso, 2013) Data should be conveyed in an interesting way. Presents conclusions and implications for researchers and managers. To produce findings based on the best available scientific data and evidence, a systematic review is done. To lift the standard for non-systematic narrative expert opinion evaluations, a systematic method to a critical review of all the relevant evidence will be employed.

## REFERENCES

- Beyea, S. C., & Nicoll, L. H. (1998). Writing an integrative review. *AORN Journal*, 67(4), 877–880. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-2092\(06\)62653-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-2092(06)62653-7)
- Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. 2. (2021). *Writing scientific research articles: Strategy and steps*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Carver, J., Dellva, B., Emmanuel, P., & Parchure, R. (2011). Ethical considerations in scientific writing. *Indian Journal of Sexually Transmitted Diseases and AIDS*, 32(2), 124. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2589-0557.85425>
- Conn, V. S., & Coon Sells, T. G. (2014). Is It Time to Write a Review Article? *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 36(4), 435–439. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945913519060>
- Daldrup-Link, H. E. (2018). Writing a review article - Are you making these mistakes? *Nanotheranostics*, 2(2), 197. <https://doi.org/10.7150/NTNO.24793>
- García-Granda, S. (2013). Writing science: how to write papers that get cited and proposals that get funded. *Crystallography Reviews*, 19(1), 53–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0889311x.2013.769529>
- Gülpinar, Ö., & Güçlü, A. G. (2013). Derleme makalesi nasıl yazilir? *Turk Uroloji Dergisi*, 39(SUPPL. 1), 44–48. <https://doi.org/10.5152/tud.2013.054>
- Harris, J. D., Quatman, C. E., Manring, M. M., Siston, R. A., & Flanigan, D. C. (2014). How to write a systematic review. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 42(11), 2761–2768. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546513497567>
- Lexchin, J., Bero, L. A., Djulbegovic, B., & Clark, O. (2003). Pharmaceutical industry sponsorship and research outcome and quality: Systematic review. In *British Medical Journal* (Vol. 326, Issue 7400, pp. 1167–1170). BMJ Publishing Group.

<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.326.7400.1167>

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2011). The construction of the author's voice in academic writing: The interplay of cultural and disciplinary factors. *Text and Talk*, 31(2), 173–193.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2011.008>

Mondal, H., & Mondal, S. (2019). Strategy to improve English language in scientific writing. *Medical Journal of Dr. DY Patil Vidyapeeth*, 12(5), 475.

Mulrow, C. D. (1987). The medical review article: state of the science. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 106(3), 485–488. <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-106-3-485>

Ng, K. H., & Peh, W. C. (2010). Writing a systematic review. *Singapore Medical Journal*, 51(5), 362-366.

Ogunsolu, O. O., Wang, J. C., & Hanson, K. (2004). *Writing a Review Article: A Graduate Level Writing Class*. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.7b00838>

Paul, J., & Criado, A. R. (2020). The art of writing literature review: What do we know and what do we need to know? *International Business Review*, 29(4), 101717.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2020.101717>

Pautasso, M. (2013). Ten Simple Rules for Writing a Literature Review. In *PLoS Computational Biology* (Vol. 9, Issue 7, p. e1003149). Public Library of Science.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003149>

Riordan, L. (2012). Modern-day considerations for references in scientific writing. *Journal of the American Osteopathic Association*, 112(8), 567–569.  
<https://doi.org/10.7556/JAOA.2012.112.8.567/XML>

Sanders, D. A. (2020). How to write (and how not to write) a scientific review article. *Clinical Biochemistry*, 81(November 2019), 65–68.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2020.04.006>

Sasson, A., Okojie, O., Verano, R., Moshiri, M., Patlas, M. N., Hoffmann, J. C., Hines, J. J., & Katz, D. S. (2021). How to Read, Write, and Review the Imaging Literature. *Current Problems in Diagnostic Radiology*, 50(2), 109–114.  
<https://doi.org/10.1067/j.cpradiol.2020.01.002>

Sharma, B. B., & Singh, V. (2011). Ethics in writing: Learning to stay away from plagiarism and scientific misconduct. *Lung India : Official Organ of Indian Chest Society*, 28(2), 148. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-2113.80337>

Short, J. (2009). The art of writing a review article. In *Journal of Management* (Vol. 35, Issue 6, pp. 1312–1317). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309337489>



Sustainability, Agri, Food and Environmental Research, (ISSN: 0719-3726), 12(X), 2023:  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.7770/safer-V12N1-art469>

Siwek, J., Gourlay, M. L., Slawson, D. C., & Shaughnessy, A. F. (2002). How to write an evidence-based clinical review article. *American Family Physician*, 65(2), 251–258.

Taylor, R. B. (2012). How to Write a Review Article. *Medical Writing*, 143–159.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8234-6\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8234-6_6)

Wright, R. W., Brand, R. A., Dunn, W., & Spindler, K. P. (2007). How to write a systematic review. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*, 455, 23–29.

Received: 23<sup>th</sup> January 2022; Accepted: 12<sup>th</sup> April 2022; First distribution: 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022.