

Endorsement of reporting guidelines is our next step

O endosso das diretrizes de publicação é o nosso próximo passo

RODRIGO PESSOA CAVALCANTI LIRA¹

Training means learning to follow rules, experience is recognizing exceptions⁽¹⁾. Unfortunately the latter is provided exclusively by the time, however initiatives such as the EQUATOR (**E**nhancing the **Q**uality **A**nd **T**ransparency **O**f health **R**esearch) Network and its reporting guidelines may help with the former. The purpose of this international initiative (launched in June 2008) is to improve the value and reliability of the research literature by promoting accurate and transparent reporting⁽²⁾.

Poorly designed reports lead to a waste of money in research. The lack of training and knowledge of existing tools by authors, editors and peer reviewers is the main reason⁽³⁾. Moreover, the public expects that research is conducted and reported to the highest standards^(4,5).

Editors noted that in the 1970-1980s many of the published studies lacked transparent methodological rigor. It was estimated that blinding was reported in only 30% of trials from major journals, primary end points were described in 27%, sample size was provided in only 43% of trials and <5% trials were truly randomized⁽⁶⁾. Use to be a hard task to the reviewer or readers of the research identify the good from the bad.

The challenge was to provide a framework for authors to ensure they reported the essential information needed to enable critical analysis by reviewers and readers. To deal with this objective there were developed checklists of essential items to be reported for each specific study design. The most popular are the CONSORT (**C**ONSolidated **S**tandards **O**f **R**eporting **T**rials), the STROBE (**S**Trengthening the **R**eporting of **O**Bservational studies in **E**pidemiology), and the PRISMA (**P**referred **R**eporting **I**tems of **S**ystematic reviews and **M**eta-**A**nalyses).

CONSORT, STROBE and PRISMA are now standard requirements for most major journals and are widely supported by the major editorial groups. In those journals adopting these checklists, an improvement in reporting of the critical elements has been observed⁽⁷⁾.

The main mechanism for dissemination and acceptance of reporting guidelines among authors and reviewers has been its endorsement by journals. Such endorsement is usually done by a statement of support in a journal's "Instructions for Authors", encouraging authors to adopt a checklist when submitting their manuscript⁽³⁾.

In conclusion, the reporting guidelines will not be an additional obstacle for publication. Advantages of its use for authors include the supply of a structure by which to upgrade the transparency and clarity of report writing; for reviewers and readers benefits include a method by which to critically analyze an article. From the 1st number of 2015, the *Arquivos Brasileiros de Oftalmologia* will endorse these guidelines and will employ them within the review process. We hope the implementation of those checklists, as a condition of submission for most of research designs by our journal, will induce an improvement in the quality of papers published.

REFERENCES

1. Wagoner K. Ao mestre com carinho, 365 reflexões sobre a arte de ensinar. São Paulo: Publifolha; 2002.
2. The EQUATOR Network. Enhancing the QUALity and Transparency Of Health Research [Internet]. Oxford; Centre for Statistics in Medicina [cited 2014 Feb 20] Available from: <http://www.equator-network.org/>
3. Shamseer L, Galipeau J, Turner L, Moher D. Improving the reporting and usability of research studies. *Can J Anaesth*. 2013;60(4):337-44.
4. Moher D. Reporting research results: a moral obligation for all researchers. *Can J Anaesth*. 2007;54(5):331-5.
5. Groves T. Enhancing the quality and transparency of health research. *BMJ*. 2008; 337:a718.
6. Altman DG, Schulz KF, Moher D, Egger M, Davidoff F, Elbourne D, et al. The revised CONSORT statement for reporting randomized trials: explanation and elaboration. *Ann Intern Med*. 2001;134(8):663-94. Comment in: *Aust Occup Ther J*. 2009;56(1):72-3; *Med Clin (Barc)*. 2005; 124(11):439; *Ann Intern Med*. 2002;136(12):926-7; author reply 926-7.
7. Hopewell S, Dutton S, Yu LM, Chan AW, Altman DG. The quality of reports of randomised trials in 2000 and 2006: comparative study of articles indexed in PubMed. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c723. Comment in: *BMJ*. 2010;340:c1432.

Submitted for publication: April 25, 2014
Accepted for publication: April 25, 2014

¹ Departamento de Oftalmologia, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (UFPE), Recife, PE, Brazil. Departamento de Oftalmologia, Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, SP, Brazil.

Funding: No specific financial support was available for this study.

Disclosure: The author has any potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

Corresponding author: Rodrigo P. C. Lira. Rua Irmã Maria David, 200/1.302 - Recife (PE) - 52061-070 - Brazil