

## Formatting Guide for Narrative Reviews

*On first review, we are very flexible about the format of the manuscript in order to facilitate reviews of manuscripts that have been prepared without our journal in mind or which have been previously submitted and declined elsewhere. If a manuscript has standard or sensible structure and meets ethical standards, we will consider it.*

*However, if you are preparing the manuscript specifically for CJKHD, please follow these guidelines as you develop your work.*

***If you receive a decision of major or minor revisions, one of the requirements at that time is to comply with mandatory formatting requirements.***

### Mandatory formatting requirements

- **Compliance with limitations for word count**
  - Limit 5,000 words
- **Non-declarative title that includes the words ‘narrative review’**
- **Structured abstract using headings below, no more than 4096 characters including spaces (about 650 words)**
- **Structured manuscript using headings below**

### Overview

We commission narrative review and consider publishing unsolicited narrative reviews. Consider corresponding with the editors before writing an unsolicited piece; we require a rigorous and evidence-based approach.

Narrative reviews are evidence-based summaries on a particular, defined topic, often covering a range of specific questions from pathophysiology to treatment. The content may be **clinical, ethical, policy or legal** review. The scope of the narrative review should be defined in the work. Though the standards of systematic reviewing cannot be applied to a work of such breadth, authors should identify evidence through unbiased methods and should document that they have done so, and that they have included all the relevant evidence that they have found.

### Title Page

The title page should:

- Present a title that includes the study design e.g.:
  - "Diagnosis and management of X: A narrative review"
  - Because the scientific process is rarely unequivocal, we do not favor declarative titles (e.g. "A reduces Y in the treatment of C"). However, if you feel your work is best served by a declarative title, you may use one and justify it in the cover letter.
- List the full names, institutional addresses and email addresses for all authors
  - if a collaboration group should be listed as an author, please list the Group name as an author. If you would like the names of the individual members of the Group to be searchable through their individual PubMed records, please include this information in the "Acknowledgements" section in accordance with the instructions below
- indicate the corresponding author

## Abstract

The Abstract should not exceed 4096 characters including spaces (about 650 words), and will usually be less than 500 words. (PubMed truncates abstracts at 4096 characters.) Please minimize the use of abbreviations and do not cite references in the abstract.

Abstracts for narrative reviews should include the following separate sections:

- Purpose of review
- Sources of information
- Methods (how was the information integrated, analyzed and synthesized?)
- Key findings. Be selective but substantive and include key recommendations, suggestions, and questions on which no suggestion could be made.
- Limitations

The abstract will be translated into French by CJKHD staff once the English is finalised.

## Keywords

Five keywords representing the main content of the article.

## Introduction

Scope and purpose.

## Methods

What sources of information were used, how were they integrated, analyzed and synthesized, and how was internal and external peer review conducted and used in the finalization of the manuscript.

## Review

Organize the review in logical sections with structured headings. Define your use of language or ratings systems that codify the strength of evidence or strength of recommendations. Document disagreements between authors or minority reports. **It is preferable, where evidence is poor, to state clearly that no suggestion or recommendation on an issue can be made. In this case we suggest outlining possible acceptable approaches and their relative merits.** Integrate discussion of the limitations of the data and evidence into your review.

## Limitations

If there were important limitations in your methodology, include a section describing them (optional)

## Conclusion

Usually one to three summary sentences.

## Ethical considerations

- usually none for this manuscript type