**Referee comments on**

Assessment of methodological description and ethical aspect in research articles published in medical journal: A Critical appraisal”

1. **General Comments**

* The study” Assessment of methodological description and ethical aspect in research articles published in medical journal: A Critical appraisal” is a good Research idea as papers like these will find gaps in methodological and ethical aspects in research in publications. The paper itself however suffers from serious methodological deficits and lacks novelty.

1. **Specific Comments**
2. **Introduction**

* Nothing about the Ethical aspects is not mentioned though ethics is mentioned in the title of the study
* Rationale behind conducting this study is not clear. It does not tell the reader about how this study is different from other studies and its unique value
* Aims and Objectives are to be specified in introduction itself rather than writing it separately. This makes the paper look like a protocol or thesis.

1. **Materials and Methods**

* Search strategy is missing
* This study itself lacks in mentioning exemption from review from the Institutional Ethics Committee as data are there in the public domain
* Assessment of assent is not mentioned.
* Reason for searching only three open access journals remains unclear.
* Why articles published within one year (January to December 2015) were analyzed- reasons need to be stated.
* Version of Microsoft Excel used for data analysis is not mentioned in this study.

1. **Results and Discussion**

* In methodology section, there is mention of 239 articles, 155 articles were observational studies which means other articles i.e 84 articles were Randomized Clinical Trials. But in the results section, assessment of 87 articles are said to be Clinical trials. There is a problem with numbers. Are RCTs that same as clinical trials?
* Values is missing in Chart 1 (Number of observational and Clinical trials)
* In CHART 2. there is no mention of P values – this assessment is also not alluded to in the methods section
* Rationale for comparison of observational studies with RCTs remains unclear.

1. **Referee’s final assessment**

* The study lacks both novelty and methodological rigor.