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Abstract
A recently published about investigation in Medical Hydrology stated that, according to the biomedical data base MEDLINE, the scientific publication with the greatest number of Medical Hydrology published works in the last five years was a Russian one, namely, the “Voprosy Kurortologii, Fizioterapii i Lechebnoi Fizicheskoi Kultury” (VKLF). The objective of the present work is to conduct a critical study of the articles on Medical Hydrology published by this journal in the last five years through a multifactor analysis of the quality of the scientific studies published. For the evaluation of the articles we use the RATS checklist modified by BioMed Central. The redaction of the papers is different than the usual practice, there is not a subtitles organization, but a continuous redaction, also the English abstracts are to plain, hardly given an introductory information. By other side the articles have a great content relevance, having a B-C Oxford: Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine (CEBM) recommendation grade and a quality levels scientific evidence quality created by the Agency of Evaluation in Medical Technology that flows from III to VII over IX. In conclusion with an English edition and a useful internal structure of the papers this journal will be important for the physicians that do balneology.
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Résumé
Analyse critique de la revue “Voprosy kurortologii fizioterpii i lechbenoi fizicheskoi kultury”. Étude des articles d’hydrologie médicale publiés au cours des 5 dernières années
Une publication récente sur la recherche en Hydrologie Médicale constate que, selon la base de données MEDLINE, la revue médicale avec le plus grand nombre de travaux publiés sur l’hydrologie médicale au cours des cinq dernières années est russe, à savoir “Voprosy Kurortologii, Fizioterapii i Lechebnoi Fizicheskoi Kultury” (VKLF). Le but de ce travail est de présenter une étude critique des articles traitant l’hydrologie médicale dans
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Introduction

We were greatly surprised when in a recently published work about investigation in Medical Hydrology [5], we find out that they emphasize that in biomedical data base MEDLINE, the scientific publication with more number of Medical Hydrology published papers in the last five years was a Russian one, specifically “Voprosy Kurortologii, Fizioterapii i Lechebnoi Fizicheskoi Kultury” (VKLF) Journal. Indeed as
the World Federation of Hydrotherapy and Climatotherapy (FEMTEC) was announced it will be published from the next November as “Russian Journal of hydrotherapy, physiotherapy and manual therapy” in English edited by Professors Razumov and Solimene [3]. The objective of the present work is to execute a critical study about the articles on Medical Hydrology published by the mentioned journal in the last five years, through the multifactor analysis of the scientific studies quality.

Material and Methods

We carried out a PubMed research (2005-2009) whose limits were:
- Russian
- Vopr Kurortol Fizioter Lech Kult AND Balneotherapy OR Balneology
- With abstracts
- Published the last 5 years

We found 69 articles indexed. From all of them we excluded the articles without author, with no clinical content and cross referred papers from another publication) (Figure 1).

So we restricted to 47 papers totally (referred in annexe). Subsequently we request the articles to the Complutense University, Faculty of Medicine, Interlibrary Service (the Library look for the articles in other Spain libraries, without success, so they must had to ask for the articles to another European concerted libraries, finding the articles in Germany), proceeding to their translation (the articles were give out to two translators in a randomized-double blinded way for avoid personal interests) and evaluation.

Figure 1. Articles reviewed
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For the evaluation of the articles we look up scales of quality [6] and decided to use the RATS checklist modified by BioMed Central [1] from the work of Jocelyn Clark [Clark JP: How to peer review a qualitative manuscript. In Peer Review in Health Sciences. Second edition. Edited by Godlee F, Jefferson T. London: BMJ Books; 2003:219-235]. Once the first contact with the articles, we give points to the different parameters of the RATS checklist, slightly modified for adjust to all the articles. We given 1 to 3 points to each RATS item, 1 point means not adequate, 2 points means adequate but with faults and 3 points means totally adequate (Table 1).

We also based on scientific evidence levels tables, specifically in the scientific evidence quality levels created by the Agency of Evaluation in Medical Technology [4] (AETM) and in the recommendation grade of the Based Medicine Centre of Oxford University [2]. Because all the data recollected were listed previously, there is not any difference between articles so no statistical management were needed.

### Results-Discussion

The topics of the papers in order to the diseases treated and medical specialities are from greater to lower: 9 of reumathology (19,16 %), 6 of cardiovascular (12,76%), 6 of mixed pathology (12,76 %), 4 of pneumology (8,5 %), 4 of gastrointestinal (8,5 %), 4 of endocrinology (8,5 %), 3 of neurology (6,39 %), 3 of gynaecology (6,39 %), 2 of
urology (4.26 %), 2 of pediatrics (4.26 %), 2 of internal medicine (4.26 %), 2 of dermatology (4.26 %) (Figure 2).

In the RATS punctuation that we made, the minor result that can get the papers was 3 and the higher was 12. Almost 80 % of the articles obtain from 6 to 8 points. Five of the papers get 5 points, fifteen get 6 points, eleven get 7 points, ten get 8 points, five get 9 points and only one get 10 points (Figure 3).

The principal fail in all the articles was in the T and the S items, in the sampling, recruitment and data collection also in the type of the analysis and the statistical interpretation. In the CEMB recommendations grade, practically all the articles have a great content relevance, having a B (63.17 %) or C (36.83 %) recommendation grade. No one had D recommendation grade (Figure 4).
When we execute the scientific evidence quality levels of the AETM we see that the articles have a quality level that ranges from III to VII over IX so 3.40 % were very good (level III), 45.10 % were good (level IV), 41.90 % were regular (V-VI level) and 9.60 % were poor (level VII). These means that almost the half of the papers reviewed have good or very good quality (Figure 5).
We would like to point out two things: first, the style used in the Russian articles is somewhat different from that usually found in indexed similar scientific journals, particularly because there is no clear division in subtitles, but a continuous flow of written text. However, even though the usual division does not exist, all the items of a scientific publication are indeed included: Introduction, Objectives, Material and methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions and Bibliography. Secondly, the English abstracts are too short and provide but mere introductory information. The majority of the articles evaluated were case control studies, but there were also cohort studies or clinical trial studies. We have observed deficiencies as regards the way recruitment was conducted, the description of data collection and the explanation of the statistical method used.

Conclusions

We may therefore conclude that the VKLF Journal has a good recommendation level and a good scientific quality, although it may be improved in certain points. We consider that it is most important for physicians specialized in balneology to have access to the information provided by this journal. That will be more accessible when be edited in English.
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Annexe

The 47 papers from “Voprosy Kurortologii, Fizioterapii i Lechebnoi Fizicheskoi Kultury” (VKLF) Journal or Vopr Kurortol Fizioter Lech Fiz Kult

2009


2008


2007
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2006


Shavianidze GO, Lapanashvili LV. [Muscular contrapulsation in rehabilitation of patients with osteoarthrosis] 2006 Sep-Oct;(5):11-4


2005