GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW ARTICLE

Editorial Policy

Last updated: 13 November 2025

Ciência Animal Brasileira | Brazilian Animal Science (CAB) has been receiving a substantial number of submissions of review articles (narrative reviews, systematic reviews, integrative reviews, meta-analyses, and others). To better guide authors, we have prepared a document highlighting the main points that should be considered before submitting manuscripts of this type to the journal.

In the past, CAB accepted only review articles submitted by invitation from the Editorial Board, and those invitations were extended to authors with <u>recognized expertise in the field</u>. Even in those cases, all manuscripts underwent peer review and remained subject to rejection. Currently, although submission of review articles is open to all authors, we strongly recommend a careful reading of our editorial policy prior to submission to avoid disappointment with possible initial desk rejection.

Considerations for authors

Before submitting your review article, we recommend that you consider the following questions:

- Do I have established expertise on the topic? **(Past)**
- Do I maintain an active role in the field addressed? **(Present)**
- Am I able to propose perspectives and future directions for the field? **(Future)**

The CONNECTION among these three pillars (past, present and future) is essential to ensure that the review offers an original, critical and relevant contribution to CAB readers.

Once you have answered these questions and begun your review, please note that, in order to be considered during the initial editorial assessment (desk review), reviews must fully comply with CAB's submission guidelines.

General guidelines for submission of review articles

Review articles submitted to CAB must include the following sections: title (in English and Portuguese), abstract (in English), abstract (in Portuguese) and, an introduction with clearly defined objectives, main body, conclusion and references. When preparing a review, authors must consult the list of documents required for submission and strictly follow CAB's formatting and submission rules, as well as the journal's general editorial policy.

Review articles that are predominantly introductory or descriptive, similar in style to theses or book chapters, are not suitable for publication in this journal.

What does CAB expect from a review article?

A review should go beyond mere description of previous studies by providing critical analysis, methodological comparison and concrete proposals to advance the field. Important points to consider include:

- Assessing the quality of studies, their methodologies, limitations and findings;
- Comparing distinct approaches and identifying points of convergence and divergence;
- Highlighting inconsistencies, methodological gaps and controversial interpretations;
- Drawing attention to underexplored areas, such as limitations related to study scale (e.g., laboratory trials vs. field experiments) or specific contexts not yet investigated;
- Suggesting future directions, innovative approaches or potential solutions—whether theoretical, methodological or technological (for example: how might the integration of machine-learning techniques help address gaps in the analysis of animal-production data?).

A review must demonstrate clear authorial contributions, going beyond a simple bibliographic compilation by analysing, critiquing, comparing, connecting ideas, pointing out contradictions and revealing aspects that readers might not perceive on their own.

What editorial criteria are considered during the initial screening (Desk Review)?

During desk review, the editorial team considers whether the review article meets the following criteria:

- Does the text identify gaps in current knowledge?
- Does it propose future directions or potential solutions?
- Does it indicate how findings in the field (or the author's own results) may advance based on this review?
- Are the sources current (preferably from the past five years), relevant, and reliable?
- Have the classical or foundational works of the field been included when appropriate?
- Does the manuscript compare different approaches and outcomes?
- Does the author discuss methodological or conceptual limitations of the reviewed studies?
- Does the text demonstrate authorial reflection and critical judgment regarding the state of the art?

Figures and images: visual and authorial contribution

Authors are strongly encouraged to include original figures, graphs, and conceptual diagrams that add analytical or explanatory value. Conceptual models, comparative schemes, and summary tables enhance the originality of the contribution and improve reader comprehension. Preferably, figures should be original and created from the analysis developed within the review itself. Do not reproduce third-party images without authorization.

Whenever graphs or images generated with artificial intelligence or software tools are used, this must be explicitly stated in the figure legend and, when appropriate, in a section titled *"Declaration of generative artificial intelligence use"* at the end of the manuscript.

Finally, before submitting — think like an Editor!

Ask yourself:

• **Contribution:** What does this article offer that is new or useful to the scientific community?
• **Relevance:** Does it address a meaningful question within the field?
• **Depth:** Will an experienced reader learn something significant from this review?

Review articles that lack critical analysis, authorial synthesis, and relevant contributions tend to be rejected during the initial screening, as they often resemble extended introductions or generic compilations.

Important: Artificial Intelligence (AI) and editorial transparency

The use of artificial intelligence tools, such as writing assistants, automated translators, and image generators, is permitted, provided it is done transparently and ethically. If any part of the text, figure, or graphic was produced with AI assistance, this must be clearly stated in the manuscript.

Authors are fully responsible for the submitted content and must ensure that the use of AI:

• Does not violate copyright or ethical standards;
• Complies with the licenses of the platforms used;
• Does not compromise the originality or scientific reliability of the article.

Specific guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-analyses

1. Study identification and scope
• The manuscript must be explicitly identified as a *systematic review* or *meta-analysis* in the title, abstract, and Materials and Methods section.
• The topic must fall within the journal's scope and demonstrate scientific relevance and timeliness.
• The research question must be well defined, using an appropriate framework (PICO, PECO, SPIDER, or equivalent).
• The title and abstract must clearly reflect the objectives, methods, and main findings of the review.

---

2. Originality and scientific justification
• The review must provide an updated synthesis of evidence or fill existing knowledge gaps.
• A clear rationale and justification for the study's importance must be presented.
• CAB recommends prior registration of the review protocol in platforms such as **PROSPERO**, **OSF**, **INPLASY**, or equivalent.

3. Methodology and transparency

The methodology must ensure reproducibility and include:

• A detailed search strategy specifying databases used, descriptors, Boolean operators, search period, and any language restrictions.

• Clearly defined and justified inclusion and exclusion criteria.

• Description of the study selection process, including the number of reviewers, consensus procedures, and any software used (e.g., Rayyan).

• Quality assessment of included studies using recognized tools (e.g., SYRCLE's, JBI, Cochrane RoB, NOS, GRADE, ROBINS-I).

• A complete PRISMA flow diagram consistent with the numbers reported.

• The final literature search must have been conducted no more than 12 months before submission.

• Any use of AI for generating, editing, or reviewing text or images must be disclosed, in accordance with CAB's editorial policies.

4. Presentation of results and evidence synthesis

• Results must be presented clearly, with tables summarizing included studies (authors, year, study design, sample, main findings).

• Evidence synthesis, whether narrative or meta-analytic, must be appropriate to the study type and methodologically consistent.

• When applicable, analyses of heterogeneity, risk of bias, and publication bias (e.g., funnel plots, statistical tests) should be included.

• The discussion should interpret results based on evidence, comparing them with existing literature.

• Conclusions must be supported by data, address the study objectives, and avoid overgeneralization.

5. Ethics, transparency, and scientific integrity

• The manuscript must be free of plagiarism and self-plagiarism; the use of plagiarism-detection software is recommended.

• Conflicts of interest must be clearly declared.

• The review must adhere to ethical standards in data use, citation, and scientific reproducibility.

• Any use of AI during the research process must be disclosed in compliance with CAB's editorial policies.

6. Writing, structure, and journal standards

• The manuscript must follow **PRISMA 2020** guidelines (and PRISMA-S, when applicable).

• The text must be clear, cohesive, well structured, and written in grammatically correct Portuguese or English using scientific language.

• The manuscript must comply with all journal standards, including formatting, citation and reference style, text length, figures, and tables.