

Request for the retraction of the manuscript “Public health in Kosovo after five difficult years of independence” (Review article). SEEJPH 2013 by authors Jerliu N, Ramadani N, Mone I, Brand H.

Slavenka Jankovic, co-editor, SEEJPH

Dear Executive Editor,

I have read carefully the manuscripts published in the first issue of the SEEJPH.

As a co-editor of the SEEJPH, I have to request the retraction of the review article: “Public health in Kosovo¹ after five difficult years of independence” by authors Jerliu N, Ramadani N, Mone I, Brand H.

This manuscript does not fulfil neither criteria for a review paper nor for any other type of scientific manuscripts that the SEEJPH publishes, as outlined in the SEEJPH authors’ instructions.

According to the checklist for review papers (please see below) none of the several basic criteria was observed.

Criteria for review articles	Article: “Public health in Kosovo* after five difficult years of independence” Criterion observed (Yes/No)
Review articles are an attempt to summarize the current state of understanding on a topic. They analyze or discuss research previously published...They come in the form of systematic reviews and literature reviews and are a form of secondary literature (1).	No The paper reports on demographic and socioeconomic indicators, health profile, lifestyle factors, health reforms and health financing in Kosovo using official data from the Agency of Statistics Kosovo, the Ministry of Health Kosovo, the World Bank, the IPH Kosovo, etc.
A systematic review is a review of a clearly formulated question that uses systematic and explicit methods to identify, select, and critically appraise relevant research, and to collect and analyze data from the studies that are included in the review (2).	No
A review article is written about other articles, and does not report original research of its own. Review articles draw upon the articles that they review to suggest new research directions, to strengthen support for existing theories and/or identify patterns among existing research studies (3).	No
Reviews should stimulate thinking and further reading indicating other sources of information (3).	No
The review should include a broad update of recent developments (from the past 3-5 years) and their likely public health or clinical applications in primary and secondary care (4).	No
Review articles provide an extensive overview of the existing literature on a topic (they should include a number of relevant references, mainly original research papers and reviews (up to 50 references according to SEEJPH Instruction for authors) (3-5).	No There are only 10 references in the reference list (only four are original papers). Half of all references (2,3,5,8,10) are incomplete (without URL and the dates of access that is not in line with the SEEJPH Authors’ instructions).

¹ This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence: (<http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/detailed-country-information/kosovo/>) (Accessed April 17, 2014).

References

1. English Encyclopedia. Review article.
<http://www.encyclo.co.uk/define/Review%20article> (accessed: April 17, 2014).
2. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2535, DOI: 10.1136/bmj.b2535.
3. American Public University system. A review article:
<http://apus.libanswers.com/a.php?qid=153014> (accessed: April 17, 2014).
4. SEEJPH. Authors' instructions: <http://www.seejph.com/instructions-for-authors/> (accessed: April 17, 2014).
5. Day RA, Gastel B. How to write and publish a scientific paper. 7th edition. Oxford: Greenwood Press, 2011.