

# From Passive Consumption to Active Interrogation: A Strategic Approach to Reading Clinical Research

Sompop Bencharit, DDS, MS, PhD<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Digital Dentistry & Innovation LLC, Chapel Hill, NC 27516

<sup>2</sup>Adjunct Professor, Department of Restorative Sciences, Adams School of Dentistry, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC

**Corresponding Author:** Sompop Bencharit, Adjunct Professor, Department of Restorative Sciences, Adams School of Dentistry, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC

**Received:** February 02, 2026; **Published:** February 16, 2026

## Abstract

In an era of exponential information growth, clinicians and researchers face an overwhelming volume of new literature. Reading linearly—from Introduction to Conclusion—is often inefficient and prone to narrative bias. This perspective outlines a systematic approach to critical appraisal, advocating for a shift from passive reading to active "interrogation." By prioritizing the Methods and Results over the narrative sections and applying a structured framework of validity, clinical importance, and applicability, practitioners can more effectively bridge the gap between published research and patient care.

## Introduction

The modern clinician is inundated with data. With hundreds to thousands of new clinical articles published daily, the traditional advice to "keep up with the literature" has become a Herculean task. For many, the default coping mechanism is to read abstract summaries or, when time permits, read articles linearly from start to finish. However, this linear approach often favors narrative over evidence. It allows the author's storytelling in the Introduction to frame the reader's perception before they have evaluated the data.

To practice true evidence-based healthcare, we must shift our mindset from consumption to interrogation. Efficient reading is not about absorbing every word; it is about aggressively questioning the validity and relevance of the study. This requires a non-linear reading rhythm—often starting with the Methods and Conclusion—and a rigorous evaluation of three fundamental questions regarding validity, meaning, and applicability.[1,2]

Before interrogating any clinical study, readers must first articulate a well-structured clinical question similar to conducting a systematic review or meta-analysis. The PICO framework (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome) provides a systematic method for formulating answerable questions that guide both literature searches and

critical appraisal.[3] By explicitly defining these four elements, readers can more efficiently assess whether a study's design matches its stated research question and whether the findings apply to their specific clinical context. This structured approach (Figure 1) transforms vague clinical uncertainties into precise, searchable questions that can be answered by the medical literature.



### Question 1: Can I Trust the Results? (Internal Validity)

The most persuasive Introduction is irrelevant if the study design is flawed. Therefore, the first step in critical appraisal is to ignore the "why" (Introduction) and scrutinize the "how" (Methods).

Internal validity hinges on whether bias was minimized. In Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), this requires evaluating proper randomization, blinding, and allocation concealment. One must ask: Did the study design accurately match the research question? Furthermore, the integrity of the analysis is paramount. Researchers must verify if the reported analyses were pre-specified in the protocol or if they represent post-hoc data dredging designed to salvage a "positive" result.[4–6] If the internal structure of the study is compromised, the results cannot be trusted, regardless of their statistical significance.

Internal validity assessment should employ validated risk of bias tools rather than subjective impressions. For randomized controlled trials, the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0 (RoB 2.0) tool provides a domain-based evaluation across six key areas: selection bias, performance bias, detection bias, attrition bias, reporting bias, and other sources of bias.[7,8] Each domain is rated as low risk, high risk, or unclear risk, with outcome-specific summary judgments. For observational studies, different tools are required: ROBINS-I for non-randomized intervention studies, Newcastle-Ottawa for cohort and case-control studies, and QUADAS-2 for diagnostic test accuracy studies.[7,8] The choice of tool should match the study design, and critical appraisal should be performed independently by at least two reviewers to minimize subjective interpretation.[7]

### Question 2: What Do the Results Mean? (Clinical Importance)

"A common pitfall in medical literature interpretation is the conflation of statistical significance with clinical relevance. A p-value <0.05 indicates only that a finding is unlikely due to chance—it says nothing about magnitude or clinical utility. Clinicians must examine the effect size and its precision (reported through confidence intervals) and compare the observed effect against the minimal clinically important difference (MCID)—the smallest change in outcome that patients perceive as beneficial.[5,9] A statistically significant reduction in blood pressure of 2 mmHg may be clinically meaningless if the MCID is 5 mmHg. Similarly, confidence intervals that span both clinically important benefits and trivial effects suggest insufficient precision to guide practice, regardless of p-value.

Many trials measure surrogate endpoints (biomarkers, imaging findings, laboratory values) rather than patient-oriented outcomes (mortality, quality of life, functional status). While surrogates may offer earlier results and smaller sample sizes, they frequently fail to predict clinical benefit. A treatment that lowers cholesterol or improves ejection fraction may not reduce cardiovascular mortality. Recent systematic evaluations demonstrate weak correlations between many FDA-approved surrogate endpoints and actual clinical outcomes.[10] Clinicians should prioritize studies reporting patient-oriented outcomes and view surrogate endpoint trials as hypothesis-generating rather than practice-changing.[11,12]

### Question 3: Do the Results Apply to My Patients? (External Validity)

Even internally valid studies with clinically important results may not apply to individual patients. The WHOM framework, as described by O'Marr et al.[4] provides a systematic approach to external validity assessment:[4,5,11]

- W (Who): Do study participants match your patient's demographics, disease severity, comorbidities, and baseline risk? Highly selected trial populations (e.g., excluding elderly patients or those with multiple comorbidities) may not represent real-world practice.
- H (How): Can the intervention be replicated in your setting? Consider required expertise, technology, cost, and healthcare

system infrastructure. A surgical technique requiring specialized training or a drug unavailable in your formulary cannot be implemented regardless of efficacy.

- O (Outcomes): Do the measured outcomes align with patient values and treatment goals? Patients may prioritize symptom relief over survival, or vice versa. Shared decision-making requires understanding which outcomes matter most to the individual patient.
- M (Minimizing bias): Is the evidence sufficiently robust to justify practice change? Consider the totality of evidence, consistency across studies, and magnitude of benefit relative to potential harms.

### The Totality of Evidence: From Individual Studies to Clinical Guidelines

Finally, no single study should dictate practice. Study design determines the strength of the conclusion; while RCTs provide evidence for causation, observational studies (cohort and case-control) generally offer only correlation and are susceptible to confounding.[13] Individual trials are susceptible to both random error and systematic bias, and even well-conducted RCTs may produce conflicting results. Critical appraisal requires evaluating the entire body of evidence through systematic reviews and meta-analyses that synthesize findings across multiple studies.[3,11]

The GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) framework provides the most widely adopted system for assessing evidence quality. GRADE evaluates five domains that can lower confidence in evidence (risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias) and three that can raise it (large effect size, dose-response gradient, and plausible confounding that would reduce the observed effect). Evidence is classified as high, moderate, low, or very low quality, directly informing the strength of clinical recommendations.[14]

When examining systematic reviews, clinicians should verify that the review employed rigorous methods: comprehensive literature searches across multiple databases, duplicate independent study selection and data extraction, formal risk of bias assessment using validated tools, and appropriate statistical methods for meta-analysis.[3,11] Funnel plots and statistical tests can identify publication bias, where negative studies remain unpublished, potentially inflating apparent treatment effects.

Clinical practice guidelines represent the highest level of synthesis, combining systematic evidence reviews with explicit consideration of patient values, resource utilization, and implementation feasibility. Trustworthy guidelines are characterized by transparent methodology, multidisciplinary panel composition including patient representatives, management of conflicts of interest, and explicit linkage between evidence quality and recommendation strength.[12,14] Critical appraisal requires a bird's-eye view. We must evaluate the "totality of evidence," interpreting individual studies within the context of systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and conflicting data.[11,15,16]

### A Practical Non-Linear Reading Approach

To implement the three-question framework efficiently, critical appraisal follows a strategic, non-linear sequence, efficient critical appraisal follows a strategic, non-linear sequence:[17,18]

1. Read the structured abstract to understand the basic question, design, and headline results
2. Examine the Methods section to assess internal validity before accepting any conclusions

3. Review the Results tables and figures directly, forming independent interpretations before reading the authors' narrative
4. Check for protocol registration and pre-specified analyses to distinguish confirmatory from exploratory findings
5. Read the Discussion critically, recognizing that authors may overinterpret findings or minimize limitations
6. Return to the Introduction last, if at all—it provides context but should not frame your interpretation

This approach prioritizes data over narrative, allowing clinicians to form independent judgments about validity and importance before encountering the authors' potentially biased interpretation.

## Conclusion

Reading clinical research is a skill that requires discipline and skepticism. By bypassing the narrative flow and focusing on systematic evaluation—interrogating the validity, clinical importance, and applicability—clinicians can transform information into actionable knowledge. In the age of information overload, the goal is not to read more, but to read better. By adopting this systematic approach to critical appraisal, clinicians can efficiently identify high-quality evidence that truly informs patient care, transforming the overwhelming volume of published research into meaningful clinical knowledge.

## References

1. Estellat C, Torgerson DJ, Ravaud P (2009). How to perform a critical analysis of a randomised controlled trial. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol*. 23: 291–303.
2. Haynes RB, Cotoi C, Holland J, Walters L, Wilczynski N, Jedraszewski D, et al (2006). Second-order peer review of the medical literature for clinical practitioners. *JAMA*. 295: 1801–1808.
3. Calderon Martinez E, Ghattas Hasbun PE, Salolin Vargas VP, García-González OY, Fermin Madera MD, Rueda Capistrán DE, et al (2025). A comprehensive guide to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis in medical research. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 104: e41868.
4. O'Marr JM, Miclau T, Morshed S (2023). Deciphering data: How should clinical trials change your clinical practice? *Injury*. 54 Suppl 5: 110928.
5. Zarbin MA (2016). Challenges in Applying the Results of Clinical Trials to Clinical Practice. *JAMA Ophthalmol* 134: 928–933.
6. Alish M, Fritsch K, Soukup M, Wilkin J (2009). Clinical trials and statistical analyses: what should dermatologists look for in a report?. *Dermatol Ther* 22: 199–203.
7. Weimer MB, Devoto A, Kansagara D, Safarian T, Brunner E, Stock A, et al (2024). The American Society of Addiction Medicine Clinical Practice Guideline Development Methodology. *J Addict Med* 18: 366–372.
8. Jacobs AK, Kushner FG, Ettinger SM, Guyton RA, Anderson JL, Ohman EM, et al (2013). ACCF/AHA clinical practice guideline methodology summit report: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 61: 213–265.
9. Pihlstrom BL, Barnett ML (2010). Design, operation, and interpretation of clinical trials. *J Dent Res* 89: 759–772.
10. Jüni P, Antoniou S, Arbelo E, Buccheri S, Cikes M, da Costa BR, et al (2025). 2024 Revision of the level of evidence grading system for ESC clinical practice guideline recommendations I: therapy and prevention. *Eur Heart J* 46: 1885–1894.
11. Murad MH, Montori VM, Ioannidis JPA, Jaeschke R, Devereaux PJ, Prasad K, et al (2014). How to read a systematic review and meta-analysis and apply the results to patient care: users' guides to the medical literature. *JAMA* 312: 171–179.
12. Guyatt GH, Sinclair J, Cook DJ, Glasziou P (1999). Users' guides to the medical literature: XVI. How to use a treatment recommendation. Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group and the Cochrane Applicability Methods Working Group. *JAMA* 281: 1836–1843.
13. Grimes DA, Schulz KF (2002). An overview of clinical research: the lay of the land. *Lancet* 359: 57–61.
14. Brignardello-Petersen R, Carrasco-Labra A, Guyatt GH (2021). How to Interpret and Use a Clinical Practice Guideline or Recommendation: Users' Guides to the Medical Literature. *JAMA* 326: 1516–1523.
15. Eshraghi Y, Chakravarthy K, Strand NH, Shirvalkar P, Schuster NM, Abdallah RT, et al (2021). The American Society of Pain and Neuroscience (ASPN) Practical Guidelines to Study Design and Scientific Manuscript Preparation in Neuromodulation. *J Pain Res* 14: 1027–1041.
16. Gelbard RB, Cripps MW (2021). Pitfalls in Study Interpretation. *Surg Infect (Larchmt)* 22: 646–650.
17. Mansfield L (2005). The reading, writing, and arithmetic of the medical literature, part 1. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 95: 100–7; quiz 107–8.
18. Mansfield L (2006). The reading, writing, and arithmetic of the medical literature, part 3: critical appraisal of primary research. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 96: 7–15; quiz 15–6, 44.