Arquivos Brasileiros de
Oftalmologia

EDITORIAL

Medical acumen and scientific approach meet the FINER method

Perspicácia médica e abordagem científica convergem para o método FINER

Caio Vinicius Regatieri[1,2], Augusto Vieira Alves[1,2], Eduardo M. Rocha[3]

1. Departamento de Oftalmologia, Escola, Paulista de Medicina, Universidade Federal de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

2. Unidade Paulista de Oftalmologia, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

3. Departamento de Oftalmologia, Otorrinolaringologia e Cirurgia de Cabeça e Pescoço, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, SP, Brazil.

Researchers need to focus on the feasibility and appropriateness of a chosen research question for their investigations[1]. The FINER method, invoked by Brian Hulley, aims at constructing and highlighting the fundamental points of an appropriate academic study[2].

FINER, a mnemonic system, encompasses five characteristics to consider when creating and completing scientific inquiries. Mnemonics are memory aids that use elaborative encoding to help individuals remember facts accurately.

The FINER acronym stands for: **feasible, interesting, novel, ethical, and relevant.** Creating questions and finding answers is rarely a straightforward endeavor. Empirical literature, scientific and clinical experiences are pivotal for building up strong research questions[3].

Feasible:

1. *Time and Money:* are you and your team funded or have your own financial means to complete the scientific proposal? Is the available time sufficient to complete the tasks?
2. *Technical expertise and satisfactory pool of potential participants:* animals, humans, and biological materials are often the basis of many scientific studies. Focusing on animals and humans requires adoption of ethical conduct standards. Studies on people carry risks, despite the best of intentions and care. Technical expertise (high levels of knowledge and skills) takes years to acquire; and a team of well-qualified professionals presenting the aforementioned traits may be hard to find.

Interesting:

1. *Captivate the scientific community*, *you*, *your peers and patients:* as a collaborative effort, research is strongest when it gets different people interested and motivated.

Novel:

1. *Know the previous and current literature of your field of expertise:* improve the contemporary body of evidence and discussion, analyzing the implications that can be brought up by your thesis is essential.

Ethical:

1. *Institutional review boards*, *Declaration of Helsinki:* a body of ethical principles, general and/or specific rules, norms, protocols and standards on how to conduct the research must be addressed at all times. Research purposes and targets can never take precedence over the rights and interests of communities, individual subjects, animals or any society whatsoever. Minimize risks and burdens, maximize benefits.

Submitted for publication: December 19, 2018
Accepted for publication: December 31, 2018

Funding: No specific financial support was available for this study.

Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest: None of the authors have any potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

Corresponding author: Caio Vinicius Regatieri

Departamento de Oftalmologia. Universidade Federal de São Paulo. Rua Botucatu, 821 - São Paulo, SP - 04023-062 - E-mail: caiore@gmail.com

Relevant:

1. *Contemporary and future research; scientific knowledge:* clinical, surgical and public health fields are to benefit and be positively influenced. Research questions presenting a well-built design and suitable planning have better chances of being reproducible, applicable, and statistically significant.

Overcoming research challenges should start at the moment of choosing a well-structured topic, gathering high-skilled professionals, and setting a robust framework of strategies. Health professionals often struggle to bridge the gap between science and their daily routine. The FINER method guides researchers through a set of rules on how to produce and conduct a proper research project.

REFERENCES

1. Brian Haynes R. Forming research questions. J Clin Epidemiol. 2006;59(9):881-6.
2. Hulley SB, Cummings SR, Browner WS, Grady DG, Newman TB. Designing clinical research [Internet]. 3rd ed. Philadelphia (PA): Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2007. [cited 2017 Nov 21]. Available from: http://192.163.246.197/~reskdeve/wp-content/uploads/designing-clinical-research_Hulley.pdf
3. Farrugia P, Petrisor B, Farrokhyar F, Bhandari M. Research questions, hypotheses and objectives. Can J Surg. 2010;53(4):278-81.