“The primary purpose of peer review is to provide the editor with an independent expert opinion on the publishability of an as yet unpublished manuscript... We consider that a review has achieved its objective when it helps grow and develop the authors to a point where their work is publishable and goes on to make a worthwhile contribution to the literature of the discipline.” (Lawrence & Ebrall, 2008, pp. 215, 219)

**General comments**

- Manuscript is confidential information
- Your review should:
  - Be balanced, fair, and objective
  - Include comments on strengths and weaknesses
  - Convey suggestions in a helpful, positive, or constructive tone

**Suggested process:**

- **Initial read** through manuscript
  - Timeliness of topic
  - Appropriateness/interest/relevance to JPSN readers
  - Consistency with purpose of JPSN

- **Second read**
  - Make suggestions for content changes

- **Third read**
  - Make suggestions for changes in style, grammar, organization, length, figures, tables, and references

**NOTE:** Adherence to APA 6 is an author responsibility. If there are APA-related issues, please only make a comment to that effect

**Recommendation to editor** as to whether manuscript should be accepted, needs minor or major revisions, or should be rejected

- If recommend rejection
  - Suggestions for changes to author need to be consistent with this recommendation
  - May suggest that it be submitted to a more appropriate journal

Please consider commenting on the following as appropriate for the type of article being reviewed:

**Originality**

- Topic, data, and methods
- Problem previously addressed
- Prior studies have insufficiently addressed the problem

**Scientific merit**

- Conveys frequency/severity of problem
- Conveys how patients will benefit

**Logical flow of manuscript**

- Concise language
- Writing style suitable
  - Appropriate use of headings and subheadings (provides a visual outline)
  - Manuscript of appropriate length (not too long or too short)
- Accurate
- Clarifies information
Identify missing content
Suggest revisions

**Ethical considerations**
- Perceived conflict of interest for authors
- Use of brand names
- Adequate protection of human or animal subjects described (IRB approval noted)
- Any question regarding legitimacy of data or findings
- Discussion of rights of study participants
- Plagiarism
- Duplicate publication (should be significantly different from any of author’s previously published work)
- Information from previous references cited appropriately
- Any other ethical concerns

Things to consider by section of manuscript:

**Title**
- Descriptive
- Succinctly and clearly reflects content

**Abstract**
- Concise reflection of article
- Accurately describes major emphasis of article
- Purpose of article clear in first paragraph
- Appropriate summary/concluding paragraph

**Introduction/background**
- Clear, succinct statement of the problem article addresses
  - Why important
  - Relevance
- Appropriate literature reviewed/assessed
  - Comprehensive, critical, and concise
  - Essential background information – to place article within context of what already known and establish its importance
- Objectives clearly stated
  - Research questions or hypotheses
  - Significance and originality of research question or problem
- Theoretical foundations
  - Articulation of theoretical or conceptual framework
  - Visual model presented/needed
  - Congruence between framework and problem

**Methods**
- Methodology and research design clearly stated and justified
  - Reader could use as guide to replicate study
  - Justified design, recruitment strategies, data analyses
  - Appropriate to aims of study/project/review
- Clear that adhered to stated methods
Population and setting clearly described
Operational definitions of variables clear
Comprehensive list of interventions
Comprehensive list of outcome measures
  Assessment tool(s)
    Appropriate
Data analysis
  Clear how analyzed/synthesized
  Appropriate
In addition, for
  Review articles
    Clear, appropriate search strategy
    Types of studies included appropriate to review
    PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) followed
      Number of articles identified and number included noted
      Overall quality of literature identified
  Quality improvement articles
    SQUIRE (Standards for QUality Improvement Reporting Excellence) followed
Results/Findings
  Related to objective(s)
  Clearly articulated
  Explains unexpected findings
Discussion
  Interpretation and discussion appropriate
    Comments on findings in light of previous findings
  Conclusions justified
  Limitations noted
  Linked to study’s theoretical or conceptual framework
  Relevance to pediatric surgical nursing practice
    Consistent w/JPSN’s purpose
  Clear that adds to nursing’s body of knowledge
  Findings can be generalized beyond study population
    To what groups
  Clear and appropriate implications for
    Future research
    Clinical practice/patient care
Tables/Figures
  Complement/supplement text
  Clear and easily interpreted
    Summarize data
    Make data more understandable
  Table(s) or figure(s) need to be deleted or added
References
  Appropriate and current (published w/in previous 5 years or landmark articles)
Represent both sides of any controversies
Accurate (correct authors, title, journal, etc.)
Valid (referenced article actually says what purports to have said)
