

Journal of Pediatric Surgical Nursing Tips for Reviewers

“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purpose of peer review is to provide the editor with an independent expert opinion on the publishability of an as yet unpublished manuscript...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)

Lawrence, D., & Ebrall, P. (2008). The scholarship of critical review: Improving quality and relevance.
Journal of the Canadian Chiropractic Association, 52, 211-223.

Additional Excellent Resource with links to study-type reporting guidelines:

<http://www.equator-network.org/library/guidance-developed-by-editorial-groups/>