

Becoming a skilled reviewer: elevating expertise in Child Health Nursing Research

Yunsoo Kim

Editor-in-Chief, *Child Health Nursing Research*
Associate Professor, Department of Nursing, Catholic Kwandong University, Gangneung, Korea

To become a competent reviewer for *Child Health Nursing Research* (CHNR), it is essential to thoroughly understand and adhere to the standards and procedures required by the journal. Reviewers should evaluate research in a fair and accurate manner and be able to contribute to the advancement of knowledge. Herein, we will cover the key points to consider in order to become a competent reviewer for CHNR.

1. Understanding the Scope and Aims of CHNR

As a review for CHNR, it is crucial to critically assess whether the study's target population aligns with the journal's scope and aim. This evaluation involves confirming that the research focuses on children and their families, covering an appropriate age range from newborns to young adults. The inclusion criteria must accurately reflect this demographic scope to ensure the study population is relevant to child health nursing. Reviewers are also tasked with determining whether the research addresses significant issues that impact child health and the factors influencing these outcomes. Specifically, the paper should explicitly discuss health issues pertinent to children and their families, highlighting the

unique needs of these groups within the context of CHNR's mission.

Although CHNR primarily emphasizes research within the Korean cultural context, it is receiving an increasing number of submissions from international researchers. Therefore, reviewers must possess both the knowledge and cultural sensitivity required to assess studies from diverse cultural backgrounds effectively. A nuanced understanding of child health practices across various regions and cultures enables a more comprehensive and impartial review process. While maintaining CHNR's strong focus on Korean cultural contexts, reviewers should also be prepared to evaluate international submissions through a culturally informed yet objective lens. This approach ensures that research is assessed fairly, regardless of the cultural, racial, or socioeconomic background of the population studied.

Many articles submitted to CHNR focus on child health issues across a variety of racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups. Cheng et al. [1] highlight that health disparities linked to race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (SES) often continue into adulthood, and these disparities are more strongly associated with social determinants than biological factors. Thus, reviewers must ensure that studies examining these variables are robustly designed and precisely interpreted. This involves carefully examining how race, ethnicity, and SES are defined and measured in the research. Additionally, reviewers should evaluate whether the study's findings can be generalized to a broader context, especially for children from diverse social and cultural backgrounds. The research should address health disparities and offer insights into both the social and biological factors that contribute to these disparities.

Corresponding author

Yunsoo Kim

Department of Nursing, Catholic Kwandong University, 24 Beomil-ro,
579beon-gil, Gangneung 25601, Korea
TEL: +82-33-649-7614
FAX: +82-33-649-7610
E-MAIL: agneskim@cku.ac.kr

Received: October 23, 2024 Accepted: October 28, 2024

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted noncommercial use, distribution, and re-production in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2024 Korean Academy of Child Health Nursing

When evaluating submissions to CHNR, reviewers should focus on the scientific rigor of the study. This includes determining whether the selection of variables is appropriate and whether the interpretation of results accurately reflects the complexity of factors that influence child health. It is particularly important to assess the extent to which the study addresses significant disparities in child health. For multinational or cross-cultural studies, reviewers must consider how well the findings are contextualized to each country's unique social and economic conditions. This is crucial when interpreting results from diverse populations, as it is essential to strike a balance between biological and social determinants of health. Ultimately, the findings should be presented within a broader context that considers their potential applicability across different cultural and social environments.

By adhering to these guidelines, CHNR reviewers can ensure that the studies they evaluate are scientifically sound, culturally sensitive, and significantly contribute to the advancement of child health nursing research.

2. Objective Assessment: Elements of the Manuscript and Quality Evaluation

CHNR requires authors to adhere to reporting guidelines from the EQUATOR Network [2], a global initiative aimed at enhancing the transparency and accuracy of health research reporting. This adherence depends on the specific type of study design used. Such a policy ensures consistency and quality across publications. During the review process, reviewers are expected to identify the study design employed and assess the manuscript according to the relevant reporting guidelines. It is imperative that each paper is structured and its content tailored to suit its specific study design.

Reporting Guidelines for Specific Study Designs

- *Observational cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies*
[Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology \(STROBE\)](#)
[Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology \(MOOSE\)](#)
- *Qualitative studies*
[Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research \(COREQ\)](#)
[Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research \(SRQR\)](#)
- *Quasi-experimental/non-randomized trials*
[Transparent Reporting of Evaluations with Non-randomized Designs \(TREND\)](#)

- *Randomized (and quasi-randomized) controlled trials*
[Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials \(CONSORT\)](#)
- *Study of Diagnostic accuracy/assessment scale*
[Standards for the Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies \(STARD\)](#)
- *Systematic Review and meta-analysis*
[Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses \(PRISMA\)](#)
[Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology \(MOOSE\)](#)
- *Quality improvement studies*
[Standards for Quality Improvement Reporting Excellence \(SQUIRE\)](#)

CHNR reviewers are tasked with assessing the originality and relevance of the topic and purpose from the introduction of the paper. They must also ensure that the supporting literature is both appropriate and current. Furthermore, reviewers are responsible for evaluating whether the theoretical framework and methodology employed in the study are scientifically sound and well-suited to the research objectives. The evaluation of the paper primarily focuses on its originality, appropriateness, relevance, and scholarly value. Reviewers provide feedback by identifying the study's strengths and suggesting areas for improvement. This feedback is crucial for enhancing the quality of the author's work. To support their evaluations, reviewers should reference the literature cited in the submitted paper and offer well-founded feedback on the research. It is important that the feedback be both constructive and detailed to facilitate improvements in the quality of the submitted manuscript.

Good General Comment

Ex: *"This manuscript addresses an important and timely topic in child health nursing, particularly in pediatric care in underserved populations. The research question is well-defined, and the study provides valuable insights into applying qualitative methods to explore family perspectives. The methodology is appropriate, and the findings are presented in a clear and structured manner. However, further elaboration on the theoretical framework and its application to the study findings would strengthen the overall contribution of the research. Expanding the discussion to include more recent literature would enhance the study's relevance."*

Why is it good?

This comment is constructive and provides a balanced evaluation. It highlights the paper's strengths and offers specific, actionable suggestions for improvement. It acknowledges the paper's contributions while suggesting areas for further development.

The reviewer's feedback is categorized into general and specific comments. Specific comments are further divided into significant and minor comments. It is advisable for the reviewer to begin with general comments, which serve as an overall evaluation of the paper, followed by specific comments that provide detailed evaluations.

Significant comments in the review should detail the primary content improvements needed in the paper, spanning from the introduction to the discussion and conclusion. These improvements should address both conceptual and methodological issues. The discussion and conclusion sections should particularly emphasize the necessity for further explanations, verifications, or extensions that could enhance the research's contribution. Minor comments are generally adequate. However, it is advisable for minor comments to focus on increasing the academic value of the paper by encouraging authors to improve aspects such as language and clarity.

Good Major Comment

Ex: *"The study presents a valuable exploration of the impact of health education on pediatric asthma management. However, the sampling strategy is a major concern in the methodology section. The paper mentions a 'convenience sample,' but a further explanation of how participants were selected and whether this sampling method may have introduced bias is necessary. Additionally, the rationale for the sample size is unclear – providing a power calculation or justification for the number of participants would strengthen the validity of the findings. Moreover, it would be beneficial to include a more detailed description of the intervention to enhance the reproducibility of the study. Addressing these issues will significantly improve the study's methodological rigor and credibility."*

Why is it good?

This comment is specific, constructive, and detailed. It identifies an apparent methodological concern, explains why it is important, and provides actionable suggestions on how the author can address it. The comment maintains a professional tone and focuses on improving the research quality.

Writing feedback can be considered the essence of reviewing papers since high-quality feedback provides authors valuable insights that can strengthen their work. It also serves as a crucial communication channel between reviewers and authors, making it imperative to craft review comments with politeness. Constructive feedback not only facilitates peer mentoring but also promotes scholarly develop-

ment and improves the quality of research in pediatric nursing. Additionally, it plays a vital role in fostering high-quality research. To support this, CHNR reviewers should consistently update their knowledge of emerging research trends and methodologies by engaging with the latest literature.

In other words, CHNR reviewers should check whether submissions align with the journal's aims and scope, ascertain whether manuscripts comply with reporting guidelines, and provide evidence-based feedback.

Dear CHNR reviewers, you play a crucial role in the academic advancement of child health nursing research and the journal's success. Fair and thorough reviews enhance the quality of research and provide credibility to the academic community. When reviewing each paper, please maintain fairness and honesty and approach the task with an open mind that is sensitive to and respectful of diverse cultural backgrounds. Your constructive feedback is invaluable to the authors and serves as a catalyst for the advancement of child health nursing. Please take pride in your significant role in advancing knowledge and continue to develop your skills while staying informed about new research trends.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Authors' contribution

All the work was done by Yunsoo Kim.

Conflict of interest

Yunsoo Kim has been the editor-in-chief of *Child Health Nursing Research* since 2022. She was not involved in the review process of this editorial. No existing or potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

Funding

None.

Data availability

Please contact the corresponding author for data availability.

Acknowledgements

None.

ORCID and ResearcherID

Yunsoo Kim <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1788-563X>
<https://researcherid.com/rid/GPF-8147-2022>

REFERENCES

1. Cheng TL, Goodman E, Bogue CW, Chien AT, Dean JM, Kharbanda AB, et al. Race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status in research on child health. *Pediatrics*. 2015;135(1):e225-e237. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2014-3109>
2. EQUATOR Network. Enhancing the QUALity and Transparency Of health Research [Internet]. 2008-2024 [cited 2024 October 23]. Available from: <https://www.equator-network.org/>