

Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing

# JOGNN

*Scholarship for the Care of Women, Childbearing Families, & Newborns*

## **Reviewer Handbook**

# **JOGNN Reviewer Handbook**

## **Contents**

|                                                                      |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Remarks from the Editor in Chief.....                                | 3  |
| Roles and Responsibilities .....                                     | 4  |
| Editor in Chief .....                                                | 4  |
| Associate Editors .....                                              | 4  |
| Assistant Editor for Statistics .....                                | 5  |
| Senior Managing Editor.....                                          | 5  |
| Editorial Advisory Board Member .....                                | 6  |
| Reviewer.....                                                        | 7  |
| Guidelines for Authors.....                                          | 8  |
| Guidelines for Reviewers.....                                        | 8  |
| Editorial Manager (EM) .....                                         | 8  |
| General Principles.....                                              | 8  |
| Getting Started.....                                                 | 9  |
| Submitting Your Review .....                                         | 10 |
| Review Criteria By Manuscript Type .....                             | 12 |
| Responding to the Criterion on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion..... | 19 |
| Sample Reviews.....                                                  | 21 |

REVISED 4/25/2025

## Remarks from the Editor in Chief



This handbook provides *JOGNN* editors and reviewers with reference material for their information and development. The review process, including the roles and responsibilities of the editors, editorial advisory board, and reviewers, is discussed.

Peer review is a respected tradition in scientific and technical journals. The tenets of the peer review process—content integrity, content ethics, fairness, usefulness, and timeliness—are essential to the advancement of knowledge and are more important than ever in scholarly publication. As a peer-reviewed journal, *JOGNN* would not be the quality publication it is without your efforts.

I hope the material in this handbook will clarify what is asked of you and make your work easier and more efficient. We may add to the handbook as new policies are developed, and we will notify you if this is the case. Please feel free to offer comments on the material or suggestions for improving the handbook.

Thank you for your work and ongoing support of *JOGNN*.

Joyce K. Edmonds, PhD, MPH, RN  
Editor in Chief , *JOGNN*  
April 25, 2025

## **Roles and Responsibilities**

### **Editor in Chief**

The Editor in Chief (EIC) of *JOGNN* is a registered nurse who is a member of AWHONN with a PhD or equivalent and a minimum of 10 years of experience in women's health, childbearing, and/or neonatal nursing; expertise in quantitative methods; a substantial record of research and clinical publications in a broad number of peer-reviewed journals on topics relevant to the journal's readership; broad experience as a peer reviewer for scholarly journals and a strong ability to critically appraise research, review, clinical, and other manuscripts; and excellent verbal, written, and interpersonal skills.

In consultation with the *JOGNN* Editorial Advisory Board (EAB), the Editor is responsible for the scientific and technical content of *JOGNN*. The Editor works with the *JOGNN* EAB, the Associate Editors, AWHONN staff, and the *JOGNN* publisher (Elsevier) to establish future direction for *JOGNN*. The Editor is responsible to keep abreast of developments in perinatal and women's health nursing, seek authors for manuscripts that reflect emerging knowledge and innovations in care, maintain content standards that are consistent with the policies of the *JOGNN* EAB, facilitate and oversee the process of peer review, review all unsolicited manuscripts and their reviews, approve content for publication, act as the final arbiter on all editorial decisions, plan contents of upcoming issues of *JOGNN*, and set priorities for specific issues in consultation with the Senior Managing Editor (SME). The Editor delegates editorial functions to the associate and managing editors, writes or solicits at least one editorial for each issue of *JOGNN*, develops and maintains guidelines for *JOGNN* authors and reviewers in conjunction with the SME, appoints reviewers and EAB members, conducts meetings of the EAB, represents *JOGNN* at professional meetings, and reports biannually to AWHONN.

### **Associate Editors**

Associate Editors (AEs) are registered nurses who are members of AWHONN with doctoral degrees; experience and expertise in the nursing care of women, childbearing families, and newborns and infants; and a record of scholarly publications and excellence in written and verbal communications. Associate Editors are responsible to keep abreast of developments in perinatal and women's health nursing, participate in EAB meetings, participate in decision-making

regarding journal policies, represent *JOGNN* at professional meetings as requested, and maintain effective communication with the editorial and production teams. Associate Editors work with the editor to manage peer review and editorial decision-making regarding assigned manuscripts in their specific areas of responsibility and other duties as requested. They may be called upon to write editorials.

### **Assistant Editor for Statistics**

The Assistant Editor for Statistics is a doctorally-prepared individual with expertise in applied statistics who assists the editors by reviewing assigned manuscripts for the accuracy and appropriateness of statistical methods and their interpretation. This individual may be called upon to write editorials on selected topics.

### **Senior Managing Editor**

The Senior Managing Editor (SME) is an individual with a minimum of a baccalaureate degree and at least 5 years of experience in peer review and publication; extensive skill in substantive editing, copy editing, proofreading, and writing; sound organizational and management skills; excellent verbal and electronic communication skills; meticulous attention to detail; and expertise in computer applications relevant to journal management. The SME oversees the *JOGNN* peer-review and production processes; works with the Editor(s) to establish procedures and develop guidelines to facilitate the work of the reviewers and EAB; works with the publisher to assure compliance with the publication contract and to maintain efficient publishing schedules and procedures; serves as liaison with the publisher's staff; monitors work of publisher's editorial and production staffs; and informs the publisher's advertising representative regarding specialty and AWHONN projects to stimulate advertising. The SME processes submissions; edits copy, prepares copy for the publisher, and proofreads pages at all stages; assists the Editor in working with authors and potential authors; assists the Editor in identifying reviewers and EAB members; maintains *JOGNN*'s database to track articles, authors, and reviewers and match reviewers to appropriate manuscripts; coordinates EAB meetings; and maintains open lines of communication with the Editor, AEs, and EAB. The SME processes requests for information related to *JOGNN* and prepares executive reports to summarize journal activities.

## **Editorial Advisory Board Member**

Members of the Editorial Advisory Board (EAB) are appointed by the EIC. These individuals meet the qualifications and fulfill the responsibilities listed below.

### **Qualifications**

- Registered nurse or other relevant professional in the fields of women's health, childbearing, or neonatal health care or a related field
- Graduate degree in nursing or related field
- Knowledgeable about health care trends and issues relevant to *JOGNN*'s mission
- Record of publication in peer-reviewed nursing, medical, or interdisciplinary journals
- Experience as a *JOGNN* reviewer with evidence of ability to critique a wide variety of manuscripts, including but not limited to research and clinical application
- Willingness to read widely within women's health, childbearing, neonatal, and public health topics

### **Responsibilities**

- Thoroughly and critically evaluate as many as two manuscripts per month according to established guidelines
- Review manuscripts for accuracy of scientific content; relevancy to women's health, childbearing, or neonatal nursing and interdisciplinary health care; and potential for publication
- Provide authors with constructive criticism and specific recommendations for revision
- Control personal biases while reviewing articles; alert SME to potential conflicts of interest with assigned manuscripts; and submit annual conflict of interest form to the SME
- Recommend acceptance, revision, or rejection for assigned manuscripts
- Represent the journal by soliciting manuscripts, letters to the editor, and new reviewers
- Contribute to the determination of timely topics for specific calls for papers in consultation with the EIC, other editors, and other members of the EAB
- Attend and actively participate in EAB meetings
- Assist in reviewing and revising editorial policies and procedures
- Participate in evaluating the journal as requested by the EIC
- Help direct the focus and future of the journal
- Meet deadlines

### **Term**

- Appointed by the editor for renewable 3-year terms of service

## **Reviewer**

Reviewers are appointed by the EIC for an ongoing term of service.

### **Qualifications**

- Registered nurse or other related professional with knowledge and expertise in the fields of women's health, childbearing, or neonatal care and/or relevant quantitative or qualitative research expertise
- Published author
- Willingness to read widely within the focus areas of *JOGNN*
- Ability to meet timelines and respond to electronic communication

### **Responsibilities**

- Thoroughly and critically evaluate manuscripts submitted to *JOGNN*
- Control personal biases while reviewing manuscripts
- Recommend acceptance, revision, or rejection for assigned manuscripts
- Provide authors with constructive criticism and specific recommendations for revision
- Meet assigned deadlines

## Guidelines for Authors

The complete and current guidelines for JOGNN authors can be found at <https://www.jognn.org/content/authorinfo> in html and pdf format. This version of the author guidelines will always be the most current, so please consult it for any questions. JOGNN's editorial style follows

American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*, 7th ed. Author.

## Guidelines for Reviewers

### Editorial Manager (EM)

All manuscript submission and peer review for JOGNN is conducted electronically via the EM system. Editorial Manager is web based, and all authors, reviewers, and editors log in to the site to complete their assignments. A complete guide for reviewers using EM is available at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jognn/account/ReviewerPage.html>. Further assistance is available by contacting Angela Hartley in the editorial office (202-261-2432, [ahartley@awhonn.org](mailto:ahartley@awhonn.org)).

All communication regarding manuscript review will be sent to you by email through the EM system. If you will be unavailable for review for a period of time (e.g., vacation, sabbatical), you may note your unavailability in your profile in EM.

Please be sure to carefully enter your name and credentials as they should appear in any published acknowledgements and to keep your contact information up to date.

### Classification Terms

When an account is created for you in EM, you will be asked to enter classification terms, which the EM system uses to match reviewers to manuscripts. These terms reflect your areas of interest and expertise, and they cover subject area as well as methodology. You may choose as many terms as you like, but note that the more terms you select, the more likely you are to receive reviewer requests.

You will not receive reviewer requests unless one or more of your classification terms matches those identified for a manuscript. ***It is not necessary for you to be an “expert” on the topic of a manuscript that you are asked to review.*** Instead, you should be able to evaluate whether the content is useful to JOGNN's readers.

### General Principles

- Editorial review for JOGNN is a double-blind process; the identities of the author and the reviewers are concealed from each other. Please call the editorial office immediately if you think you might be biased because your interests conflict with those of an author(s) or if you recognize a manuscript because you have a close personal or professional relationship with the author.

- The manuscript is a privileged communication for your personal review. You are free to solicit advice from others, but please do not refer the manuscript to anyone else to review without approval from the editors. The manuscript is the property of the author and should not be photocopied. Any printed copy of a manuscript should be destroyed by confidential means, such as shredding, once the review process is complete.
  - **Update on the use of artificial intelligence (AI).** Reviewers must treat the manuscripts they review as confidential documents. Reviewers should not upload a submitted manuscript or any part of it into a generative AI tool as this may violate the authors' confidentiality and proprietary rights and, where the paper contains personally identifiable information, may breach data privacy and human subjects rights.
- Reviewers are selected for their varying perspectives and may render different opinions. Decisions to request revision or publish are not based on votes by the reviewers; the editor weighs all the evidence, including the timeliness of the subject and the scientific integrity of the report, in deciding whether a manuscript should be published.
- All reviews must be returned within 21 days, and a deadline will be included in your reviewer invitation. Reviewers who consistently fail to meet deadlines may not be considered for continuation on the review panel or selection for the EAB.
- A well-written manuscript is the author's responsibility. If a manuscript's content has potential, but the writing is of poor quality, you may recommend that it be returned to the author and suggest that the author obtains professional assistance. It is neither your role nor the role of JOGNN staff to rewrite poorly written manuscripts. Your recommendation regarding the potential merit of the content is what is needed.
- Peer review is not "voting" on a manuscript, although you will make a recommendation (accept, revise, reject) to the editor. Peer review is the process through which several independent experts critique the logic, methodology, writing, and clinical utility of a manuscript and make a recommendation to the editor about the suitability of the manuscript for publication in JOGNN. The individual perspectives of the reviewers help to inform and clarify the editor's own evaluation and eventual decision. When revision is requested, reviewers' comments to the author are essential to guide the author's revision.

## Getting Started

An automatically generated e-mail message will be sent to you as a request to review. It is important that you accept the invitation as soon as possible. ***If you are unable to accept a request for review, please decline the invitation rather than ignoring it.*** If you do not accept a reviewer assignment within 5 days, you will be "uninvited" by EM, and another reviewer will be assigned. Please do not ignore reviewer requests, as this can add 5 days to the review process. Complete instructions, the abstract of the manuscript, and a link through which you can accept or decline the assignment will be included in your letter of invitation.

After you accept the reviewer invitation in EM you will have access to the complete manuscript in PDF format. You may read the manuscript online or download and print it. Remember to destroy any printed copies to ensure confidentiality.

Consider the manuscript's scientific accuracy, originality, and relevance to *JOGNN* readers. Evaluate the quality of the presentation and critique its strengths and weaknesses. Here are suggestions that may be helpful.

1. Scan the title and subheadings. Read the abstract.
2. Read the manuscript quickly without stopping to make extensive notes.
3. Re-read the manuscript for accuracy of content, logical presentation, and relevance to nursing and/or interdisciplinary practice.
4. Evaluate the manuscript on its merits based on the concrete information available to you. If you do not feel capable of judging a specific portion of a manuscript, please note that in your review and proceed with other sections. Clinicians are asked to review research articles for their relevance and clinical utility; these manuscripts are also reviewed by researchers for the quality of the methods.
5. Note whether or not the manuscript conforms to *JOGNN*'s author guidelines and any relevant international guidelines for reporting specific types of manuscripts (e.g. CONSORT, SQUIRE, STROBE, PRISMA, PRISMA-SR, CARE, etc.). See the EQUATOR Network website at: <https://www.equator-network.org>.
6. Complete the information as requested in EM using the specific review sheet provided for the type of manuscript.

### Submitting Your Review

When you are ready to submit your completed review, log in to the EM system. You will be asked to complete a reviewer form with a checklist in which you will rate the manuscript on elements specific to the type of manuscript. The review page also includes a text box for comments to the editor and another for comments to the author(s). If you have extensive comments for the author or editor, we recommend that you write and save these comments in your word processing program. Once you are ready to submit your review, you can simply copy and paste your comments into the EM reviewer form. The Editor will see the comments in both boxes after you submit your review.

### Recommendation Terms

**ACCEPT.** If, aside from *minor* suggestions for revision, you feel the manuscript could be published in its present form, check this option. Please note that it is your responsibility to check for technical, medical, nursing, and clinical accuracy and to evaluate research methods and conclusions. It is a rare manuscript that meets this standard on initial review.

**REVISE.** If the manuscript contains good material and has potential for publication but should be revised by the author and resubmitted for additional review, check this option. Please check this category only if the paper has a good chance to be acceptable after the author satisfies your present criticisms. Please distinguish essential revisions from those you judge merely desirable in your confidential remarks to the editor.

**REJECT.** If the manuscript should not be published, check this option. Please identify specific reasons for this recommendation. Feel free to provide additional rationale for your decision in your confidential remarks to the editor.

### **Reviewer Rating Guidelines**

You will be asked to rate the manuscript in specific areas according to the type of manuscript (Case Report, Critical Commentary, Health Care Improvement and Evaluation, Research, Review, Methods, or Principles & Practice) using the scale 1 = *poor* to 5 = *excellent*. The criteria for each manuscript type follow in alphabetical order after these general directions.

### **Comments to the Author**

Make your suggestions to the author in the "Comments to Author" box. Indicate possible or necessary improvements in substance, organization, logic, and style. A brief section-by-section evaluation is most helpful. For each specific comment, please refer to the page number and line number if relevant. Indicate any text that should be shortened or omitted and any figures or tables that should be deleted or added. Please make your criticisms and suggestions to the authors in a constructive and courteous manner.

Please use spell check and read through your critique before submitting it.

Do not express your opinion about the overall quality and whether the article should be published in the comments to author. Make your recommendation about acceptability of the manuscript in your confidential remarks to the editor only.

It is not a good use of reviewer's time to rewrite sections of the manuscript or edit the text. Writing is the author's job, and professionals edit all manuscripts before publication. We encourage general editing comments regarding adherence to APA style requirements, language issues, and grammar and typographical errors.

### **Comments to the Editor**

Please write your confidential opinions in this section, and as mentioned above, the compelling reasons for your recommendation regarding the disposition of the manuscript. Include general suggestions and your overriding concerns. It is important to note whether or not you believe the manuscript has the potential to contribute substantive new information to the literature.

Comments in this section are of great value to the editor in making a decision about the manuscript, in writing rejection and revision letters, and in preparing accepted manuscripts for publication.

### **Other Guidelines**

Please notify the editorial office and update your EM profile at your earliest convenience regarding changes in address, telephone number, email address, or credentials.

Reviewers are the cornerstones of any peer-reviewed journal. Your work is extremely important to JOGNN. If you have questions or suggestions, please call the JOGNN staff.

## **Review Criteria By Manuscript Type**

### **Case Report**

Please rate this Case Report on the following criteria using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Well enough written for review.
2. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.
3. The case makes a significant contribution by adding unique or new information to the nursing literature.
4. Abstract is factual and provides the main points of the case in an unstructured format of no more than 125 words.
5. The CARE Guidelines are followed.
6. The introduction summarizes why the case is unique and includes references.
7. Deidentified patient information is summarized, and the relevant clinical findings, diagnostic assessments, and unique clinical challenges are presented in a clear timeline of events.
8. Medical and nursing interventions are thoroughly presented with rationale for any changes in clinical approach.
9. Patient follow-up and outcomes are discussed including the patient's response, adherence to the plan of care, and adverse or unanticipated events.
10. Discussion summarizes the strengths and limitations of the clinical approach to the case, the relevant medical/nursing literature, and primary take-away message.
11. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with *JOGNN's* scope and aims.

### **Critical Commentary**

Please rate this Critical Commentary on the following criteria using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Well enough written for review.

2. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.
3. The commentary makes a significant contribution by adding unique or new information to the nursing literature.
4. The abstract is factual and provides the main points of the commentary in an unstructured format.
5. The introduction summarizes the issue, opinion, experiences, or personal perspective the commentary addresses.
6. The commentary presents a scholarly analysis of the issue, opinion, experiences, or personal perspective with evidence from the current literature.
7. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with *JOGNN*'s scope and aims.

### **Health Care Improvement and Evaluation**

Please rate this manuscript on the following criteria, using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Written well enough for review and adheres to the *JOGNN* author guidelines.
2. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.
3. Follows the SQUIRE guidelines.
4. Makes a significant contribution to the literature on this topic and is applicable beyond the local setting.
5. Abstract is adequately detailed and structured appropriately for article type.
6. Introduction and background, including the local problem, are succinctly presented and support the clinical inquiry purpose or project aims or objectives.
7. The project objective or aim, intervention or practice change, and clinical outcomes are stated clearly.
8. Methods are appropriate to answer the purpose, aims, or objectives.
9. If a clinical project, methods of the project, including setting, intervention, methods of evaluation, analysis, and ethical issues are adequately described.

10. Results present a clear description of the outcomes of the project and are consistent with the aims or objectives.
11. Discussion summarizes the successes and challenges of the project and interprets the findings in relationship to the published literature.
12. Limitations and implications (practice, research, and/or policy) are appropriate.
13. Figures and tables are necessary and not duplicative with the text.
14. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with *JOGNN*'s scope and aims.

## **Methods**

Please rate this methods manuscript on the following criteria using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Well enough written for review.
2. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.
3. Makes a significant contribution to the literature on this method.
4. Abstract is unstructured, factual, and provide the main points of the manuscript.
5. Introduction and background lead to a succinctly stated need for the method's application, development, or psychometric study.
6. Methods of the project, including ethical issues, setting, sample, measures, procedures, and analysis are adequately described and appropriate.
7. Results present a clear description of the outcomes of the project.
8. Discussion summarizes the knowledge gained and interprets the method in relationship to others in the literature.
9. Limitations and implications (practice, research, and/or policy) are appropriate.
10. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with *JOGNN*'s scope and aims.

## **Principles & Practice**

Please rate this methods manuscript on the following criteria using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Well enough written for review.
2. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.
3. Makes a significant contribution to the literature on this innovation or trend in health care, clinical practice, care delivery systems, or public policy.
4. Abstract is unstructured, factual, and provides the main points of the manuscript.
5. Introduction and background lead to a succinctly stated need for a discussion of the innovation or trend in health care, clinical practice, care delivery systems, or public policy.
6. Provides a scholarly analysis of the innovation or trend in health care, clinical practice, care delivery systems, or public policy.
7. Applies theory or new information to nursing practice at the individual, organizational, or policy level.
8. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with *JOGNN*'s scope and aims.

## Research

Please rate this research (qualitative or quantitative) manuscript on the following criteria, using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Well enough written for review.
2. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.
3. Makes a significant contribution to the literature on this topic.
4. Abstract is adequately detailed and structured with the following headings: Objective, Design, Setting, Participants, Methods, Results, and Conclusion.
5. Introduction and literature review lead to a succinctly stated purpose statement and provide sufficient background in support of the study.
6. Methods are appropriate to answer the study questions.
7. Methods are adequately described including design, sampling and participants, procedures, measures, and analysis as appropriate to the design.

8. Results are consistent with the study purpose and questions and are logically and accurately presented.
9. Text and tables are not duplicative.
10. Conclusions are supported by the data and are logically discussed in comparison to the extant literature.
11. Limitations and implications (practice, research, and/or policy) are appropriate.
12. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with *JOGNN*'s scope and aims.

## **Review**

Please rate this review manuscript on the following criteria using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Well enough written for review.
2. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.
3. Makes a significant contribution to the literature on this topic.
4. Abstract is adequately detailed and structured with the following headings: Objective, Data Sources, Study Selection, Data Extraction, Data Synthesis, and Conclusion.
5. Uses international guidelines (e.g. PRISMA, MOOSE, etc.) as appropriate.
6. Introduction and background lead to a succinctly stated need for and question of the review.
7. Methods of the literature search and the selection of studies with inclusion criteria are adequately described; a flow diagram documenting the process is included.
8. Data extraction from the studies is clearly described.
9. Results present a clear synthesis of the data using statistical, qualitative, or narrative methods. Conflicting findings are described.
10. Discussion summarizes the main findings including the strength of evidence for applicability to clinical practice.

11. Limitations and implications (practice, research, and/or policy) are appropriate.
12. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with JOGNN's scope and aims.

### **Brief Report**

Please rate this manuscript on the following criteria, using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Well enough written for review.
2. This manuscript is appropriate for fast-track review: 10 pages or fewer, 20 references or fewer, no more than one figure and one table, contains a concise report of initial discoveries, innovative methodologies, and preliminary or pilot studies.
3. Abstract is adequately detailed and structured appropriately.
4. Introduction leads to a succinctly stated purpose statement that matches the objective in the abstract.
5. The rationale for the proposed study is clear, accurate, and directly addresses an existing knowledge gap or deficiency in the literature related to the topic.
6. Methods are suitable, technically sound, and adequately described.
7. Results are consistent with the study purpose, and questions and are logically and accurately presented.
8. Use of tables or figures is appropriate.
9. Limitations and implications (practice, research, and/or policy) are appropriate.
10. Conclusions are supported by the data and are logically and appropriately discussed in the context of the current literature.
11. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with JOGNN's scope and aims.
12. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.

### **Policy Report**

Please rate this manuscript on the following criteria, using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Written well enough for review and adheres to the JOGNN author guidelines.

2. This manuscript is appropriate for fast-track review: 10 pages or fewer, 20 references or fewer, contains a detailed report of planned or ongoing research study or a clinical research trial.
3. The unstructured abstract is no more than 150 words, factual, and provides the main points of the report.
4. Introduction and background include a well-defined purpose statement and a complete and current description of the health or public policy and all relevant stakeholders.
5. The analysis or evaluation of the policy is clearly presented with useful information for nursing practice.
6. Recommendations for modification or improvement are provided.
7. If identified, the methods of analysis or evaluation are clearly defined and appropriate for the identified purpose.
8. Report includes current references and is based on evidence.
9. All terms, programs, and/or policies are clearly defined.
10. Discussion summarizes the evaluation or analysis of issues and avoids jargon, unsubstantiated claims, and arguments for a specific political party, candidate, or ideological perspective.
11. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.
12. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with JOGNN's scope and aims.

## **Protocol**

Please rate this manuscript on the following criteria, using the scale 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

1. Written well enough for review and adheres to the JOGNN author guidelines.
2. This manuscript is appropriate for fast-track review: 10 pages or fewer, 20 references or fewer, contains a detailed report of planned or ongoing research study or a clinical research trial.
3. Abstract is adequately detailed and structured appropriately.
4. Introduction leads to a succinctly stated purpose statement that matches the objective in the abstract.

5. The rationale for the proposed study is clear, accurate, and directly addresses an existing knowledge gap or deficiency in the literature related to the topic.
6. The protocol has a clear, robust, and technically sound methodology appropriate to answer the study question(s).
7. The methodology is feasible and detailed enough to make the work replicable.
8. The proposed data analysis and statistical plan are adequately described and appropriate to the study design.
9. Limitations are appropriate and adequately described.
10. Ethical issues relating to the study are adequately described.
11. Plans for dissemination of outcomes once the study is completed are adequately described.
12. Contributes to or expands the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to the problem/population under study.
13. Contributes to the scholarship of nursing and is consistent with JOGNN's scope and aims.

### **Responding to the Criterion on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

The editors ask each reviewer to evaluate the degree to which manuscripts contribute to or expand the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) as they relate to the problem or population under study. The goal is to provide constructive feedback to the authors on how they can improve the manuscript's overall quality. When evaluating manuscripts, reviewers should consider the following points when assessing this criterion (as appropriate) and preparing comments for authors.

- Be aware of your own biases.
- Are there potential biases or stereotypes in the study's design, data collection, or analysis?
- Are the characteristics of participants appropriately reported? Is the choice of participants justified? Are inclusion efforts described?
- Are efforts to include members of the population under study in the design and conduct of the research described?
- Is the sample size adequate to draw meaningful conclusions about underrepresented groups if that is the purpose of the study?

- Do the authors account for cultural and contextual factors that may influence the research outcomes?
- Is bias-free language is used?
- Are ethical considerations, particularly in relation to informed consent, privacy, and protection of vulnerable populations, adequately reported?
- Does the study address broader implications of findings for promoting equity and inclusion in the relevant field?
- Does the study add value to the existing literature on diversity, equity, and inclusion?
- Do you have recommendations for relevant work that was not cited by the authors?

## Sample Reviews

The following three examples represent excellent reviews taken from the EM system.

### EXAMPLE 1

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Reviewer Recommendation Term:</b> Reject                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>Comments to Editor:</b> This manuscript is poorly written and lacks rigor. I do not believe that it is salvageable.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <p><b>Comment to Author:</b></p> <p>The manuscript presents an important topic. Knowledge of postpartum depression in different ethnic groups is lacking and sorely needed as the population of the U.S. becomes more diverse. A review of the literature is the logical place to start to determine subsequent research and practice priorities. The method of review is appropriate and the author specified in detail the search engines utilized and the key words employed. Tables of findings are provided for the seven articles that met the study criteria and the discussion serves to explicate the data.</p> <p>General critique: There are many instances where words are omitted from sentences. Perhaps a grammar check would help to pick these up. Additionally, the format does not adhere to APA (serial commas, first page of manuscript text on a new page, omit the title of Introduction, citation within parentheses). The abstract is too long and not well structured. I would advise using more headings.</p> <p>Specific Critique:</p> <p>Title: The title is appropriate.</p> <p>Callouts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This could be made more significant by stating that "As Mexican American women become acculturated, the prevalence of PPD increases".</li> <li>2. I would advise restating this to be: "The Spanish and English versions of the Postpartum Depression Screening Scale have similar psychometric properties".</li> <li>3. This callout is not eye-catching. Is there another point that you could emphasize in the manuscript that would be appropriate to researchers or clinicians? How about "cultural practices may provide a protective mechanism against PPD".</li> </ol> <p>Abstract: The abstract benefits from the use of headings but needs to be tightened up by decreasing words and focusing more on the important points. Additionally, the conclusion is not well supported by the findings. PPD exists... to a greater extent than was realized - there is no evidence presented that supports this assertion.</p> <p>Introduction: Cultural patterning is a term that needs to be defined (page 5, line 102). This is crucial since you are making the argument that culture and acculturation</p> |

affect PPD development.

I am unclear in the paragraph on page 5, line 112, why you move into discussion barriers. Barriers to what? The topic sentence was birth rate. This entire paragraph is poorly structured and has at least 3 different thoughts in it.

Please be consistent within the introduction. In some places you state nursing research or nursing literature while in others, you state research or literature. I am never sure when you are referring only to nursing and when you are not. Along the same lines, I am not sure why one would limit their search only to nursing.

Results of Criteria Search: Could this information be consolidated in a table? The key text begins on page 8, line 175. However, the second part of the paragraph on meta-synthesis is not helpful to the manuscript.

Please omit a discussion related to a personal communication.

Instead of including a study that does not meet your criteria, perhaps starting with a conceptual framework would be helpful. Berry could be the framework that guides your selection of variables in your search. Rigor decreases dramatically from her through the rest of the procedure when you choose to include other articles/works that initially were discarded.

Emerging Conceptual Areas: I would like to see each of these discussed fully, bringing in what is known and what is yet to be discovered. These are important topics. The list format creates questions about why something is there and where it came from (for example #4, measurement. There are many other ways to measure PPD - and are you referring to PPD symptoms or PPD diagnosis?).

Summary and Consistency of Findings:

The listing of results by study is not a synthesis.

Recommendations: Why is #2 there? Why would we want to discover socioeconomic diversity? The same question for #3 - are you saying that these factors should be explored in relation to PPD?

Clinical considerations:

If nurses did administer the PDPI when the woman came in for labor, what would they do with the results? Is that the best time to assess a woman for risk factors for a potential postpartum problem?

Lines 329-334: Can you provide specific examples for this population? What is written can apply to any mother.

**EXAMPLE 2****Reviewer Recommendation Term:** Revise**Comments to Editor:**

The manuscript needs a major, major revision. Currently, it lacks any literature review and discussion section. Moreover, the authors seem so committed to abstinence education that they ignore findings indicating that the respondents wanted a more comprehensive sexuality education. Finally, there are a number of methodological issues, including lack of clarity about which professionals were sampled and sampling and high percentage of adolescents outside the target age range.

**Comment to Author:**

This study examines the perceptions of parents, youths, and professionals about abstinence education for youths 10-12 years of age. This is an important topic that would be of interest to the readers of JOGNN. However, the manuscript is seriously flawed by the lack of any scientific justification for the study. No review of the research literature on this topic is presented in the introduction, and the findings are not related to previous studies. Thus, extent to which this study contributes anything new is unknown. In addition, the title is inaccurate since 10-12 year-olds are early adolescents, not pre-adolescents. Puberty begins at about 9 years for girls and 6 months later for boys. Moreover, the findings support sexuality education, rather than narrowly focused abstinence education.

The abstract is well written. However, the description of the results is deceptive since this description does not refer to the participants' desires for broad-based sexuality education.

Keywords are appropriate. The callouts need revisions. In Callout#2, the reason that it is important to define abstinence as refraining from all genital contact needs to be explained.

Callout #3 is largely irrelevant to the findings of this study since the study did not address either one-to-one education or cost-effectiveness of abstinence education.

The introduction needs to be re-written to include a review of the literature on sexual abstinence.

Why particularly was this study needed, and what will it add to the literature? In addition many statements are made without the needed references, such as lines 55-57 and 74-75. What evidence is there that early abstinence education prepares re-adolescents to prevent exposure to sexual risks? Moreover the current controversy over abstinence educations versus comprehensive sex education is not even mentioned.

The methods section also needs extensive revisions for clarity. What evidence is there that the patients of urban primary care clinic used for recruitment were representative of the community?

No rationale is provided for the age off the youths to be studied. More details about the professionals who were recruited for the study are needed. A copy of the interview guide for each group should be presented. Lines 121-131 in the findings section should be moved to the sample section. The rationale for interviewing youths outside the targeted age range of 10-12 is totally unclear. At least 30% of the youth group was not in the targeted age range. This is a major limitation of the study. No rationale is presented for interviewing 10 individuals in each group. Lines 123-125 should be omitted since they are redundant with the table.

The results section also needs revisions for clarity. Given the differences among the groups, it is unclear why the authors so often pool their results, such as in lines 139-141. When discussing non-response to a question, the authors should mention from which group these participants came. In lines 178-179, the authors mention that early education prepares youths for puberty, but education begun at 10-12 years occurs after puberty has begun. Table 2 repeats some, but not all, of the findings. It does not add anything new to the paper and should be omitted.

No discussion section is included in the manuscript. Thus, the findings are not related to previous studies, limitations of the study are not mentioned, and recommendations for future research are not given. Instead, the authors provide a two-page discussion of clinical implications that does not focus on the major findings of the study. Lines 381-382 are irrelevant to the study and should be omitted.

In addition, several editorial changes are needed. The sub-headings should be flush with the left margin, rather than centered, and done in APA format.

### EXAMPLE 3

#### **Reviewer Recommendation Term:** Revise

##### **Comments to Editor:**

A very "muddled" manuscript that lacks a consistent and coherent conceptualization. I would "vote" reject except the findings are quite intriguing and have clinical applicability. However, I am not certain that the authors are capable of placing the study they actually did in the context of the literature or of discussing the findings they have, rather than the findings they would like to have like to have.

##### **Comment to Author:**

This study examines the perceptions of first-time parents of their relationship with their infants. This is an important topic that would be of interest to the readers of JOGNN. However, the manuscript is seriously flawed by a lack of a clear conceptualization of the problem, inaccurate descriptions of the methods, and overstating the findings in the discussion section. In addition, the manuscript is quite and should be shortened by 3-4 pages.

The abstract and keywords are well written. However, the statement of the objectives is unclear since themes are something researchers derive from participant statements, not something that participants present. It also unclear what the themes refer to. The first callout is not a complete sentence and does not present a complete thought.

The introduction needs to be re-written. It is currently confusing and does not present a coherent conceptualization of the problem and relies too heavily on secondary sources. The first sentence does not present any meaningful information. Lines 39-41 need a reference. Why is a perspective that brings together developmental, systematic, and parent experience needed and how does the present study accomplish this? The purpose statement is poorly stated since themes are something researchers derive from participant statements, not something that participants present. It also unclear what the themes refer to. Lines 50-55 are largely incoherent.

The "parent-infant relationship" is not another term for "attachment," nor is it a "process." Attachment as conceptualized by Ainsworth is the process by which the infant becomes involved with the parent, not the other way around. Parents promote infant attachment through caregiving, protection, and sensitivity. Likewise, as the authors admit, bonding is a discredited theory so should not be used to justify the current study as is being done in lines 56-65. Most of the citations by Brazelton and Klaus and Kennell are not primary research studies. Line 68 is unintelligible. Information on postpartum depression (lines 71-75) should be omitted since depression is not examined in this study. Lines 76-78 need references. Likewise, lines 93-96 seem largely irrelevant to the focus of this manuscript and should be omitted. In lines 98-100, the authors claim that the lack of studies focusing on mothers' intimate experience with their infants as a justification for the need for the current study. However, this term is quite vague, and the exact nature of this intimate experience is unclear. Given that mother's experiences have been studied from a psychodynamic perspective (lines 101-107), one would assume that the intimate nature of the experience has been captured. A number of concepts are introduced without any definitions: maternal role attainment (lines 113-114), related internal issues (line 147), paternal identity (lines 149). Lines 135-138 do not appear relevant to this study and could be omitted. As a result of this overall lack of clarity, the introduction and literature provide a weak argument for the significance of the current study. In addition, in the description of the study aims (lines 158-181, it is unclear what exactly is being studied.

The methods section also needs extensive revisions for clarity. Although the authors state they are doing grounded theory, they are not since they make no attempt to develop theory from their data, instead they moved "toward a more generalized mode of description" (line 252). Likewise, although the authors state the interpreted "how these categories are linked together in a theory-generating fashion" (line 260), there is no evidence in the findings of this being done. Thus, they seem to be doing a qualitative descriptive study. What are the ethnic group backgrounds of the sample and the genders of the infants? The rationale for the study time points of the study is quite weak because the Brazelton reference is not a primary research source and because the authors do not explain the significance of the times points they selected. A copy of the interview schedule should be included as a table. This is particularly important in this study since the interview was designed to elicit the five themes so it is necessary to see the interview schedule to determine whether the interview suggested the specific themes to the parents. Descriptions of the parents who did not fit the model (mentioned briefly in lines 256-257) need to be given in the findings. Although inter-rater reliability is not normally done in a qualitative study, when it is done as in this study, the inter-rater reliability statistic must be reported.

The results section is generally well-written and only needs a few changes. Given that the interview schedule focused on the five themes, it was not surprising that they were found. Lines 317-322 appear to contradict themselves with some mothers describing a two-way discovery process and others a one-way relationship. Babies should never be called an "it" as is done in line 338, 343, and 357. The mothers' theme at 16 weeks is reported to be "commitment to love and care for the baby" when the information in the text (lines 390-415) actually describes the mothers' need and ability to begin to individuate from the infant. This interpretation is the one given in the discussion section—lines 468-470.

The discussion section also needs major revisions for clarity and to avoid overstating the

findings. The description of the major findings in the first paragraph (lines 433-444) is incorrect because it emphasizes the presence of the five themes-two of which are not even mentioned in the body of the findings. Likewise there is no evidence of periods of stability followed by period of disorganization as stated in lines 441-452 in the findings. In addition, the linkage of the change in themes to external and internal demands (lines 454-456) is not mentioned in the findings. Lines 475-477 need a reference. In lines 488-489, the "subjective experience of fathering" can not suggest "an expressed need." The findings also do not present evidence of stylistic differences in parenting between mothers and fathers (lines 493-496), only that fathers and mothers have different internal goals and emotions. Likewise the findings do not provide evidence of the "interweaving of these developing relationships" as stated in lines 499-500. How does one resolve a theme (line 503)? The fact that fathers are more preoccupied with the mother and how she is doing (lines 504-506) is also not given in the findings. Finally, different predominant themes at three time points does not provide evidence of continuous change in parental themes as stated in lines 512-515. The conclusion section is redundant and could be eliminated.

In addition, several editorial changes are needed. Citations in the text are not consistently done in APA format (see for examples lines 147 and 485). A number of incorrect word choices are made: line 90 "impairs" is used when impairment is meant, line 179 "interplay" is used when interaction is meant, line 353 and others "complementary interactions" is used when reciprocal interactions is meant, line 483 "coherent" is used when consistent is meant, and line 491 "claim" is used when want is meant. "In sync" (line 425) is jargon. I spot-checked 10 references. All were correct, except Bell et al. 1996 was listed as (1999) 5:19-28, Bendek is spelled without the "c," and "Delphi" should be capitalized in Crisp et al.