

NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM

1st Review

Manuscript # 2005/100
Manuscript title: Cardiovascular risk in preschool children
Manuscript type: Regular
Number of text pgs.: 15
Number of figures: 2
Number of tables: 1
Reviewer: Christine M. Kennedy
Stat reviewer assigned?: No -- do you recommend a stat reviewer?
NO

Please evaluate the following with these choices: (1) adequate, (2) inadequate (describe in written review) or (3) not appropriate (describe in written review)

Problem statement: 1
Attention to relevant literature: 1
Theoretical framework: 2 (not really presented)
Research design: 1
Data analysis: 2
Discussion of results: 2
Organization: 1
Writing style: 1

Please rate the following topics 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rating):

Value of topic: 5
Probable reader interest in topic: 4
Importance of present contribution to nursing: 4
Priority of topic for publication: 3
Rank this manuscript for its value: as is 3 (light on analysis & discussion), with revision maybe a 4

Reviewer's Recommendation (please type "X" after your choice):

Accept without revisions
Accept with revisions
Maybe accept with revisions X
Do not accept

Comments for Editor only:

The front half of this paper is good, then it falls apart at the data/results/discussion sections. Hopefully the authors just ran out of steam towards the end and with a revision could do a better job with the data presentation/results/and then discussion.

Please provide a comprehensive and integrated review of this manuscript.

Be sure to present a balanced view of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses.

This paper addresses an important problem in the primary care of children, especially those of Latino heritage. The problem statement and literature review are fine, although this reader would have liked to see presented more of the relevant pediatric risk factor literature and perhaps less concerning adults and those of other ethnicities – given the focus of the study population. There is only brief mention of a theoretical framework as implied by the references to Halfon & Hochstein as a rationale for early identification and intervention (pg3). However, given the import of health promotion and thus the impetus for this descriptive study what are the barriers to primary care providers in doing this type of screening to begin with? Esp. given that these are all well known risk factors? Can the authors cite any papers in the lit. review that demonstrate that this type of multi-risk factor screening is/is not happening in primary care? This would bolster the import of their study.

Pg 3 lines 6-9 delete local/state reference to Colorado-since this is not followed through in rest of paper (i.e. comparisons within/to local state data)

Pg.4 lines 1-15 – reads abit choppy -suggest reworking

Pg.10 lines 12-22 Tobacco Use or Exposure section is very short. Can Au. Provide information/statistics on smoking prevalence by ethnicity & income level (it does exist) as other risk areas are presented this way. If page limit is a concern suggest eliminating parts of the review that go into the adult data, since the focus of this descriptive study is preschool children.

Pg 13 lines 7-11. Can Au. address issue/problem of using a single blood pressure reading for this variable – given the controversy over the variability of bp measures?

Pg. 14 results section. The data analysis and discussion sections are very short and superficial. This is where the paper falls short and needs more work. No data provided regarding income levels/ranges, acculturation level, adult physical activity, cholesterol level or smoking behaviors despite it being collected.

Data for children are only provided in %'s, would suggest having means and ranges (SDev.) when appropriate. Also data for children who demonstrate more than one risk factor (i.e. 2,3,4,5 etc?) is lacking. Certainly it would be helpful to present not only solo risk factors but an analysis of factors that clustered together and a description of children who present with multiple risk factors. Can au provide rates of occurrence by age, since the sample ranged from 3-6 in interest of the questions as to whether there was any

change over time (longitudinal) or at least an analysis demonstrating that there was no difference based on age, similar to the gender stats?

Discussion of problems with dietary recall tool should not be in results section. Results of the dietary information need more precise presentation

Discussion section does not align well with child data, focuses briefly on “family unit” which given the absence of the adult data appears out of place.

Au needs to address limitations of study.

Discussing how results align/fit into lit. review papers with an emphasis on those concerning Latino families/population will strengthen this particular studies contribution.

Table 1- is repetitive of the narrative, could be deleted.