

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: Barbara Mandleco
Stat reviewer assigned?: No -- do you recommend a stat reviewer?

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: NA
Research design: 1
Data analysis: 1
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: 5
Importance of present contribution to nursing: 5
Priority of topic for publication: 4
Rank this manuscript for its value: 4

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

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

Comments for Editor only:

**Please provide a comprehensive and integrated review of this manuscript.
Be sure to present a balanced view of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses.**

Cardiovascular risk in preschool children

The topic chosen is important and relevant and would make a fine contribution to the literature. As pediatric and family nurse, I would be interested in reading the article. The manuscript was well written and easy to read. It held my interest throughout.

Specific comments and suggestions follow:

- 1. Abstract:** The abstract discussed the important findings and provided information justifying the project. However, I would have liked some specific intervention strategies, given the study results. I might add the word “risk factors” to the key word lists.
- 2. Problem statement:** The author justifies the need for the study with relevant and important information. This is an area where little research has been conducted so the need for the study is evident. The problem statement is clear, concise, and simple
- 3. Literature review:** The literature review is well written, seems to be quite thorough and is precise. There did not seem to be any gaps in the literature and since there was no prior work on the topic with this population (preschoolers), the author used information from other age groups. That was appropriate. However, there was not much criticism of prior work and there were 22 citations in the reference list that were older than 2000. Using some of these works is all right, but I am concerned that articles older than 10 years (older than 1995) were cited. I would suggest reexamining these older references and seeing if some could be eliminated.
- 4. Research Design:** The design (quantitative, descriptive) is appropriate. The author sought to discover if the participants were at risk for cardiovascular disease. The method of gathering data also seemed to be appropriate.
- 5. Methods/analysis** Data were gathered appropriately, and the measures used were mostly reliable. However I was confused as to the difference between *race* and *ethnicity*. I see there was a choice of Hispanic or Non hispanic for ethnicity and then five choices for race. It is difficult to understand how ethnicity and race can be combined when describing the sample (see page 14 lines 15 – 20). As a reader, I was confused. Perhaps the author could re examine these variables and describe to the reader how those designations were determined. The sample seemed to reflect the geographic area where the study was conducted (majority Hispanic). However, since this was the case, the title of the manuscript ought to reflect the sample description (Cardiovascular risk factors in Hispanic/Non hispanic preschoolers). I also would have liked to see income as a variable as that is always an important variable in research and if these children were low income it may have effected the results. There were some difficulties interpreting

some of the data gathered from parents (dietary history), so alterations were made in how the data were gathered/verified and those changes seemed to help in analysis. Analysis was appropriate.

6. Results: Results were presented in table and figure form with minimal presentation as text. The figures and table were easy to understand.

7. Discussion: The discussion mentioned the major findings and used the literature to validate/support the findings. However, I was disappointed that it was so short. I would have liked a more in depth discussion of the findings and then some specific interventions that could help these families. I also would suggest some limitations, especially related to the dietary history problem and the fact that the majority of these children were Hispanic.