

NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM

1st Review

Manuscript # 2004/212
Manuscript title: Predicting use of specialized hospital discharge planning services
Manuscript type: 12
Number of text pgs.: 2
Number of figures: 2
Number of tables:
Reviewer: Kathryn H. Bowles
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)

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

Value of topic: 5 I think this is a very valuable topic that addresses a clinical need and also shows the readers a fine example of building decision support
Probable reader interest in topic: 3 limited to acute care clinicians with an interest in discharge planning
Importance of present contribution to nursing: 4 patients will get better care and we all care about that. It is an important example of nursing research helping to improve practice
Priority of topic for publication: 3.5 moderate-high it is unique
Rank this manuscript for its value: 4

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

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

Comments for Editor only:

Problem statement: (score 1) nicely done

Attention to relevant literature: 1 thorough and accurate review of the literature

Theoretical framework: (score 2) I think the reader needs more detail about the keywords used to review the literature in determining what factors to put into the analysis. The author mentions a review of the literature on page 7 line 7 that generated a list of likely predictor variables. I would like to know more about that. Were there items found in the literature that were not in their existing data and therefore not included in the model. If so, this should be in the discussion.

Research design: (score 2) The definition of specialized dc services needs to be moved up. It is first found on page 6 line 9-14 but is referred to much earlier in the manuscript.

The author(s) need to make it more clear where this data came from. The author said it is from three sources and there was mention on page 6 line 16-17 about it being from a previous study. I think we need to know the purpose of that original study and some information about who collected that information and how to assure us that is valid and reliable information. Also, please clarify whether the development dataset was from existing records and the validation set was new? Patient interview data was used so it is not clear if these were done on a new, prospective sample. The author uses the word “recruited” so this implies a new sample. If so, was there consent for new data collections versus exempt status granted by the IRB for the use of existing data? On page 7 line 11, why were the records limited to 48 hours after admission? Did both datasets contain interview data? Who did the interviews, using what? For the data extracted from existing records was there much missing? If so, could it have affected the results? How were judgments made by patients as to whether they had a limitation in function or not? How was limitation defined? Again, this goes back to a need to understand the data collection procedures. What is a Rankin disability score?

Data analysis: (score 2) Was the Hosmer and Lemeshow test examined for goodness of fit? How were the variables of interest determined for the final model—page 7 line 22? More detail is needed to describe how or why 4 was chosen as the constant multiplier, page 8 line 12-14.

Discussion of results: (score 1) Page 10 lines 14-15. The numbers in the text do not match the numbers in figure 1. The same for page 11 line 1 and 2.

Organization: (score 1) Nicely organized

Writing style: (score 1) very well written and clear

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 is a very well written, well designed study with very interesting and important findings that are useful to clinicians. The author(s) need to address some of the points described above and it will be improved. The main weakness is a lack of detail about where the data came from and how it was handled.