

NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM

1st Review

Manuscript # 2005/090
Manuscript title: Buried alive: The presence of nursing on hospital Web sites
Manuscript type: Regular
Number of text pgs.: 14
Number of figures: 0
Number of tables: 3
Reviewer: Eun-Ok Im
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: 2 (sometimes, statements were made without supporting literature)
Theoretical framework: 2 (no theoretical basis for the measurement)
Research design: 1
Data analysis: 1
Discussion of results: 2 (the findings need to be linked to the discussion points)
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: 3
Priority of topic for publication: 5
Rank this manuscript for its value: 3

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:

**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 interesting paper on “the presence of nursing” on hospital websites. This paper will provide very important information on “existence of nursing” on the web. However, there are several major concerns that need to be addressed.

Abstract: More findings need to be added while shortening the discussion section.

Introduction: The significance of the study is adequately supported by the existing literature.

Aim: The overall goal/purpose of the study needs to be more explicitly made. Currently, only three research questions are presented.

Theoretical basis/framework: The theoretical bases/framework of the study is not clear (no information on theoretical bases is provided).

Methods: The study design is not clearly stated. Was it only a descriptive study or correlational study? The rationale for the sample size is missing. It is not clear what theoretical basis/construct was the basis for development of the instrument (the checklist). Any reliability and validity information from the pilot test of the instrument? More detailed information on the instrument is needed.

In the analysis section, please provide more information on how the data from the instrument are categorized. In other words, what range of the total scores from the instrument is regarded as “minimal nursing presence,” “somewhat of a presence,” “a moderate presence,” and “very present”?

The method used to analyze the data from the comment column needs to be detailed.

The limitations of the study are well discussed.

Discussion

How many nurses were employed in the hospitals (mean and SD)? Any correlations found between the total scores from the instrument and the general characteristics of the hospitals?

For the discussion section, more references or supporting evidence need to be added. Some statements are made without supporting evidence (see pp. 14-16).

The link between the findings and the discussion points needs to be made more explicit.

Implications: More implications for future research or nursing practice need to be added while connecting the findings from this study to the implications.

Tables: Table 3 could include means and SDs of the number of characteristics (with ranges) according to the categories.