

NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM

1st Review

Manuscript # 2005/027
Manuscript title: Use of situation-specific Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire (NSSQ) items
Manuscript type: Brief Report
Number of text pgs.: 8
Number of figures: 1
Number of tables: 4
Reviewer: Marsha L. Ellett
Stat reviewer assigned?: Yes-- a stat reviewer has been assigned

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
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: 4
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: 4

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

Accept without revisions
Accept with revisions X
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.**

The two stated purposes of this brief report were “to report the findings of a factor analysis done to explore statistical parameters of situation-specific affect, affirmation, and aid items and to recommend to recommend formulation of [Nordeck’s Social Support Questionnaire] NSSQ situation-specific items.’ For the most part the author(s) achieved these purposes. The problem statement, attention to relevant literature, organization, and writing style are quite adequate. Data analysis will be discussed separately by the statistical reviewer.

Attention to the specific questions/suggestions that follow will improve the clarity of the theoretical framework and discussion of results sections of this report. Consistent use of past tense verbs in the abstract is needed (line 8). Was (NSSQ) based solely on Kahn’s definition of social support rather than a theoretical framework? If so, then the theoretical basis of the original work was not strong. On page 3 (line 8), it is not clear whether Norbeck combined the two situation-specific items into one global work-related (thus global situational) support measure. On the same page (line 17), beginning the sentence with Situation-specific before items will help reader understanding. How were the situation-specific items in this study developed? Were they supported by “strong theory” as recommended in the conclusion and recommendation section for future investigators? No evidence of this was found. On page 3 (lines 21-23) should the items in parentheses be (SSAffect), (SSAffirm), and (SSAid), respectively for clarity? On page 5 (line 10) indicating for the reader how this range of scores was computed (≤ 24 members of network X 0-4 ordinal scale = 0-96 range of scores) will help. Combining the two sentences on the same page (lines 12-13) with a semicolon is suggested. On page 5 (line 19) begins with “To test the model...” What model are you testing? Because the Results and Discussion sections are combined in this short report, it would be helpful for the author(s) to spell out what the poor fit of the proposed model indicates on page 6 (line 8). On page 7 (line 18), should the first word in this paragraph be “As” rather than “Though?” Also, on page 7, the meaning of the sentence that begins “Thus, it is recommended...” (lines 21-23) is not clear. On page 8 (lines 4-5) beginning this sentence with “Up to six situation-specific...rather than a combined global...” may be more clear.