Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 33 · Issue 3 · e135556

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of the Clinical Nurse Specialists Training Program in Pediatric Intensive Care Units in China: Quantitative Results from Participants' Perspectives

Cangcang Fu, Jihua Zhu, Nan Lin

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
14 Feb 2023	14 Mar 2023	24 Mar 2023	10.5812/ijp-135556

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Mohammadali Cheraghi, Leili Borimnejad, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Leili Borimnejad, Associate Editor 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

3 comments · 25 Feb 2023 – 26 Feb 2023

Mohammadali Cheraghi Reviewer

ACCEPT 25 Feb 2023

This article has been written in good style and can be published in this format with some very minor revisions that have been marked using tracked changes inline in the main manuscript.

Leili Borimnejad Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 26 Feb 2023

Evaluating the effectiveness of the training program for nurses is an important issue that has been addressed in this research. The field of research is well described, but there are uncertainties in the methodology. For example, the type of study was stated as “SURVEY” and the questionnaire was used as a research tool. The study would probably be expected to use a quantitative research method, but the author subsequently mentions methods such as interviews, etc., which are related to qualitative research; however, statistical methods were again applied in the results. This is the most important ambiguity in the methodology of the present study.
It would be better if a table presenting the training program were also provided in the article. Indeed, it is stated on page 5, line 76, “A small group of sixty PICU nurses a.…..”
According to the definition, a small group consists of 3 to 7 people, and it is unclear how to lead this group, divide its members into small groups, and reach a consensus within the group.
In the result section, given that table number three depicts demographic information, Table N 1 is unnecessary. Also, it is better to present the questions of the questionnaire and the response rate to each of them in a table.
Minor concern:
There is no structured abstract.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 26 Feb 2023

Dear Authers,
Greetings, and thank you very much for your valuable survey and data. I appreciate all your efforts.
After review, we found that this article does not have a strong design. The sampling and validity methods weren't clear. There are no references in the discussion section. The limitations of the study and data collection are not mentioned in detail and are not clear.
However, evaluating the effectiveness of the training program for nurses is an important issue that has been addressed in this research. There are uncertainties in the research methodology. For example, the type of study was stated as “SURVEY“ and the questionnaire was applied as a research tool. A quantitative research method would probably be expected, but later, the author mentions methods such as interviews, etc., which are related to qualitative research.
In the results, again, statistical methods were applied. This is the most important ambiguity in the method of the present study.
It would be better if a table presenting the training program was also provided in the article. Indeed, it is said on page 5, line 76, “A small group of sixty PICU nurses a.…..”
According to the definition of a small group, such a group has 3 to 7 people, and it is unclear how to lead this group, divide its members into small groups, and reach a consensus in this group.

In the result section, given table number three, which depicts demographic information, Table N 1 is unnecessary. Also, it is better to present the questions of the questionnaire and the response rate to each of them in a table.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response to Reviewers

(**Evaluation of the clinical nurse specialists training program in the pediatric intensive care units in China**)

Dear editors and reviewers:

Thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions, which will greatly improve our manuscript. According to your nice suggestions, we have made extensive corrections to our previous draft, the detailed corrections are listed below. We have marked all the modified parts in the text with red font.

Reviewer 1:

1. Evaluating the effectiveness of the training program for nurses is an important issue that has been addressed in this research. The field of research is well described, but there are uncertainties in the methodology. For example, the type of study was stated as "SURVEY" and the questionnaire was applied as a research tool. It is probably expected to be a quantitative research method, but in the following, the author mentions methods such as interviews, etc., which are related to qualitative research, but in the results, again, statistical methods were applied. This is the most important ambiguity in the present study method.

Answer:

Thank you very much for your reminding. This study is a quantitative research, and we have deleted the description of qualitative research in the article.

2. It would be better if a table with the provided training program was also provided in the article. In the result section, despite table number three, which depicts demographic information. Table N 1 is unnecessary. Also, it is better to present the questions of the questionnaire and the response rate to each of them in a table.

Answer:

According to your nice suggestion, we have deleted Table 1 in the original manuscript and added the training program plan and the questionnaire. However, due to excessive space, we upload this as supplementary material. We limited the electronic questionnaire and required participants to complete all items before submitting the questionnaire. Therefore, the response rate for each item of the recovered questionnaire was 100%.

3. Indeed It is said on page 5, line 76 "A small group of sixty PICU nurses a……."According to the definition of a small group, there are 3 to 7 people, and how to lead this group, divide its members into small groups, and reach a consensus in this group is unknown.

Answer:

We apologize for our mischaracterization. In fact, these 60 nurses were not a group, but we selected 60 nurses in advance for a survey to evaluate the reliability of the questionnaire, and made appropriate modifications to the questionnaire. We have modified this part as follows:

"The final version was pre-tested in sixty PICU nurses and it demonstrated satisfactory readability with a Cronbach's α coefficient of 0.81. "

4. There is not structured Abstract.

Answer:

We have adjusted the structure of the abstract and the text, please refer to the revised draft.

Reviewer 2:

1. After review, I found that this article does not have any specific and strong design and research methodology, it seems to be a survey study of program evaluation type, but you did not mention this clearly, and scientifically.

Answer:

Thanks for your advice. We have stated this problem as a limitation of the study. Please refer to **Limitations** in the revised manuscript.

2. Sampling and validity methods wasn't clear.

Answer:

We have supplemented the sampling methods in the **Study design and participants** of study in the **Methods** and the use of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to measure build validity and suitability (KMO) in the **Measure**. “KMO=0.864, Bartlett's spherical test χ^2=1469.764(P<0.001).”

3. You did not use any references in the discussion section.

Answer:

We are sorry for the previous oversight, we have added the reference in the discussion, please refer to the revised draft.

4. You did not mention the limitations of the study and data Collection as detail and clear, and did not explain about platform you made online questionnaire and issues of data gathering.

Answer:

We have added the limitations in the revised draft, and we have supplemented the data collection in the Methods section and mentioned in detail that the data was collected online via the corresponding software and that the questionnaire was issued 1 year after the participants completed their training.

We sincerely appreciate your valuable comments.

Nan Lin

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 6 Mar 2023 – 7 Mar 2023

Leili Borimnejad Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 6 Mar 2023

Thanks to the respected authors who have made most of the requested corrections. But there are still uncertainties in the research method.
1. According to the information added in this edition, sampling took 5 years, but the reason is not clear. Were the questions sent every year at the end of the course to the graduates of that course? How much time had elapsed since each person's graduation when the questionnaire was sent? (This should have been considered in the inclusion criteria because the expected outcomes, such as publishing an article or obtaining a job promotion, take time.)
2. Although three references have been added to the discussion in the new edition, the discussion still needs to be enriched by comparing the results of the present study with other studies.
3. According to the questionnaire questions given in the attachment, the evaluation of the program is from the learners' point of view, which should be mentioned in the title and objective.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 7 Mar 2023

Accepted with revisions made.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response to Reviewers

(**Evaluation of the clinical nurse specialists training program in the pediatric intensive care units in China**)

Dear editors and reviewers:

Thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions, which will greatly improve our manuscript. According to your nice suggestions, we have made extensive corrections to our previous draft, the detailed corrections are listed below. We have marked all the modified parts in the text with red font.

Reviewer 1:

1. According to the information added in this edition, sampling took 5 years, but the reason is not clear. Are the questions sent every year at the end of the course to the graduates of the same course? How long has it been since each person's graduation that the questionnaire was sent? (It should have been considered in the inclusion criteria) because the expected ideas such as the process of printing an article or job promotion are time-consuming.

Answer:

Considering the time required for publication and job promotion, we sent questionnaires to each participant 2 years after graduation to know more about the personal development of the participants after the training program. We have added instructions to the Study design and participants and Data collection.

2. Although three references have been added to the discussion in the new edition, the discussion still needs to be enriched by comparing the results of the present study with other studies.

Answer:

We have supplemented the reference according to your suggestion, please refer to the revised draft.

3. According to the questionnaire questions given in the

attachment. The evaluation of the program is from the learners' point of view, which should be mentioned in the title and objective.

Answer:

We have modified this part as follows:

"**Evaluation of the clinical nurse specialists training program in the pediatric intensive care units in China: quantitative results from participants' perspectives**

Abstract

Objectives: This study aimed to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of a clinical nurse specialists training program in China from participants' perspectives."

We sincerely appreciate your valuable comments.

Nan Lin

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.