

Review of a Research Study (Cleary & Dowling, 2009)

This example relates to the review of a research study:

Cleary, A. and Dowling, M. (2009) 'Knowledge and attitudes of mental health professionals to the concept of recovery in mental health: A questionnaire survey', *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 16, 529-545.

The verdict on the submission of this paper was 'major changes' with a resubmission. The comments from the reviewers below reflect the major changes needed.

Reviewer 1

Suggested the following changes to the paper:

- A cautious comment should be added to the introduction and discussion sections reflecting the fact that the adoption of recovery principles is not an exercise in evidence-based policy making, and is essentially experimental and occurring ahead of any solid clinical trial or naturalistic outcome data.

Add:

Specific comment on the use of the term 'medical doctor' and an expansion of what roles fell under that title.

- Explanation for the sampling strategy employed with nursing respondents.
- Explanation for what is meant by the term 'acute unit' in Table 1.
- Clarification regarding the independent test reported in the paper.
- Justification for grouping together of all the non-nursing mental health professions.
- Further explanation of the non-statistical findings. Further details regarding the sample's demographics to help readers judge the legitimacy of splitting the sample by experience at the 15-year point.
- Another table to present statistical findings to help readers' interpretation of the study findings.
- More commentary on the rejection of the illness models in favour of the recovery model.

Reviewer 2

Suggested the following changes to the paper:

- Correct a number of errors in grammar and punctuation.
- Change one long sentence in the abstract to two shorter sentences.
- Add clarification to Table 2 regarding 2% of respondents who did not answer the question.
- Build up the discussion to include more on the concept of risk-taking.
- Include more verbatim accounts in presentation of qualitative data.
- Correct the referencing style used in two of the references.
- One reference missing from the reference list.

What do you think of the reviewers' suggested changes to the paper? Were you surprised that the 'major changes' were actually quite manageable? Were you surprised that we forgot one reference and did not use the journal's referencing style in two others? This often happens, even with a number of proof reads!