

# REVIEWING FOR CLINICAL SIMULATION IN NURSING: A HANDS ON WORKSHOP

CYNTHIA THOMAS, EDD, MS, BSN, ADN

NICOLE HARDER, RN, PHD, CHSE

KIM LEIGHTON, PHD, RN, CHSE, CHSOS, ANEF

MARIAN LUCTKAR-FLUDE, RN, PHD

LESLIE CATRON, M.A.ED, BSN, RN, FAHCEP, CHSE

SANDRA GOLDSWORTHY, RN MSC PHD CNCC(C) CMSN(C)



INACSL  
CONFERENCE,  
2017

June 21-24, 2017  
Marriott Wardman  
Park Hotel  
Washington, DC



# ANCC

## Continuing Nursing Education



International Nursing Association for Clinical Simulation & Learning is accredited as a provider of continuing nursing education by the American Nurses Credentialing Center's Commission on Accreditation.

# DISCLOSURES

## Conflict of Interest

- Cynthia Thomas (Editorial Board, Clinical Simulation in Nursing)
- Nicole Harder (EIC Clinical Simulation in Nursing, BOD INACSL)
- Kim Leighton (Assistant Editor, Clinical Simulation in Nursing)
- Marian Luctkar-Flude (Editorial Board, Clinical Simulation in Nursing)
- Leslie Catron (Editorial Board, Clinical Simulation in Nursing)
- Sandra Goldsworthy (Editorial Board, Clinical Simulation in Nursing)
- Julia Greenawalt (INACSL Conference Administrator & Nurse Planner) reports no conflict of interest
- Leann Horsley (INACSL Lead Nurse Planner) reports no conflict of interest

## Successful Completion

- Attend 100% of session
- Complete online evaluation



# LEARNING OUTCOMES

**Upon completion of this educational activity, participants will be able to:**

1. Learn what happens to a manuscript from the moment it is submitted until a final decision is reached
2. Review a manuscript
3. Discuss your review and compare it to the work of the Editorial Board.

# WHO ARE WE? WHO ARE YOU?

- **Where are you from?**
- **Have you previously reviewed for a journal?**
- **What do you want to achieve at the end of this pre-conference workshop?**

# WHAT IS THE REVIEW PROCESS?

- **Why is peer review a part of the scholarly publishing process?**
- **Upon submission, reviewed by Editor-in-Chief. Does it meet the aims and scope of the journal?**
- **Reviewers selected based on areas of expertise**
- **Number of reviewers depend on the type of manuscript**
- **Upon completion of reviews, options are reject, revise (major or minor revisions) or accept**

# WHY DO REVIEWERS REVIEW?

- **Fulfill an academic 'duty'**
- **Keep up-to-date with latest developments**
- **Helps with their own research**
- **Build associations with prestigious journals and editors**
- **Remain aware of new research**
- **Develop one's career**

# CONDUCTING THE REVIEW - ORIGINALITY

- **Sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication?**
- **Adds to the canon of knowledge?**
- **Answers an important research question?**
- **Satisfies the journal's standards?**
- **Falls in the top 25% of papers in this field?**
- **A literature scan of review articles can help the reviewer determine originality**



# STRUCTURE OF THE MANUSCRIPT

- **Has the author read the author guidelines? It won't take long before you know.**
- **Format, APA, headings, key sections.... These all need to be clear**
- **Simulation Reporting Guidelines**

# SENDING YOUR REPORT TO THE EDITOR

- **Anticipate the deadline**
- **Summarize the article at the top of your report**
- **The report should be comprehensive**
- **Explain and support your judgments**
- **Make a distinction between your own opinions and your comments based on data**
- **Be courteous and constructive**

# SAMPLE REVIEW

- **Some are good, some have room for improvement**

# GROUP A: NON-RESEARCH MANUSCRIPT

- **Please read this manuscript and be ready to provide a critique**
- **Once you are done your review, you will be provided with examples of actual reviewer comments the same work that you reviewed**
- **Compare their review to yours. What are the differences/similarities?**

# GROUP B: RESEARCH MANUSCRIPT

- **Please read this manuscript and be ready to provide a critique**
- **Once you are done your review, you will be provided with examples of actual reviewer comments the same work that you reviewed**
- **Compare their review to yours. What are the differences/similarities?**

# LARGE GROUP DISCUSSION

- **How did you feel working through the manuscript review?**
- **Did you feel prepared to be able to complete the review?**
- **Did you notice any themes or patterns between your review and those from experience reviewers?**
- **What did you learn in this workshop that prepared you to complete a review?**
  
- **So.... Do you think you are ready to be a reviewer?**

# REFERENCES

**Burnard, P., & Hannigan, B. (2001). Reviewing the review process: Towards good practice in the peer review of manuscripts submitted to nursing journals. Nurse Education Today, 21(3), 238-242.**

**Currie, G., McCuiag, C., & Di Prospero, L. (2016). Systematically reviewing a journal manuscript: A guideline for health reviewers. Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences, 47, 129-138.**

**Happell, B. (2008). The responsibility of review: Guidelines to promote professional courtesy and commitment through the peer review process. Journal of Psychiatric Nursing Research, 13(3), 1-9.**

# CONTACTS

**Cynthia Thomas email: [cmthomas@bsu.edu](mailto:cmthomas@bsu.edu)**

**Nicole Harder email: [nicole.harder@umanitoba.ca](mailto:nicole.harder@umanitoba.ca)**

**Kim Leighton email: [kleighton@devry.edu](mailto:kleighton@devry.edu)**

**Marian Luctkar-Flude email: [mfl1@queensu.ca](mailto:mfl1@queensu.ca)**

**Leslie Catron email: [lcatron@valleychildrens.org](mailto:lcatron@valleychildrens.org)**

**Sandra Goldsworthy email: [sandra.goldsworthy@ucalgary.ca](mailto:sandra.goldsworthy@ucalgary.ca)**