



Kotronoulas, G. (2023) Building on health care professionals' research literacy for sustained quality care. *Seminars in Oncology Nursing*, 39(2), 151400. (doi: [10.1016/j.soncn.2023.151400](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soncn.2023.151400))



Copyright © 2023 Elsevier Inc. Reproduced under a Creative Commons License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.en>

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/295766/>

Deposited on: 4 April 2023

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

It is a privilege and an honour to be appointed as Editor-in-Chief for Seminars in Oncology Nursing. This is a unique journal that speaks the language of clinicians, academics and researchers working in cancer care. I am taking over from my dear colleague, Prof Catherine Paterson, whose vision and leadership have seen the journal reaching Q1, being ranked in the top 10 nursing journals, and achieving a remarkable impact factor of 3.527 for the first time in its history. Big shoes to fill in, and an even greater challenge to sustain this success in the years to come. I am ready, and thanks to my esteemed Associate Editors, Drs Maura Dowling and Amanda Drury, and distinguished Editorial Board members, I feel strongly we can achieve this goal. We are targeting contemporary issues, introducing new features, and looking to expand our reach to people affected by cancer and the public to showcase the research work that nurses and allied health professionals do to enhance cancer care.

It is a happy coincidence for my inaugural special issue to be focusing on Education in Research Scholarship. Building on research literacy and capacity among the healthcare workforce is a top priority according to principles of evidence-based practice,¹ and proficiency standards of Nursing qualification bodies.²⁻⁴ Enhancing the research skills of clinical staff and (early career) nursing scientists also is key to seeing innovative ideas translate into projects to support change in practice through systematic implementation efforts.⁵ This special issue features articles for the interest of a wide and varied audience. Importantly, all articles offer numerous practical examples to clarify concepts and consolidate knowledge, thus making them excellent guides for healthcare students, clinicians, researchers and academics.

Drury et al. (2023) draw on a wealth of research experience to provide tips on how to write a comprehensive and informative research abstract to serve strengthening conference presentations, scientific publications and grant applications. Johnston and Dowling (2023) explore the principles of qualitative research with direct application to oncology nursing, thus providing a comprehensive guide. Conversely, Kotronoulas and Papadopoulou (2023) break down quantitative research into its core areas of inquiry, and examine major experimental and non-experimental study designs through the lens of an example case from oncology. For those interested in or apprehensive of statistics, Kotronoulas et al. (2023) provide a comprehensive guide to the fundamentals of data management, analysis, and interpretation in quantitative research, using simple language and practical examples. Implementation science is research to promote the systematic uptake of research evidence into routine practice,⁵ and Roberts et al. (2023) provide an insightful account of the use of implementation science in nursing. Finally, Chan and Hart (2023) have put their collective minds and research wisdom together to give us 10 tips about how to prepare a grant application that will stand out as the next research project to be funded.

These articles are made to build on knowledge, skills and confidence around healthcare research, evidence-based practice, and research excellence in cancer care. They also function as precursors to enabling more of our readers to sign up for the crucial service of peer-reviewing. Peer-review is creative yet under-recognised, rewarding yet non-remunerated, educative yet time-consuming – there is no shortage of praise and challenges reported in the literature.^{6,7} For me, peer-review is a critical, quality-assurance exchange of knowledge. Peer-review of health care research requires skilful application of research literacy, critical thinking and clinical wisdom. These are all qualities of modern day professionals in health care; thus, eligibility for peer-review can be taken for granted. What is it however that motivates us to peer-review? Among others, confidence in skills and knowledge, good mentoring, practical support, and an urge to help promote our own field and learn from this in the process. In my capacity as co-Chair of the Research Working Group of the European Oncology Nursing Society, I asked my good colleagues in the group to share top tips based on their

personal experiences as peer-reviewers (**Table 1**). Crucially, peer-review is not an impossible task. We need more peer-reviewers to support this knowledge exchange. Equally, we need better supported peer-reviewers. And we need to keep investing in those new to peer-review and those contemplating signing up for it.

I do hope you find the articles in this special issue widely useful and thought-provoking.

References

1. Kumah EA, McSherry R, Bettany-Saltikov J, van Schaik P. Evidence-informed practice: simplifying and applying the concept for nursing students and academics. *Br J Nurs*. 2022;31(6):322-330. doi:10.12968/bjon.2022.31.6.322
2. Nursing & Midwifery Council. Future nurse: Standards of proficiency for registered nurses. NMC. <https://www.nmc.org.uk/globalassets/sitedocuments/standards-of-proficiency/nurses/future-nurse-proficiencies.pdf>. Published 2018. Accessed January 30, 2023.
3. American Association of Colleges of Nursing. The Essentials: Core Competencies for Professional Nursing Education. AACN. https://pncb.org/sites/default/files/resources/Essentials_Core_Competencies_Professional_Nursing_Education.pdf. Published 2021. Accessed January 30, 2023.
4. Nursing and Midwifery Board of Australia. National competency standards for the registered nurse. NMBA. file:///C:/Users/gkk3d/Downloads/Nursing-and-Midwifery-Board---Standard---National-competency-standards-for-the-registered-nurse-1.PDF. Published 2015. Accessed January 30, 2023.
5. Boehm LM, Stollendorf DP, Jeffery AD. Implementation Science Training and Resources for Nurses and Nurse Scientists. *J Nurs Scholarsh an Off Publ Sigma Theta Tau Int Honor Soc Nurs*. 2020;52(1):47-54. doi:10.1111/jnu.12510
6. Tennant JP, Ross-Hellauer T. The limitations to our understanding of peer review. *Res Integr Peer Rev*. 2020;5(1):6. doi:10.1186/s41073-020-00092-1
7. el-Guebaly N, Foster J, Bahji A, Hellman M. The critical role of peer reviewers: Challenges and future steps. *Nord Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2022;40(1):14-21. doi:10.1177/14550725221092862

Table 1. Tips for peer-review provided by members of the Research Working Group at the European Oncology Nursing Society (<https://cancernurse.eu/research/>).

Expert reviewer	Tips for peer-review*
<p>Dr Eva Pape</p> <p>Ghent University Hospital, Belgium</p>	<p>“[...] First, I look at the purpose of the article and then I decide if it falls within my scope of practice. I also look at the methodology of the article to see if I am familiar with it. [...] Then, I read the article to get a better picture. In general, I look at the quality and originality. In addition, it is important to see a contribution to (nursing) practice. [...] See if the discussion section is critically written...”</p>
<p>Dr Cherith Semple</p> <p>Ulster University, United Kingdom</p>	<p>“[...] It takes time to give careful and considerate peer review, so ensure you have the time to undertake the task in a timely manner. [...] Make every effort to be courteous with your feedback – offer feedback in a respectful and professional tone that will help the author see the strengths of the paper and how the paper could be improved [...] REMEMBER – the process is to enhance the quality of the paper and scientific rigour of the research.”</p>
<p>Prof Karin Dieperink</p> <p>University of Southern Denmark, Denmark</p>	<p>“[...] I have decided to review the number of articles a year that I expect to publish myself. [...] Doing a review is not an exact science but is also about personal preferences. However, I still think that you should try to achieve a high scientific standard, depending on the different methods. Now, I always try to include my PhD students in one or two review processes during their PhD [...] [to] improve the quality of their own manuscripts, and skills improve over time...”</p>
<p>Dr Sara Colomer-Lahiguera</p> <p>Lausanne University Hospital, Switzerland</p>	<p>“When peer-reviewing I have a list of questions that I ask myself. Maybe an obvious one: when accepting to review, am I confident enough with the topic and the literature? [...] For students: ask your supervisor to share some of the peer-review requests with you. For supervisors: be a mentor. [...] I keep my reviews as well as the reviews I got as an author as they help me to learn different styles of addressing comments and pointing out issues...”</p>
<p>Dr Amanda Drury</p> <p>Dublin City University, Ireland</p>	<p>“[...] Caution readers – novelty/original contribution might not be groundbreaking, studying a phenomenon in a new context/country/clinical setting can add to the literature. Revisiting old concepts where there have been changes in practice, policy or related evidence can add value. Small studies conducted in underserved/rare contexts have value! My advice here always goes back to, do the authors recognize the limitations of their work and interpret the results cautiously in light of these limitations?”</p>
<p>Dr Gülcan Bağçivan</p> <p>Koç University, Turkey</p>	<p>“[...] While suggesting revision, I avoid saying very general things such as “discussion needs to be rewritten”. I hate this kind of suggestion when I receive it for my manuscripts. And I think being clear about your suggestion to authors is also very important... [...] Sometimes, I have difficulty to decide between suggesting minor or major revision. If the journal offers any guide for reviewers, I check it but not every journal has one. I decide major or minor, based on the intensity of required revisions...”</p>

Expert reviewer	Tips for peer-review*
<p>Dr Paz Fernandez-Ortega</p> <p>University of Barcelona, Spain</p>	<p>“[...] When I look at a manuscript, there are 3 points that are essential for me as a reviewer: first, how well the text communicates the research question. Second, how the study was done and how it is reported in the manuscript. Third, how useful the results are for nursing practice. [...] Sometimes, very innovative studies fail to be realistic in clinical contexts, because they are only designed for research. Consistency and coherence in these 3 points helps...”</p>
<p>Susana Miguel</p> <p>Portuguese Institute of Oncology of Francisco Gentil, Portugal</p>	<p>“If it was the first time I reviewed a manuscript from that journal, I would start by reading the author guidelines and review guidelines. [...] Analyse the methodology (depending on the kind of manuscript, check if it respects all the steps of the method). [...] Analyse the figures and graphics to see if they are done well. [...] Before submitting, I usually re-read the manuscript and what I write to the authors. Usually, I do this the day after I complete the review process.”</p>
<p>*For a full account of these points, please see: https://cancernurse.eu/research/useful-research-resources/</p>	