

Checklist for Preparing and Evaluating Review Articles

- 1. What is the significance of the topic or question addressed by the review to the field of pediatric psychology?**
 - How specifically does this review advance knowledge of science, theory, or practice?
 - What is the significance or special novel contribution of the review? (e.g. provides new insight in specific content areas; calls attention to a critical new issue, suggests new solutions to methodological issues; suggests new intervention models)?
 - Is the significance of the research topic and review for the field of pediatric psychology sufficiently clear?
- 2. Level of scholarship:**
 - Is the review sufficiently comprehensive and scholarly?
 - Does the review summarize all the information in a domain of interest?
 - Are the references appropriate and up-to-date?
 - Are there any major omissions?
- 3. Is the level of the review appropriate in terms of the purpose/focus/depth of citations for the audience of the Journal of Pediatric Psychology?**
- 4. Quality of method and method description**
 - What type of literature search was conducted?
 - Over what time periods?
 - Using what key words?
 - What other data retrieval efforts were conducted? (e.g. reference lists, contact with authors, etc.).
 - What was the rationale for the literature described?
 - Was this method well described and appropriate to the topic and question?
 - Does the method clearly define the domain of the review, the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and rules for including and excluding articles with a rationale?
 - What process was used to determine eligibility of studies for the review?
 - Can the method be replicated?
 - What is the quality of the statistical methods used?
- 5. Clarity and substantiveness of the presentation of content**
 - Are the major findings clearly presented?
 - Are suitable methods used for analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating the studies?
 - Does the review organize, synthesize, and explicate findings including inconsistent findings.
 - Does the review evaluate research critically?
- 6. Conciseness, liveliness, and impact of the findings presented (is the material presented in a clear, engaging manner?)**
- 7. Are the major conclusions and implications clear and appropriately drawn from the findings?**
- 8. Is the generalizability of the findings discussed?**
- 9. Are limitations of the review discussed?**
- 10. Quality and potential impact of the recommendations for future research based on the review.**
 - Does the review develop specific questions for future research?
 - Does the review suggest novel research ideas and/or hypotheses?
- 11. Clinical relevance: Quality and potential impact of the recommendations for clinical care and/or policy based on the review**

- Does the review develop specific suggestions for clinical care; diagnosis and interventions and/or health-related policy?

Note: Meta-analytic reviews require special attention to the presentation and analysis of effect size data etc. Please consult the meta-analyses reporting standards in APA's reporting standards for research in psychology (*American Psychologist* (2008) 63, 839-851).

Other relevant references include:

Durlak, J.A. (2003). *Basic principles of meta-analysis*. In M. Roberts and S.S. Ilardi (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Clinical Psychology*. p.196-209. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Lipsey, J.A. (2003). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.