

## **JPP EDITORIAL POLICY: GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

### **Enhancing the Quality and Consistency of Statistical Reporting in JPP**

As the science of pediatric psychology advances, so do requirements for methods. The editorial policy now requires that authors include confidence intervals in manuscripts (Cumming & Finch, 2005; Wilkinson & the Task Force on Statistical Inference, 1999). In addition, authors should include effect sizes for all major findings reported along with *p* values (APA, 2001; Vacha-Haase & Thompson, 2004).

### **Enhancing the Clinical Relevance and Implications for Practice of Articles That are Published in JPP**

Improving the integration of research and practice and the clinical significance of research is an important goal for the field of pediatric psychology (Drotar & Lemanek, 2001). For this reason, authors should describe the implications and/or the significance of their research findings for relevant areas of current or future clinical practice. Clinical significance concerns the practical value or importance of an intervention – i.e., whether the intervention makes a real difference in everyday life to the child/family or to others with whom the child and/or family interacts (Kazdin, 1999). Clinical significance can be assessed in any number of ways such as comparison to normative or dysfunctional samples, absolute change, change in symptoms, or diagnosis, subjective evaluation of functioning by parents, teachers, or social impact (e.g., school attendance, health care utilization) (Kazdin, 2000). Authors are strongly encouraged to use one of several approaches that have been recommended for describing clinical significance, including (but not limited to) the reliable change index (Jacobson et al., 1999; Jacobson & Truax, 1991), the extent to which dysfunctional individuals show movement into the functional distribution (Jacobson & Truax, 1991; Ogles, Lambert, & Sawyer, 1995), other normative comparisons (Kendall, Marrs-Garcia, Nath, & Sheldrick, 1999), or functional impact (Kazdin, 1999, 2001).

### **Reporting of Randomized Clinical Trials and Nonrandomized Trials**

JPP will continue the policy established by the Publications and Communications Board of the American Psychological Association concerning the use of the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) reporting standards (i.e., a checklist and flow diagram) for randomized clinical trials (RCTs) (Moher, Schultz, & Altman, 2001; Stinson-McGrath, & Yamoda, 2003). Authors of RCTs should carefully review the criteria for reporting this evidence-based approach ([www.consort-statement.org/](http://www.consort-statement.org/)). Manuscripts that report on RCTs are required by JPP to include a flow diagram of the progress through the phases of the trial and a checklist ([http://www.consortstatement.org/statement\\_revised\\_statement.htm#checklist](http://www.consortstatement.org/statement_revised_statement.htm#checklist)) that identifies where in the manuscript the various criteria are addressed. (The checklist should be placed in an appendix of the manuscript for review purposes.)

Similar guidelines have been developed for nonrandomized designs that are often used in public health and mental-health interventions, referred to as the Transparent Reporting of Evaluations with Nonrandomized Designs (TREND) statement (Des Jarlais, Lyles, Crepaz, & the TREND Group, 2004) (available from <http://www.trend-statement.org/asp/statement.asp>).

## **Reporting of Studies of Diagnostic Accuracy**

Studies of diagnostic accuracy should be reported in accord with the Standards for Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy (STARD) (Bossuyt et al., 2003) (<http://www.annals.org/cgi/content/full/138/1/W1>).

### **Use of Authors' Checklist**

We encourage use of the Author's Checklist for manuscript submission to *JPP*. Developed in collaboration with the *JPP* editorial board, this checklist summarizes the most common problems with manuscripts that were noted by the *JPP* editorial board. We should enhance the consistency and quality of submissions (see *JPP* website).

### **New Policy for Mentored Reviews**

As of 1/1/07, *JPP* will institute a formal policy for mentoring of junior reviewers that clarifies the roles and responsibilities of senior reviewers and their mentees (see *JPP* website).

## References

- American Psychological Association. (2001). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), Washington, DC: Author.
- Bossuyt, P., Reitsma, J.B., Bruns, D.E., Gatsonsis, C.A., Glasziou, P.P., Irwig, L.M., Moher, D., Rennie, D., de Vet, H.C.W., & Lijmer, J.G. (2003). The STARD Statement for Reporting Studies of Diagnostic Accuracy: Explanation and elaboration. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 138, W1-W12.
- Cumming, G., & Finch, S. (2005). Inference by eye: Confidence intervals and how to read pictures of data. *American Psychologist*, 60, 170-180.
- Des Jarlais, D.C., Lyles, C., Crepaz, N. & the TREND Group. (2004). Improving the reporting quality of nonrandomized evaluations of behavioral and public health interventions: The TREND Statement. *American Journal of Public Health*, 94, 361-366. Retrieved September 15, 2004, from <http://www.trend-statement.org/asp/statement.asp>.
- Drotar, D., & Lemanek, K. (2001). Steps toward a clinically relevant science of interventions in pediatric settings. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 26, 385-394.
- Jacobson, N.S., Roberts, L.J., Berns, S.B., & McGlinchey, B. (1999). Methods for defining and determining clinical significance of treatment effects: Description, application, and alternatives. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 300-307.
- Jacobson, N.S. & Truax, P. (1991). Clinical significance: A statistical approach to defining meaningful change in psychotherapy research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59, 12-19.
- Kazdin, A.E. (1999). The meanings and measurement of clinical significance. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 332-339.
- Kazdin, A.E. (2000). *Psychotherapy for children and adolescents: Directions for research and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kendall, P.C., Marrs-Garcia, A., Nath, S.R., & Sheldrick, R.C. (1999). Normative comparisons for the evaluation of clinical significance. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 285-299.
- Moher, N., Schultz, K.F., & Altman, D. (2001). The CONSORT statement: Revised recommendations for improving the quality of reports of parallel-group randomized trials. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285, 1987-1991.
- Ogles, B.M., Lambert, M.L., & Sawyer, J.D. (1995). Clinical significance of the National Institute of Mental Health Treatment of Depression Collaborative Research Program data. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63, 321-326.
- Stinson, J.N., McGrath, P.J., & Yamada, J.T. (2003). Clinical trials in the *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*: Applying the CONSORT statement. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 28, 159-167.

Vacha-Haase, T., & Thompson, B. (2004). How to estimate and interpret various effect sizes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 473-481.

Wilkinson, L., & the Task Force on Statistical Inference. (1999). Statistical methods in psychology journals. *American Psychologist, 54*, 594-604.