

Confidential Peer Review Form
The Social Work Practitioner-Researcher

Manuscript number	298/16
Article title	THE ROLE OF PARENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRAUMATIC EXPOSURE AND SUICIDE-RISK AMONG ADOLESCENTS
REVIEWER 1	

Evaluation of article

Criteria	1 = low agreement; 5 = high						Comments
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
This research is relevant to the focus of this journal			X				
This research contributes to knowledge development in social work or related professions		X					
The practice implications of this research have been well spelled out		X					
Sufficient & appropriate literature is cited and suitably discussed		X					
The methods used (empirical or otherwise) are appropriate to the study & have been correctly applied		X					
The argument is adequately developed & logically consistent	X						
The article is theoretically sound		X					
Cognisance is taken of alternative points of view		X					
The material is well-structured and the presentation is clear	X						
Language is fluent and writing style satisfactory			X				

Recommendation (Please tick one of the boxes below)

Publish after routine editorial corrections	
Publish after revision (as stipulated) without being submitted for further review	
Not acceptable in present form but can be re-submitted for further review after revision (as stipulated)	X
Reject (grounds of rejection as stipulated)	

Loose Guide for Substantive Report: The Social Work Practitioner-Researcher

TITLE

- Does the title succinctly and accurately describe the topic as presented in the text?
No. The literature, theory and method do not focus on the research question. In other words, the focus of the whole study is vague and always connected with unrelated aspects.

We have looked and unfortunately the title is limited to change. The first three words were excluded to try and shorten it however the title depicts the statistical procedure procedure into the variable analysis. When reading the title one will exactly know what the researcher intends doing with the variables.

ABSTRACT

- Does the abstract describe the study's purpose, methods, results and conclusions?

Not clear enough and to the point. It is obvious that a lot of data was collected and as an after-thought this aspect of suicide –risk and parental employment was (unsuccessfully) linked.

The abstract was amended, especially the introduction where an attempt was made to focus on parental socio-economic status as a protective factor buffering adolescents against suicide behaviour. Hopefully this has made the abstract a bit clearer thereby increasing the focus of the abstract. It must be borne in mind the unemployment is seen as a risk factor which has a direct association with parental employment status, hence the approach to this study.

INTRODUCTION

- Is the research issue clearly defined?

No. This is a messy effort to show something that is/was not the focus.

- Is there a compelling rationale for study of this issue?

Yes, but I think that too many other variables were brought in to give it body and unfortunately, contributed negatively towards a concise study.

- Is the issue relevant to social development?

Not the contribution of this effort.

Cognisance was given to the reviewers concerns.

Introduction was streamlined to increase clarity in defining the research

Unnecessary wording was removed to present a more coherent introduction

Suicide behaviour has become the third highest cause of death globally and in SA we have been showing escalating tendencies. In the same breath many of our population in SA are struggling with basic "bread and butter issues". Learning and understanding how these factors impact on one of the most critical developmental ages, should surely be considered relevant as a contribution. I hope this effort will be seen as such.

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

- Is the issue discussed in relation to previous research?

Yes, but also in relation with unrelated research.

- Is relevant theory summarised?

An effort was made, but it did not convince me.

- Are the theories to be tested / hypotheses / research questions / assumptions clearly stated?

The authors are not clear about a research question and its function. Because this study could not give a clear answer to its research question, its contribution is insignificant.

- Are concepts operationally defined and used consistently throughout the paper?

Yes.

Sections have been either removed if thought not to contribute to the overall theme while other sections have been reformulated with some additions to literature here and there.

The research hypothesis are exactly aligned with the title and indicate very clearly that parental employment status as moderating variable will be used to investigate its effect on an already known relationship namely traumatic exposure and suicide-risk

I have to disagree on the significant contribution of this research. Surely one cannot go into a research process with only one vested outcome in mind. We have learnt from these findings which enable others to adopt an altered approach if using the variable parental-employment status again. In addition to this a significant relationship between trauma experiences and suicide-risk was once again confirmed.

METHOD

- Are the sampling procedures described?

Not in sufficient detail and clarity.

- Is there an account of missing cases, non-respondents, subject attrition, etc?

Yes.

- Is the research design appropriate for the problem addressed?

Not a problem with the design, but with various other aspects of the method. For example, the questionnaires were not standardised for this population, although it is claimed. And other obvious flaws.

- Have the appropriate data analysis procedures been used?

I will agree.

Additional information was included into the methodology however the reviewer did not specify any specific obvious short-comings

Standardised questionnaires were used which were at no time claimed to have been standardised on a SA population. In light of the absence of a more appropriate SA standardised questionnaire these instruments were the best that were available.

RESULTS

- Are the findings accurately reported?

Accepted.

- Do tables and figures support the text?

Unnecessary stats, not related to the research question.

More descriptive values were added

A Table dealing with the themes of trauma was removed as it was deemed not to make any significant contribution to the research document. A Table indicating the suicide-risk values has also been removed.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

- Are the limitations of the study presented?

Yes, but not in enough detail, especially regarding methodological short comings.

- Is the contribution to knowledge clearly stated?

There is no contribution to report.

- Do the implications logically follow the findings?

I doubt it.

- Are the conclusions related back to the theory?

No.

As mentioned earlier we have learnt much from this research findings and will be able to use a different approach when doing follow-up research in this regard. We do not see negative findings as insignificant, but rather as opportunities to get to a point of greater understanding.

Methodologically more emphasis was given to the study

The researchers tried to increase the flow and alignment of the implications of this study

OVERALL

- Is the paper well organised?

No. Difficult to read.

With the changes made it is hoped that the study will read in a more organised manner

- Are subheadings used to enhance readability?

- Is prose concise?

- Is style consistent throughout the paper?

- Can the paper be shortened without loss of necessary information? How?