

WCET[®] Journal

Volume 39 Number 2 June 2019

Official Journal of  The World Council of Enterostomal Therapists[®]
and  International Inter-professional Wound Care Group

Editorial

Peer review: purpose, process and positives

News and views

Around the WCET[®] world

Original article

Experience of negative pressure wound therapy over sternal wound healing: A retrospective review

Case study

Avoidance of lower limb amputation from a diabetic foot ulcer: The importance of multidisciplinary practice and patient collaboration

Original article

Effects of enterostomal therapists training: Evaluated with Kirkpatrick's model

Case study

Impact of chronic osteomyelitis on wound healing and the quality of life of the patient with a chronic wound

Vale

Patricia Blackley



A world of expert professional nursing care for people with ostomy, wound or continence needs

Official Journal of  The World Council of Enterostomal Therapists®
and  International Inter-professional Wound Care Group



IIWCG office bearers

President

Gulnaz Tariq RN, IIWCC, MSc.
President Elect, WUWHS

Unit Manager for Wound Care Sheikh Khalifa Medical City
Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

Vice-President

Jassin Hamed, MD

Member of Executive Board WUWHS
Physician, Internal Medicine Sheikh Khalifa Medical City
Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

Publications

Hiske Smart RN, MA(Nur), PG Dip (WHTR — UK), IIWCC (Can)
Clinical Nurse Specialist — Hyperbaric and Wound Care Unit
King Hamad University Hospital
Kingdom of Bahrain

World Council of Enterostomal Therapists® Journal

ISSN 0819-4610

Copyright ©2019

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Non-member individuals £60
Institutions £120

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY



10 Walters Drive
Osborne Park WA 6017 Australia
Tel +61 8 6154 3911

Email admin@cambridgemedias.com.au
www.cambridgemedias.com.au

Advertising Sales Simon Henriques
simonh@cambridgemedias.com.au

Copy Editor Rachel Hoare
Graphic Designer Mark Orange

Contents

Editorial	
Peer review: purpose, process and positives	6
News and views	
Around the WCET® world	8
Original article	
Experience of negative pressure wound therapy over sternal wound healing: A retrospective review <i>Wai Sze Ho, Wai Kuen Lee, Ka Kay Chan & Choi Ching Fong</i>	9
Case study	
Avoidance of lower limb amputation from a diabetic foot ulcer: The importance of multidisciplinary practice and patient collaboration <i>Margaret Mungai & Emmy Sirmah</i>	19
Original article	
Effects of enterostomal therapists training: Evaluated with Kirkpatrick's model <i>Shenlv Ying, Jiang, Hai-Hong & Ai-hua Chen(Alice)</i>	28
Case study	
Impact of chronic osteomyelitis on wound healing and the quality of life of the patient with a chronic wound <i>Swapna Johnson-Kunjukutty & Carmel Delille</i>	34
Vale	
Patricia Blackley <i>Jenny Prentice</i>	42

The *World Council of Enterostomal Therapists® Journal* is indexed in the *Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature*.

Disclaimer Opinions expressed in the *WCET® Journal* are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the World Council of Enterostomal Therapists®, the editor, the editorial board or Cambridge Media.

The WCET® mission is to lead the global advancement of specialised professional nursing care for people with ostomy, wound or continence needs

The WCET® Journal has a strategic Sustaining Journal Partnership with these companies. Their commitment to supporting the Journal with advertising helps the WCET® to achieve its mission.



Peer review: purpose, process and positives

For referencing Prentice J. Peer review: purpose, process and positives. WCET® Journal 2019; 39(2):6

DOI <https://doi.org/10.33235/wcet.39.2.6>

The aims and scope of the WCET® Journal support the dissemination of information that advances the care of people with ostomy, wound or continence needs. It is imperative, however, that any information published is highly credible. One of the best ways of ensuring the reliability and validity of published material is to assess articles submitted for publication through the peer review process.

Peer review is commonly defined as... “a process of subjecting an author’s scholarly work, research or ideas to the scrutiny of others who are experts in the same field”¹. The WCET® Journal uses invited international subject matter experts and members of the editorial board to peer review submitted articles.

There are multiple reasons for adopting a peer review process that impact editors and authors. Firstly, from an editor’s perspective the primary reasons generally subscribed to are to maintain a high standard of published material; be it research, clinical case studies, educational theories, literature reviews or other commentary. Peer review assists editors to determine the worthiness of the publication from the point of view of originality, value and implications of research findings to the professions and the public. Are the conclusions drawn reliable and valid? Secondly, peer review assists in improving the quality of information published through independent constructive critique and suggestions for refining an article.

Other reasons are suitability of subject matter and does the article meet the WCET® Journal’s stated criteria in terms of interest, quality or new and significant information? Have the guidelines for authors been followed in respect of an abstract, word limits, accurate statements of the problem or methods used to review a subject and are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results? Reviewers comments guide editors’ decisions to accept articles for publication with nil, minor or major revisions or to reject the article.

The WCET® Journal uses a double-blinded approach to peer review. Authors are unaware of who has critiqued the article and reviewers are unaware of who the authors are. Using this approach limits the potential for reviewer bias. Further, there is no direct communication between authors and reviewers.

Post article review editorial decisions, along with reviewers’ comments, are communicated to the author(s). The editor may also provide further advice. Authors are provided with instructions through ScholarOne on how to address

comments made. Authors always have a right of reply to justify article content and their points of view and to seek further clarification from reviewers. Once the article is resubmitted it is either sent for further review by the same or different reviewers or accepted for publication.

There are positive and negative views on the peer review process. Negative views centre around the time it may take to review an article, reviewer bias, lack of thoroughness or superficial assessments, failure to identify serious flaws and lack of transparency^{2,3}. The positives include articles that are well written, are clear in their methodology, analysis and conclusions. The profession benefits from exposure to peer reviewed articles in which there is greater trust and authors benefit from the wisdom of the reviewers.

First time authors especially may benefit from the peer review process as comments relayed back to the author(s) assist with article structure, grammar, correct use of figures, tables, references and most importantly subject matter and interpretation of findings^{1,3,4}.

As Mrs Margaret Mungai – Deputy Director Nursing Clinical Services Moi Teaching & Referral Hospital, Eldoret Kenya – and first author of the article ‘Avoidance of lower limb amputation from a diabetic foot ulcer: The importance of multi-disciplinary practice and patient collaboration’ as published within this issue of the journal recently stated, “The contribution of the editors was amazing and how they transformed our document to a case study was unbelievable. We look forward to continue working together on Wound and Ostomy care- a unique line of service in need by so many patients than the health care providers can ever imagine and more so in Kenya and Africa in general”, (personal communication 17 June 2019).

Peer review will continue to be an important, useful and positive attribute that underpins the essence of the WCET® Journal.

REFERENCES

1. Kelly J, Sadeghieh T & Adeli K. Peer review in scientific publications: benefits, critiques, & a survival guide. *eJIFCC* 2014, 25(3):227-243.
2. Schmitz J. Peer Review: Why is it important? <https://www.publisso.de/en/advice/publishing-advice-faqs/peer-review/> Accessed 1st June 2019
3. Gannon F. In: Editorial. The essential role of peer review. *EMBO Rep.* 2001 Sep 15; 2(9): 743. doi: 10.1093/embo-reports/kve188 Accessed 8th June 2019.
4. Jennings CG. Quality and value: The true purpose of peer review. *Nature* (2006). doi:10.1038/nature0503

Jenny Prentice

PhD, BN, RN, STN, FAWMA