

Review of: "Grandparenting Children With Special Needs and Disabilities: A Narrative Review"

Catherine Lejeune¹

¹ Université de Bourgogne

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The goal of this article was to conduct a narrative review to explore the experience of grandparents involved in raising children with special needs and disabilities. Regarding the important role of caregivers in supporting the healthcare system, this topic is important to study.

Despite its undeniable interest, the way the topic was justified, the research was conducted, and the results, conclusion, and perspectives were presented totally prevented me from understanding this work. You will find here my comments. I hope they will help you to improve your article.

Abstract: It is unusual to start the abstract with the objective. There is no background. I will not make any comments on this part, as they are similar to those I am going to develop below.

Abbreviations: It is unusual to find a list of abbreviations. Generally, they are found in the text and defined the first time they are used.

Globally: Be synthetic. This article is an enumeration of ideas. I was unable to make links between them.

Title: It is not clear what special needs are, what these disabilities are, and the possible link between these two terms is.

Introduction

1-Global comments

-I do not know what the instructions for the authors are, but generally, the reader should find an Introduction section.

-An introduction cannot be a lot of small sections. Transitions must be made. For example, there is no link between the first two paragraphs: "*The distinction between.... Two categories*" and the title "*What or Who is a grandparent*".

-I was unable to find the main idea (and guideline) of the article. There is no justification. The introduction is a list of ideas. They look like affirmations and are not contextualized. The grandparents' populations to which you refer should be described in terms of country, age, gender, time period. Similarly, what type of grandchildren was concerned too? For example, I did not understand the § "*For children aged 3-5, the joint tasks.... Pieper 1976*". First, this is a quite old reference. Moreover, the reader is not able to know what kind of children population is concerned (disabled children? What kind of disease?) Please, detail.

-I do not agree with the distinction between CWSN and CWD: medical conditions (what are they?) can they generate inabilities. Please be clearer concerning these two categories and, above all, just why they interested you.

-It is not clear if you are interested specifically in the Indian context or more generally in the role of grandparents.

2-References are quite old. I can understand it is possible to have quite old references. But 1976, 1982, 1982, 1988, 1991, 1995.....?

3-I did not understand the paragraph "*Some inherent rewards... through generations*". Where do you want to take the reader?

4-Pages 4 and 5 should be synthesized and seem partly redundant. Again, where do you want to take the reader? What is the research question?

5-I was surprised by some of the expressions you used "*They are honored for their unconditional love and guidance*". To which society or country do you refer? If you refer to the Indian society, it should be indicated in the title and the whole introduction.

6-"ASD" is mentioned. Why this pathology? This is an illustration of the juxtaposition of ideas without any distinction of populations and contexts. Therefore, I am not able to judge the relevance of this part. You should be clear about your research question and then write this introduction to justify it.

7-You enumerate a list of theories. Again, why? This part cannot be understood by the reader. Similarly, for Tools and measurements (some questionnaires do not concern GPs but only children).

Research questions

You present too many goals.

Objectives

1-The objective is not clear. What are the dimensions of the "experience of GP"?

You must restrict your work to a very precise objective.

Method

1-The § Procedure is not clear. It belongs to the Method section. Please be clear by presenting the method (identification of articles with Mesh, selection, blinded reading).

2-I did not understand "*for at least a quarter of entries*". Please explain.

3-Please create a specific section for the analysis in the Method paragraph.

4- Please create a flow chart with included and non-included studies and why they have been excluded.

5-Is it a narrative or a systematic review?

6-The Table 1 is informative. Is it presented with standards of publication? A lot of abbreviations are not explained. Why so many old publications? 1957-1980.... It should be rebuilt: what do you want to show and why?

Results

1-They should not be redundant with the table. What information is important for the reader?

I did not understand the § *"There is a National Research.... With them"*

There are too many results because the objective of your work was not clearly defined. A table with main results, presenting the authors, the country, the year, the population (GP and GC), and the explored dimensions could be created, but only if you know exactly what you are looking for.

Therefore, I did not understand why you separated the GP and the GC populations: they should be linked.