

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

Idi Warsah

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The introduction of the article provides a broad overview of the roles and relationships between grandparents (GPs) and grandchildren (GC), as well as the different types of GP roles. However, there are several areas that could be improved to enhance the accuracy and clarity of the information presented. First, the article tends to cover a lot of information in one paragraph, which can make it dense and difficult to understand. It is recommended to break the paragraph into smaller parts to improve readability. Furthermore, although the operational definition of GP has been mentioned, the lack of explanation regarding the importance of this definition in the research context or broader context can confuse readers. It is advisable to provide a brief background on why the operational definition of GP is important before mentioning the definition itself.

To maintain the relevance of the information, it is important to include the publication year of the sources mentioned. This helps readers understand the extent to which the information presented is still relevant or has been updated. Some parts, such as the explanation of the different types of GPs, feel somewhat disconnected from the overall context of the article. Try to integrate this information more seamlessly into the overall narrative. Some references mentioned, such as Schultz (1980) in the context of a cognitive-developmental perspective, may be less relevant to the article's topic of GP roles in educating and guiding grandchildren. The article could be strengthened by presenting a stronger and clearer conclusion about the importance of GP roles in the lives of grandchildren and the family as a whole. A strong conclusion will leave a deeper impression on readers.

It is important to ensure that all information presented, including the theories and models described, is relevant to your research objectives. Make sure to highlight how this information supports your research framework. Lastly, make sure to use accurate and clear terms in the context of your article, and review the use of references to ensure consistency and accuracy of the information presented.

The methodology section of this study presents a detailed outline of the research approach, yet there are areas where clarity and rigor could be enhanced. Firstly, the survey method, while suitable for collecting a broad range of information, lacks detailed information on the survey design. More specifics on the survey instrument, including question types, response format, and respondent selection criteria, would improve transparency. Additionally, the study mentions using various databases and search engines for the literature review, which is commendable. However, there is a lack of detail on the search terms and criteria used, which are crucial for ensuring the search process's transparency and reproducibility.

Furthermore, the description of data extraction and synthesis is somewhat vague. It would be beneficial to outline the criteria for selecting articles, extracting relevant information, and synthesizing data into key points and themes. Providing examples of how data were organized in the Excel spreadsheet could also enhance clarity. The study mentions involving two independent coders for reliability checks, a good practice. However, more information is needed on how disagreements were resolved and how the robust correlation coefficient was calculated, such as whether Pearson's r or another method was used. In the statistical analysis section, more detail is needed on the specific non-parametric measures used and their application. Providing information on the statistical tests used, including assumptions and rationale for their selection, would improve the methodological clarity.

While the use of PRISMA-Narrative guidelines for bibliometric analysis is appropriate, the description of the analysis process could be expanded. More detail on how the flow diagram and harvest plot were prepared, as well as how study characteristics were summarized and analyzed, would enhance the methodological rigor. Lastly, the study briefly mentions ethical issues related to caring for children with disabilities, but more detail is needed on how these issues were addressed in the research design and implementation. Discussion on how informed consent was obtained and participant confidentiality protected would strengthen the ethical considerations of the study.

The results of this study, compiling 150 references on grandparents (GPs) in relation to children with special needs and disabilities (CWSN-Ds), are presented under various headings for format, timelines, journal titles, and topics or themes. However, several aspects of the presentation and interpretation could be improved for clarity and depth. Regarding format, the presentation of data regarding the format of publications in the review is clear. However, the description could be enhanced by providing more context on the significance of each format in contributing to the overall body of knowledge on GPs and CWSN-Ds. In terms of timelines, the timeline analysis provides valuable insights into the historical development of research on GPs and CWSN-Ds. However, the description could be improved by providing more context on the reasons behind the increase in publications during certain periods and how these trends reflect changes in societal attitudes or research priorities.

The analysis of journal titles provides useful information on the publication outlets for research on GPs and CWSN-Ds. However, the significance of each journal in the field could be elaborated to help readers understand the prominence of these publications in shaping the discourse on the topic. The detailed information on specific research topics related to GPs and CWSN-Ds is comprehensive. However, the presentation could be more structured to highlight key themes and trends in the literature. The analysis of GPs' perceptions, reactions, coping mechanisms, and experiences in caring for CWSN-Ds is insightful. However, the presentation could be improved by organizing the information into distinct categories to facilitate easier comparison and understanding.

Regarding developmental and mental health issues, the discussion on developmental and mental health issues in children with disabilities and the impact on GPs is informative. However, the presentation could be enhanced by providing more context on the specific challenges faced by GPs in managing these issues and how they impact their caregiving role. The comparison of the roles of grandfathers and grandmothers in caring for CWSN-Ds is valuable. However, the analysis could be strengthened by providing more context on the societal and cultural factors that influence these roles and how

they impact the overall well-being of the children. The discussion on the link between culture and GP roles in different societies is insightful. However, the presentation could be improved by providing more specific examples of how cultural norms and practices influence GP involvement in caring for CWSN-Ds.

The analysis of GP roles in specific disease or disability conditions is comprehensive. However, the presentation could be more focused on highlighting the unique challenges and coping mechanisms specific to each condition. The discussion on therapeutic interventions involving GPs is valuable. However, the presentation could be improved by providing more specific examples of successful interventions and their impact on the well-being of GPs and CWSN-Ds. The discussion on limitations and recommendations for future research is insightful. However, the presentation could be more structured to clearly outline the key challenges and potential avenues for addressing them in future studies.