

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

Siméon T.A. Lahaije¹

¹ University of Groningen

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In general, I find the article to be well readable and covering an interesting subject. However, I do have questions and comments regarding the set-up of the article, as well as the methodology, and would recommend major revisions. Also, I would like to ask the author to clarify the additional value of this article compared to existing reviews regarding the same subject.

Moreover, I was somewhat confused by the terms "special needs" and "disabilities". The term "special needs" is a somewhat outdated term to refer to disabilities and should therefore not be used. However, you use this term to refer to a different group of people. To avoid confusion, and considering the limited results you found regarding this group, consider limiting the scope of your review to grandparents of children with disabilities. Also, add at least one paragraph to the Introduction describing and defining the term "disabilities" and how you will interpret this term for your review.

As a general note, I would recommend the author to critically review the age of the cited literature and see if more recent literature can be found.

Also, please demarcate clearly the different sections of the article, e.g., Introduction, Method, Results, Discussion, and use relevant subheaders.

Introduction

-Please rewrite the Introduction to be both more condensed (e.g., deleting the section "Tools and Measurements") as well as more in line with the review (e.g., include a section on disabilities). I found the Introduction to be quite long, including information that, while interesting, did not seem specifically relevant to the review or could be written more concisely. Please ensure that the topics discussed and information shared in the Introduction match your research questions/objectives.

-Please state clearly the specific research questions or objectives of your study.

Methodology

-Please define exactly which databases and search engines you have used for replicability.

-Similarly, define the search terms that were used (and why).

- Also, clearly state the inclusion as well as exclusion criteria.
- You state the analysis of the themes was subject to an ICA, though the selection process appears not to be. Is this correct, and can you clarify this?
- The scope of the included literature dates back to 1957. I would strongly recommend limiting the scope to only recent literature (e.g., 2000-2023) and thereby revising the results.
- It is unclear to me what the numbers in Figure 1 represent. It is also unclear why the same information is presented in two different figures. Please consider using the standard flowchart template for literature reviews.
- The added value of the journal titles is unclear to me. I would recommend deleting this section.
- A vast majority of the articles found in your review did not specify a condition. Why were these articles included then? Also, what is the added value of analyzing needs per condition since there were limited articles per condition? Please add to, reconsider, and/or discuss these results, also within the goal of your article.

Results

- Please use contemporary nomenclature for autism (i.e., “autistic children” or “children on the autism spectrum”).
- Similarly, use “Deaf children.”
- Consider creating a table with an overview of the different articles with their characteristics, including results.

Discussion

- Please discuss the results of your study within a theoretical framework, while also discussing the limitations of your study, as well as the practical implications, and recommendations for practice and future research.
- Please offer a more concrete summary of the article. Also, be precise and reserved with your recommendations, and make more clear how these follow the results.