

JWOCN Manuscript Preparation Checklist: Evidence Based Report Cards (EBRC), Systematic and Scoping Reviews and Meta-Analyses

**See [Ramundo \(2018\)](#) and [Kent \(2018\)](#) for examples of EBRC – references below.

Title

- Written as a PICO Question

Title Page

- Author Names and credentials
- Authors' institutions
- Corresponding author: provide physical address, email address

Structured Abstract (around 250 words)

- Purpose: main purpose of undertaking the report in a single sentence
- Question: entire question or statement of the problem posed to guide the review
- Method: identify method of review (scoping or systematic)
- Search Strategy: briefly describe how your group reviewed the literature, including electronic databases searched, the number of studies located, approach used to extract the data, inclusion criteria for selecting the studies/literature, and methods to evaluate strength and quality of the evidence
- Findings: describe main findings in 2-4 sentences, include on overall rating of quality of evidence
- Conclusion/Recommendation: describe the impact of on current practice; provide specific recommendations for change as indicated in no more than 3 sentences

- Key Words: up to 6 terms (use key terms used when searching literature, include MeSH terms whenever possible)

Introduction (3 – 5 paragraphs)

- Relevance to clinical practice, identify the gaps, and cite appropriate references
- Purpose of review - this should be in the last paragraph of this section

Question (2 – 3 sentences)

- PICO or similar format where P = population, I = intervention, C = comparison (or baseline), and O = outcome
- Search question

Method (two words, either a scoping or systematic review)

- Definition of scoping review – provides a *preliminary* summary or “chart” of potential size of literature and scope of available research literature (all types of studies and can systematic reviews, case reports, consensus statements, etc.) that aims to identify key concepts or themes (may be to clarify working definitions and conceptual boundaries of a topic or field), identify gaps in research, and locate types of evidence to inform practice, future research or process improvement. The search question is often broadly defined.
- Definition of systematic review - synthesizes and aggregates the results of defined types of studies such as controlled trials and provides a high level of evidence on the outcomes or effectiveness of interventions. The search question is highly focused.

Search Strategy (2 – 3 paragraphs)

- Use of librarian (provide type – reference, health, medical, university) and role
- Electronic databases searched such as MEDLINE (Ovid); PubMed (National Library of Medicine); Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL, The Cochrane Library); SCOPUS (Elsevier); EMBASE (Ovid); CINAHL (EBSCO); PsycINFO; Science Citation Index Expanded on Web of Science; OTseeker; Speechbite and PEDro.
- Inclusion/exclusion criteria including range of years studies were abstracted, types of studies (randomized controlled trials, observational non-randomized studies, cross-sectional/prevalence studies, case series, reviews, consensus statement, etc.)
- Search terms
- Data extraction process including method and by whom (what data were extracted from each table that are included in the evidence table)
- Critical appraisal of studies method; to appraise/assess the quality of individual studies consider methods such as:
 - Procedure described by Gray M , Bliss D , & Klem ML. (2015).
 - Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Worsheets <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>;
 - Methodological Index for Non-Randomized Studies (MINOR) <http://cobe.paginas.ufsc.br/files/2014/10/MINORS.pdf>;
 - Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) <https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/evidence-based-reports/technical/methodology/index.html>
 - Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies (AXIS) <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/bmjopen/6/12/e011458.full.pdf>;
 - Transparent Reporting of Evaluation with Non-Randomized Designs (TREND <http://www.cdc.gov/trendstatement/>
 - Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies (cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional (STROBE) <http://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=available-checklists>;
 - Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Practice Methodology https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/evidence-based-practice/ijhn_2017_ebp.html
 - The Joanna Briggs Institute <https://joannabriggs.org/research/critical-appraisal-tools.html>

- Strength of evidence rating method: to rate the overall body of evidence consider methods such as:
 - Strength of Recommendation Taxonomy (SORT) – preferred by J WOCN as adapted by Gray et al from Ebel and colleagues
 - Essential Evidence Plus: Levels of Evidence
https://www.essentialevidenceplus.com/product/ebm_loe.cfm?show=oxford
 - Oxford Center for Evidence-Based Medicine
<https://www.cebm.net/2016/05/ocebmllevels-of-evidence/>
 - Describe techniques used to provide meta-analysis of pooled findings when indicated

Findings (2 – 3 paragraphs)

- Numbers and types of studies located with references (2 -3 paragraphs)
- PRISMA diagram of evidence of search results <http://www.prisma-statement.org>

Summary of evidence (6 – 10 paragraphs – 2 pages)

- Summary of individual studies that generally includes: author(s), sample and size, what was studied, and findings.
- Synthesis of overall findings to answer the search question
 - Evidence review summary table of each study that includes author/citation, study design and strength (level of evidence), sample size and description (purpose of study), data collection approach, key findings (depends on whether scoping or systemic review), limitations
- SORT statement(s) recommended (generally one paragraph); particularly when reporting systematic review with or without analysis if pooled findings
- Limitations of review

Conclusion/Recommendations (1 – 2 paragraphs)

- Clinical implications - Summarize the 2 to 3 most important points readers should remember having read your EBRC

Readings and references on scoping and systematic reviews

Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory and Practice*. 2005;8(1):19–32.

Cacchione PZ. The evolving methodology of scoping reviews. *Clin Nur Research*. 2016;25(2):115-119.

Gray M , Bliss D , Klem ML. Methods, levels of evidence, strength of recommendations for treatment statements for evidence-based report cards . *J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs*. 2015; 42(1):16 - 18 .

Ebell MH , Siwek J , Weiss BD , et al. Strength of Recommendation Taxonomy (SORT): a patient-centered approach to grading evidence in the medical literature. *J Am Board Fam Pract*. 2004;17(1): 59-67 .

Kent DJ, Scardillo JN, Dale B, Pike C. Does the use of clean or sterile dressing technique affect the incidence of wound infection? *J Wound Ostomy and Continence Nurs*. 2018;45(3):265-269.

Khalil H, Peters M, Godfrey C, et al. An evidence-based approach to scoping reviews. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs*. 2016;13(2):118-123.

Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien K. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implement Sci*. 2010;5(1):69.

Lockwood C, Oh EG. Systematic reviews: Guidelines, tools and checklists for authors. *Nurs & Health Sci*. 2017;19:273–277. doi: 10.1111/nhs.12353.

Morris M, Boruff J, and G Gore. Scoping reviews: establishing the role of the librarian. *J Med Lib Assoc*. 2016;104(4):346-353.

Munn Z, Peters M, Stern C, et al. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2018;18:143.

OCEBM Levels of Evidence Working Group . The Oxford levels of evidence 2 . <http://www.cebm.net/index.aspx?o = 5653>. Accessed August 1, 2019.

Peters M, Godfrey C, Khalil H, et al. Guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015;13:141-146.

Peterson J, Pearce PF, Ferguson LA, Langford CA. Understanding scoping reviews: definition, purpose, and process. *J Am Assoc Nurse Pract*. 2017;29(1):12-16.

Research Evidence Appraisal Tool. Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Practice.
https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/evidence-based-practice/_docs/appendix_e_research_evidence_appraisal_tool.pdf. Accessed August 1, 2019.

Ramundo J, Pike C, Pittman J. Do prophylactic foam dressings reduce heel pressure injuries? *J Wound Ostomy and Continence Nurs.* 2018;45(1):75-82.