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 an 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/](https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/);
  - Methodological Index for Non-Randomized Studies (MINOR) [http://cobe.paginas.ufsc.br/files/2014/10/MINORS.pdf](http://cobe.paginas.ufsc.br/files/2014/10/MINORS.pdf);
  - Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies (AXIS) [https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/bmjopen/6/12/e011458.full.pdf](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/](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](http://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=available-checklists);
• **Strength of evidence rating method**: to rate the overall body of evidence consider methods such as:
  
  o Strength of Recommendation Taxonomy (SORT) – preferred by J WOCN as adapted by Gray et al from Ebel and colleagues
  
  o Essential Evidence Plus: Levels of Evidence
    https://www.essentialevidenceplus.com/product/ebm_loe.cfm?show=oxford
  
  o Oxford Center for Evidence-Based Medicine
    https://www.cebm.net/2016/05/ocebm-levels-of-evidence/
  
  o 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
  
  o 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
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