

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

## **Standards for Publishing a Scoping or Systematic Review in JWOCN**

The Editorial Board of JWOCN acknowledges differences in the criteria used by various groups when publishing a systematic or scoping review. We also concur with Moher and colleagues who strongly recommend journals establish clear guidelines for publishing systematic and scoping reviews. This document outlines criteria for submitting a scoping or systematic review to JWOCN; all manuscripts submitted to JWOCN after March 15, 2021 must adhere to these guidelines before acceptance and publication in the Journal.

**Reference:** Moher D, Tetzlaff J, Tricco AC, Sampson, M, Altman DG. Epidemiology and Reporting Characteristics of Systematic Reviews. PLOS Medicine 2007; 4(3): 447-455.

- **Systematic Review:** The search question or review aim is highly focused. The search must be limited to **published quantitative research studies or systematic reviews that include meta-analysis of pooled data** that 1) compare outcomes to a comparison/placebo, sham, or control or historical control group, 2) summarize and synthesize observational epidemiologic data measuring the burden of a diseases of health disorder, or 3) summarize and synthesize data related to etiology, pathophysiology, prognosis or diagnosis of a disease or disorder. Based on criteria recommended in the 2020 PRISMA guidelines, these will be subsequently referred to as *elements*. Systematic reviews published in JWOCN also must include an evaluation of the quality of included research studies (including likelihood of bias), along with a box with key evidence-based statements. In addition, we strongly recommend including a box containing recommendations for practice. The following types of records *may not* be included in your systematic review: 1) previously published systematic reviews without meta-analysis of pooled data, 2) qualitative studies, 3) clinical guidelines, 4) best practice statements, or 5) consensus documents and similar scholarly work.
- **Scoping Reviews:** The search question or review aim is broad and typically focuses on current knowledge in a particular area of our practice. Scoping reviews *may* include a variety of published records such as: 1) published studies using a quantitative or qualitative design for data collection and analysis, 2) systematic reviews with or without meta-analysis of pooled data, 3) clinical guidelines, 4) best practice statements, and 5) consensus documents and similar scholarly work. A scoping review must summarize and synthesize the current state of knowledge/practice, and identify gaps in research.

Studies that do not adhere to these guidelines *may* be considered for publication as an integrative review but *will not* be published as a systematic or scoping review.

### **Title Page** (required for systematic and scoping review)

- Include:
  - Title (must include topic *and* identity review as systematic or scoping)

- All author names and credentials
- All authors' institutional affiliations
- Corresponding author: provide physical address, email address
- Identify potential conflicts of interest/ pertinent disclosures of *all* authors

### **Structured Abstract** (around 250 words; required for systematic and scoping review)

- Purpose: state main purpose of the systematic or scoping review in a single sentence, or insert the PICO query or review aim used to guide your review.
- Method: identify review as scoping or systematic (this must agree with review type identified in your title)
- Search Strategy: briefly describe how your group reviewed the literature, including electronic data bases searched, the number of studies located, the approach used to screen records for inclusion, inclusion/exclusion criteria for selecting records including date ranges and language of records reviewed, and methods to evaluate strength and quality of evidence (risk of bias within individual studies include as records)
- Findings/Conclusions: describe main findings in 2-4 sentences, include an overall rating of quality of evidence (risk for bias within individual studies)
- Implications: describe impact on current practice; provide specific recommendations for change as indicated in around 3 sentences
- Key Words: identify up to 6 terms that will guide readers to YOUR review after publication (use key terms used when searching literature, use MeSH terms whenever possible)

### **Introduction (3 – 5 paragraphs)**

- Describe the relevance of your review to clinical practice and cite appropriate references; your last paragraph must include: (required for systematic and scoping review)
  - PICO formatted (questions) where P = population, I = intervention, C = comparison (or baseline), and O = outcome (2 to 3 sentences) **OR**
  - A clearly written review aim may be substituted for PICO question
  - This statement must agree (or simply repeat) with the purpose stated in your structured abstract

### **Search Strategy (2 – 3 paragraphs)**

- We strongly recommend consulting a medical librarian when completing your review. If one is used, ask the librarian to provide a paragraph describing their search strategies.
- Identify all 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. (identification of data bases searched is required for *all* systematic and scoping reviews)
- Identify inclusion/exclusion criteria: (required for systematic *and* scoping reviews)
  - range of years *and* a rationale for selecting your time frame

- types of records (i.e., studies, guidelines, best practice documents; remember restrictions that apply to systematic reviews)
- Language
- Any additional criteria: (i.e., age range, diagnoses such as type of ostomy, wound, or incontinence)
- Identify major search terms: search strings should be included as supplemental digital content; we recommend seeking help from medical librarian for this task (required for systematic and scoping review)
- Selection process: Describe how you screened records for eligibility including how many reviewers (coauthors) screened each record and how any uncertainties were resolved. This process should include the following steps:
  - Exclusion of duplicate records (usually done by medical librarian)
  - Read by title and abstract (by one or more reviewers/co-authors)
  - Records read in full (by one or more reviewers/co-authors)
  - Describe how you resolved disagreements related to included or excluded records (usually based on discussion among all reviewers/co-authors)
- Data Extraction: Describe which data you extracted based your PICO questions or review aim (data extraction *must include*: sample characteristics, number, treatment comparison/control groups, intervention/interventions applied, findings specific to PICO/aim, limitations, quality rating (provide in a table format))
- A critical appraisal of potential bias within studies must be included in your systematic review; we strongly recommend a critical appraisal of bias within studies included in your scoping review as well. Consider using one of the following instruments to appraise/assess the quality of individual studies consider methods such as:
  - 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>;
  - 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](https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/evidence-based-practice/ijhn_2017_ebp.html)
  - The Joanna Brigs Institute <https://joannabriggs.org/research/critical-appraisal-tools.html>

## Findings (2 – 3 paragraphs)

- Identify the number of records (articles/documents) included in your review including number of studies and their overall design (something like this...we included 2 systematic reviews with meta-analysis of pooled findings, 6 randomized controlled trials, 2 nonrandomized cohort studies). For scoping reviews, you should also identify the type and number of records that are not research studies (something like this...we included 2 practice guidelines, and 3 consensus-based best practice statements)
- Include a PRISMA flow diagram this will be a figure in your final manuscript placed *after* your reference list. It must include excluded and included records (articles or documents), you must include reasons for excluding records *read in full* only (i.e.: wrong population, intervention of interest, observational or descriptive studies, single case studies). Use this link ( <http://prisma-statement.org/prismastatement/flowdiagram> ) for a template for your PRISMA Flow Diagram (this figure is required for systematic and scoping reviews)
- Include one or more tables summarizing all records included in your review: these tables must identify each record included in your review; you may compose one or more tables depending on the number of outcomes you identified in your PCICO formatted review question or review aims. These tables should be divided into columns that summarize data extracted from each review and an evaluation of potential bias when reporting original research or systematic reviews with analysis of pooled data.

## Summary of evidence (6 – 10 paragraphs, about 1-3 manuscript pages)

- Provide a synthesis of overall findings to answer the search question, consider a statement such as “Considered collectively, evidence suggests...” (required for systematic and scoping review) to explain the various points you wish readers to remember having read our article.
- Include a box with around 3 to 5 key points based on your synthesis of evidence; include 1-3 corresponding recommendations for practice based on these evidence based statements whenever feasible (the key point box is required for all systematic and scoping reviews)
- Include 1 to 3 paragraphs that address gaps in evidence and recommendations for additional research (required for systematic *and* scoping reviews; most authors find that a single paragraph is sufficient)

## Conclusion (single paragraph 2 – 3 sentences)

- Summarize the 2 to 3 most important points readers should remember having read your scoping or systematic review.

## **Resources for Differentiating and Completing a Systematic or Scoping Review for Publication in JWOCN**

### **Systematic Reviews**

Page M J, McKenzie J E, Bossuyt P M, Boutron I, Hoffmann T C, Mulrow C D et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews *BMJ* 2021; 372:n71 doi:10.1136/bmj.n71

Engberg S. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: Study of Studies. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*. 35(3):258-265

Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and cumulative incidence data. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*. 2015; 13(3):147-53.

Moola S, Munn Z, Sears K, Sfetcu R, Currie M, Lisy K, Tufanaru C et al. Conducting systematic reviews of association (etiology). *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*. 2015; 13(3):163-9.

### **Scoping 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.

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.

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.

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.