

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

Title (must include review type, i.e., scoping, systematic)

- Write as a PICO Question or Aim

Title Page

- Include:
 - 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 or question/aim
- Method: scoping or systematic review (scoping or systematic)
- Search Strategy: briefly describe how your group reviewed the literature, including electronic data bases searched, the number of studies located, approach used to extract the data, inclusion criteria for selecting the studies/literature including date ranges and rationale, and methods to evaluate strength and quality of the evidence
- Findings/Conclusions: describe main findings in 2-4 sentences, include an overall rating of quality of evidence
- Implications: describe the impact 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)

- Describe relevance to clinical practice, identify the gaps, and cite appropriate references; last paragraph must include:
 - PICO or similar format (questions) where P = population, I = intervention, C = comparison (or baseline), and O = outcome (2 to 3 sentences)
 - A review aim may be substituted for PICO question

Method (tell readers whether you are writing a scoping or systematic review or other type of review)

- Definition of scoping review – The search question is often broadly defined. It provides a *preliminary* summary or “chart” of potential research and scholarly literature (includes all types of published studies, clinical guidelines, best practice statements, consensus

documents, and similar scholarly work) that aims to identify key concepts and current state of knowledge/practice, and identify gaps in research.

- Definition of systematic review - The search question is highly focused. Search is limited to published research studies that compare outcomes to a comparison/placebo, sham, or control or historical control group. Includes evaluation of quality of research. Must include box with key evidence-based statements and recommendations for practice.

Search Strategy (2 – 3 paragraphs)

- We strongly recommend use of a medical librarian. If one is used, ask the librarian to provide a paragraph describing the search.
- 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.
- Identify inclusion/exclusion criteria:
 - range of years and rationale for time frame
 - types of articles (i.e., studies, guidelines, best practice documents)
 - Language
 - Any additional criteria: (i.e., age range, diagnoses such as type of ostomy or wound)
- Include major search terms - search strings should be included as supplemental digital content; we recommend seeking help from medical librarian for this task
- Describe data extraction process including method and by whom (what data were extracted from each table that are included in the evidence table):
 - Exclude duplicates
 - Read by title and abstract
 - Read full journal article
 - Describe which data are extracted based your PICO questions/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)
- Consider using one of the following as critical appraisal resources 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
- The Joanna Brigs Institute <https://joannabriggs.org/research/critical-appraisal-tools.html>

Findings (2 – 3 paragraphs)

- Add numbers and types of studies located with references (2 -3 paragraphs)
- Include PRISMA diagram of excluded and included elements (articles or documents), include reasons for excluding articles/elements read in full (i.e.: wrong population, not the intervention of interest, observational or descriptive studies, single case studies)

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

- Provide synthesis of overall findings to answer the search question, consider a statement such as “Considered collectively, evidence suggests...”
 - Study table: sample characteristics, number, treatment comparison/control groups, intervention/interventions applied, findings specific to PICO/aim, limitations, quality rating (provide in a table format)
- Include a box with 3-5 key points based on your synthesis of evidence and 1-3 corresponding recommendations for practice based on these evidence based statements
- Address gaps in evidence, recommendations for additional research

Conclusion (single paragraph 2 – 3 sentences)

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

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.