Template for Publishing an Evidence-Based Practice Project

|  |
| --- |
| **Title and Abstract** |
| **Title**: Identifies the report/project as an evidence-based project  Enter text |
| **Abstract**: Provide a summary which includes, as applicable: the rationale for the EBP project, with EBP question, literature search and appraisal methods, results, best-evidence synthesis, and organizational translation recommendations.  Enter text |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Introduction** |
| **Appendix B** | **Rationale for the EBP Project**: Describe the problem, internal data to validate the problem, the problem’s importance, risks of not addressing the problem, and the current practice.  Enter text |
| **Available Knowledge**: Include what is currently known about the problem from the literature to create a broad view (e.g., organizationally, nationally, globally).  Enter text |
| **EBP Question**: Provide the EBP question being addressed using the PICO format.  Enter text |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Methods** |
|  | **Information Sources**: Describe the sources (e.g., databases, standards, clinical practice guidelines, organizational data, evidence-based professional organization position statements, consensus studies) used in the evidence search.  Enter text |
| **Appendix B** | **Search Methods**: Describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria, date ranges, and rationale for search strategy limits.  Enter text |
| **Keywords**: List the keywords, phrases, or search concepts used for the literature search.  Enter text |
|  | **Article Screening**: Describe the process for title, abstract, and full text screening of literature search results.  Enter text |
|  | **Data Collection and Article Appraisal Process**: Explain the process for completing the article appraisal process, including the model used (Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Model and Guidelines), the number of reviewers, elements collected in the individual evidence summary tool, and how the team resolved discrepancies/reached consensus.  Enter text |
|  | **Synthesis, Recommendations, and Translation Process**: Describe the process used to synthesize the evidence, generate best-evidence recommendations, and translate this to the team’s setting.  Enter text |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Results** |
|  | **Study Selection**: Provide the number of articles screened by the EBP team, including the final number of articles included in the synthesis and recommendations. Consider using a flow diagram.  Enter text |
| **Appendix G** | **Study Characteristics**: Provide the relevant information from the individual evidence summary for all included articles (e.g., author, type of evidence, population size and setting, intervention, findings that answer the EBP question, measures used, limitations, and level and quality rating) in table format.  Enter text |
| **Findings of Individual Studies**: Consider the value of including additional elements of interest of each study by visual display (table, figure, or chart) to provide more in-depth description and clarity.  Enter text |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Discussion** |
| **Appendix H** | **Synthesis of Evidence**: Synthesize the findings of the overall evidence review including the strength (level, quality), quantity, and best evidence recommendations.  Enter text |
|  | **Limitations**: Discuss the limitations of the project. This can include limitations of the articles within the review (e.g., low quality, small sample sizes) and limitations of the review process itself (e.g., difficulty retrieving all relevant articles).  Enter text |
|  | **Conclusions**: Include a brief restatement of the problem and why it is important and a broad interpretation of relevant findings—avoid summarizing key points. Show whether, or to what extent, the project succeeded in answering the PICO question and addressing the problem.  Enter text |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Implications** |
| **Appendix C & I** | **Translation Strategies**: Describe the organization-specific recommendations and action plan, including considerations of risk, fit, feasibility, acceptability, and stakeholder engagement.  Enter text |
| **Appendix I** | **Outcomes**: Identify the measure used to determine the success of any changes associated with the project. If the project has been implemented, report on relevant outcomes.  Enter text |

**Directions for Use of the Dissemination Tool**

**Purpose**: This template is a structured guide for writing a manuscript for publishing an evidence-based practice project. Each section above includes the aspects of the project required for developing a robust manuscript. It can also help divide the writing among team members and provides guidance on which elements of the EBP project fall under each heading (introduction, methods, results, and conclusion) without redundancy. When used, the JHEBP Model tools provide much of the information needed for a manuscript. Use the appendix references to locate the team’s previous work. This template was created with reference to the SQUIRE 2.0 guidelines (Ogrinc et al., 2016), PRISMA Statement (Moher et al., 2009), and Evidence-Based Practice Process Quality Assessment Guidelines (Lee et al., 2013).

**References**

Lee, M. C., Johnson, K. L., Newhouse, R. P., & Warren, J. I. (2013). Evidence‐based practice process quality assessment: EPQA guidelines. *Worldviews on Evidence‐Based Nursing*, *10*(3), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6787.2012.00264.x>

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & the PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. [*BMJ*, *339*, b2535, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2535](file:///C:/Users/kjewett1/AppData/Local/Temp/Temp1_OneDrive_1_5-20-2021.zip/BMJ,%20339,%20b2535,%20https:/doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2535)

Ogrinc, G., Davies, L., Goodman, D., Batalden, P. B., Davidoff, F., & Stevens, D. (2016). SQUIRE 2.0 (Standards for QUality Improvement Reporting Excellence): Revised publication guidelines from a detailed consensus process. *BMJ Quality and Safety*, *25*(12), 986–992. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004411>