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• National League for Nursing (NLN) *Nursing Education Research Priorities*

• 2016-2019 priorities challenged nurse educators to “Build the science of nursing education through discovery and translation of innovative evidence-based strategies” (NLN, 2016, p. 2).

• Rapidly expanding body of nursing education science.

• Need for synthesis and dissemination.
Purpose

• Propose process for reviewing integrative review manuscripts.
• Describe criteria for critiquing published integrative reviews.
Knowledge Synthesis

• Evaluation, critical analysis, and fusion of all that is known about a specified topic based on evidence gleaned from a systematic, comprehensive literature search.

• Integrative review
  • Type of systematic review.
  • Permits synthesis of diverse types of knowledge (Shellenbarger, 2017; Whittemore & Knafl, 2005).
Integrative Review (IR)

• “The integrative review method is an approach that allows for the inclusion of diverse methodologies (i.e. experimental and non-experimental research) and has the potential to play a greater role in evidence-based practice for nursing” Whittemore & Knafl, 2005, p. 547).

• “The Integrative Review: Updated Methodology” (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005)
  • Cited 2157 times in Scopus (2172 counting self-citations)

• Gold standard.
Proliferation of IRs in Nursing Education

• Search of Medline and Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL):
  • "integrative review“ in article title AND
  • Nursing education journals in Nurse Educator “Nursing Education Journal Resource” table (Pagel, 2015).

• 134 records 1999 to present (2-21-20):
  • 1999-2010: 7
  • 2011-2015: 32
  • 2016-present: 95 (71%)
## Nursing Education Journals Publishing IRs Since 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>IRs Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Education In Practice</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Education Today</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Educator</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Education Perspectives</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The ABNF Journal:</strong> Official Journal of The Association of Black Nursing Faculty In Higher Education, Inc.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Journal of Nursing Education</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal For Nurses In Professional Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and Learning In Nursing</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criticisms and Counterarguments

• Criticism (Melnyk & Fineout-Overholt):
  • Prone to bias
  • Lack of rigor and appraisal criteria
  • No summary statistic

• Counterarguments (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005; Toronto, 2020):
  • Make large volume of knowledge accessible and useful
  • Help identify what is and is not known
  • Indicate strengths of evidence
  • Inform theory, practice, policy
Critical Review of IRs

Ample guidance for systematic, rigorous conduct

- (e.g., Hopia et al., 2016; Mendes et al., 2010; Russell, 2005; Soares et al., 2014; Toronto & Remington, 2020; Whittemore & Knafl, 2005)

Critical scrutiny necessary.
Types of Critical Review of IRs

- Peer Review of IR Manuscript
- IR Critique Criteria
- Critique of IR Journal Article
Criteria for Critiquing IRs

- No standard criteria.
- Established critical appraisal tools for systematic reviews could be adapted:
  - Critical Appraisal Skills Program (CASP): [https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/](https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/)
A Synthesis of IR Theory & Synthesis Review Criteria

- JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Systematic Reviews
- Proposed Criteria for IR Review
- Whittemore & Knafl (2005)
- Toronto & Remington (2020)
- Melnyk & Fineout-Overholt (2019)

Rapid Critical Appraisal tools for Reviews

Whittemore & Knafl
(2005)
Toronto & Remington
(2020)
Problem and Purpose of IR

• Is the problem clearly specified?
• Is a PICOT or review question stated?
• Is the purpose of the review clearly specified?
Examples: Purpose of Review

This review will examine, critique, and synthesize the literature on instruments to measure healthcare providers’ self-efficacy in neonatal resuscitation training programs that include neonatal resuscitation in HIC and LMIC. The results serve as the basis for using or adapting an existing validated scale for new programs to train community-based midwives and traditional birth attendants in LMIC.

(Mendhi et al., 2020, p.2)

The problem of TA is not new in nursing education, as demonstrated by a substantial volume of literature spanning more than 50 years. However, despite this long history of scholarship, there have been to date no comprehensive, systematic syntheses of peer-reviewed literature specifically about interventions for TA in nursing students. This article reports on an integrative review to identify and evaluate interventions for TA in nursing students.

(Brodersen, 2017, p. 131)
• Was appropriate review framework used?
• Possibilities:
  • Integrative Review Methodology (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005)
  • A Step By Step Guide to Conducting an Integrative Review (Toronto & Remington, 2020)
  • Frameworks oriented to metanalytic and systematic reviews.
Metanalytic and Systematic Review Frameworks

- Matrix Method (Garrard, 2017)
- Cochrane handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions
  https://training.cochrane.org/handbook
- Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Reviewers Manual:
  https://joannabriggs.org/ebp
- Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA):
  http://www.prisma-statement.org/
- Institute of Medicine (IOM) Standards for Systematic Reviews: Finding What Works:
Examples: Frameworks Used to Conduct IR

This integrative review followed the Matrix Method (Garrard, 2017), beginning with a comprehensive search of the literature on interventions for TA in nursing students. The following terms were used in

(Brodersen, 2017, p. 131)

Whittemore’s and Knafl’s (2005) five-step integrative review method (e.g., problem identification, literature search, data evaluation, data analysis, and presentation) was used to critically analyze and synthesize the literature regarding military students because it allowed for the incorporation of various methodologies.

(Cox et al., 2019, p. 392)
Search for Literature (1)

- Were inclusion and exclusion criteria specified?
- Did a health sciences librarian assist with the search strategy?
- Was the search strategy described (key words, subject headings)?
- Does the search reflect the review question and purpose?
- Were appropriate databases searched?
- Were other search methods used (e.g., reference lists, table of contents)?
Examples of Search Strategy Descriptions

A survey of the CINAHL, Web of Science, PubMed, and PsychINFO databases was undertaken using the search terms of “undergraduate nursing students” AND “empath*” with the limits of English language and publication date of 2008 – current. Included articles described an

(Engbers, 2020, p. 2)

tions for TA in nursing students. The following terms were used in combination with nursing and student to search multiple electronic databases: anticipatory, exam, examination, performance, or test, and anxiety or stress. These terms were used to search the Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), MEDLine, PsychInfo, PsycARTICLES, and SciVerse Scopus.

(Brodersen, 2017, p. 131)
Examples if Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

Articles were included for review if they were (a) narrative reports, (b) written in English, (c) published in peer reviewed journals, (d) focused on the implementation of pediatric practicum in school settings, including Head Start, primary or elementary, and middle or high-school, and (e) discussed evaluation of the pedagogical strategy.

(Schultz et al., 2019, p. 3)

Publications were excluded if they featured interventions for licensure examination testing, did not include undergraduate nursing students, were not written in English, were not published in peer-reviewed journals, or were available only in abstract form. Studies or projects involving simulation or clinical skills testing were also excluded. It was intended that this review represent all interventions.

(Brodersen, 2017, p. 132)
Example: Description of Other Search Methods

Literature searches were conducted in three electronic databases: Cumulative Indexes to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), PubMed, and Web of Science. MeSH terms included schools, elementary; education, clinical; and nursing, student. Scholarly articles were also retrieved from references in key publications that met the inclusion criteria. No restriction was placed on date of publication.

(Schultz et al., 2019, p. 3)

or geographic locations of studies or projects. Reference lists of publications meeting the inclusion criteria were searched to identify additional publications.

Brodersen, 2017, p. 131)
• Does it appear that all relevant literature was included in the review?
• Is there evidence of publication bias?
• Was a publication selection diagram (e.g., PRISMA diagram) included?
• Is the diagram numerically accurate and consistent with the narrative?
Example of study Selection
(Brodersen, 2017)

Figure 1. Publication selection process
Data Extraction

• How was data collected from the sources?
• Was the data extraction method described (e.g., use of worksheet or form)?
• Did more than one person extract data from sources to control data extraction errors?
Example of Data Extraction

Data relevant to the purpose of this review including the aim, definition of empathy utilized for the study, sample, intervention description, and methods of data collection and analysis were extracted from each study (Garrard, 2017). Additionally, key concepts, ideas, student quotes, and summarized phrases were abstracted from the results section of each study. Through a method of constant comparison.

(Engbers, 2020, p. 2)
Data Evaluation

• Was the data evaluation procedure described?
• Were data displayed in an evaluation table/matrix?
• Were appropriate critical appraisal methods described for qualitative, quantitative, and non-research evidence?
• Were sources critically appraised by more than one individual?
Tools for Appraising Research Evidence

- All have checklists for critically appraising qualitative and various quantitative studies (e.g., controlled trials, case-control, cohort, etc.)
  - *Critical Appraisal Skills Program (CASP): [https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/](https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/)

- *Checklists appear to be publicly available. ** Requires copyright permission form.
Strategies for Appraising Non-Research Evidence

• Theory: Walker and Avant’s procedure (as cited in Remington, 2020)

• JBI Checklist for Text and Opinion: https://joannabriggs.org/ebp/critical_appraisal_tools

Examples: Data Evaluation (1)

The authors used a published qualitative and quantitative guideline to appraise the methodological quality of the studies. This 9-item instrument rates the title and abstract, introduction and aims, methods and data collection, sampling, data analysis, ethics and bias, results, transferability or generalizability, and implications and usefulness. Each item was rated on a scale of 1 (very poor) to 4 (good), with totals ranging from 9 to 36. No studies were excluded based on the level of methodological rigor.

(Foster et al., 2019, p. E8)
Examples: Data Evaluation (2)

To evaluate the level of evidence of the reviewed studies, we applied the 2011 Oxford Center for Evidence Based Medicine Levels of Evidence criteria (Howick et al., 2011). The Levels of Evidence range from 1 to 5 based on whether the study was a systematic review, randomized controlled trial, cohort study, case study, or other forms of empirical reasoning, respectively. All the instruments were part of a cohort study

(Mendhi et al., 2020, p. 3)

This review was limited to reports published in peer-reviewed journals, excluding dissertations and other types of gray literature; therefore, it is subject to publication bias. It was also limited to studies and projects

(Brodersen, 2017, p. 136)
Data Analysis and Synthesis

• What methods were used to synthesis data (e.g., narrative, synthesis tables)?

• Was the evidence from all sources synthesized, or was a source-by-source synopsis of the evidence provided?

• Did conclusions stem from synthesis of findings?

• Were recommendations for nursing education and research stated?

• Are recommendations warranted by the findings?

• Are methodological limitations acknowledged?
Examples: Analysis & Synthesis

Table 2: Effect of Intratreat and Peritreat Interventions on Measures of Test Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intratreat interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative testing, G</td>
<td>5 DS (Duane &amp; Satre, 2014; Ligeikis-Clayton, 1996; Parsons &amp; Teel, 2013; Phillips, 1988; Rossignol, 2004)</td>
<td>1 DS (Hickey, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 QES\textsuperscript{a} (Durrant et al., 1985; Lusk &amp; Conklin, 2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis was accomplished by summarizing the data in a matrix table. TeamSTEPPS concepts were identified in the studies to describe how simulation is being used to teach teamwork skills to nursing students.

(Brodersen, 2017, p. 133).

(Foster et al., 2019, p. E8)
Examples: Implications

music and aromas. Furthermore, given the well-established relationship between TA and academic performance (Chapell et al., 2005; Duty et al., 2016; Hembree, 1988; Khalaila, 2015), future studies need to examine the effect of interventions on academic performance as well as TA.

(Brodersen, 2017, p. 136)

A nursing faculty that becomes familiar with the uniqueness of this student population and proactively recognizes when they are challenged is a faculty who will best serve other students who may need to tap into resources before it is too late to academically succeed.

(Cox et al., 2019, p. 398)
Critical Review of IR Manuscript

Peer Review of IR Manuscript

IR Critique Criteria

Critique of IR Journal Article
Specific Aims of Manuscript Peer Review

- Provide feedback to journal editor—readiness for publication.
- Provide feedback to author—strategies to improve manuscript.
  (Hill, 2016; Medicine®, n.d.)

- Engaging in scholarship—Core Competency for nurse educators
  (Patterson & McLaughlin, 2019).
- Peer review = scholarship and professional service.
Preparation

• Prepare workspace.
• Paperless approach
  • Multiple monitors displaying
    • .doc for draft
    • Manuscript
• Paper approach
  • Printed manuscript
  • Scratch paper
  • Pen/pencil, highlighters
Manuscript Review Process

1. Read it
2. Do a quick search
3. Draft preliminary comments
4. Read it again
5. Write detailed feedback
6. Apply IR critique criteria
7. Finish general comments
8. Compile comments/feedback
9. Submit review
Read It

• Purpose: Become familiar with content and structure.
• Read sequentially—title to references.
• Highlight and/or mark
  • unclear statements
  • possible methodological issues
• Resist urge to comment, edit.
Do a Quick Search

- Do a quick search of the literature (e.g., in editorial management system).

- Purpose:
  - Check for originality.
  - Check for similar or related work that should be cited.

(Allen & Ho, 2017; Wiley, n.d.)
### Pending Reviewer Assignments for Lisa Doreen Brodersen, Ed.D, Ph.D

**Page: 1 of 1 (1 total assignments)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>My Reviewer Number</th>
<th>Manuscript Number</th>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Status Date</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Date Rev Inv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similar Articles in MEDLINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Reviewer Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Decision Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft
Preliminary
Comments

• Understanding of nursing education problem and purpose of IR.

• Value of IR findings to nursing education practice:
  • Interesting, original, unique, important?
  • Sound IR methodology?
  • Conclusions reflect findings?

• Initial impressions of writing quality and structure of manuscript.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Line</th>
<th>General Comments to Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of understanding</td>
<td>Briefly summarize your understanding of the problem, purpose, methodology, results, and conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>Is the work unique, or does it replicate previous work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Comment on your initial impressions about the value of the work to nursing education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Preliminary General Comments (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Line</th>
<th>General Comments to Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of IR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Extraction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis, Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures and Tables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Comment on your initial impressions of writing quality and structure of manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Work sequentially through each section, line-by-line.
• Study figures and tables.
• Note substantive issues related to any aspect of the review.
• Compile comments in a spreadsheet or .doc.
• Alternately, annotate manuscript, then transfer comments to spreadsheet or .doc.
## Detailed Feedback (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Line #</th>
<th>Detailed Feedback to Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantive Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 3, line 80</td>
<td>It is reported that &quot;148 studies were screened by the two reviewers.&quot; This statement conflicts with the PRISMA diagram, which indicates that 150 full text articles were assessed for eligibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 3, line 83</td>
<td>It is reported that 29 publications were selected for review. This number is consistent with the publications summarized in the review matrix, but the PRISMA diagram indicates there were 28 publications selected for the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 5, line 143</td>
<td>One of your conclusions is that &quot;collaborative testing is an effective intervention for promoting long-term retention of learning.&quot; Do you think this conclusion is warranted by the findings of the review? From what I can tell, based on the review matrix and evidence synthesis table, collaborative testing is an effective strategy for mitigating test-related anxiety, but long-term retention was not an outcome that was evaluated in any of the studies included in the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Line #</td>
<td>Detailed Feedback to Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editorial Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 2, lines 6, 10</td>
<td>Series of items are presented without a comma prior to the conjunction that precedes the last item in the series. This issue appears in other series throughout the manuscript. To meet APA editorial style requirements, include a comma after the second to last item in the series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 4, line 120</td>
<td>Seven authors are cited. Three or more authors are cited in various places throughout the manuscript. When citing a source with two or more authors, APA guidelines permit the use of first author followed by et al.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Apply Critique Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Line</th>
<th>General Comments to Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of IR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Extraction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis, Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment on remaining aspects of manuscript.
Revise preliminary comments to reflect new understanding of manuscript.
## General Comments to Author (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Line</th>
<th>General Comments to Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>Express appreciation for the reviewers' work and opportunity to read it. Identify strengths of the manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of understanding</td>
<td>Briefly summarize your understanding of the problem, purpose, methodology, results, and conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>Is the work unique, or does it replicate previous work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Comment on your conclusions about the value of the work to nursing education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Is the title succinct? Does it directly reflect the work reported in the manuscript?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key words</td>
<td>Do the key words accurately represent the major concepts in the manuscript?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Is the abstract an accurate synopsis of the work reported in the manuscript?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Comments to Author(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Line</th>
<th>General Comments to Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Introduction</td>
<td>[Comments based on IR review criteria]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of IR</td>
<td>[Comments based on IR review criteria]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR Framework</td>
<td>[Comments based on IR review criteria]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Strategy</td>
<td>[Comments based on IR review criteria]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Extraction</td>
<td>[Comments based on IR review criteria]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Evaluation</td>
<td>[Comments based on IR review criteria]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis, Synthesis</td>
<td>[Comments based on IR review criteria]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures and Tables</td>
<td>Are the figures and tables easy to read and interpret? Do they supplement the narrative without duplicating it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Comment on the quality of the writing. If revision is needed to improve writing and/or to address mechanical errors, politely direct the authors to a few examples provided after the line-by-line comments about substantive issues that need to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Feedback</td>
<td>Refer authors to detailed, line-by-line comments following the general comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compile
General and
Detailed
Feedback

• Compile in .doc.
• Convert from table to text.
• Run spell check.
• Remove residual table formatting.
• Copy and paste into editorial management system.
• Include comments to editor as needed.
Reviewer Comments to Author

Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor

(1) Answer yes or no for each of the questions below:

Do you have a conflict of interest in reviewing this paper?
Yes______  No______

Do you perceive a conflict of interest for the authors within the paper? Yes______  No______

Do you agree to hold its contents confidential?
Yes______  No______
Critical Review of IR Journal Article

- Peer Review of IR Manuscript
- IR Critique Criteria
- Critique of IR Journal Article
Critique of Published IR

• Critique of IR that has undergone peer review.
• Same process as peer review of IR manuscript.
• Possible journal club activity.
• Consider publishing critique.
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