

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

| | |
|----------|--|
| Title | STORIES Statement: publication standards for healthcare education evidence synthesis |
| Type | Article |
| URL | https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/id/eprint/12077/ |
| DOI | https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-014-0143-0 |
| Date | 2014 |
| Citation | Gordon, Morris and Gibbs, Trevor (2014) STORIES Statement: publication standards for healthcare education evidence synthesis. BMC Medicine, 12 (143). ISSN 1741-7015 |
| Creators | Gordon, Morris and Gibbs, Trevor |

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-014-0143-0>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

| Checklist item | | Page/section and comments |
|---------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Title | | |
| 1 | Use a title that includes a description of the aims of the piece (educational effectiveness, descriptive, etc) and method of evidence synthesis (e.g. realist, meta-ethnographic, etc) | |
| Abstract | | |
| 2 | Provide a structured summary | |
| Introduction | | |
| 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known | |
| 4 | Provide a statement of the questions being addressed by the study | |
| 5 | State why this method of evidence synthesis was selected within the context of the questions being asked | |
| Methods | | |
| 6 | State and provide a rationale for how the searching was done | |
| 7 | Provide details on all the sources of information and dates searched | |
| 8 | Electronic databases - provide full search terms for at least one database, with details of deviations in subsequent searches | |
| 9 | Describe the process of data extraction and any process of contacting authors for confirmation of / or more data | |
| 10 | Explain the method for judging inclusion / exclusion | |
| 11 | If quality appraisal tools are used, please describe and justify their choice | |
| 12 | Describe qualitative methods for synthesising primary evidence (where appropriate) and the goal of these methods, such as thematic analysis; meta-ethnography, and realist synthesis | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| 13 | Describe quantitative methods for synthesising primary evidence (where appropriate), such as meta-analysis and how issues of heterogeneity will be considered | |
| Results | | |
| 14 | Give a flow diagram summarising study selection | |
| 15 | If individuals familiar with the relevant literature and/or topic area were contacted, provide a summary of the contact and information obtained | |
| 16 | Provide summarised details of included works, considering elements such as methodology, key results and conclusions | |
| 17 | Describe methods of quality assessment of education reported, including all parameters considered (e.g. Details of study theoretical underpinning, pedagogical strategies and details of teaching activities to allow replication or dissemination) | |
| 18 | Describe quality assessment of the research methods of included studies | |
| 19 | Present the results of qualitative and/or quantitative evidence synthesis | |
| Discussion | | |
| 20 | Present the main findings in light of the review objectives | |
| 21 | Discuss strengths and limitations of the review and its findings, commenting on the strength of the evidence | |
| 22 | Discuss how the findings of the evidence synthesis impact future primary research | |
| 23 | Describe possible implications of the findings for educators | |
| Other | | |
| 24 | Provide details of funding | |
| 25 | Describe the skills and expertise of the review team and acknowledge any outside help | |

Key reference works

- Bearman, M. and Dawson, P. Qualitative synthesis and systematic review in health professions education. *Medical Education*, 2013; 47: 252–260.
- Greenhalgh T, Peacock R. Effectiveness and efficiency of search methods in systematic reviews of complex evidence: audit of primary sources. *BMJ* 2005;331:1064–5
- Hammick M, Dornan T, Steinert Y. Conducting a best evidence systematic review. Part 1: From idea to data coding. *BEME Guide No. 13. Medical Teacher*, 2010; 32:3-15

Other supporting reference works

- Boland A, Cherry MG, Dickson R. *Doing a systematic review: a student's guide*. Sage, 2013.
- Booth A, Papioannou D, Sutton A. *Systematic Approaches to a Successful Literature Review*. Sage, 2012.
- Brown PA, Harniss MK, Schomer KG, Feinberg M, Cullen NK, Johnson KL. Conducting systematic evidence reviews: core concepts and lessons learned. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2012; 93:S177-84.
- Cook DA, West CP. Conducting systematic reviews in medical education: a stepwise approach. *Med Educ*. 2012 Oct;46(10):943-52
- Cook DA. Narrowing the focus and broadening horizons: complementary roles for systematic and nonsystematic reviews. *Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract*. 2008 Nov;13(4):391-5.
- Crowther MA, Cook DJ. Trials and Tribulations of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses. *Hematology* 2007; 493-7.
- Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*. 2009; 339:b2700.
- Wells G, Shea B, O'connell J, Robertson J, Peterson J, Welch V, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analysis. 3rd Symposium on Systematic Reviews: Beyond the Basics, July 3–5; Oxford; 2000.
- Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, Pawson R. Realist methods in medical education research: what are they and what can they contribute? *Medical Education*. 2012; 46:89–96.