PEN® CONTENT REVIEW GUIDELINES
(Practice-Based Evidence in Nutrition)

Thank you for your interest in being a Reviewer for the PEN® System. This document describes the PEN Content review process and a checklist to facilitate the review assignment.

Who can review PEN content?
The PEN System looks for individuals with expertise (academic and/or applied) on a wide range of topic areas related to nutrition practice. This may include:
- Researchers who are actively researching a topic area
- Practitioners with work experience in specific nutrition practice areas, settings and client populations
- Masters or doctorate students who are researching a topic area
- Dietetic learners (students)/interns/stagiaire working in the practice area*

* Dietetic learners (students)/interns/stagiaire can act as reviewers with support from a supervisor who oversees the review assignment and discusses the overall review recommendation.

We aim to support a comprehensive review process that includes academic and practice-based perspectives. We also seek reviewers globally, predominantly from Australia, Canada and the UK.

What PEN content is reviewed?
A. Practice question(s) as part of a Knowledge Pathway update
B. Background

Learn more about PEN Terminology and Features here.

Your assignment invitation will identify whether the PEN content you are being asked to review is new to the PEN System or recently updated material.

Reviewers are required to read the Declaration of Affiliations and Interests and declare any conflicts of interest by completing an online form in the PEN Content Management System (PCMS) when they submit their review. For any questions about perceived conflict, please get in touch with your assignment PEN Responsible Administrator.

How is PEN content developed?
PEN Evidence Analysts search relevant literature using a hierarchal approach to ensure the best quality of evidence is found. Where possible, content is based on systematic reviews. They then critically appraise the content to develop recommendations for practice.

How do I accept a review invitation?
You will be sent an email invite to complete the review from the PEN Content Management System (PCMS). Follow the instructions in the email to accept the review assignment. Communication of the review assignment tasks, including accessing the content ready for review and providing the review recommendation, is completed through the PCMS. For detailed instructions on how to use the PCMS, consult the PCMS Guide.

Overview of PEN review process:
Your primary task is to determine the acceptability of the PEN content (i.e., your assignment) based on the criteria outlined in the table below. You are providing feedback to the author(s) for the purpose of improving the quality of PEN content and its usefulness to practitioners.

The review should focus on:	The review should not focus on:
- Quality of evidence - Accuracy of synthesis - Clarity of content - Relevance for practice (including the country in which practice recommendation will be applied) - Recommended tools and resources - Highlight any relevant guideline or research that haven't been included	- Spelling (Canadian database) - Grammar - Referencing style

- The most straightforward way to provide feedback to the author is to use Track Changes in the MS Word document containing the PEN System content that you have been invited to review. Use the appropriate checklist as a guide in providing feedback to the author.

- Reviewers must respect Dietitians of Canada's ownership of PEN System content and authors' rights by not making copies of the PEN documentation or sharing it with others, except with the permission of the PEN Responsible Administrator.

- On the Reviewer's Feedback Form (RFF), permission is requested to add your name as a contributor to the PEN content reviewed. If you do not wish to be listed, you may omit to check this criterion.

Additional notes:
- The reviewer is not anonymous to the author(s), unless you indicate otherwise. The review contains your constructive feedback and questions directed to the author(s), which go directly to them without editing. Be as clear and concise as possible since these comments form the basis for their revision.

- Contact your Responsible Administrator if you need access to related PEN content to support the review assignment.

- The author of the content may respond to your reviewer feedback, as appropriate.

QUESTIONS?
Respond to your Responsible Administrator through the PCMS or contact your country-specific administrator:
> **Canada** - Dietitians of Canada - coordinator@pennutrition.com
> **United Kingdom** - British Dietetic Association - consultation@bda.uk.com
> **Australia** - Dietitians Australia - penadmin@dietitiansaustralia.org.au

A. REVIEWING PRACTICE QUESTION(S):
Practice questions are generally formulated using the PICO approach (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome). Practice Questions reflect the everyday practice situations dietitians face, organized by subcategories: Assessment, Diagnosis, Intervention, Monitoring, Evaluation (ADIME) and Other. A collection of practice questions form the Knowledge Pathway about a topic. Learn more about our PEN terminology.

1. **Practice Question**
   - ☐ Is the *practice question* clear, identifying the population, intervention and outcome?

2. **Key Practice Point(s)**
   - ☐ Is the *Recommendation* succinct?
       - i. The Recommendation should be straightforward, practice-based and reflects the evidence.
   - ☐ Is the *Evidence Summary* practical and relevant for the country you are representing in your review?
       - i. The Evidence Summary should provide a good overall summary, capturing information from all of the evidence statements.
   - ☐ Is the *Grade of Evidence* appropriate?
       - i. The Grade of Evidence should reflect the criteria in the PEN Evidence Grading Checklist.
   - ☐ Do the *Remarks* (if applicable) add value?
       - i. The Remarks should contain relevant information that is needed to support the Recommendation. Remarks would be most useful and relevant to a client.

3. **Evidence Statements**
   - ☐ Do the *Evidence Statements* for each article contain pertinent details (e.g., sample size, sample description, statistical evidence)?
       - i. The Evidence Statements should be made from the best available evidence. This is the most relevant, high-quality reviews/studies and guidelines that answer the question and focus on important outcomes, e.g., high-quality systematic reviews or the high-quality/impactful primary research that affects practice recommendations.
       - ii. The Search Strategy is complete with no missing information.
   - ☐ Are the *Evidence Statements* fully captured in the *Evidence Summary*?

4. **Related Practice Questions**
   - ☐ Are the included related practice questions relevant to the practice questions/topic (as applicable)? *NB You do not need to suggest any additional practice questions.

5. **References**
   - ☐ Are the references appropriate in scope in that they are accurate, verifiable, and peer reviewed from an authoritative source, including practice guidelines when appropriate?
   - ☐ Are the references included in the reference list cited in the content?

6. Tools/Resources (T/Rs) and Keywords

☐   Are the T/Rs consistent with the evidence you've just reviewed?

☐   To the best of your knowledge, are the T/Rs the very best available?   These may be client or professional focused and may include tools that our international partners have identified.

☐   Do you have any additional suggestions of existing non-PEN System developed resources that should be included? Refer to the PEN Guidelines for Third Party Tools for guidance. (NB: As a reviewer, you are not responsible for identifying all related T/Rs within the related content area you are reviewing).

☐   Are the suggested keywords inclusive of all relevant terms related to the knowledge pathway and practice questions?

After completing your review, please log into the PCMS and complete the **Reviewer's Feedback Form (RFF).** In the RFF, you will be asked to provide your Recommendation (Accept; Accept Minor Revisions; Accept Major Revisions or Reject). You are also able to provide additional comments as needed.

B. REVIEWING A BACKGROUND

Backgrounds provide general knowledge information about a topic that will be useful in making evidence-informed decision making in practice. Backgrounds are usually one aspect of a knowledge pathway, but sometimes it is the only aspect until practice questions are added.

1. **Accuracy and Completion**
   - ☐ Does the Background information adequately address clinical and non-clinical background subheadings, including Importance of Topic to Practice?

2. **Additional content**
   - ☐ Is additional content, including other links to background information, included as appropriate?
   - ☐ Are the external links to the Background information congruent with the information in PEN (must not contain any advertising or sponsorship)?

3. **References**
   - ☐ Are the references appropriate in scope in that they are accurate, verifiable, and peer reviewed from an authoritative source, including practice guidelines when appropriate?
   - ☐ Are the references included in the reference list cited in the content?

4. **Tools/Resources (T/R) and Keywords**
   - ☐ Are the T/Rs consistent with the evidence you've just reviewed?
   - ☐ To the best of your knowledge, are the T/Rs the very best available?   These may be client or professional focused and may include tools that our international partners have identified.
   - ☐ Do you have any additional suggestions of existing non-PEN System developed resources that should be included? Refer to the PEN Guidelines for Third Party Tools for guidance.
     (NB: As a reviewer, you are not responsible for identifying all related T/Rs within the related content area you are reviewing).
   - ☐ Are the suggested keywords inclusive of all relevant terms related to the knowledge pathway and practice questions?

After completing your review, please log into the PCMS and complete the **Reviewer's Feedback Form (RFF)**. In the RFF, you will be asked to provide your Recommendation (Accept; Accept Minor Revisions; Accept Major Revisions or Reject). You are also able to provide additional comments as needed.