PEN® Practice-based Evidence *in Nutrition*





Guide to Being a PEN[®] Reviewer



What PEN® Knowledge Objects Get Reviewed

- Knowledge pathways all aspects
- Practice questions updated and new
- Background documents
- Tools and resources
- Toolkits
- Trending Topics







Who Can Review

- Expert in the topic area
- PEN users of the content
- Ideally we have a variety of reviewers: academic and practitioners
- With the supervisor's support master or doctorate student





General Reviewing Guidelines

• Focus on

- Currency of evidence
- Completeness of evidence
- Accuracy of synthesis
- Clarity of content
- Relevancy for practice
- Relevancy for partner country
- Tools and resources

Do not focus on

- Spelling (Canadian database)
- grammar











Reviewing Practice Questions

- Is the right question asked?
- Is the evidence synthesis succinct?
- Is the practice guidance practical and relevant for your country?
- Do evidence statements contain appropriate details?
- Is the Grade of Evidence appropriate?



Reviewing Practice Questions

- Are all of the highest quality references / studies / guidelines included?
- Does the Rationale (if applicable) provide useful information on the proposed or known mechanisms of action, reasoning behind research hypotheses and explanations for theories?
- Does the Comment section (if applicable) contain relevant information that does not belong in the evidence statements but Is needed to support the KPP







Giving Evidence a Grade

Grade (A):

The conclusion is supported by good evidence. Results are from good quality relevant RCTs with consistent findings or a systematic review of same



Grade (B):

The conclusion is supported by fair evidence. Results are from studies with minor methodology concerns, or with weaker designs, or with differing results

Grade (C):

The conclusion is supported by limited evidence or expert opinion.

The results are from studies of weak design for answering the practice question or there is substantial uncertainty attached to the conclusion because of inconsistencies among the results from different studies

Grade (D):

A conclusion is either not possible or extremely limited because evidence is unavailable and/or of poor quality and/or is contradictory.

The results are from a single study with major design flaws or from studies with such contradictory results that conclusions can't be drawn. Alternatively, evidence is lacking from either authoritative sources or research involving humans





Reviewing Evidence Checklist

If you are not familiar with the PEN[®] grading system please refer to the:

PEN[®] Evidence Grading Checklist

on the **PEN®** Authors and Reviewers Resources page on the PEN[®] website:

PEN® Authors Tools

PEN Evidence Grading Checklist

https://www.pennutrition.com/authorsreviewersreso urces.aspx

Reviewing Background documents

• Backgrounds:

 provide general knowledge information about a topic that will be useful to a new practitioner or will serve as a refresher for more experienced professionals.

- are usually one aspect of a knowledge pathway, but sometimes it is the only aspect until there are practice questions added.
- Reviewers can recommend an external link to background information if it is deemed a comprehensive overview of the topic, is congruent with the information in PEN and does not contain any advertising or sponsorship. An example would be the Merck Manual.





Reviewing Toolkits



- Practice Guidance Toolkits
 - are based on the information found in the practice questions and occasionally the Background document
 - written after the practice questions and the Background have been reviewed
 - are only for nutrition care process or 'clinical' topic areas.
- All aspects can be reviewed, but in particular:
 - the PES (problem, etiology, signs and symptoms) statement(s) in the Nutrition Diagnosis section
 - goals in the Nutrition Intervention section

Reviewing Tools and Resources

Related tools and resources can be for clients and/or professionals. Each knowledge pathway contains a Related Tools and Resources section which can be sorted by Audience, Country and Language.

What to review:

- Are the tools listed correct for your country?
- Are there any missing (country-specific or international)?
 - If yes, recommend ones that:
 - match the PEN evidence
 - apply health literacy principles
 - are free from sponsorship; not commercial
- Use in your review: <u>PEN® Guidelines for Third Party Tools & Resources</u> <u>Approval</u>







Reviewing Trending Topics

- Does the Trending Topic piece read well?
- Any there key points missing from the supportive evidence?
- If applicable is the "bottom line" practice section practical enough?
- Any other aspects you would like to see addressed?

https://www.pennutrition.com/TrendingTopics.a spx

Reviewers Process



- Indicate your interest in being a PEN reviewer by completing the form at: <u>http://www.pennutrition.com/BecomeAuthor.aspx</u>
- You will be sent an email invite from our PEN Content Management System (PCMS). Accept the assignment by clicking on the link in the email invite which takes you to the PCMS to respond.
- The WORD document with content to review will be uploaded to the assignment you have accepted in the PCMS.
- Use Track Changes in the WORD to provide feedback in comment boxes.
- Save and upload the WORD document to the PCMS.
- You will be asked to complete PEN Reviewer's Feedback form in the PCMS.
- Author or PEN Editor may need to discuss your feedback and may get in touch with you
- You will receive acknowledgment of your contribution once content posted in PEN.





Reviewers Forms – completed online in the PCMS

Reviewer's Feedback Form

DC PEN: Practice-based Evidence in Nutrition® REVIEWER'S REPORT TO PEN® PATHWAY COORDINATOR

eviewer's Name:	Due Date:
ecommendations for this Knowledge Accept as is	Pathway / Key Practice Question:
Accept with minor revision (Unles revisions for further review.)	s notified otherwise by you, we will not circulate minor
Accept with major revision (e.g. a	major re-approach to analysis or new data incorporated
Reject	

Declaration of Affiliation and Interests

Name:		
the atta	ached <i>Affiliations and Interests Check</i> a and immediate family members in so	bese of recent years, particularly as they relate list. I have also considered the activities of my of ar as they could be viewed to affect my
l bring	the following to the attention of the PI	EN: Practice-based Evidence in Nutrition® tea

I hereby certify that I am not in a position of real, potential or apparent conflict of interest except as disclosed above.

Transparency is important

The PEN[®] System values transparency at all stages of content development.

There is no commercial sponsorship on the PEN[®] website.

Conflict of interest statements are available for all PEN reviewers and authors.





Conflict of Interest

Affiliations and Interests Checklist

- In reviewing your activities (and those of your spouse and immediate family members) to determine whether they affect your impartiality or create a real, potential or apparent conflict of interest, among other things, consider the following:
- Investments in a business enterprise (Other than mutual funds or Registered Savings Plans)
- Retirement Savings Plans that are not self-directed);
- Participation as investigator in clinical trials of relevance to the knowledge pathway;
- Previous, present and potential Contracts, Grants and/or Contributions;
- Pending negotiations regarding potential contracts;
- Honoraria and other sources of personal income;
- Gifts and hospitality of significant value;
- Travel sponsorship;
- Promotion of a product(s) of relevance to the knowledge pathway;
- Publications, Public statements, Lobbying activities;
- Membership in special interest groups;
- Expert testimonies in court;
- Any interest or activity, which may create a reasonable apprehension of bias.



Benefits of Being a Reviewer

- Enhance your critical appraisal skills
- Be recognized and listed as a pathway contributor for your contribution to an internationally recognized database
- Be part of an international review process
- Add to your professional continuing education dossier; you may print out a letter of contribution from your Profile in the PCMS





Thank you for reviewing this guide



If you have any questions contact:

DAA: Emily Sunderland - penadmin@daa.asn.au

BDA: Eleanor Johnstone -<u>e.johnstone@bda.uk.com</u>

DC: Beth Armour <u>beth.armour@dietitians.ca</u>

Ready to be a Reviewer?

- If you have been invited to be a PEN[®] reviewer then respond to the invitation by clicking on the link in the email invitation you received.
- If you want to submit your name for consideration as a PEN[®] reviewer please go to the PEN[®] website: Become and Author or Reviewer:

http://www.pennutrition.com/BecomeAutho r.aspx



Reminders...

- 1. Sign up for PEN eNews its free!
- 2. Follow us on social media



Sign up for PEN eNews





Conference Controversial Topics Counseling Credibility Dietetic Education Dietetic Practice Dietitians Diversity Evidence Literacy Evidence Quality Food Food Policies Gluten-free Health Literacy Internationa Microbiome Myth Busting Networking Nutrigenomic: Nutrition Labelling Nutrition Science Opinions Organic Paleo Diet Peer review PEN Achievements PEN Applied PEN Features PEN Partners PEN Skills PEN Uses Profile Help Pseudoscience Public Health References Social Media Students Sugar Thought Leadership Tools

Come be social with PEN



pennutrition PENNutrition PEN Nutrition @pennutrition

